Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- ☐ Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- ☑ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

- ☐ Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☑ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/ Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☑ Pages detached / pages détachées
- ☑ Showthrough / Transarence
- ☑ Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Includes supplementary materials Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- ☐ Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- ☐ Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible.

Pagination is as follows: p. [1], [2529]-4940, [i]-c.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

FOURTH SESSION — SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

53° VICTORIÆ, 1890.

VOL. XXX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF MAY, INCLUSIVE, 1890.

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY BROWN CHAMBERLIN, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

1890.

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of the reports of the Committee on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended until Thursday, 17th April next.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1890; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 26th March, 1890.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in rising to-day to present my second annual statement to the House respecting the financial operations of the completed year 1888-89, of the current year and my estimates for the year succeeding, I think I may congratulate the House and the country upon the satisfactory nature of one and all of these three. I think I may also congratulate the House and the country upon the results of the past twelve months. They have not disappointed the hopes which were expressed concerning them when I made my annual statement a little more than a year ago. The general state of the business of the country has been reasonably good, and although a deficiency of harvest in some portions, and the unseasonable state of the weather, and the somewhat low prices which ranged for some of the stample articles, have had their depressing effects, on the whole the year has been, as I have stated, a fairly average one. The general trade of the country has kept up, and in fact somewhat exceeded that of the preceding year, and, as a consequence, the returns which were anticipated have been fully, or very nearly fully realised. The railway building during the past year has been vigorous, as will be shown later when I come to speak of the sums which have been taken from the public treasury in the way of payment on construction of railways which have been subsidised, and the volume of traffic which has been moved in our country has been larger than in any preceding year of its history. Ocean freights have continued high, and the vessel owners of the maritime portions of the Dominion have reaped a rich and well-merited reward from the vessels which they have owned, while upon the great lakes and rivers of Canada the tonnage has been well employed and the season has been fairly remunerative. I find that the immigration of this year has been superior in numbers and superior in class to that of many preceding years, and there are indications that that is now taking place, which is to be, I believe, the strongest factor in drawing people into this country; namely, the formation of a nucleus of people in our country, especially in the North-West, who having passed the earliest and severest stages of settlement, and having come into prosperous and settled conditions, are writing home to their friends and spreading information, which is the strongest and best means of drawing immigrants from those far-off countries to our own shores. Not only have those interests of which I have spoken been prosperous, but, I think I may say, from a general review, that the lumber interests have had, on the whole, a satisfactory year. The farmers and the fishermen have probably had not more, if not something less, than an average year; but, taken on the whole, their condition is one of reasonable prosperity, and without the want

and hardship which are found in many countries outside of Canada. While the internal trade and the condition of the country has been thus fairly satisfactory, there has been something done as well towards the realisation of the hopes which have been entertained for a number of years, and which were placed in a permanent way of being fulfilled last year, by means of the generosity of this House, which granted a sum of money towards the establishment of swift communications between Canada and other important sections of the world. Since last year a contract for building the Canadian Pacific vessels which are to ply between Vancouver and Victoria and China and Japan has been let, and within a year we shall see some of the best equipped and swiftest vessels making their regular voyages between our country and those far regions of the East, between which there will spring up, I believe, a very large and a very profitable trade. The Atlantic fast service has not materlised, but the failure has not been due to any fault of the Government. A contract was entered into which it was supposed would have had the result of placing a satisfactory line of steamships on the ocean between our ports and those of Great Britain and France, but various causes which are well known to hon. members—the great rise in prices of ship-building, stimulated as they were by the rise in freights and by the operations of the British Government as well—rendered the fulfilment of that contract impossible, and also made it impracticable, for a little time at least, to go into the market and supplement the effort which had failed to bring about the result we supposed it would. The West India trade, for which a sum of money was granted last year, has been inaugurated, and we have now three direct lines, with monthly sailings, between the ports of the Maritime Provinces and different ports of the West Indies and South America. The two which ply between Halifax, Jamaica and Cuba, respectively, are routes which have been heretofore tried ; the one which plies between the ports of St. John and Demerara, in connection with the West India Islands, is a new venture, and I am happy to be able to state to the House that, notwithstanding the newness of the enterprise, the numerous ports which have to be called at, and the expensive nature of these as ports of call, the pioneer sailings have been eminently successful, and the interest which has been awakened in the West India Islands, and more especially in our own country, leads us to believe that these lines will develope a large and growing trade between our country and that section of the southern country to which we must look largely as an outlet for our products in the future. Taken all in all, we have passed a year in Canada in which want has been practically unknown, in which labor has been well employed, and has found good remuneration, in which peace and order have abounded in all our borders, and out of which the 5,000,000 people, who have enjoyed the blessings of prosperity and peace in their homes look for the advent of other years, the successors of the past, equally prosperous and equally happy. Coming now more particularly to the first part of my duty, which is to lay before the House a statement of the proceedings of the year 1888-89, I may say that the estimates of revenue compare with the receipts as follows :—

REVENUE, 1888-89.

	Estimate.	Actual Receipts.	Difference.
Customs....	$23,533,971 =	$23,726,783 +	$ 192,812
Excise.....	7,068,143 =	6,886,738 -	181,405
Miscellaneous	7,999,180 =	8,169,349 +	170,169
Totals..	$38,601,294 =	$38,782,870 +	$181,576

This is satisfactory, not only as regards the closeness of the estimate to the amount which was realised, but also as regards the sum total which was realised as the revenue of the past year. Comparing 1888-89 with 1887-88, the results are most satisfactory. The Customs show an increase over the preceding year of $1,620,857, or 7⅓ per cent. ; Excise, an increase of $815,252, or 13⅔ per cent. ; and Miscellaneous shows an increase of $438,299, or 5⅔ per cent.—and the total increase was $2,874,-408, or an increase of 8 per cent. over the revenue realised in 1887-88. If we take the revenues derived in 1880-81 and compare them with those of last year, we will find that the increase in Customs and Excise has been 28 per cent., and the increase in Miscellaneous 43½ per cent., and when we consider that this last is made up of investments and earnings, it is satisfactory to find that the larger increase is in that particular line of our revenues. The figures are as follows :—

	Cutsoms and Exercise.	Miscellaneous.	Total.
1880-81.....	$23,942,138	$5,693,158	$29,635,297
1888-89.....	30,613,522	8,169,347	38,782,870
Increase.....	$6,671,384	$2,476,189	$9,147,573
	28 p.c.	43½ p.c.	or 31 p.c.

The following are the principal items from which increased Customs duties were received last year, as compared with the year 1887-88 :—

Animals.....	$ 10,044
Arrowroot, biscuits, &c.....	15,218
Grain of all kinds.....	50,510
Flour and meal.....	106,015
Carriages.....	56,706
Carpets, N. E. S.....	8,426
Coal and coke.....	14,912
Cotton manufactures.....	6,906

Fancy goods	$ 24,332
Flax, hemp, &c.	30,220
Fruits and nuts, dried	5,213
Gutta percha	21,331
Iron and steel	318,739
Leather, manufactures of	14,256
Marble, and manufactures of	3,741
Musical instruments	8,554
Provisions	156,328
Silk	60,369
Soap	6,527
Spirits and wines	191,003
Stone	4,764
Sugar of all kinds	242,390
Molasses	16,831
Sugar candy	7,584
Tobacco	48,853
Wood	46,218
Wool, and manufactures of	162,110

In the following articles there has been a falling off in the duties paid :—

Bricks and tiles	$ 5,030
Coffee	3,665
Drugs	10,233
Embroideries	6,942
Fish	3,778
Fruits	27,765
Furs	5,991
Gloves	13,319
Hats	5,289
Metal	5,280
Oils	16,073
Paints	5,261
Seeds and roots	35,607

When we come to Excise, we find there has been an increase all round, as will be seen by the following table :—

Excise.	1887-88.	1888-89.	Duty.	Increase duty over 1887-88.
Spirits	2,405,716 gals.	2,972,931	$3,873,607	$774,591
Malt	48,640,467 lbs. or 15,944,002 gals.	51,111,429 / 16,363,349	530,949	30,922
Cigars	90,783,558	92,599,820	563,172	9,105
T'b'co Cig'rs &Sn'ff	9,248,033 lbs.	9,749,213	1,840,522	99,980
			$6,808,250	$914,598

It is satisfactory to know that this increase of spirits is not supposed to represent a corresponding increase in their use as a beverage. It is explained by the Inland Revenue Department as being largely due to the duty paid alcohol taking the place of methylated spirits in the preparation of tinctures and liniments and the like. For the information of hon. gentlemen, so that they may not have to refer to the report, I have a statement showing the use per head of spirits, wine, beer and tobacco, comparing 1867 with 1888-89 :

	Spirits. galls.	Beer. galls.	Wine. galls.	Tobacco. lbs.
Average since 1867	1·176	2·633	·143	2·116
do do 1889	·776	3·263	·097	2·153

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what population is the percentage based ?

Mr. FOSTER. On the percentage used by the Customs Department in the calculations of its averages. Turning now to the question of expenditure, it was intimated last year that it would reach $36,600,000 ; the actual expenditure has been $36,917,834, an increase of $317,834. To show how this increase came about, I may state that the amount expended for interest on the public debt shows an increase over 1888 of $325,618 ; superannuation, an increase of over $6,000 ; militia, an increase of over $50,000 ; mail subsidies and steamship subventions, a slight increase ; ocean and river service, an increase of $106,636 ; lighthouse and coast service, an increase of $22,521 ; expenditure upon Indians, an increase of $112,000 ; miscellaneous, an increase of $128,000. There were also considerable items of decrease, but taking the two together, they show a difference of expenditure over that of the estimate, of $317,834. The amount that was estimated for revenue, as I said before, was $38,601,294 ; the amount which was actually received was $38,782,870. I estimated last year that we would have a probable surplus of $1,900,000, the actual surplus is $1,865,035, a surplus which was very close indeed to that which was estimated, and which was very satisfactory, as showing an increase over the preceding year. Taking the surplus of the past year and adding to it the sinking fund, which is so much offset against the public debt, the two sums amount to $3,601,679. Taking the minus surplus of 1887-88 and the sinking fund of that year, they amount to $1,129,046 ; so that the operation of the past year as compared with that of the preceding year, counting surplus and sinking fund together, shows a favorable difference of $2,472,633. The following table shows the capital expenditure, estimated and actual :—

Capital Expenditure.	Estimated.	Actual.	Over Expend't
Railways and Canals	$2,772,867	$3,682,774	$909,907
Public Works	385,700	575,408	189,708
Dominion Lands	100,000	130,684	30,684
North-West Rebellion	1,205	31,448	30,243
Redemption of Debt	3,094,386	3,516,091	421,705
Railway Subsidies	1,183,428	846,721	336,707
	$7,537,586	$8,783,126	$1,245,540

In railways and canals, the excess is owing to the fact that these works were under contract and they were pushed with great vigor, and consequently earlier and larger payments had to be made

than were anticipated. In public works the increase was caused by an expenditure of $243,334 in improvement of the St. Lawrence. In the redemption of debt the increase in the expenditure over the estimate is owing to the fact that we have redeemed $300,000 of 6 per cent. currency of Canada, British Columbia Bonds, $33,000, and some A and B stock, making a larger expenditure for redemption of debt than was anticipated, but which is, of course, so much of our debt moved out of the way. In regard to railway subsidies, it is a difficult matter to estimate with any degree of certainty what will be the expenditure, as it is not known with what vigor the work will be pushed, or how many of these companies may make contracts and go on with their work. Deducting redemption of debt, there was a capital expenditure last year of $5,267,035, against a capital expenditure, exclusive of redemption of debt, of the preceding year, of $5,464,521. The net debt on the 1st July, 1888, was $234,531,358, showing an addition in that year of $7,216,583. The net debt on the 1st July, 1889, was $237,530,041, showing a net addition of $2,998,683. Taking the operations of 1888-89 over 1887-88, and comparing them with the operations of 1887-88 over 1886-87, I find that there was a gain in revenue of $2,874,408, or 8 per cent. in 1888-89, as compared with a gain of $153,970, or less than one-half per cent. in 1887-88. There was an increased expenditure of $199,339 on consolidated revenue, or one-half per cent. in the former, as compared with an increase of $1,060,815, or 3 per cent. in the latter year. The surplus of 1888-89 shows an amount of $1,865,035 as compared with a deficit of $810,031 in 1887-88. The capital expenditure is a little less, while the debt increase was less than $3,000,000 as against the previous year's increase of $7,217,000. The following statement will show this :—

1888-89 over 1887-88.	1887-88 over 1886-87.
Gain in Revenue, $2,874,408, or 8 p.c.	
	as compared with $153,970, or nearly ½ p.c.
Increased Expenditure, $199,339.	
	or ½ p. c. as compared with $1,060,815, or 3 p.c.
Surplus of $1,865,035 as compared with (deficit) $810,031.	
Surplus and Sinking Fund, $3,601,679	
	as compared with $1,129,046
Capital Expenditure $5,267,035 as compared with $5,464,521	
Debt Increase, $2,998,683 as compared with $7,216,583	

Passing to the year 1889-90, it will be found that about a year ago I estimated that the Customs would yield $23,900,000, the Excise $7,125,000, and the Miscellaneous $8,150,000, or a total of $39,175,000. The receipts up to the 20th March of this year have been : from Customs, $17,259,352 ; from Excise, $5,179,220, and from miscellaneous, $5,440,932, or a total of $27,879,504. If we were to proceed upon the supposition that we would get from the 20th March to the 30th June of this year the same revenue in proportion that we received during the same period last year, it would add to these amounts : from Customs, $6,913,819 ; from Excise, $1,914,737, and from miscellaneous, $3,080,238, or a total of $11,908,794, which would give a total revenue of $39,788,298. But I cannot proceed altogether upon that assumption. I find that the revenue has somewhat diminished since the 1st January, in comparison with the same months of the preceding year, and a proportionate allowance for the continuance of this diminution during the remainder of the year will amount to $113,000. In the latter part of 1888-89 there was credited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund an amount of accrued interest of about $100,000, as was also an amount of $375,000 from Open Railway Accounts. These sums will not to that extent come into the revenue for the latter part of the current year, and making these deductions, I estimate for the current year : from Customs, $24,000,000 ; from Excise, $7,000,000, and from Miscellaneous, $8,200,000, making the total revenue which I think we will get $39,200,000, against my estimate about a year ago of $39,175,000. The expenditure to 20th March of this year has been $22,353,399. The expenditure last year from the 20th March to the 30th June, if applied to the remainder of the current year, would lead us to expect added expenditure of $13,771,778, if we proceed upon the same scale of expenditure for the remainder of the current year, showing, on that basis, a total expenditure of $36,125,177. I have, however, just placed on the table the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1889-90. They are a little larger than I had expected, and, therefore, in order to be on the safe side, I think the expenditure for the present year should not be estimated at less than $36,500,000, which was the sum at which I estimated it a year ago. Suppose this holds good, the expenditure will be $36,500,000, and the revenue on Consolidated Fund Account $39,200,000, giving us a surplus for the current year of $2,700,000 as against the surplus actually received last year of $1,865,035. I am sure this statement is one which will be particularly pleasing to the House and the country, as showing the buoyancy of our resources, and the fact that we have a surplus of this magnitude without imposing any increased rate of duty, and in fulfilment of my forecast of about a year ago. In regard to the capital expenditure, including subsidies to railways, the position is as follows :—

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE, INCLUDING SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

	Estimated last year.	Expended to 20th March.	Estimate for remainder of year.	Total.
Rys and Canals	$3,836,521	$2,299,443		
Pub. Works.....	407,000	336,447	$1,000,000	$3,715,917
Dom. Lands.....	100,000	80,027		
Redemption of Debt.....	2,417,267	1,806,502	610,765	2,417,267
Ry. Subsidies....	1,095,202	1,510,228	400,000	1,910,228
	$7,855,990	$6,032,647	$2,010,765	$8,043,412

The total is somewhat in excess of the amount which was estimated last year, but the excess is largely due to the greater expenditure on subsidised railways. Taking off the redemption of debt from the capital expenditure for the current year there will remain $5,626,145, and deducting from that the surplus of $2,700,000 and the sinking fund which is offset against the debt of $1,790,000, a total of $4,490,000 to be taken from the sum before mentioned, we shall have at the end of the year an addition to our debt of $1,136,145, which is about one-third of the addition made to the net debt in the preceding year. Taken in all, the operations of the year 1889–90 as compared with those of 1888–89 show as follow :—

	1889-90.	1888-89	Difference.
Revenue.....	$39,200,000 =	$38,782,870 +	$417,130
Con. Fund Exp.	36,500,000 =	36,917,834 —	417,834
Surplus.....	2,700,000 =	1,865,035 +	834,965
Capital Exp...	5,626,145 =	5,267,035 +	359,110
Increase of debt	1,136,145 =	2,998,683 —	1,862,538
Net Debt.....	238,666,186	237,530,041	

When we come to the year 1890-91, of course all certainty fails, and I can simply make, as I had to make last year, a probable estimate of what we may receive. Looking over the state of the revenue for the past year, the condition of the trade of the country, its resources, and the condition of the country itself, I think I may be warranted in saying that for the year 1890-91 we shall receive :

Customs Revenue.....	$23,500,000
Excise.....	7,000,000
Miscellaneous Works—Revenue...	8,700,000
Total.....	$39,200,000

or about the same as for the current year. The Estimates already brought down to the House amount to $36,035,445, and if we consider the probable increase at $664,555, we shall have a probable expenditure of $36,700,000 ; deducting this from the estimated revenue, we shall have for 1890-91, if this forecast is realised, a surplus of about $2,500,000 as far as consolidated revenue is concerned. So far, Mr. Speaker, the review and retrospect of these years have been, I think, gratifying and satisfactory to the House. After twenty-one years of our existence as a Dominion, to find the three years, 1889, 1890 and 1891, showing the financial results which they have shown, and which I have had the honor of detailing to the House, is, I think, a cause for congratulation. After this period of struggle to come into existence as a Dominion, after all the difficulties and all the disadvantages incident to the early period of growth, I say it is a matter for congratulation that the three years supervening upon these show such excellent and gratifying results, so far as the finances of the country are concerned. This leads us irresistibly to look back in swift review over the history of the Dominion from its inception. Evoked as it was by the summons of the master statesmen of that period, from what I might call almost a chaos of scattered Provinces, and from large, unexplored, and unorganised territories, the Dominion has swiftly advanced upon the view of the world. It has steadily assumed the proportions of continually enlarging and substantial greatness, and to-day it stands self-contained and confident, wielding a practically absolute sway over the northern and greater half of the English-speaking portion of this continent. It has overcome the difficulties which were incident to its first organisation, and we all know how great those difficulties were. It has surmounted the disadvantages of wide separation, and we know that these were formidable. It has conquered the almost illimitable distances which the people who lived a score of years ago, and scanned the future of this country, thought almost insurmountable. It has conquered these difficulties ; it has solved this problem of immeasurable distance, and has succeeded in moulding the ambitions of its widely different creeds, and races, and interests, into a growing and dominant sentiment of national unity, and a confidence in national progress and national development. It has built magnificent channels of inter-communication ; it has dotted its broad waters with busy ships, and its broader lands with wide and varying industries, and has laid broad and deep the foundations of a development, the wonderful progress of whose past is only to be excelled by the still more wonderful promise of its future. It has done this by pouring out its treasure—treasure which was hard earned by land and by sea—and pouring it out like water. It has done this by an expenditure out of Consolidated Revenue, beginning with $13,500,000 in 1867, and reaching in this year nearly $37,000,000, and, in the total of these years, the munificent sum of $558,000,000, or an average of twenty-five and one-third millions a year ; and it has besides pledged

its resources to the extent of $237,000,000, all to equip itself for a noble race and leave to its children a goodly heritage. I am here to-day to maintain that every dollar of this expenditure, and that all of these obligations which the Dominion has taken upon itself, have been wisely assumed, and in pursuance of a policy which has been for the best interests of the country, as far as its present and future is concerned. To-day, Sir, after twenty-one years of existence, we are face to face with an abundant and buoyant revenue, which ranges from thirty-five and three-quarter millions in 1887, to $39,200,000 as estimated for 1890-91. We are here with an average expenditure out of the Consolidated Fund, for the ordinary services of the country, of about $36,500,000 for these five years which I have named, and we are here with a capital expenditure averaging somewhere about $5,500,000. But, Sir, as I said last year, so I will take occasion to utter this year, a word of caution, and if it be allowable in one so young, a word of counsel as well. I stated last year that looking at the condition of the country, and looking at the munificent contributions which had been given by this country for her public works, and at the splendid equipment which Canada had by means of these contributions gained for herself, it seemed to me that we ought not, after the close of the year 1889, to increase the public debt, that we ought not to increase the public expenditure for ordinary purposes, and, that it was possible by a prudent course, without stinting the public service in any way, to carry on this service in a generous manner, to meet the capital obligations which we had already assumed, and to go to the year 1892 without adding to our net debt. After that it seemed to me that we might well take into consideration whether or not we could not gradually decrease the amount of the debt which we had assumed and placed upon ourselves. Now, Sir, I am here to-day, one year after the time of making that statement, to affirm that I believe the same may be said to-day with equal emphasis and with equal truth : $36,500,000 of ordinary expenditure, from our Consolidated Revenue Fund gives us, what? In the first place, it is sufficient to carry our national debt, that is to pay the interest on the debt ; it provides for our legislation and civil government ; it administers our justice ; it polices the North-West ; it provides a million and a third for the militia system of the country ; it gives over $300,000 for steamship subsidies and subventions ; it sustains an expenditure of $900,000 on lighthouse, ocean, river and coast service ; it gives $4,000,000 for distribution among the different Provinces of this Dominion ; it looks after the collection of our revenue ; it inspects our gas, our staple foods, our weights and measures ; it provides motive power to the extent of $3,000,000 for our post office and $4,000,000 for our railways and canals ; and over and above these and other ordinary services, it gives into the hands of the Minister of Public Works more than $2,000,000 with which each year to build new and necessary public works in this country. Such a contribution as that seems to me to be a generous and princely contribution for a people of 5,000,000 to carry on the ordinary services of the country. The capital obligations, for the building of railways and canals and other public works of necessity and utility, may be met by the surplus which I have outlined, and which we may look for in these three years, to the amount of about $2,500,000 per year, which, with the sinking fund, would give us about $4,500,000 per year to meet the capital obligations we have assumed, and the expenditures we may think it necessary to make on capital account. We must recollect what we have done in this country in the way of building public works and opening channels of communication. I find that we have spent out of capital : for the Intercolonial system, $35,776,129 ; for the Pacific Railway system, $61,899,600 ; for the Short Line Railway, $209,356, besides the subsidy which is to run now for some nineteen years, which, at present value, is $2,679,529 ; for Intercolonial extensions and other Government railway extensions, $4,389,760 ; for the improvement of the St. Lawrence channel, $2,968,838 ; for the Canal system, so far, $32,841,932 ; for Canal works now under contract, $5,158,749 ; and for the two large and commodious docks which face our eastern and our western waters, $1,857,499 ; making the total equipment of this country out of capital expenditure for these great means of intercommunication and commerce, $147,781,392. This is the amount we have paid out of capital for the equipment of the country in its race for commerce, foreign and domestic—for channels of communication which were absolutely necessary to open up this vast extent of country, and which the country has willingly and cheerfully paid for, for the sake of present advantage and future advantage in the great race this country has to run in its competition for commerce and trade with the other countries of the world. For what Canada has assumed in this respect, I believe she has had full warrant ; her circumstances, her hopes and her future demanded it. To carry her present burdens I believe she is amply sufficient ; but for any further increase I believe good reasons are demanded, and good reasons must be given. We have a princely equipment, a royal endowment in these great works I have mentioned ; and if private

enterprise continues to take hold and work in unison with them, as it is doing every day more and more, the future of this country, on account of that equipment and the facilities given thereby, is assured; and for the sake of that future, the country will cheerfully bear the burdens imposed upon it by the building of these great lines of communication. Now, Sir, I come to the second part of my duty this afternoon, and I must beg the indulgence of this rather worn and tired House. After the long fight of the night, I will try not to trespass on its patience any longer than is really necessary to set forth, in a very brief way, what I propose to lay before the House in the shape of changes and emendations in the tariff. I suppose it will be taken for granted that in bringing down certain resolutions to-day I am not going to propose anything that will interfere very materially with the system of reasonable protection which was assured to this country in 1878 and 1879, and which has been retained since. Hon. gentlemen who passed through the long and able discussions of 1878 and the succeeding years will know that if ever a matter was well argued and thoroughly discussed, the changes involved in the tariff of 1879 and the principles which underlay it were well discussed, were ably argued, and were settled as thoroughly as any question could be settled, by intelligent discussion and consideration of everything involved. Sir, it was stated in 1878, and in 1879—and I think my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was one who indulged in some, as they have proved, fanciful imaginings at that time—that the system of protection which was then devised would be short lived, and would die chiefly because the system of protection in the great country bordering on ours to the south was doomed, where free trade principles were even then coming quickly into the ascendant, and that in a little time the protective system of that country would be a thing of the past, and with it would pass away any system of protection which we were building up in Canada. That prediction has not been fulfilled, and every succeeding year in the legislative history of the United States goes to prove that the principle of protection has received no set-back in that country; but to-day, after an election run, not between free trade and protection but upon the question of a higher or lower degree of protection, the Republican party, which went to the country on the ground of an increased protection, came back from the polls strengthened, and to-day holds its majority in both Houses of Congress; and if what we see reported in the papers is a foreshadowing of what may be expected to happen, we may find that legislation which is imminent there will not disturb the protection which has been given to the great manufacturing industries of that country, but may proceed a little further in some directions than even the legislation which has been in existence there for the las tten years. As nothing has taken place in the history and condition of the United States to make us believe their protective policy will be abandoned, so nothing has occurred in the wider history of European countries to show that the principles of protection have taken light root and are not held as strongly as they were, even more strongly than they have been for a number of years past. Nor have any circumstances arisen in the Dominion of Canada which make it necessary, or reasonable, or prudent, that, once having set our hand to the plough, and determined under existing circumstances to fairly and reasonably protect our growing industries, we should now look back and disturb, in any material way, the reasonable system of protection which this country has declared for, under which it has prospered and under which it is expected to prosper for many a year to come. I know I will be said to be tinkering with the tariff, and thereby offending against some special eternal principles which underlie tariffs when I introduce my resolutions for some changes in this tariff. But it seems to me that tariffs are, in the main, a device for the raising of revenue and the protecting of the interests of the country, and that they are not like confessions of faith, which, when once settled, must endure for centuries; but, being such a device, they will change according to the circumstances of the country and according to the needs of the peculiar time in which they are operative. And just as conditions change, the conditions in the country and out of the country, so it becomes necessary that alterations from time to time shall be made in the tariff to keep up its original idea of reasonably fair protection to industries which it is proper and right to protect in the country. If values change, then the relative protection that was given by specific or by *ad valorem* duties certainly change with them. If new products come into existence they must have a category in which to be placed, and in order to prevent constant disputes in practically carrying out the Customs laws, provision has to be made for them in sections of the tariff laws. The same is true when new industries open up—and new industries are continually opening up; and it is the pride and the gratification of the party on this side of the House that within the last ten years and under the influences of the tariff which has been the law in this country new industries have sprung up as by magic in this Dominion; and if we look to-day at the quality, at the variety, at the quantity of manufactured articles, as compared with ten years ago, it is astonishing to see the progress which has been made in the various industries throughout this country. So that not only is it not my intention to interfere, in these resolutions, with the principle and the policy which has been adopted by this Government and by this party, but it is not my intention to be frightened by the cry that we are continually tinkering with the tariff and so be prevented from introducing changes which are necessary. At the same time, I hold it to be true, that it is neither wise nor prudent to be making too frequent changes in the tariff, because the gen-

eral trade industries of the country demand that no changes be made without sufficient reasons being adduced to prove a revision of the tariff to be necessary. Last year repeated applications were made, and many pressing demands were brought forward, demands which, in some cases, seemed to the Minister of Customs and myself just in the premises, but we felt that the tariff, having been re-arranged in 1887, should be left to its own working for another year. This year we propose various changes; not all the changes which have been pressed upon us, for there have been many requests made which, I must say, after very careful consideration, the Minister of Customs and myself have not deemed it wise to recommend to the Government, and which the Government have not deemed it wise to adopt as alterations in the tariff law. But this I can say for my colleague and myself, that every proposition which has been put before us has been carefully scrutinised, has been closely considered, and that we have come to a decision on those questions with a desire to do justice in the premises, to the interests themselves as well as to the interests which would be affected by them, and which are so intimately connected with them in the country. What I propose, then, broadly in my resolutions, is this: to introduce an interpretation clause, by means of which certain often used terms will be defined, and which will, therefore, make it unnecessary to have continual repetitions through the different clauses of the tariff; to strike out all the headings which are found now, and which are so misleading, in the Customs law and in the tariff as it is arranged and distributed. For instance, we have a heading "tubing," and following a little down below "tubing" we come to "jellies and jams," and it is difficult to know what in the world jellies and jams have to do with the heading "tubing" which stands but a little way before it. The heading "pianofortes" later on is followed by "pickles," but what these have to do with one another it is impossible for the average untrained mind to tell. The skilled and ingenious mind of my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs may at the present time know. It is proposed, also, to cancel all Orders in Council which have been passed under the authority of the Customs Act, and the substance of which is to be embodied in the tariff changes; and then to repeal all the items in the tariff in which any change is made, so that the item will be enacted anew; and, lastly, to enact the new items in the Act. The purpose of the resolutions broadly is this: to render more plain to the business public some of the items at present existing in the tariff which, though carrying their meaning clearly to the Department and its officers, are yet somewhat indefinite to the outside and business public, and to enlarge and remodel these, and to add cognate articles which the Customs have placed under these different headings, but about which disputes might constantly arise between the trade and Customs Department as to whether they should be included in that class or not; in the second place, to reduce in some instances existing duties which changed conditions have rendered in our opinion higher than they should be, or upon articles which, failing to be manufactured in this country, should bear a revenue tariff, and a revenue tariff only; in the third place, to put on the free list articles which either serve as raw materials for manufacturers, or which would, by their admission, help to develop the resources of the country; and, in the fourth place, to re-adjust certain duties, which for various reasons are not now considered as effective as they should be. I do not propose to weary the House by reading all the different items which are embodied in the resolutions. I propose to name a few of the more important, and then submit the resolutions for the action of the House. One item which in changed is that of acetic acid and vinegar. Vinegar bears a duty at present of 15 cents per gallon, and acetice acid a duty of 25 cents per gallon and 20 per cent. The difficulty that has arisen is that acetic acid has been imported far above the degree of proof, coming in at 90, and as high as 95 degrees, and it was possible to evade the plain intent of the item, which was to exact a duty upon the acetic acid as commonly known to commerce. This interfered with the manufacture of vinegar, and led to frauds upon the revenue, and it was in every way unequal in its working. It is proposed to put upon acetic acid and vinegar a duty of 15 cents per gallon on a strength of 6 degrees, and on every degree of strength above that to add 1 cent addi tional duty. That will keep vinegar at practically the same duty which is upon it to-day, and will correct the abuses I have explained. However, as acetic acid is largely used in various manufactures, and in the making of acetates and various other substances, it is proposed to continue the privilege enjoyed by these manufacturers of getting their acetic acid at the same rate of duty as before, and without any limitations upon its degree of strength. The article of fancy boxes and cases and all the cognate fancy manufactures have been raised from 30 to 35 per cent. This is an industry which is growing in this country, and which has proved to be excellent and varied in its kind. Large duties are paid upon the different articles that enter into the manufacture of these boxes, and altogether it is felt that an increase of 5 per cent. is due to that industry, in view of the strong competition it has to meet from German manufacturers, labor being so cheap in Germany, and these articles being put together there at such low rates. A change is made in paints. One finds the item of paints scattered here and there all through the tariff, and, it seems, without much system. It is proposed to classify all paints under five different classes. On some of these the duty is increased, and the increase takes place upon those made from materials and substances which are found in large quantities in our own country. The next item is that of glass, and a redistribution has been made of the duties. At present in the tariff, common and colorless window glass, plain, colored, stained or tinted glass, ornamental, figured, enamelled, colored glass, painted and vitrified glass, and stained glass windows, all stand at one rate, 30 per cent. This has the effect of placing the highly finished and perfect article at exactly the same rate of duty as the parts of which it is made; and with reference to common and colorless window glass, the duty of 30 per cent. is as high as the duty upon the stained window glass or the other higher grades of glass. Now, common and colorless window glass has not been made in this country, and under present conditions we do not think it can be successfully made here. It is used throughout the country in every

home, and I find, in looking at last year's returns, that there were 14 million odd square feet of that kind of glass imported into this country and it paid a duty of $87,893. It is proposed to reduce the duty on common or colorless window glass from 30 to 20 per cent., which will involve a loss to the revenue of about $30,000 on the basis of last year's figures; and, so far as that is concerned, I suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite and myself will look through the same glass and see the same conclusion. The ornamental, figured and colored window glass, the painted and vitrified glass, which now bears 30 per cent., is made to bear 25 per cent; and the stained glass windows, the finished product, bears its present duty of 30 per cent. Silver plate glass remains at 30 per cent., as at present; bevelled glass bears 35 per cent. The others remain as they are in the present tariff, except that when they are bevelled they pay an additional duty of one cent per square foot. Gloves and mitts, which now bear a duty of 30 per cent., are raised to 35 per cent. We imported last year $346,059 of gloves and mitts. We have raised the duty on one or two of the constituent articles on account of industries having developed in this country which make them here; and altogether it was thought better to raise these 5 per cent., and to give to that industry, which is largely prosecuted here, the Canadian market, so far as reasonable protection could do it. Wall paper and hangings of various kinds have been reduced. The present duty was placed upon them on the basis of from 30 to 35 per cent. protection, but the prices from that time to this have fallen very considerably, and what was a protection at that rate in 1887, comes to be a largely increased protection under the present prices. Representations have been made, and very forcibly made, by the dealers throughout the country, and counter representations have been made by the manufacturers, and the cut in the duty is not so great as it would have been if it were not for the peculiar state of that industry now in the United States, and the peculiar difficulties which, owing to the total disorganisation of that business in the United States, and the consequent slaughtering of prices, our manufacturers would have to contend with while that state of things exists. However, it is determined to reduce the rate of duties somewhat as follows: Brown blank and white papers had respectively a duty of 2 and 3 cents under the old tariff. The two have been grouped together, as the prices are now very nearly the same, and a duty of 2 cents has been placed upon them. Print bronzes and colored bronzes had a duty upon them of 7 and 9 cents per roll respectively. The prices of these two differ very little, they have been put together, and the duty of 6 cents imposed instead of 7 and 9 cents. Embossed bronzes bear a duty of 11 cents; that has been reduced to 8 cents. Colored borders, narrow and wide, had a duty of 8 and 10 cents respectively; these are grouped together on account of the little difference in price, and a uniform duty of 6 cents is placed upon them. Bronze borders, narrow and wide, had a duty of 15 and 18 cents respectively; they are grouped together for the same reason as the others were grouped, and a uniform duty of 14 cents per roll is imposed. Embossed borders, which now bear 20 cents a roll, have been placed at 15 cents. All other wall paper hangings are 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. Dry plates have borne a duty of 15 cents heretofore, and have been a subject of much contention between the dry plate manufacturers and the photographers, and representations and counter representations have been made for many years with reference to this duty. After a careful consideration of the whole matter, I have decided to reduce the duty from 15 cents to 9 cents, which will give a good round protection, but at the same time will diminish the inordinate rate of duty which they at present bear. It is believed that the dry plate makers will not find it difficult to hold the market with the rate of duty which it is proposed to give them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do these specific duties represent on an *ad valorem* standard?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it will give between 35 and 40 per cent. at present prices. A change has been made in stereotypes and stereotyped plates. The old duty was framed on the weight, it was so much per pound, but a radical change has taken place in the method of manufacturing them. They are now put up very lightly, and the weight has been reduced until a duty founded upon the weight becomes no longer anything like an equivalent of the duty which was placed upon them at the time when they possessed this heavy weight. It has been thought best to change the duty from a weight to a square inch basis. It is pretty difficult to say what is the equivalent, the difference in weights is so great. However, the duty has not been placed very high, but the change has been thought to be a wise one, for two reasons: First, in order to give the adequate protection which it was proposed to give when the tariff was arranged; and, secondly, to encourage the labor of setting type and making these plates in our own country, and so adding to the employment in that line. On umbrellas the duty is changed from 30 per cent. to 35. There are indications that the manufacture of umbrellas will be undertaken in this country and pushed far more vigorously than it has been. Last year we imported $303,777 worth of umbrellas. The silk of which they are made bears a duty of 30 per cent., and the other cloths in proportion. The margin of protection which the manufacturer had was so small that it was insufficient to give this industry a start and maintain it properly, and, therefore, it is proposed to increase the duty to 35 per cent. In regard to wire of copper and brass, which has heretofore been free, manufacturers are now making, and are prepared to make to a sufficient extent to fill the Canadian demand, and it was thought wise to put, not a heavy, but a moderate protection upon that article of 15 per cent. Covered wire is to be 35 per cent. instead of 25 per cent. as at present. All other kind of wire is at 25 per cent. The woollen industry of the country has, for the past few years, not been particularly prosperous. Several reasons have been assigned for this, which can better be gone into when the item is before the Committee. Under all the circumstances, considering the decrease in weight and the strong competition manufacturers have to meet, and the large expense they are at for machinery, it has been decided to give woollens an increased duty, raising the present duty of 7½ cents a pound and 20 cents *ad valorem* to 10 cents a pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. A re-arrangement has been made

of the duties on spirits and alcohol, and the principle which has been adopted is that the duty shall be arranged upon the proof strength, and that spirituous liquors which are imported with additions of strength above proof shall pay in proportion to the strength they have. The duties at the proof rate remain at about the same rates as at present. The only change of any moment is in the principle which has been adopted, that the duty shall be paid on the proof strength, and that strongly fortified spirits which are brought into the country shall not have the advantage of the payment of a less rate of duty over the spirits which are at or about proof. The explanations with reference to this I shall not trouble the House with now, but I shall be prepared to make them when we are in committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman adopted the English system?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the system we have adopted is more nearly like the American than the English system. We have had deputations and representations from both sides of those engaged in the hat business. Strong pressure has been brought to bear in order to have the duty on the different kinds of hats and caps raised, both on the wool, the fur, the felt and the straw hats, and counter representations have been made from almost all the importers and dealers in foreign goods. After looking over the whole matter carefully, we have decided to recommend a change. There were a number of articles which went into the manufacture of hats, such as sweats and linings, and that kind of thing, which were allowed in free, and which it was found had taken a larger range than was intended, and were used for the manufacture of other articles, thus escaping the duty. For instance, silks supposed to be for the purpose of linings alone, were used to make neckties, and so these articles went into a larger consumption than it was intended to allow. It has been decided to recommend that these articles shall be taken from the free list, that these sweats and linings shall pay their legitimate duty, and especially because they are now, in great part, being made in this country. It is proposed as a compensation for that to increase the duty on straw hats and woollen hats by 5 per cent. Ladies' hats remain at the same rate of duty as at present, and fur-felt hats have $1.50 per dozen additional, with a reduction of the *ad valorem* duty from 25 to 20 per cent. As hon. gentlemen are aware, for a year or two there has been considerable discussion with reference to the flour duties. The millers are in this position: that they have a protection of 50 cents per barrel on their flour, while wheat comes into this country at 15 cents per bushel. At the rate of 4⅔ bushels of wheat to a barrel of flour, the duty paid on sufficient wheat to make a barrel of flour would be in the neighborhood of 71 or 72 cents. It has been felt that this disparity of duty between flour and wheat should be remedied, and it has been decided to give an advance of 25 cents per barrel upon flour, and thus equalise it with the wheat duty. For a country which produces a surplus of wheat, and has capacity to mill all the flour which is necessary for the consumption of this country, and to supply outside markets as well, it is not reasonable to believe that this will do more than keep the market for Canadians. It is not reasonable to suppose that it will materially raise the price of flour. The milling capacity is so large, and the competition is so keen, that the flour will go into the hands of the consumers at about the same price as it does now under like conditions. It is proposed to introduce added protection to another series of the great farming products of the country. It is felt that in a country like ours, with its large grazing areas, equal to any in the world, with its rapidly increasing dairy and cheese industries, with its unrivalled facilities for the production of meats of various kinds, the time has come when these great industries should be protected by an adequate duty from the competition which they are at present receiving largely from the country to the south of us. For instance, in the article of beef, we find that last year there was introduced from the United States 3,795,105 pounds of beef, at a value of $160,624. We find that bacon and hams were introduced to the value of $335,159, the large amount of 3,653,758 pounds; 174,944 pounds of mutton were imported, at a cost of $13,555; 15,205,972 pounds of pork were imported at a value of $992,423; prepared meats to the amount of 983,834 pounds, value $90,305; and of tried lard there were imported 8,290,000 pounds, value $636,078. To-day, beef is sent to the markets of Halifax and St. John, and all large and small towns west of that, and is sold to the dealers in meat, at just sufficient cut to enable them to dictate lower prices to the raisers and producers of cattle in our own country. It does not follow at all that the consumer gets his meat one single tenth part of a cent less, but the introduction of this imported meat makes it possible for the jobber and dealer to bring down the price to the native producers; and so the producer is met in this country with a competition which makes it difficult for him to pursue his industry with profit to himself. Now, there is no reason in the wide world, to my mind, why Canada should not only raise all the meat necessary for the consumption of her own people, but should become one of the largest exporters of these different kinds of meat to foreign countries. It is with a view of fostering these meat-producing industries with a fairly protective duty, that the Government have come to the conclusion to protect the farmers by raising the rates on these meats in this way: Mess pork, or heavy pork, which now bears a duty of one cent per pound, shall bear a duty in the future of one and a-half cents; all salted and fresh meats, which now bear a duty of 1 and 2 cents per pound, shall bear a duty of 3 cents per pound. Prepared meats which now bear a duty of 2 cents, shall be raised to 3 cents. Tried lard, which now bears a duty of 2 cents, shall be raised to 3 cents; and untried lard, which now bears a duty of 1½ cents, shall be raised to 2 cents. Live cattle, hogs and sheep shall have the duty raised upon them proportionately from 20 to 30 per cent. This, in brief, is the schedule which is proposed in the resolutions which will be submitted to the House. Now, it is proposed as well to make some changes with regard to the corn duties. The people of the Maritime Provinces especially, use a large quantity of corn meal. It is used by the fisher folk, and by people of the rural parts of the Provinces, and is more largely consumed by the people of Nova Scotia,

and less largely by the people of New Brunswick and the other Provinces. It is proposed to couple with the duties which have been already mentioned, this provision : that in the case of corn kiln-dried, or to be kiln-dried, and ground into meal for human food, a rebate be given to those who mill it, of 90 per cent. on the original duty paid, and that Customs regulations shall be prepared and put into force for the carrying out of this resolution. It is also proposed that molasses, which to-day bears a duty of 15 per cent. when imported direct from the place of production, and which is practically confined to the tests between 40 and 55—it is proposed that the duty on molasses shall be lowered about one-half, and that a duty of 1½ cents per gallon, when imported direct from the place of production, shall be charged upon it. It is also proposed that the test for molasses shall be lowered, and that it shall run between 30 and 35. The duty collected upon molasses last year, was in the neighborhood of $123,000, and by lowering the duty by about one-half, it will be seen that we propose to meet a loss of revenue in this, of some $60,000. Molasses is an article which is used very widely in the Maritime Provinces. In the Province of New Brunswick from which I come, molasses of a good grade, not the vile stuff called "black-strap," is used in all our rural districts, and the same is the case with reference to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. It is, therefore, proposed to couple the rebate on corn, when milled for human food, and the reduction of one-half of the duty of molasses, with an increased duty of 25 cents upon flour. I now come to another item about which there has been considerable discussion in the House and out of it. It is that which relates to plants, fruits, shrubs and the like, and with which this House dealt in 1888. By an Order in Council of 14th April, 1888, certain fruits and plants and shrubs were placed upon the free list. This arose from the fact that in the Tariff Act of 1879, there was a clause which left it permissive with the Government, on a certain list of articles, to either reduce the duty upon them or to remove the duty altogether when such articles were either free, or of less duty in the United States than was charged here. The matter was brought to the attention of the Government in 1888 under the peculiar circumstances which at that time prevailed. It was contended by gentlemen of the Opposition that it was not treating the United States fairly, when they had any one of these articles at a lower duty, if we did not place that article on the same tariff footing as it was in the United States. It was contended on this side of the House that this clause of the Act was simply permissive and not mandatory on the Government, and that it rested with the Government of Canada to say whether this should be done in individual instances or not, and that what was contemplated in that article in the tariff law was that when those products as a whole, or as many of them as Canada should consider it to be in her interest to reciprocate in, were placed on the free list or had a lower rate of duty imposed upon them, the Government would reduce its duties upon them to the same level. However, under the circumstances that prevailed at that time, it was decided to put these articles on the free list, and a very considerable amount of duty was lost in consequence, and a very considerable damage was done to a large and important interest in this country. For it must be borne in mind, that the removal of the duty from those articles did not place our people in a position of fair and equal competition with the people to the south of us, and there are various considerations which will easily suggest themselves to the minds of hon. gentlemen conversant with this subject when I make that statement. For instance, there was State legislation in most of the bordering States, making it practically impossible for men who raised nursery stock on this side of the line, to undertake any profitable conduct of their business on that side, owing to the way they would be hampered as aliens engaging in trade in that country. With reference to fruits, the United States has a wide range of climate. Its fruits commence to ripen from late in the winter or early in the spring, and it has a gradation of climate enabling it to produce a certain class of fruits through a range of three or four or even five months. The season with us is short, and the competition for this reason was felt to be unfair to the large fruit-growing and nursery industries in this country. It is, therefore, proposed to put these articles back in the same place they occupied in the tariff previous to 1888, with the exception that on blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, the rate of duty shall be 3 cents instead of 4 cents. Then we have placed on the free list: bananas, plantains, pineapples, pomegranates, guavas, mangoes, shaddocks, wild blueberries and wild strawberries, which were formerly on the dutiable list. Beet, carrot, turnip and mangold seeds, for the use of farmers of this country, are also placed on the free list. The House will recollect the discussion which took place here a short time ago on mining machinery, when I urged that the House should defer the discussion until the Government had brought down its tariff measure. All over our country the indications of interest in the development of our mining resources are plain and unmistakable; our resources are being, every year, more and more explored ; we are coming ourselves to have a better and more adequate knowledge of the immense wealth we have in this line ; and this information is filtering out into other countries, and is producing an interest in the minds of capitalists in other countries, which is continually growing, and which we believe will be productive of large investments in this country. On the whole, it appears to me that we are on the eve of large developments of the mining industries of this country, and in the future we may look for large accretions of interest and increasing employment of labor in the development of the vast mineral and metallic stocks which we have scattered throughout this country from Cape Breton to British Columbia. There has thus arisen a demand for free mining machinery. It is stated that the best and most improved machinery must be used by experimenters who put their money into enterprises the outcome of which they cannot certainly see. It is felt by them that the very best possible machinery should be got. It is felt by some that for a period at least there should be no restriction whatever on the buying of it, and by others, that there should be no other restriction than that imposed by the consideration whether or not the machinery is made in this country. Looking over the whole question,

the Government have come to the conclusion that it will not be wise or prudent to resist this demand at the present time, in the interest of the development of that large part of the country's resources, and it is proposed to allow mining machinery of a class and kind which is not made in Canada at the time of the importation, to be imported into this country free for the period of three years and no longer. That will have a double effect. It will give to those persons who are investing their money in the development of our mining interests the freest market for the purchase of the best possible machinery they can get—a market, the freedom of which is only limited by the fact that the machinery they may require is made in Canada; and no person, I apprehend, is so unpatriotic as to wish a provision to be inserted which would allow him to buy machinery outside of Canada when it could be made in Canada by industries which have been fostered and brought into their present state, by the operation of the tariff which we have enacted and maintained. It will have this other effect. By the free introduction of mining machinery such as is not made in Canada, and by the impetus which will be given to mining after the period of experimenting is over, and after the richness and paying qualities of these resources are demonstrated, there will be a continued and progressive development of that industry; and after the period of three years that development will naturally add to the demand for the production of this machinery in Canada, which will, consequently, promote and encourage its manufacture after that period. There has been another subject brought to the attention of the Government, that is, the building of iron ships in this country. It may be an open question whether or not the wooden ship has seen its day. I do not believe myself that the wooden ship, so far as the smaller kinds of coasting vessels are concerned, has at all seen its best days. I do not think any person who sits at these boards will see the time when the good, trim, staunch coasting vessels of our Maritime Provinces will be superseded by iron or steel or any other material. But the whole trend of development to-day goes upon the line of building steel and iron vessels for quick transit and for large carrying capacity between foreign and distant countries. We have this anomaly in this country, that an iron or steel vessel can be built in Great Britain on the Clyde, and can be brought into this country and put on our lake, river or sea routes free of duty entirely, if she is registered in England, while people interested in the building of similar vessels in Canada who import the steel and iron machinery and parts which are necessary for building them here, and which cannot be made in this country, are met by heavy duties; and so the industry is handicapped. It has, therefore, been determined, for the encouragement of this industry which has already planted itself in our country and which is promising to develop with very great vigor, to assist it in the following way: by allowing all steel and iron parts, which are used in the manufacture of iron or steel vessels, to come in free, so long as they are not made in Canada; and that designation at the present time will take in a very large proportion of the heavy iron and steel work which enters into the construction of these vessels. The Minister of Customs has asked me not to forget another point, and for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who have been urging the matter for some time, I will mention it. It is this: that among the other numerous articles which have been placed on the free list in these resolutions is that of corn of the kinds used for seed to be grown for ensilage purposes, and thereby we remove one of the great standing grievances, from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite of which the farmers have to complain. With this brief and incomplete introduction I beg leave now to move that this House resolves itself into a Committee of Ways and Means on the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 33—Revised Statutes—intituled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," as follows:—

1. By repealing section one of said Act, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:—

In this Act, or in any other Act relating to the Customs, unless the context otherwise requires:

(*a*) The expression or contraction "*ad val.*" represents and has the meaning of the words "*ad valorem.*"

(*b*) The initials N.E.S. represent and have the meaning of the words "not elsewhere specified."

(*c*) The initials N.O.P. represent and have the meaning of the words "not otherwise provided for."

(*d*) The initials F.O.B. represent and have the meaning of the words "free on board."

(*e*) The expression "gallon" means an Imperial gallon.

(*f*) The expression "ton" means two thousand pounds avoirdupois.

(*g*) The expressions "proof" or "proof spirits," when applied to wines or spirits of any kind, mean spirits of the strength of proof as ascertained by Sykes' Hydrometer.

(*h*) The expression "gauge," when applied to metal sheets or plates or to wire, means the thickness as determined by Stubbs' Standard Gauge.

(*i*) The expression "in diameter," when applied to tubing, means the actual inside diameter measurement.

(*j*) The expressions "sheet" or "sheets" when applied to metals mean sheets or plates of not exceeding three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness.

(*k*) The expressions "plate" or "plates" when applied to metals mean plates or sheets more than three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness.

2. By enacting that the interpretation clauses comprised in section 2 of the "Customs Act," 49 Victoria, chapter 32—(Revised Statutes)—as amended, shall, until the context otherwise requires, apply to, and form a part of this Act; and that any power conferred upon the Governor in Council by the said "Customs Act" to transfer dutiable goods to the list of goods which may be imported free of duty shall not be by this Act abrogated or impaired.

3. By repealing sub-section 1 of section 5 of said Act, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:

The importation of any goods enumerated in Schedule "D" is hereby prohibited, and any such goods, if imported, shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown, and shall be forthwith destroyed,—and any person importing any such goods shall in each case incur a penalty of two hundred dollars.

4. By enacting that all medicinal or toilet preparations imported for completing the manufacture thereof, or for the manufacture of any other article by the addition of any ingredient or ingredients, or by mixing such preparations, or by putting up or labelling the same alone, or with other articles or compounds, under any proprietary or trade name, shall be, irrespective of cost, valued for duty and duty paid thereon at the ordinary market value, in the country from whence imported, of the completed preparation, when put up and labelled under such proprietary or trade name, less the actual cost of labor and material used or expended in Canada in completing the manufacture thereof, or of putting up or of labelling the same.

5. By enacting that regulations respecting the manner in which molasses and syrups shall be sampled and tested for the purpose of determining the classes to which they shall belong with reference to the duty chargeable thereon shall be made by the Minister of Customs, and the instruments and appliances necessary for such determination shall be designated by him and supplied to such officers as shall be by him charged with the duty of sampling and

testing such molasses and syrups; and the decision of any officer (to whom is so assigned the testing of such articles) as to the duties to which they are subject under the tariff shall be final and conclusive, unless upon appeal to the Commissioner of Customs within thirty days from the rendering of such decision, such decision is, with the approval of the Minister, changed, and the decision of the Commissioner with such approval shall be final.

6. By enacting that any goods or packages being the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, and having been exported therefrom and intended to be returned, may be admitted free of duty on being re-imported to Canada, provided such goods or packages were entered for exportation, and branded or marked by a Collector or proper officer of Customs, and fully identified by the Collector or proper officer, at the port or place where they are so re-imported; and further, provided that the property in such goods or packages has continued in the same person or persons by whom they were exported, and that such re-importation takes place within one year of the exportation thereof.

7. By enacting that any person who sends or brings into Canada, or who, being in Canada, has in his possession any bill-heading or other paper appearing to be a heading or blank capable of being filled up and used as an invoice, and bearing any certificate purporting to show, or which may be used to show that the invoice which may be made from such bill-heading or blank is correct or authentic, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to a penalty of five hundred dollars or to imprisonment to a term not exceeding twelve months, or both, in the discretion of the court, and the goods which may be entered under any invoice made from any such bill-heading or blank shall be forfeited.

8. By striking out from the Schedule "A" to said Act the following headings, viz.:—

The words "Agricultural Implements, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 7 in said schedule.

The words "Books, etc.," which immediately precede item 33 in said schedule.

The words "Breadstuffs, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 52 in said schedule.

The word "Carriages" which immediately precedes item 83 in said schedule.

The words "Cotton, manufactures of, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 121 in said schedule.

The words "Fruits (dried) viz.:—" which immediately precede item 162 in said schedule.

The words "Fruit (green) viz.:—" which immediately precede item 165 in said schedule.

The words "Furs, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 174 in said schedule.

The words "Glass and manufactures of, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 181 in said schedule.

The words "Gunpowder and other explosives, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 193 in said schedule.

The words "Iron and manufactures of, viz.:—" which precede item 213 in said schedule.

The words "Pianofortes, viz.:—" which immediatly precede item 344 in said schedule.

The words "Steel and manufactures of, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 403 in said schedule.

The words "Stone, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 414 in said schedule.

The words "Sugars, syrups and molasses," which immediately precede item 419 in said schedule.

The word "Tobacco," which immediately precedes item 438 in said schedule.

The words "Trees—fruit trees, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 441 in said schedule.

The words "Vegetables, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 455 in said schedule.

The words "Wools and woollens, viz.:—" which immediately precede item 473 in said schedule.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal the following items in Schedules "A," "B" and "C" to the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 33—Revised Statutes—intituled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," viz.:—

Schedule "A," items numbered 2, 5, 6, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 40, 45, 47, 49, 58, 67, 81, 87, 98, 99, 100, 109, 110, 115, 117, 118, 119, 123, 134, 149, 153, 157, 166, 177, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 205, 206, 208, 209, 258, 262, 264, 265, 268, 269, 271, 274, 277, 283, 286, 288, 294, 295, 297, 298, 301, 305, 311, 312, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 335, 336, 340, 341, 342, 358, 361, 363, 370, 372, 376, 379, 385, 387, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 402, 406, 412, 413, 415, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 435, 437, 438, 448, 451, 452, 457, 459, 460, 461, 463, 467, 468, 473, 476, 481, 482.

Schedule "B," items numbered 489, 490.

Schedule "C," items numbered, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 512, 513, 515, 518, 522, 523, 524, 526, 527, 529, 538, 539, 542, 544, 545, 550, 553, 554, 555, 564, 566, 568, 570, 571, 576, 577, 580, 581, 586, 587, 591, 594, 597, 601, 603, 604, 605, 608, 612, 613, 616, 620, 624, 628, 630, 632, 637, 643, 658, 665, 674, 677, 681, 682, 684, 686, 688, 697, 698, 699, 700, 703, 709, 710, 711, 712, 714, 725, 726, 728, 734, 737, 738, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 751, 756, 760, 762, 763, 764, 765, 769, 774, 778, 782, 793, 796, 801, 803, 804, 809, 810, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof, by adding to such respective schedules, as follows:—

SCHEDULE "A."

1. Acid, acetic and pyroligneous, N.E.S., and vinegar, a specific duty of fifteen cents for each gallon of any strength not exceeding a strength of proof, and for each degree of strength in excess of the strength of proof, an additional duty of one cent. The strength of proof shall be held to be equal to 6 per cent. of absolute acid, and in all cases the strength shall be determined in such manner as may be established by the Governor in Council.
2. Acid, acetic and pyroligneous of any strength, when imported by dyers, calico printers or manufacturers of acetates or colors, for exclusive use in dyeing or printing, or for the manufacture of such acetates or colors in their own factories, under such regulations as may be established by the Governor in Council, a duty of twenty-five cents per gallon and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
3. Acid phosphate, three cents per pound.
4. Precious stones, polished but not set or otherwise manufactured, and imitations thereof, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
5. Animals, living, viz.:—Cattle, sheep and hogs, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
6. Artificial flowers, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
7. Feathers of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
8. Axle grease, one cent per pound.
9. Barrels containing petroleum or its products or any mixtures of which petroleum forms a part when such contents is chargeable with a specific duty, forty cents each.
10. Surgical belts or trusses and suspensory bandages of all kinds, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
11. Blacking, shoe and shoemakers' ink, and shoe, harness and leather dressing, and harness soap, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
12. Advertising pamphlets, pictures and pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price lists, advertising calendars, advertising almanacs, tailors' and mantlemakers' fashion plates, and all chromos, chromotypes, oleographs, photographs and other cards, pictures or artistic work of similar kinds, produced by any process other than hand painting or drawing, whether for business or advertising purposes or not, printed or stamped on paper, cardboard or other material, N.E.S., six cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*
13. Geographical, topographical and astronomical maps, charts and globes, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
14. Newspapers or supplemental editions or parts thereof, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
15. Bank notes, bonds, bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, drafts and all similar work unsigned, and bill-heads, envelopes, receipts, cards and other commercial blank forms printed or lithographed, or printed from steel or copper or other plates, and other printed matter, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
16. Bookbinders' tools and implements, including ruling machines, and bookbinder's cloth, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
17. Fancy work boxes, writing desks, glove boxes, handkerchief boxes, manicure cases, perfume cases, toilet cases and fancy cases for smokers' sets, and all similar fancy articles made of bone, shell, horn, ivory, wood, leather, plush, satin, silk, satinette or paper; dolls and toys of all kinds including sewing machines when of not more than two dollars in value, and toy whips; ornaments of alabaster, spar, terra-cotta or composition; and statuettes, beads and bead ornaments, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
18. Brass in strips for printers' rules, not finished, and brass in strips or sheets of less than four inches in width, fifteen per cent, *ad valorem*.
19. Braces or suspenders and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent, *ad valorem*.
20. Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, seventeen and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

21. Wheat flour, seventy-five cents per barrel.
22. Buttons of vegetable ivory, horn, hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, ten cents per gross and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
23. Carpetting, matting and mats of hemp; carpet linings and stair pads, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
24. Tobacco pipes of all kinds, pipe mounts, cigar and cigarette holders and cases for the same, thirty-five per cent, *ad valorem.*
25. Clocks and clock cases of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
26. Clock springs and clock movements other than for tower clocks, complete or in parts, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
27. Horse clothing, shaped, N.O.P., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
28. Cocoa mats and matting, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
29. Cocoa paste and chocolate, not sweetened, one cent per pound.
30. Cocoa paste and other preparations of cocoa containing sugar, five cents per pound.
31. Extract of coffee or substitutes therefor of all kinds, five cents per pound.
32. Collars of cotton, linen or celluloid, twenty-four cents per doz. and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
33. Combs for dress and toilet of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
34. Colored fabrics, woven in whole or in part of dyed or colored cotton yarn, or jute yarn, or of part jute and part cotton yarn, or other material except silk, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
35. Non-elastic webbing, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
36. Elastic webbing, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
37. Old and scrap copper, copper in pigs, bars, rods, bolts, ingots and sheathing not planished or coated, and copper seamless drawn tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
38. Copper, all manufactures of, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
39. Copper in sheets or strips of less than four inches in width, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
40. Cotton cordage and cotton braided cords, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
41. Cordage of all kinds, N.E.S., one and one-quarter cents per pound, and ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
42. Cotton denims, drillings, bedtickings. ginghams, plaids, cotton or canton flannels, flannelettes, cotton tennis cloth or striped zephyrs, ducks and drills dyed or colored, checked and striped shirtings, cottonades, Kentucky jeans, pantaloon stuffs, and goods of like description, two cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
43. Cotton sewing thread in hanks, black, bleached or unbleached, three and six cord, twelve and a-half per cent, *ad valorem*
44. Jeans and coutilles when imported by corset and dress staymakers for use in their own factories, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
45. Cuffs of cotton, linen or celluloid, four cents per pair and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
46. Curtains when made up, trimmed or untrimmed, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
47. Hammocks and lawn tennis nets, and other like articles manufactured of twine, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
48. Drain pipes, sewer pipes, chimney linings or vents, and inverted blocks glazed or unglazed, earthenware tiles, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
49. Feathers, viz.:—Ostrich and vulture, undressed fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
50. Feathers, viz.:—Ostrich and vulture, dressed, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
51. Apples, 40 cents per barrel.
52. Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, N.E.S., three cents per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
53. Cherries and currants, one cent per quart.
54. Cranberries, plums and quinces, thirty cents per bushel.
55. Peaches, one cent per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
56. Gas meters, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
57. Crystal and decorated glass table-ware made expressly for mounting with silver-plated trimmings, when imported by manufacturers of plated ware, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
58. Glass carboys and demijohns, empty or filled, bottles and decanters, flasks and phials of less capacity than eight ounces, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
59. Lamp, gas light and electric light shades, lamps and lamp chimneys, side-lights and head-lights, globes for lanterns, lamps, electric lights and gaslights, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER.

60. Common and colorless window glass; and plain, colored, stained or tinted glass in sheets, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
61. Ornamental, figured and enamelled colored glass; painted and vitrified glass; figured, enamelled and obscured white glass; rough and rolled colorless plate glass, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
62. Stained glass windows, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
63. Silvered plate glass, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
64. Silvered plate glass, bevelled, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
65. Plate glass, not colored, in panes of not over thirty square feet each, six cents per square foot, and when bevelled, one cent per square foot additional.
66. Plate glass in panes of over thirty and not over seventy square feet each, eight cents per square foot; and when bevelled, one cent per square foot additional.
67. Plate glass in panes of over seventy square feet each, nine cents per square foot; and when bevelled, one cent per square foot additional.
68. Imitation porcelain shades and colored glass shades, not figured, painted, enamelled or engraved, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
69. All other glass and manufactures of glass, N.O.P., including bent plate glass, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
70. Gloves and mitts of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
71. Gold and silver leaf, and Dutch or schlag metal leaf, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
72. Gun, rifle and pistol cartridges; and cartridge cases of all kinds and materials; percussion caps, and gun wads of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
73. Fur felt hats, one dollar and fifty cents per dozen, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
74. Hats and caps, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
75. Ladies' hats and bonnets, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
76. Honey and imitations thereof, in comb or otherwise, three cents per pound.
77. India rubber boots and shoes with tops or uppers of cloth or of material other than rubber, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
78. India rubber boots and shoes and other manufactures of India rubber, N. E. S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
79. Corset clasps, spoon clasps or busks, blanks, busks, side steels and other corset steels, whether plain, japanned, lacquered, tinned or covered with paper or cloth; also buck, bone or corset wires, covered with paper or cloth, cut to lengths and tipped with brass or tin, or untipped, or in coils, five cents per pound and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
80. Ferro-manganese, ferro-silicon, spiegel, steel bloom ends and crop ends of steel rails, for the manufacture of iron or steel, two dollars per ton.
81. Builders', cabinet-makers', harness-makers' and saddlers' hardware, including curry-combs, carriage hardware, locks, butts and hinges, N. E. S., and tools of all kinds, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
82. Fire-arms, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
83. Surgical and dental instruments of all kinds, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
84. Lap-welded iron tubing, threaded and coupled or not, one and one-half to two inches inclusive in diameter, for use exclusively in artesian wells, petroleum pipe lines and petroleum refineries, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
85. Other wrought iron tubes or pipes, one and three-quarter cents per pound.
86. Wrought iron or steel nuts and washers, iron or steel rivets, bolts with or without threads, nut and bolt blanks, T and strap hinges and hinge blanks, N.E.S., one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
87. Jellies, jams and preserves, N.E.S.. five cents per pound.
88. Laces, braids, fringes, embroideries, cords, tassels, and bracelets; braids, chains or cords of hair; lace collars and all similar goods, lace nets and nettings of cotton, silk, linen or other materials, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
89. Lard, tried or rendered, three cents per pound the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

90. Lard, untried, two cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
91. Lead, nitrate and acetate of, not ground, five per cent. *ad valorem.*
92. Lead pipe and lead shot, one and a-half cents per pound.
93. Leather-board and leatheroid, three cents per pound.
94. Skins for morocco leather, tanned, but not further manufactured, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
95. Belting leather and upper leather including kid, lamb, sheep and calf, tanned or dressed but not waxed or glazed, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem; if* dressed and waxed or glazed, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
96. Belting of leather or other material, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
97. Liquorice paste, two cents per pound.
98. Liquorice in rolls or sticks, three cents per pound.
99. Extract of malt (non-alcoholic) for medicinal purposes, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
100. Magic lanterns and slides therefor, philosophical, photographic, mathematical and optical instruments, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
101. Mess pork, as defined by the General Inspection Act, one and one-half cents per pound.
102. Meats, fresh or salted, N.E.S., three cents per pound.
103. Dried or smoked meats and meats preserved in any other way than salted or pickled, N.E.S., three cents per pound; if imported in tins the weight to include the weight of the tin.
104. Milk food and other similar preparations, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
105. Mucilage, and liquid glue, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
106. Mustard seed, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
107. Linseed or flaxseed oil, raw or boiled, one and one-quarter cents per pound.
108. Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, and costing less than thirty cents per gallon, seven and one-fifth cents per gallon.
109. Oil cloth and oiled silk, in the piece, cut or shaped, oiled, enamelled, stamped, painted or printed, india-rubbered, flocked or coated, N.O.P., five cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
110. Opium (crude) one dollar per pound, the weight to include the weight of the ball or covering.
111. Paintings, prints, engravings, drawings and building plans, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
112. Dry white and red lead, orange mineral and zinc, white or carbonate of zinc, five per cent. *ad valorem.*
113. Colors, dry, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
114. Paints and colors, pulped or ground in oil or other liquids, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
115. Paints, ground or mixed in, or with, either japan, varnish, lacquers, liquid dryers, collodion, oil finish or oil varnish; rough stuff, fillers, and all liquid, prepared or ready mixed paints, N.E.S., five cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
116. Oxides, ochres and ochrey earths, fire-proof, umbers and siennas, ground or unground, washed or unwashed, calcined or raw, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
117. Paints and colors, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, one dollar per gallon.
118. Paper hangings or wall paper in rolls, on each roll of eight yards or under, and so in proportion for all greater lengths of the following descriptions, viz.:—
    (*a*) Brown blanks, white papers, grounded papers and satins, two cents.
    (*b*) Single print bronzes and colored bronzes, six cents.
    (*c*) Embossed bronzes, eight cents.
    (*d*) Colored borders, narrow, and colored borders, wide, six cents.
    (*e*) Bronze borders, narrow, and bronze borders, wide, fourteen cents.
    (*f*) Embossed borders, fifteen cents.
    (*g*) All other paper hangings or wall paper, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
119. Paper sacks or bags of all kinds, printed or not, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
120. Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
121. Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, glossed or finished, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
122. Paraffine wax, stearic acid and stearine of all kinds, three cents per pound.
123. Lead pencils of all kinds, in wood or otherwise, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
124. Perfumery, including toilet preparations (non-alcoholic) viz.:—Hair oils, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes, and all other perfumed preparations used for the hair, mouth or skin, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
125. Photographic dry plates, nine cents per square foot.
126. Aluminised paper chemically prepared for photographer's use, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
127. Pickles in bottle, forty cents per gallon, including the duty on the bottles, and each bottle holding less than one-half pint shall be dutiable as containing one-half pint, and each bottle holding more than one-half pint, but not more than one pint, shall be dutiable as containing one pint, and each bottle holding more than one pint, but not more than one quart, shall be dutiable as containing one quart.
128. Pickles in jars, bottles or other similar vessels, forty cents per gallon on the ascertained quantity, the duty to include the duty on the jar, bottle or other vessel.
129. Pickles in bulk, in vinegar or in vinegar and mustard, thirty-five cents per gallon, and in brine or salt, twenty-five cents per gallon.
130. Plumbago, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
131. Plumbago, all manufactures of, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
132. Printing presses and printing machines, such only as are used in newspaper, book and job printing offices; folding machines and paper cutters used in printing and bookbinding establishments, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
133. Lithographic presses, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
134. Prunella for boots and shoes, and cotton netting for the lining of boots, shoes and gloves, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
135. Woollen netting for the lining of boots, shoes and gloves, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
136. Red and yellow prussiate of potash, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
137. Rubber belting, hose, packing, mats and matting, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber, five cents per pound, and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
138. Sauces and catsups in bottle, forty cents per gallon, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*; and each bottle holding less than one-half pint shall be dutiable as containing one-half pint, and each bottle holding more than one half-pint but not more than one pint shall be dutiable as containing one pint, and each bottle holding more than one pint but not more than one quart shall be dutiable as containing one quart.
139. Sauces and catsups in bulk, thirty cents per gallon, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
140. Soy, ten cents per gallon.
141. Seeds, viz.:—Garden, field and other seed for agricultural or other purposes, N.O.P., when in bulk or in large parcels, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem;* when put up in small papers or parcels, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
142. Shawls and travelling rugs of all kinds and materials except silk, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
143. Sewing and embroidery silk and silk twist, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
144. Silver, German silver, and nickel silver, rolled or in sheets; and composition metal for the manufacture of filled gold watch cases, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
145. Slate pencils, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
146. Castile soap, mottled or white, and white soap, two cents per pound.
147. Soap powders, pumice, silver and mineral soaps, sapolio and other like articles, three cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
148. Spirituous or alcoholic liquors distilled from any material or containing, or compounded from, or with distilled spirits of any kind and any mixture thereof with water—for every gallon thereof of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than the strength of proof, at the same rate on the quantity there would be if reduced to the strength of proof, as follows, viz.:—
    (*a*) Ethyl alcohol or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl, or spirits of wine; gin of all kinds, N.E.S.; rum, whiskey, and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, N.O.P., one dollar and seventy-five cents.

(*b*) Amyl alcohol or fusil oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil, two dollars.

(*c*) Methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit, or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirit; absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, N.E.S.; ginger wine, mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura, and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars.

(*d*) Spirits and strong waters of any kind mixed with any ingredient or ingredients and being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures, or medicines, N.E.S., two dollars and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

(*e*) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavander waters, hair, tooth and skin washes and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in bottles or flasks weighing not more than four ounces each, fifty per cent. *ad valorem;* when in bottles, flasks or other packages weighing more than four ounces each, two dollars and forty per cent. *ad valorem.*

(*f*) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

(*g*) Vermouth containing not more than forty per cent. of proof spirits, seventy-five cents per gallon; if containing more than forty per cent. of proof spirits, two dollars per gallon.

(*h*) In all cases where the strength of any of the foregoing articles cannot be correctly ascertained by the direct application of the hydrometer, it shall be ascertained by the distillation of a sample, or in such other manner as the Minister of Customs may direct.

(*i*) Each red case of gin of fifteen bottles containing not more than four gallons, shall be dutiable as containing four gallons, and each green case of gin of twelve bottles containing not more than two gallons shall be dutiable as containing two gallons; and red or green cases holding a greater or less number of bottles shall be dutiable in proportion to those above specified. As respects all other spirituous or alcoholic liquors, whether in cases or bottles, each bottle holding more than a half pint and not more than a pint shall be dutiable as containing one pint, and each bottle holding more than a pint and not more than a quart shall be dutiable as containing a quart.

149. Starch, including farina, corn starch or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, not sweetened or flavored, two cents per pound; when sweetened or flavored, four cents per pound.

150. Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids for almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspaper advertisements or engravings, and all other like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, N.E.S.; and matrices or copper shells of the same, two cents per square inch.

151. Stereotypes, electrotypes, and celluloids of newspaper columns, and bases for the same, composed wholly or partly of metal or celluloid, three-fourths of one cent per square inch, and matrices or copper shells of the same, two cents per square inch.

152. Water limestone or cement stone, one dollar per ton of thirteen cubic feet.

153. Curling stones (so-called) of whatever material made, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

154. Molasses derived from raw cane sugar in the process of its manufacture direct from the cane, not refined or filtered or bleached or clarified, testing by the polariscope thirty degrees or over and not over fifty-five degrees, when imported direct without trans-shipment from the country of growth and production, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon, or when not so imported, of four cents per gallon; when testing over fifty-five degrees and imported direct without trans-shipment from the country of growth and production, a specific duty of six cents per gallon, or when not so imported, of eight cents per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER.

155. Syrups, N.E.S., cane-juice, refined syrup, sugar-house syrup, syrup of sugar, syrup of molasses, syrup of sorghum, corn-syrup, glucose syrup and all syrups or molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of refined sugars, or in the refining of sugars, or in the refining of molasses, or in the production of molasses sugars, and all bleached, clarified, filtered or refined molasses, a specific duty of one cent per pound and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*, and the value for duty shall be the value thereof f.o.b. at the last port of shipment.

156. Provided that molasses when imported for or received into any sugar refinery or sugar factory or syrup or glucose factory, distillery or brewery, shall be subject to, and there shall be paid thereon, an additional duty of five cents per gallon.

157. Saccharine or any product containing over one-half of one per cent. thereof, ten dollars per pound.

158. Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery including sweetened gums, one and a quarter cents per pound and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

159. Sweetened biscuits of all kinds, candied peels, popcorn, preserved ginger, condensed milk, and condensed coffee with milk, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

160. Telephones and telegraph instruments; telegraph, telephone and electric light cables; electric and galvanic batteries, electric motors and apparatus for electric lights, including incandescent light globes and insulators of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

161. Stamped tinware, japanned ware, granite ware, enamelled iron ware and galvanised iron ware, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

162. Tinware and manufacturs of tin, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

163. Cut tobacco, forty cents per pound and twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem.*

164. Manufactured tobacco, N.E.S., and snuff, thirty cents per pound and twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem.*

165. Files and rasps, ten cents per dozen and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

166. Picks, mattocks, hammers weighing three pounds each or over, sledges, track tools, wedges or crowbars of iron or steel, one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

167. Shovels and spades, shovel and spade blanks and iron or steel cut to shape for same, one dollar per dozen and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

168. Scythe handles or snaths, one dollar per dozen.

169. Trunks, valises, hat-boxes, carpet bags and carpenters' tool baskets, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

170. Satchels, pocket-books and purses, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

171. Plants, viz.:—Fruit, shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*

172. Gooseberry bushes, two cents each.

173. Grape vines costing ten cents and less, three cents each.

174. Raspberry and blackberry bushes, one cent each.

175. Rose bushes, five cents per plant.

176. Apple trees, of all kinds, two cents each.

177. Peach trees, four cents each.

178. Pear trees, of all kinds, four cents each.

179. Plum trees, of all kinds, five cents each.

180. Cherry trees, of all kinds, four cents each.

181. Quince trees, of all kinds, two and one-half cents each.

182. Seedling stock for grafting, viz.: Plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*

183. Cases for jewels and watches, cases for silver and plated ware, and for cutlery and other like articles, ten cents each and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

184. Cotton twine, one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

185. Twine for harvest binders, of jute, manilla or sisal, and of manilla and sisal mixed, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

186. Twine of all kinds, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*

187. Umbrellas, parasols and sun-shades of all kinds and materials, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

188. Umbrella, parasol and sun-shade sticks or handles, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*

189. Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other packages, weighing not over one pound each, two cents per can or package, and two cents additional per can or package for each pound or fraction of a pound over one pound in weight—and the weight of the cans

or other packages to be included in the weight for duty.

190. Vegetables, when fresh or dry salted, N.E.S., including sweet potatoes and yams, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
191. Velveteens, and cotton velvets and cotton plush, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
192. Veneers of wood, not over one-sixteenth of an inch in thickness, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
193. Walking sticks and canes, of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
194. Watches, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
195. Watch cases, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
196. Whips, of all kinds, except toy whips, fifty cents per dozen and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
197. Wire, of brass or copper, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
198. Wire, covered with cotton, linen, silk or other material, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
199. Pails, tubs, churns, brooms, brushes and other manufactures of wood, N.E.S., and wood pulp, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
200. Fibre ware, indurated fibre ware, vulcanised fibre ware and all articles of like material, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
201. Clothing, ready-made and wearing apparel of every description composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat or other like animal, made up by the tailor, seamstress or manufacturer, N.O.P., ten cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
202. Carpets, viz.:—Brussels, tapestry, Dutch, Venetian and damask; carpet mats and rugs of all kinds, N.E.S.; and printed felts and druggets and all other carpets and squares, N.O.P., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
203. Smyrna carpets, mats and rugs, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
204. Yeast cakes, compressed yeast and baking powders in packages of one pound and over, or in bulk, six cents per pound.
205. Yeast cakes, compressed yeast and baking powders, in packages of less than one pound in weight, eight cents per pound.
206. Wire of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
207. Electric arc light carbons or carbon points, two dollars and fifty cents per thousand.
208. Scrims and window scrims of cotton, plain or colored, cambric cloths, muslin apron checks, brilliants, cords, piques, diapers, lenos, mosquito nettings; Swiss, jaconets and cambric muslins, and plain, striped or checked lawns, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
209. Manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat, or other like animals, viz.:—Blankets and flannels of every description; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, felt cloth of every description, N.E.S.; horse-collar cloth; yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn, knitted goods, viz., shirts and drawers and hosiery, N.E.S., ten cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
210. Plough plates, mould boards and land sides, when cut to shape from rolled sheets of crucible steel but not moulded, punched, polished or otherwise manufactured, and being of a greater value than four cents a pound, twelve and a half per cent. *ad valorem.*
211. Wrought scrap iron and scrap steel being waste or refuse wrought iron or seeel and fit only to be re-manufactured, the same having been in actual use, not to include cuttings or clippings which can be used as iron or steel without re-manufacture, two dollars per ton.
212. Illuminating oils composed wholly or in part of the products of petroleum, coal, shale or lignite, costing more than thirty cents per gallon, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
213. Wrought iron or steel sheet or plate cuttings or clippings, as cut at the rolling mills, and fit only for re-rolling and to be used for such purpose only, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
214. Sulphuric ether, five cents per pound.

SCHEDULE "B."

215. Salmon, pickled or salted, one cent per pound.
216. All other fish, pickled or salted in barrels, one cent per pound.

SCHEDULE "C."

217. Admiralty charts.
218. Alkanet roots, crude, crushed or ground.
219. Precious stones, in the rough.
220. Aloes, ground or unground.
221. Alum, in bulk only, ground or unground.
222. Aluminum or aluminium and alumina and chloride of aluminium or chloralum, sulphate of alumina and alum cake.
223. Anatomical preparations and skeletons or parts thereof.
224. Aniline dyes and coal tar dyes, in bulk or packages of not less than one pound weight, including alizarine and artificial alizarine.
225. Aniline salts and arseniate of aniline.
226. Antimony, not ground, pulverised or otherwise manufactured.
227. Ashes, pot and pearl, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight.
228. Asphalt or asphaltum and bone pitch, crude only.
229. Argal or argols, crude only.
230. Beans, viz.:—Tonquin, vanilla and nux vomica, crude only.
231. Bells, when imported by and for the use of churches.
232. Bismuth metallic in its natural state.
233. Books printed by any Government or by any scientific association, for the promotion of learning, and letters and issued in the course of its proceedings and supplied gratuitously to its members, and not for the purposes of sale or trade.
234. Books specially imported for *bonâ fide* use of public free libraries, not more than two copies of any one book.
235. Borax, ground or unground, in bulk only.
236. Botanical specimens.
237. Old scrap brass and brass in sheets or plates of not less than four inches in width.
238. Fire bricks, for use exclusively in processes of manufactures.
239. Gold or silver bullion, in bars, blocks, or ingots.
240. Burrstones, in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, not bound up or prepared for binding into mill stones.
241. Cups or other prizes won in competitions.
242. Cabinets of coins, collections of medals and of other antiquities.
243. Canvas of not less than forty-five inches in width, not pressed or calendered, for the manufacture of floor oilcloth.
244. Celluloid or xylolite in sheets, and in lumps blocks or balls in the rough.
245. Chalk stone, china or Cornwall stone, and cliff stone, unmanufactured.
246. Citron rinds in brine.
247. Clays, unground.
248. Anthracite coal and anthracite coal dust.
249. Cocoa beans, shells and nibs, not roasted, crushed or ground.
250. Communion plate, when imported by and for the use of churches.
251. Copper in sheets or plates of not less than four inches in width.
252. Cotton yarns not coarser than No. 40, unbleached, bleached or dyed, for use in covering electric wires; also for the manufacture of cotton loom harness; and for use in the manufacture of Italian cloths, cotton, worsted or silk fabrics.
253. Cotton yarns in cops only, made from single cotton yarns finer than No. 40, when used in their own factories by the manufacturers of Italian cloths, cashmeres and cotton cloths for the selvages of said cloths, and for these purposes only.
254. Indian corn of the varieties known as "Southern Dent Corn" (Mammoth Southern Sweet) and "Western Dent Corn" (Golden Beauty), when imported to be sown for ensilage, and for no other purpose.
255. Colors, metallic, viz.:—Oxides of cobalt, zinc and tin, N.E.S.
256. Diamond drills, for prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power.
257. Diamond dust or bort and black diamonds for borers.
258. Emery in blocks, crushed or ground.
259. Entomological specimens.
260. Extracts of logwood, fustic and oak bark.
261. Mexican fibre, and tampico or istle.
262. Fish hooks, nets and seines, and fishing lines and twines, but not to include sporting fishing tackle or hooks with flies or trawling spoons, or threads or twines commonly used for sewing or manufacturing purposes.

263. Foot grease, being the refuse of cotton seed after the oil has been pressed out, but not when treated with alkalies.
264. Fowls, domestic pure bred, for the improvement of stock, and pheasants and quails.
265. Gas coke (the product of gas works), when used in Canadian manufactures only.
266. Grease, rough, the refuse of animal fat, for the manufacture of soap only.
267. Gums, viz.: — Amber, Arabic, Australian, copal, damar, kaurie, mastic, sandarac, senegal, shellac: and white shellac, in gum or flake, for manufacturing purposes; and gum tragacanth, gum gedda and gum barberry.
268. Hair, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled or otherwise manufactured.
269. Indigo auxiliary or zinc dust.
270. Iron or steel, rolled round wire rods under half an inch in diameter, when imported by wire manufacturers for use in making wire in their factories.
271. Jute yarn, plain, dyed or colored, when imported by manufacturers of carpets, rugs and mats, and of jute webbing or jute cloth, for use in their own factories.
272. Kryolite or cryolite, mineral.
273. Liquorice root, not ground.
274. Litharge, not ground.
275. Lemon rinds, in brine.
276. Lumber and timber planks and boards of boxwood, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, sycamore Spanish cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satin wood and white ash, when not otherwise manufactured than rough sawn or split; and hickory billets to be used in the manufacture of axe, hatchet, hammer and other tool handles, when specially imported for such use; and the wood of the persimmon and dogwood trees, when imported in blocks for the manufacture of shuttles; and hickory lumber sawn to shape for spokes of wheels, but not further manufactured.
277. Locomotive driving-wheel tires of steel, when in the rough.
278. Locust beans and locust bean meal for the manufacture of horse and cattle food.
279. Mineralogical specimens.
280. Mining machinery imported within three years after the passing of this Act which is, at the time of its importation, of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada.
281. Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts; but no article or articles shall be deemed a model which can be fitted for use.
282. Iceland moss and other mosses, and seaweed, crude or in their natural state or only cleaned.
283. Oil cake and oil cake meal, cotton seed cake and cotton seed meal and palm nut cake and meal.
284. Oils, viz.:—Cocoanut and palm in their natural state.
285. Orange rinds in brine.
286. Ottar or attar of roses and oil of roses.
287. Pelts, raw.
288. Pipe clay, unmanufactured.
289. Platinum wire; and retorts, pans, condensers, tubing and pipe made of platinum, when imported by manufacturers of sulphuric acid for use in their works in the manufacture or concentration of sulphuric acid.
290. Rags of cotton, linen, jute, hemp and woollen, paper waste or clippings, and waste of any kind except mineral waste.
291. Rattans and reeds in their natural state.
292. Resin or rosin in packages of not less than one hundred pounds.
293. Roots, medicinal, viz.:—Aconite, calumba, ipecacuanha, sarsaparilla, squills, taraxicum, rhubarb and valerian.
294. Rubber crude.
295. Seed and breeding oysters, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters.
296. Seeds, aromatic, which are not edible and are in a crude state, and not advanced in value or condition by grinding or refining or by any other process of manufacture, viz.: Anise, anise-star, caraway, cardamom, coriander, cummin, fennel and fenugreek.
297. Soda, sulphate of, crude, known as salt cake, for manufacturing purposes only.
298. Soda ash, caustic soda in drums; silicate of soda in crystals only; bichromate of soda, nitrate of soda or cubic nitre, sal soda; sulphide of sodium, arseniate, binarseniate, chloride and stannate of soda for manufacturing purposes only.
299. Steel of No. 20 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 30 gauge, to be used in the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs and shoe shanks; and flat wire of steel of No. 16 gauge or thinner, to be used in the manufacture of crinoline and corset wire, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles for use in their own factories.
300. Sulphate of iron (copperas); and sulphate of copper (blue vitriol).
301. Terra japonica or gambier.
302. Ultramarine blue, dry or in pulp.
303. Whiting or whitening, gilders' whiting and Paris white.
304. Wool and the hair of the Alpaca goat and of other like animals not further prepared than washed, N.E.S.
305. Books printed in any of the languages or dialects of any of the Indian tribes of the Dominion of Canada.
306. Brass and copper wire twisted, when imported by manufacturers of boots and shoes for use in their own factories.
307. Noils, being the short wool which falls from the combs in worsted factories.
308. Seeds, viz.:—Beet, carrot, turnip and mangold.
309. Wire, when imported by manufacturers of toilet pins, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories only.
310. Crucible cast steel wire when imported by manufacturers of wire rope, pianos, card clothing and needles, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories only.
311. Ribs of brass, iron or steel, runners, rings, caps, notches, ferrules, mounts and sticks or canes in the rough or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol or sunshade sticks, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades for use in their factories in the manufacture of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades only.
312. Fruits, viz.:—Bananas, plantains, pine-apples, pomegranates, guavas, mangoes and shaddocks; and blueberries and strawberries, wild only.
313. Camwood and sumac for dyeing or tanning purposes when not further manufactured than crushed or ground.
314. Blood albumen, tannic acid, tartar emetic and grey tartar, when imported by the manufacturers of cotton and woollen goods for use in their factories only.
315. Manufactured articles of iron or steel which at the time of their importation are of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in the construction of iron or steel ships or vessels.
316. Wire of iron or steel, No. 13 and 14 gauge, flattened and corrugated, used in connection with the machine known as the wire grip machine for the manufacture of boots, shoes and leather belting, when imported by manufacturers of such articles to be used for these purposes only in their own factories.
317. Steel of No. 12 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 30 gauge, when imported by manufacturers of buckle clasps and ice creepers, to be used in the manufacture of such articles only in their own factories.
318. Blanketing and lapping and discs or mills for engraving copper rollers, when imported by cotton manufacturers, calico printers and wall paper manufacturers, for use in their own factories only.
319. Yarns, made of wool or worsted, when genapped, dyed and finished, and imported by manufacturers of braids, cords, tassels and fringes, to be used in the manufacture of such articles only in their own factories.
320. Chlorate of potash in crystals, when imported for manufacturing purposes only.
321. On imported Indian corn, to be kiln-dried and ground into meal for human food, or ground into meal and kiln-dried for such use, under such regulations as may be made by the Governor in Council, there may be allowed a drawback of ninety per cent. of the duty paid.

To amend Schedule "D" by striking out the following words which immediately precede item 813:—

"The following articles are prohibited to be imported "under a penalty of two hundred dollars, together with "the forfeiture of the parcel or package of goods in "which the same are found, viz.:—"

Mr. FOSTER.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal the following numbered items in the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 39, intituled "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs," viz. :—

Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 31, 32, 34, 37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 72, 74, 79, 80, 85, 92, 94, 95, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 113, 115, 116, 119, 120, 122, 130, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 159, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 179, and by striking out from the said Act the following headings, viz. :—

The word "carriages," which immediately precedes item 11 in Section one.

The word 'cottons," which immediately precedes item 21 in said Section one.

The words "Iron and Steel, manufactures of viz. :—" which immediately precede item 39 in Section one.

The words "Tools and Implements," which immediately precede item 142 in the said Section one.

And the word "Woollens," which immediately precedes item 155 in said Section one.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to cancel certain Orders in Council made under the provisions of section 245, sub-section (1) of the "Customs Act," chapter 32, Revised Statutes, transferring certain articles therein specified to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of duty, as follows, viz.:—

Sections 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 24 of Chapter 15, and the whole of Chapter 16 of the Consolidated Orders in Council of Canada, and the following as published in the Supplement to the said Orders in Council, viz.:—

Special regulations *re* lithographic printing presses ;

Special regulations *re* ferro-manganese, ferro-silicon, &c., passed on the 4th and 26th of June, 1889 ; and the following additions to the Free List as also published in said Supplement as items added to the said Free List, viz..:—

Re felloes of hickory wood, O.C. November 16th, 1888.

Re homo-spring steel wire, O.C. December 6th, 1888.

Re sulphate of alumina or alum cake, O.C. May 22nd, 1889.

Re sumac, O.C. June 4th, 1889.

Also the Orders in Council defining the rates of duty payable upon certain articles as follows, viz. :—

On carpenters' tool baskets, O.C. June 6th, 1888.

On celluloid balls, etc., O.C. April 12th, 1887.

On Vermouth bitters or Vermouth wine, O.C. August 25th, 1888.

On sapolio and silver soap, O.C. April 4th, 1889.

On veneers of wood, O. C. May 14th, 1889.

And the following transfers to the Free List, viz.:—

Wire, for the manufacture of wire cloth, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Cotton yarn for covering wire, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Jute yarn, O.C. May 14th May, 1889.

Wire of iron or steel for wire grip machines, O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Steel for the manufacture of buckle clasps, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Blanketing, lapping, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Yarns for the manufacture of braids, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

White ash lumber, O.C. June 10th, 1889.

Camwood, O.C. June 10th, 1889.

Steel wire for the manufacture of pins, O.C. September 19th, 1889.

Wire for crinolines, etc., O.C. September 19th, 1889.

Sulphate of soda, O.C. November 22nd, 1889.

Cotton yarn for loom harness, O. C. November 27th, 1889 ; and the Order in Council of May 14th, 1889, defining the rate of duty payable upon plough plates, mould boards, &c.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs on the articles therein mentioned shall take effect on and after the twenty-eighth day of March instant.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. BOWELL. It is usual upon the presentation of resolutions having reference to the tariff, that the motion should be made that the House resolve itself into a Committee at once, pass the resolutions *pro formâ* and report, and upon the reception of the report the debate will be continued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course that has been the practice. and no objection will be taken to it on this side. The hon. gentleman knows, however, that we do not in the least waive our right to the fullest possible discussion in the most conversational manner, of the various items when the discussion takes place in Committee.

Resolutions considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of the resolutions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I listened to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance delivered this afternoon with a feeling of profound regret. To me, and I think to most men, no matter what their political proclivities may be, who have paid any serious attention to the state of affairs in Canada, our position at this moment must appear, in many respects, to be both critical and delicate. We are to-day in a situation in which a false step may entail very serious consequences upon us ; and I could not but feel that it was extraordinary, almost unprecedented, to find that a gentleman occupying the position of Finance Minister, having, presumably, access to more sources of information than are at the command of any ordinary member of Parliament, should feel justified, under those circumstances, in adopting a tone which I might almost say was one of levity, in view of certain matters to which I propose to call your attention. Sir, the Minister of Finance could see no cloud on the horizon. Whether he looked east or west, north or south, he, at any rate, was happy in his fool's paradise. He told us that the last year had been a fairly satisfactory one. I tell him, and I tell this House, that not for thirty-five years has there been in the annals of Canada, and notably not a year in the annals of the great Province of Ontario, in which, in many portions of the country, there has been such extreme distress and such well-founded apprehensions for the future. The hon. gentleman told us that our farmers and fishermen were in a condition of fair prosperity, that want was practically unknown, and that labor found full and fair remuneration throughout this Dominion. Sir, unless I knew that the hon. gentleman was speaking in ignorance of the condition of a great number of the people of Canada, I would say that these were words of cruel mockery. The hon. gentleman alleges that he has a large surplus ; he tells us that he expects a still larger one. As I have said, he must know, and if he did not know, surely there are men who support him who could have informed him, that whether or not it be true that certain classes in this community have enjoyed a fair amount of prosperity, there is throughout Canada to-day a great amount of distress. Nevertheless, the hon. Minister had no word of substantial relief for these parties. The hon. gentleman did, indeed, make a few delusive and illusive promises of the assistance that he would grant to some of these people ; but I repeat that of substantial relief, or of any real and genuine appreciation of the position, the hon. gentleman's speech from start to finish was entirely devoid. On the contrary, when these men, speaking through their accredited representatives, ask the hon. gentleman for bread, he gives them a stone ; when they ask to be relieved from the taxes which are injuring them

and destroying the very foundation of their prosperity, the hon. gentleman, with a large surplus, and in the expectation of a still larger surplus, for sole panacea, proposes to add still further to the burthens of the people. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place, but I am afraid that after listening to his speech, I must say to him, as I have said to some of his predecessors, that he has sunk the high and responsible position of the Minister of Finance, the sworn guardian of all classes of the people, to the position of speaking trumpet for a number of combines. The hon. gentleman is not only deaf to the murmurs of distress at home, which ought to have reached his ears, but he is likewise deaf to certain threatening aspects abroad, which no statesman should venture to disregard for a moment. He is satisfied, and he asks us to be satisfied, if the huge taxation which he and his comrades have imposed, is successful in filling their coffers. But, Sir, he never pauses, nor have they paused, nor have their masters and paymasters ever paused, to consider at what a cost to the whole community these results have been obtained. As was said of another person in somewhat similar circumstances

'Half ignorant he turns an easy wheel
Which sets sharp racks at work to pinch and peel."

Now, I have long seen and known, for my part, that the propositions which were made to us from the other side of the House, when we were asked again and again to impose additional taxes on the people for the purpose of promoting this or that infant industry, were, to all intents and purposes, attempts to obtain money from us under false pretences. They may, in a number of cases, have fostered new industries, they may occasionally have produced a temporary splutter ; some weak industry may have been nursed into existence for a few months and years, and afterwards disappeared. But, although the industry disappeared, although the promised benefit to Canada disappeared, although it vanished into the thinnest of thin air, the tax remained, and no doubt helped to swell the surplus of which the hon. gentleman boasts to-day. Now, Sir, to me, and I think to most gentlemen in this House who have studied and reflected on the present position of Canada, there are two questions which tower above all others. Those questions are closely related, no doubt, to each other ; nevertheless, they are distinct, and require distinct treatment. One of those is the present condition of Canada as regards the United States, and the other is the condition of the agricultural population of this Dominion. Now, no Canadian statesman ought, in delivering a discourse on the financial condition of the country, to ignore the unsatisfactory conditions which exist with respect to these two great questions ; and yet I put it to the intelligence of this House, whether, during his entire speech, the hon. Minister of Finance appears to have had even the slightest appreciation of the real position of these two great questions. I will pause here for a moment or two, to review one or two of the statements which were made by that hon. gentleman. I agree with him that he deserves, in this respect, at any rate, a reasonable amount of credit, in that, I think, he fairly estimated both the revenue and the expenditure of the past year, and I daresay he has made a reasonably fair approximate estimate of the probable income and the probable expenditure for the present and succeeding years. But, as I have said, I dissent entirely from the hon. gentleman, I take issue with him in the strongest possible terms, when he states that, on the whole, the last year has been a satisfactory one, and much more, when he stated that our farmers and fishermen were in a condition of fair prosperity, that want was practically unknown, that labor had found full and fair remuneration in Canada, and that all we need, forsooth, to make us a united and happy people, was swift communication with the West Indies and other countries to the south of them—and, I suppose, liberal subsidies for the benefit of my hon. friend from St. John, and some other friends of the hon. gentlemen who also reside in St. John. I notice that the hon. gentleman declares that it is communication with countries to the south that we must look to. But his vision swept over 5,000 miles of territory in order to see countries south of the equator, to whom he holds we must look for profitable trade and intercourse. He cannot see, though we can, that there is a country to the south, in communication with which, in free trade and free relations with which, an infinitely more valuable, an infinitely more important trade, a trade of infinitely greater consequence to all classes in this community, can be had if there were only a little wise statesmanship and a little common sense displayed in the conduct of the Government of this country. The hon. gentleman went on to tell us that we had laid broad and wide the foundations of a development, the like of which—if I understand him aright—the world has never seen. Well, I hope he may be correct. The hon. gentleman went on to say that, in laying broad and wide the foundations of this development, we had poured out treasure like water, a statement no one on this side of the House will contradict, though we may dissent extremely from his other statement that every dollar of that treasure had been wisely spent, that we had a princely equipment and a royal endowment. When we turn to one of these princely equipments and royal endowments—which its other name is the Intercolonial Railway—we find that it cost us fifty-one millions of dollars, and, according to the last statement which has been placed in my hands, in the first eight months of this year, besides not paying one cent of interest on this fifty-one millions, it shows a deficit of actual working expenses over receipts of $416,000. That is the royal endowment, and that is the proof of the wise expenditure of every dollar which the hon. gentleman assures us has taken place. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to reproach my friend beside me because my hon. friend had ventured to say that the intelligence and good sense of the people of the United States would, he thought, ere long free them from their protectionist trammels ; and, with a singular ignorance—although perhaps, looking to the previous part of his speech—it was not an unnatural ignorance— of what transpired in the United States at the late presidential election, the hon. gentleman went on to declare that the people of the United States were practically unanimous in their adherence to their tariff policy, when it must be known to him that, in the last great contest between the protectionist and free trade parties in that country, President Cleveland, the champion of the free party, had a popular majority of over 100,000

strong. The United States, the hon. gentleman tells us, are practically a unit in favor of their tariff policy. Does the hon. gentleman know what majority the Republican party have in Congress to-day? because if he does not, I think I can tell him. The total majority of that party in a House of 339 members, I think, was eight. That is the decisive majority to which he refers. That is the evidence and the proof that the people of the United States are a unit in favor of protection. I do not intend at the present moment to spend any great length of time in discussing the various points to which the hon. gentleman has called our attention in the matter of the tariff, other than this. I notice that the hon. gentleman dwelt on the new industries which had sprung up by magic, but he forgot to enumerate them. Now, I know something of the industries which sprung up by magic, and I know more, I am sorry to say, of the industries which, having been fostered into existence by unwise protection, resulted in total loss of capital to those who had invested in them and in very great loss to the localities which had been induced to subscribe in order to aid them. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had reference to an industry nearer at home. I remember one industry in which he might at one time have been induced to take an interest, and that was the industry of timber limits, though I think a check has been given to that particular branch of development. As I said, I will defer, for the moment at any rate, my remarks on the various items in which the hon. gentleman proposes to increase our taxation. I think it is more in the public interest that we should apply ourselves at present to consider what are the immediate needs of the time, and I propose to review, in a few words, our position in regard to the people of the United States. I say—and if my words do not find an echo on the other side of the House, they will find an echo far and wide through the Dominion of Canada—that, to-day, our position in regard to our great neighbor is eminently unsatisfactory, and why is it so? I will tell the hon. gentleman why. We are standing at the cross-roads. Two policies are now face to face before the people of this country. You may see, if you choose, the reflection of the policy of the Government in the McKinley resolutions, and you may see the reflection of the policy of the Opposition in this House in the resolutions which were introduced by Mr. Hitt, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Here is our position: It is perfectly clear that, whatever else this Government may or may not have done, they have succeeded in bringing Canada into this position, that Canada will shortly be compelled to choose between our policy and theirs, between free intercourse and non-intercourse, and I know well what particular decision the people of Canada, if they were allowed a fair and honest choice, would choose to make in that matter. But I have something to say as to the policy the Government have inaugurated towards the United States. It is now five years and more, since the members of the Opposition in this House called the attention of the Government to the fact that, as our treaty with the United States with respect to the fisheries was about to expire, it was eminently desirable that the Government of Canada, should exert themselves to bring about proper and friendly relations with the people of the United States. What has been the course of these hon. gentlemen from that day to this? It can be characterised as nothing but a succession of imbecile blunders. First of all, those hon. gentlemen were only too ready to make concessions to the United States, without the slightest idea of what the results of those concessions would be. Then suddenly turning round on their previous action, after having, as I say, gone perhaps further in the way of concession than was either necessary or desirable, we saw them resorting to a policy of bluster and annoyance in which they—I will not say falsely, but certainly mistakenly—supposed they would have the support of the English Government. But, when it was seen by the mother country that these foolish men were playing with fire, that they were incurring dangers altogether too great to be incurred either by ourselves or by the empire, we saw a complete and total reversal of their previous policy, and we saw an English statesman sent out from England practically for the purpose of ordering these gentlemen—for it amounted to that—to withdraw their pretensions and make peace as best they could, no matter at what humiliation or at what risk to our interests, with the people of the United States. Then, Sir, we had a little while ago a declaration on the part of these gentlemen that they refused to be bound by the offer they themselves had made to the people of the United States. As I said, that offer they were compelled to implement probably by the action of Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Finance, within two or three days. But, I suppose, by way of provoking and challenging the people of the United States, scarcely had our backs been turned when we saw these men commit the further folly—the insane folly for such it was— of deliberately risking a great injury to a most important trade, by attaching an export duty to lumber, which they ought to have known would simply serve as a lever to parties in the United States who desire to injure our trade in that important commodity. Then, we had twice the rejection of the resolution, which I had the honor to propose in this House; not binding the Government to any particular form of trade with the United States, but simply asking that they would invite negotiations for the purpose of seeing whether we could not obtain better trade relations with our American neighbors. I suppose, by way of giving emphasis to that, they added to this double rejection a further refusal to take any steps whatever to maintain an agent at Washington, who could keep them advised of what they extremely need to be advised—the real temper and feeling of the American politicians and people. I say, that in dealing with the United States these hon. gentlemen opposite, from first to last, have displayed an utter want of statemanship and capacity for Government. These hon. gentlemen may be, as one of their supporters last night described them, persons who are extremely well fitted to gerrymandering fifty-four constituencies, under pretence of providing constituencies for four new members; they may be able enough to pass Franchise Bills; they may be able to debauch members, and constituencies, and Provinces too, for that matter; but when a real emergency occurs, we find these men helpless, or compelled to adopt the policy furnished them from this side of the House. In this matter I say, that we on this side of the House, speak at least for one-half the

people of Canada, even supposing that the hon. gentlemen opposite do speak, which I doubt, for the other half ; we know, and we have proof, that in advocating the course we have advocated, we reflect correctly the views of the Local Legislatures of the people who are in many important respects, closer to them, or at least quite as well acquainted with their real wants and wishes, as we can be. I have no doubt that if the hon. gentlemen were to submit to-morrow a plebiscitum to the people of this Dominion, demanding of them plainly whether they did or did not desire to cultivate close trade relations with the United States, by every honorable means and methods—I have no doubt whatever that such plebiscitum would obtain a perfectly overwhelming vote throughout this Dominion. I have no doubt either for my part, that if it were possible for us to obtain a fair and honest expression of the people at the polls, free from those debasing and perverting influences to which I have alluded ; free from the effects of Gerrymander Acts, and Franchise Bills, and a subsidised press, and all the side issues which disturb a political election—I have no doubt, whatever, that the result would be precisely the same. I say, it is an ostrich-like policy on the part of these hon. gentlemen to affect—as the Minister of Finance appears to affect in his speech this afternoon—indifference to the policy which may be pursued by the country to the south of us. The United States are our closest neighbors, bordering on us for more than three thousand miles, they are our chiefest and most profitable customers, they are the home of a very large number of our people, and more than that, their prosperity, as hon. gentlemen well know, most largely affects our prosperity. A great crisis and a great depression in the United States would mean great injury and great loss to an enormous number of our people. Now, Sir, that being so, and there being no possiblity of disputing these facts, why cannot the hon. gentlemen recognise that ? Why must they neglect the ordinary precautions, which would recommend themselves to men of common sense ? Why, must they deliberately invite and challenge grave injury to this country, as has been done to-night, by the proposition submitted by the hon. gentleman ? I tell the hon. the Minister of Finance and I tell his colleagues, that if the Bill now known as the McKinley Bill passes through the United States Congress in its present shape, these portions of the Bill, which are likely to affect our people injuriously, will have been passed, humanly speaking, more in consequence of the ill-advised acts of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, than from any other cause whatever. I say that the hon. gentleman has acted most imprudently and that he has done all that he can possibly do to inflict a grave injury on the people whom it is his bounden duty to protect and to provide for. Now, Sir, in listening to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance, I missed two or three things which we were in the habit of hearing commented on in former occasions. I can well remember when hon. gentlemen, occupying the position of Finance Minister, were wont to tell us that nothing did so much injury to this country as the great preponderance of imports over exports. The hon. gentleman is well aware that we imported some $20,000,000 worth more than we exported during the last year, but on the present occasion he does not consider that fact as even worthy of notice. The hon. gentleman likewise, and the hon. gentleman's colleagues, a little while ago, lost no opportunity of explaining to the House, and explaining to the people of Canada, that it was an unanswerable proof of the general prosperity of the people of the country that our savings banks deposits kept increasing by millions and millions every year. It was no doubt quite an accidental oversight on the part of the hon. gentleman that he did not mention to-day, that whereas the savings banks' deposits amounted to $42,999,692 on the 1st of October last, on the 1st March last they had been reduced to $41,305,493, being a loss of $1,700,000 of savings banks' deposits in the course of five months. That is a fact which has no doubt entirely escaped the hon. gentleman's memory. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, or some of his friends, will tell us that was because of the reduced rate of interest from 4 to 3½ per cent. Now, Sir, I call the attention of the House, as I have done on two or three occasions before, to the fact that the hon. gentleman's proof of "marked prosperity," simply indicated that they were paying some 30 or 40 per cent. more than the money was actually worth, and, therefore, they got the additional deposits of which they boasted. But when they come down to the fair market rate, not to 3 per cent. but 3½ per cent., in five months their deposits were reduced by nearly $2,000,000. The hon. gentleman cannot see, I suppose, that is any evidence either of the falsity of the system on which he worked, or—if his previous statements were correct—any evidence of the pressure which, according to him and his friends, is now inflicted on the country. When the hon. gentleman and his friends were calling the attention of the people of Canada to the increase of the savings banks' deposits as a proof of our great prosperity, I took the opportunity on many occasions of pointing out to them that that was an entire delusion. I pointed out that Canada was a borrowing country and not a lending country, and that it was perfectly absurd for them to suppose that if they borrowed from the people of Canada, they could produce any other result than to oblige the people of Canada to borrow from somebody else. I have in my hand a very curious proof of the exact accuracy of my prediction. I have here the returns of the moneys borrowed by loan companies abroad in the last few years, and I find that whereas on the 1st of July, 1879, we borrowed through our savings banks $9,207,000, and on the 1st of January, 1890, $41,800,000, being an increase of about $32,000,000, at the same time the Canadian public were borrowing, in England chiefly, in precisely the same ratio. In 1879 they had borrowed $6,602,000, and on the 1st of January, 1888, within a period two years shorter than the term for the savings banks' deposits, they had borrowed $36,502,000. So that the whole result of the policy of these hon. gentlemen was that they borrowed from the people of Canada, and compelled the people of Canada to borrow abroad at higher rates ; and that statement does not take into account the numerous other loans, municipal and private, which have constantly been made. Sir, the hon. gentleman had not one word to say at the same time of the growth of our trade with the United States. According to our Trade and Navigation Returns, our trade with the United States appears

to have grown more than our trade with any other country. In the last year our trade with the United States appears to have increased from $91,000,000 to $94,000,000, while our trade with Great Britain barely increased from $79,000,000 to $80,000,000, which is proof enough, if proof were needed, of the enormous importance to the people of this country of cultivating close and friendly relations with a nation which in the face of the disadvantage of two hostile tariffs takes from us very nearly one-half of our total exports and imports. The hon. gentleman estimated his surplus at $1,867,000. That is a substantial surplus, but I observe that in obtaining it he charged to capital account $163,000 for expenses of North-West lands, while he appropriated the entire receipts from North-West lands to income, and also that he charged to capital account about $370,000 for rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway; so that in my judgment at least $530,000 ought to be deducted from the hon. gentleman's surplus, leaving a substantial surplus it is true, but one very considerably less than that which he claims. And, Sir, while I am on this subject I may call the attention of the hon. First Minister, who is the party most chiefly responsible in the first instance, to the fact that although we have now come within five or six months of the time when we were to receive $68,000,000 profit from the sale of the North-West lands, our expenses for North-West lands, up to the 30th of June last, amounted to $5,909,462, and the total receipts credited to us to that date amounted to $4,205,526; so that to-day we have five or six months left to us to overcome a deficit of $1,633,936 and to realise the much desired profit promised by the hon. First Minister of $68,000,000 odd, payable on the 1st of January, 1891, both days inclusive. Well, Sir, all I will say is this, that looking at the promises held out to us when this same National Policy was introduced, and looking also at the performances, the results with respect to the National Policy correspond very accurately, so far as the majority of the people of Canada are concerned, to the results of the hon. gentleman's North-West land policy. But, Mr. Speaker, there a question of still greater magnitude which I desire to discuss to-night. We have now had something like eleven years of the operation of this same protective nostrum, and the time has come for us to see to what position it has brought us; and more particularly has the time come for us to see to what position it has brought the greatest class in this community. I need not say, for I have the authority of hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the hon. First Minister, for declaring that the prosperity of Canada mainly depends on the prosperity of the agricultural class—that our wealth comes chiefly from that class, and next to them from our miners, our fishermen, our sailors and our lumbermen; the rest are practically to a very great extent dependents or waiters or servants on those classes. Of these productive classes, as every one knows, our agriculturists are by far the chief. If they prosper, the rest will prosper, and prosper permanently; if they do not prosper, I need not tell the House that the prosperity of all the rest will depend on a very unstable equilibrium. Now, it may interest the House to know what, in the opinion of the hon. First Minister, was the condition of the farmers of Canada a few years ago. I find that in 1876, when the subject of the National Policy was first introduced to the notice of the people, that hon. gentleman, speaking of the condition of the agricultural class, made use of the following rather remarkable words:

"It is not every man who can be or likes to be a farmer, and the man who is unwillingly made one will be a failure. There is no life in the world, in my estimation, more happy and enviable than the farmer's under the circumstances in which he is placed in Canada. It is a pleasant, independent life, bringing domestic happiness and all that the expression implies, but still all men are not to be farmers."

A little later on he went on to say:

"I shall not assert on their part that they come here *in formâ pauperis*, or that they are suffering from distress or pecuniary difficulty. I am not going to say anything of the kind; no man could truthfully say that the farmers cannot live in comfort or happiness under the present tariff."

That is the tariff to which my name is attached. Well, if the hon. gentleman had never stated an exact fact in his life before, he stated it then. Sir, it was all true. The condition of the farmers of Canada was fairly good in 1876, and more than fairly good, take the whole country throughout. The land values of the farms was certainly rising. On the whole, barring accident from unprosperous seasons, their indebtedness was diminishing; the taxation of the country was stationary, the farming population—and to this I call the attention of the House—was increasing with reasonable rapidity, and, as the statistics of the United States clearly show, emigration from this country, and emigration on the part of the farmers was lessening. Moreover, there was reasonable probability then of retaining our surplus population in our own country. It is true at that time there was a serious commercial difficulty, not merely in Canada but in the United States, in England and in almost the entire civilised world. And it was equally true, and the right hon. gentleman knew it well, that so far as Canada was concerned our commercial difficulties arose, to a very considerable extent, if not altogether, from the state of things in the United States, which were then going through a period of unexampled depression, and that our commercial difficulties were far less than those existing in the United States, and that they were certain to disappear the first moment that a revival of prosperity took place there. Waiving this, however, we have had, on the authority of the First Minister, his own admission of the condition of the farmers of Canada, and notably of the farmers of Ontario, at the time when the late Government was in power. It becomes our duty to examine the condition of the farmers of Canada to-day. Anywhere and everywhere that is a most important task; here it is supremely so. At all events so far as our inland Provinces go agriculture is, agriculture must be for many a day our great staple. Sir, I do not at all mean to say that we may not have a reasonable number of manufacturing industries in this country, but I do say that, taking Canada as a whole, circumstances do not seem to fit us to become a great manufacturing country, and most assuredly, if I am to judge of the progress which the exports of manufactures have made in the last eleven years, the policy of hon. gentlemen has been singularly unfortunate in promoting the exports of manufactures at all events from this country. It becomes our duty to ascertain what are the best tests of the

condition of the farmers in any given country. To me it appears that our first duty is to ascertain how rapidly the rural population in the Dominion of Canada is increasing, how much the value of farm land in Canada is increasing, how far the indebtedness of the farmers has increased, how high they are taxed; and, in the last place, how fast the settlement of unoccupied lands is advancing. Here I must perforce take the Province of Ontario as the best illustration I can get of the actual condition of the farming population. Not only is it the largest and richest Province, but here we have got, on the whole, tolerably clear and satisfactory evidence of what is going forward, more so at all events than we are as yet able to obtain in any other Province. I want to call the attention of the House to the growth of the rural population of the Province of Ontario within two periods; one covering the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, and the other covering the Administration of the hon. gentleman who succeeded him. Sir, it is noteworthy, and it would be well for those who represent agricultural constituencies to call the attention of their voters to it. I find that in the years from 1872 to 1879 the rural population of Ontario increased 84,603 souls. I find that from 1879 to 1888 the rural population of Ontario increased a little less than 11,000 souls; in the seven years under the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie chiefly, the rural population of Ontario—which I submit is a very good test of the prosperity of the farmers—increased eight times more than it did in a period of nine years under the Administration of the hon. gentleman opposite. And, Sir, it is well to remember that that increase under the Mackenzie régime took place against that all but absolutely stationary condition under his successor, in spite of the fact that a large amount of new territory was thrown open in Ontario, that many thousands of miles of railway were constructed in the period from 1879 to 1888, whereby a great impetus ought to have been given to the growth of the rural population. Even at the risk of somewhat wearying my hon. friends, I must call their attention to a statement which has been furnished to me, showing how the rural population in fifty constituencies in Ontario has retrograded during the last nine years. The figures are as follows:—

RURAL POPULATION, ONTARIO.

	1879.	1888.
Kent	30,847	29,816
Elgin	27,772	26,420
Norfolk	25,200	23,879
Haldimand	18,540	16,603
Welland	19,199	17,965
Huron	51,592	48,451
Grey	56,263	54,549
Bruce	45,176	41,789
Middlesex	50,861	50,837
Oxford	30,106	28,881
Perth	32,719	29,834
Wellington	37,203	35,079
Lincoln	15,982	14,311
Halton	14,910	13,811
Peel	18,973	18,145
York	46,258	39,866
Ontario	33,468	30,496
Durham	22,632	22,617
Northumberland	26,686	25,967
Prince Edward	15,473	13,277
Lennox and Addington	18,906	18,148
Leeds and Grenville	39,852	37,313
Glengarry	18,590	18,113
Lanark	21,333	20,889
Victoria	22,112	20,752

Now, out of eighty-three rural constituencies in

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the Province of Ontario, in fifty the rural population had actually retrograded. Many of the remainder were absolutly stationary, hardly one, with the exception of those which were perfectly new territories, had maintained its natural increase. Will hon. gentlemen opposite dare to assert, in the face of these figures, that the whole Province of Ontario is already filled up, that there is no room there for agriculturists or settlers, and that the state of things which exists there is a natural and wholesome condition of affairs? I turn to the Hand Book of this Dominion, which was laid on the Table last night, and I see there that the total area of Ontario is 181,000 square miles, or 115,000,000 acres. Now, I suppose, if I or anybody on this side had dared to insinuate that this was not all good land, we would have been accused of being woefully unpatriotic. Nevertheless, I cannot say that I consider the whole of these 115,000,000 acres perfectly good land, but I do believe that a very large portion of it is quite capable of profitable agriculture; and I ask: What can be thought about such a state of things as this? We have but a little more than 200,000 families engaged in agriculture in the Province of Ontario, with its area of 181,000 square miles, or one square mile to each family; and we have an enormous extent, fully equal to that now occupied, of good land waiting cultivation; and yet in nine years the total rural population of the great Province of Ontario has increased less than 11,000 souls. Why, if I look at the municipal returns, I find that the total occupied land in Ontario, in the year 1887, was given at 21,799,000 acres, of which 11,108,000 acres were returned as cleared. So that of 115,000,000 acres, which is the nominal area of Ontario, 11,108,000 appear to be cleared; and yet the population of that Province, during nine long years of the Administration of the right hon. gentleman, has remained positively stationary. It has gained but 1 per cent. in that period, the natural increase of population being something like 2¼ per cent. per year. In the meantime, if the hon. the Minister of Agriculture's statistics are to be relied upon, we have imported into Canada many hundreds of thousands of immigrants, the greater portion of whom must clearly, if they have stayed here at all, have settled in the Province of Ontario. Now, not merely is it clear from this evidence that the rural population of that great Province is perfectly stationary, but I say that, with such an area as I have described unoccupied, a stationary state is a retrogressive state; and I ask, is it our misfortune or our fault that such a state of things has been created that we cannot keep the natives of our own country here, but they must leave our shores by the hundred thousands, and that, when we bring out at great expense hundred of thousands of emigrants, we cannot keep them either? I turn to the second part of my investigation. It is clear, as I have shown, that there is no increase of the rural population—but what of the other proofs of prosperity, and, more particularly, what of the amount of indebtedness existing among the farmers of Ontario? It is quite true—I am not disposed to dispute the proposition—that in newly settled countries an increase of indebtedness is not always a proof that the country has retrograded; but, in old settled countries, I say there is no clearer proof that farming has become unpro-

fitable and that the farmers are hampered in their circumstances, than to find, instead of paying off their indebtedness, they are largely increasing it. I have always believed that it was the duty, both of this Government and of the Local Government, to have investigated this matter, to have ascertained and put on record the increase or diminution of mortgage indebtedness, especially on farms, from year to year; and I regret much that neither one nor the other of these Governments has seen fit to do so. As the Governments would not act, and as I had cause to know that this indebtedness was increasing enormously, I took such means as were fairly open to me to ascertain what was the extent of the mortgage indebtedness of the Ontario farmers, and I am going to submit to this House a brief statement, based on actual investigation, which may, perhaps, open the eyes of some people here and more people in the country to the condition at which the farmers of Ontario have arrived. I caused eleven ridings to be selected in various parts of the country, such as, in my honest judgment, afforded the fairest samples of its condition. Among those, I selected certain townships and certain concessions; and I have here from the reports of the registry offices of those counties a rather remarkable statement, to which I call the particular attention of my hon. friends from Ontario, showing the extent of the mortgage indebtedness among the farmers of this Province. In the first group I found that in one single concession, covering 10,200 acres, the mortgage indebtedness was returned at $139,983; in a second constituency in a concession of 5,600 acres the mortgage indebtedness was returned at $146,-271. In another group in a concession containing 6,400 acres, the mortgage indebtedness was $93,906, and in another concession in the same group of 4,600 acres, the mortgage indebtedness was $57,288; in the fifth case, in a concession of 4,220 acres, there was a mortgage indebtedness of $55,850; and in the sixth case in a concession of 6,800 acres, there was a debt of $84,300. In the fourth group in a concession of 5,600 acres, there was an indebtedness of $59,062, and in the second case, in a concession of 4,600 acres, there was an indebtedness of $79,900; in the fifth group, in a concession of 5,600 acres, the indebtedness amounted to $92,441; and on one of 7,200 acres, it amounted to $150,361. In no case were any village properties included, in no case were any farms of less than 50 acres put down. Now, I would like to call the attention of the country to what that means. If these assessments fairly represent the indebtedness of the respective counties in which they are made, and if those counties are, as I have every reason to believe, a fair sample of the condition of the various rural constituencies throughout Ontario, then you are confronted with this alarming state of facts, that in the greater number, probably, of the older settled townships of the Province of Ontario, the average indebtedness of a township, according to its size, will range from $500,000 up to one million dollars; that the average indebtedness of each constituency, according to its size, will range to two or three millions; and that the total mortgage indebtedness of the Province of Ontario is probably well over 200 million, if it does not attain to 300 million dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of these mortgages are paid off?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. None of these mortgages were paid off in the cases to which I refer. The registrars took great care to say that they returned none that were paid off. On the contrary I fear that if a critical analysis had been made, it would be found that there was a large amount of interest in arrear on those mortgages, and the true indebtedness was considerably in excess of what I had stated. Now, if these samples, which were taken fairly and without prejudice, at all represent or are a fair average of the general condition of the Province of Ontario, then, in the largest and richest of our agricultural Provinces to-day, one-half of all the farms there would be mortgaged within two-thirds of their actual selling value. At this present moment the total assessed value of the entire Province of Ontario is something like 429 million dollars, and though that sum is considerably below the actual value, it needs no great degree of calculation to see what a proportion such a mortgage indebtedness as I have alluded to would involve. That means that a very large proportion of the once prosperous farmers of the Province of Ontario have sunk below the level of tenants at will, that they are in a worse position to-day in Canada than if they held their property at a landlord's caprice, because I hold that a man who is mortgaged to such an extent is in a more helpless position, and less likely to extricate himself, than even a tenant at will could be. If the Government of Canada, or any of their supporters, dispute this assertion—and I am merely giving it as the results at which I have arrived after considerable care and after taking all precautions which could be taken—it is easy for the Government, by devoting a few thousands to the task, to obtain from the registrars of the Province of Ontario a perfect answer, either in confirmation or refutation of the statement which I now make in my place in Parliament. I may tell the hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) who interrupted me just now, that in the cases where I myself examined the records of registry offices, there was no one fact which was more painful, no fact which was more apparent than this, that within the last few years mortgages had increased in an almost preternatural rapidity, both in number and in amount. Now, Sir, simultaneously with this, there has ensued in Ontario an enormous depreciation in the value of farm land. Here I am prepared to admit that there is room for considerable difference of opinion, but as to the main fact that there has been a great depreciation, there is no possibility of doubt. I will be prepared to hear very different opinions advanced. All I can say is this: I have had occasion, in the discharge of my political duties, to visit nearly every county in Ontario repeatedly for some years, and wherever I have gone I made it a point, knowing that it was a question on the answer to which a great deal depended, to make careful enquiry as to the extent of the depreciation that had occurred. I took precautions wherever I could, not to get mere guesses, but to obtain the records of actual sales made in the different localities. I know well that the estimates which have been put forward, particularly by Mr. Blue, may differ in one or two respects, may differ perhaps to a considerable extent, from the results at which I have arrived; but in making these estimates I wish the House to understand that I am speaking of the

actual selling value ; whereas the estimates brought forward by that gentleman, no doubt perfectly correct, so far as his information went, were based on the estimates furnished him by parties who owned lands, and who were not unnaturally interested in keeping up the price as high as they reasonably could, or who, at any rate, were naturally most reluctant to admit that the value of their lands had materially fallen. Some time ago I had occasion to consult a gentleman of very large experience as to the extent of this depreciation. I do not know a better authority in Ontario, and this is what that gentleman wrote to me with reference to the mode in which the value of farm properties is arrived at:

"No doubt you will have the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries thrown in your face, in contradiction of the statement as to depreciation in value of farm land, and while I am free to admit that they are computed honestly, probably from the best data obtainable, still as to the value of the farm lands, they are terribly misleading. The number of acres sown in wheat, oats, barley &c., price of cleared and wild per acre, &c., are probably returned complete, and from the average of this return the tables are computed. A farmer can tell exactly how many horses, cattle and sheep he has, also how many acres he has in wheat, oats or barley, but if he gives the price of his land, he invariably puts it down at the highest price he has ever been offered, or bases his figures on some price generally that has been paid in his neighborhood, adding for improvements he has made in the meantime at cost, hence the misleading character of that portion of the statistics. I have gone over these sheets carefully in townships where I knew the parties and the farms well, and found that it was generally the best, most independent and enterprising farmers who made returns, and while they gave the other statistics correctly, they invariably placed their land at a great deal more than it is worth, and we find the same thing occurs in applications for loans."

Now, I am very sorry to say that in a great number of cases it is patent to all who have had experience, that were you to place any considerable number of farms in the market at the present time, it would be quite impossible to obtain purchasers for them at almost any price. Sir, cases, and many cases, have been named to me, and details given, where expensive farm buildings had been erected and improvements made, when it was impossible to obtain for the whole farm more than the cost of the farm buildings and the fencing. Now, this need not surprise anybody who will fairly consider the situation, because it is perfectly well known to every practical agriculturist, that within the last few years there has been an enormous reduction in the price of all farm produce of every kind and description whatever. The actual margin of profit has almost entirely disappeared. It stands to reason, therefore, that the value of land must fall, and the onus would rather be on those who maintain that, under such circumstances, land could preserve the value it had a few years ago. But here again, I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, if you dispute my statements, if you deny the conclusions I have arrived at, it rests with yourselves to have this matter properly tested and examined into. Go to those impartial parties who are likely to know what the result has been. Consult your registrars, consult your sheriffs, consult your county judges, consult your assessors, and I believe that, without exception, they will bear me out in saying that there has been an enormous depreciation in the value of farm lands, in the Province of Ontario at any rate, and that I am well within the mark when I say that, within the last nine or ten years, the average reduction in value of farms in Ontario is not less—I am sorry to say, is probably more on the average —than $10 an acre. If you choose to multiply the amount of farm lands in Ontario by $10 an acre you will arrive at something like an approximate estimate of the total depreciation in the value of farm property in that Province. For other Provinces I will not pretend to speak. Hon. gentlemen are here present who are better qualified than I am to say how things have turned out in their part of the country. And, lest I should be accused by any of those hon. gentlemen of venturing to speak without authority for the farmers of Ontario, I would like to call your attention and that of the House to certain resolutions which were recently adopted at a meeting of the Ontario Central Farmers' Institute, where delegates from fifty constituencies, I am told, were present. These gentlemen, with four dissentient votes out of about 120, passed the following resolutions, which, probably, the Finance Minister has never heard of, because, if he had, he would not have ventured on the assertions he has made to-day:

"The Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario do memorialise the Dominion Government that:—

"Whereas, we consider the present high tariff is very injurious to the agricultural interests, making what we buy proportionately dearer than the products we sell; and,

"Whereas, the present high tariff has given rise to the combine system, by which competition is to a great extent prevented ; and,

"Whereas, the agricultural interest is suffering under serious depression and unable to bear the strain occasioned by the tariff and the combine system aforesaid, and, as the agricultural interests represent the large majority of the population ; that,

"Therefore, this, the Central Institute, do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the tariff on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is now laboring."

And to-night we had the response of the First Minister and his colleague to their address, to their reasonable and modest request that a portion of the great surplus, at the disposal of the Government, should be used for the relief of the farmers of Canada, by the declaration that there should be greater duties on iron, and there should be greater duties on paints, which are largely used by agriculturists, that there should be greater duties on woollens, and that these duties should be so arranged, by virtue of the imposition of large specific duties, that they should press with special severity on the poorest class of the community, who necessarily consume the class of goods on which a specific duty works the greatest injustice.

Mr. SPROULE. Such as paints for rail fences.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my hon. friend would speak louder I would attend to him, but I cannot always hear what he says. I do not desire to pass him by. It has been argued on the floor of this House, and it has been argued by the press, subsidised and other, in favor of hon. gentlemen, that precisely the same state of things exists in the United States. It is true. Precisely the same state of things does exist in the United States, only rather worse than here, because they have had a protective system rather longer.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what you want to join.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I do not want to join them.

Mr. BOWELL. Commercially, I mean.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that commercially such a proposition as I have advocated here means in the largest sense free trade for Canada, and, therefore, I have advocated it. I do not desire it to be supposed for a moment that I regard the mischievous and mistaken policy of the Government as the sole cause of the disastrous consequences which I deplore. There are several causes. Some of these causes are beyond our control and beyond the control of the Government, and my charge against hon. gentlemen is rather that they falsely pretended that they were able to avert these disasters than that they caused them. But some of these were of their own making. One very important factor, at all events, they are directly responsible for, and that is the outrageous taxation which they have levied upon the people of Canada, and which falls worst and heaviest upon the agriculturists of Canada. Not only is that taxation enormous, but there is this further feature that the real taxation is vastly in excess of the nominal taxation. There is another thing which you are bound to consider, and that is the cumulative effects of this taxation extending over a number of years. What was our nominal taxation during the last decade which ended on the 30th June, 1889? In that decade, commencing with 1879 and ending with 1889, the nominal taxes paid by the people of Canada aggregated, all told, $262,812,578. That was the nominal taxation paid into the Treasury. The real taxation, in my opinion, was at least half as much greater. The Minister declared before recess that he thought we could get along with thirty-six millions and a half of annual expenses on Consolidated Fund. Surely we ought to get along with that amount with a population of five millions or less, when we remember that the United States, in the most truly prosperous period of their history, when they had a population of twenty millions of souls, expended for all federal purposes put together a little less than twenty-three million dollars. In 1845, if the hon. gentleman chooses to look, he will see that the United States, with twenty millions of people, expended a little less than twenty-three millions of dollars for the same services which he thinks he can manage to get along with for thirty-six and a half millions, or, deducting the four million dollars paid to the Provinces, let us say thirty-two and a half millions. It only costs this frugal and economical government of Canada 50 per cent. more to administer the government of five millions of people than it cost the United States to administer the federal government of twenty millions of people. I have said that I cannot estimate, for it would be almost impossible to estimate, the full extent of the real taxation. I believe it cannot be much less than 50 per cent. more than the nominal taxation, and it may be a great deal more. However, take the nominal taxation by itself and what does it mean? We are taxed $30,000,000 a year. The average wages throughout the Dominion of Canada, not merely of the agricultural laborer but of the ordinary artisan, rarely exceed on an average $300 per man in each family per year, so that at the present moment we are administering our affairs so economically that we require to raise $30,000,000; —enough to maintain 100,000 families or 500,000 individuals in reasonable comfort without their doing one stroke of work. Sir, if we were to make a further calculation we would find that at least thirty days' wages, on an average, of every workingman in Canada were acquired to defray the expenses of our Federal Government. If we look at the proportion of taxes which Ontario pays and if we were to assume, as I think we might fairly assume from various indications, that it pays about three-fifths of all the taxes of the Dominion, we would find that ten years of the taxes of Ontario would represent two-fifths of the value of every farm in Ontario from one end to the other. Now, Sir, the result is, as every hon. gentlemen who has studied this question knows, and as I think the First Minister himself admited time and again, the burthen falls on the land. It may be shifted from hand to hand for a time, but in the last result the burthen falls on the land and if my calculation be correct, if the mortgage indebtedness of Ontario reaches between two and three hundred millions on the farms of Ontario, it is something more than a coincidence that ten years of the real taxation would about equal the amount of that mortgage indebtedness. But the point to which I specially call the attention of the House, and of the country too is this: these hon. gentlemen opposite contend and with some show of reason, that a good deal of the depression of the value in land and a good deal of the distress of the Dominion, and notably of Ontario, is due to world-wide causes which they cannot control. Sir, in part that may be true; but what shall we say to the statesmen who, knowing that a combination of causes exist which have depressed the agriculturist and reduced the value of his property, selected that time to increase the oppressive burthens upon him? If ever there was a time when the agriculturist should have been favored, and when his burthens should have been lessened, it was during these last ten years—the precise period these gentlemen chose to load them down with burthens. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are certain facts which are beyond all possibility of dispute. In the first place, no human being who has taken the trouble to examine statistics, or who has travelled in the rural parts of Ontario extensively, can, I think, deny the fact that throughout the greater number of constituencies in Ontario the rural population is almost absolutely at a standstill, that if it is not absolutely retrograde it is stationary, and that in spite of many influences which ought to have added largely to our available area of territory and to our population. Nor can any man with a map of Ontario before him, and in view of the facts I have stated, deny the other fact to which I call attention, namely, that in Ontario to-day there are vast quantities of agricultural land wholly unoccupied, and, therefore, there is no pretence for saying that the rural population is stationary, because there is no more land left for them to occupy. Nor, Sir, can any one who knows the condition of our farmers dispute my third proposition, that the mortgage debt in the Province of Ontario, and particularly on the farming population, has reached most alarming proportions. Of the grave depression in land I speak with positive knowledge in many localities. I speak after having taken every means available to ascertain the actual facts, and if the Government dispute my assertions on either of these points, it is possible for them, by devoting a small sum to the

purpose of obtaining information as to the mortgage indebtedness from the various registry offices, and of obtaining perfect confirmation or refutation of what I say. They can also obtain information as to the depression of lands from the proper source. As to the excess of taxation, it is unnecessary to speak further, but there can be no doubt that so far as we have gone, nothing has been more apparent than the total failure of our efforts, by our so-called National Policy, to keep the natives of Ontario at home, or to induce any considerable number of the immigrants whom we import at great cost to this country, to remain with us. To what does all this point? I say that it all points to the permanent impoverishment, and to the permanent degradation of the chief class in the Province of Ontario. It points to the failure of the experiment in all material particulars of which the hon. gentleman spoke so boastfully this afternoon. It also points to a grave and important displacement of wealth. I do not believe that these gentlemen have by their policy added one penny piece to the collective wealth of this country; but I do believe and I know, that they have to an enormous extent contributed to the displacement of wealth throughout this country, and that from first to last their policy has been to create 500 millionaires and to impoverish 500,000 farmers. That may be wise on their part, for we know, too, that it pays the Government to create millionaires on whom they can draw for another ten thousand, or it may be a hundred thousand or two, when their coffers are empty. And very few, indeed, of the manufacturers that the First Minister comes in contact with get loose without subscribing more or less freely to his election fund, as he well knows. The truth is, that the hon. gentleman has done his best to create what I take to be the basest form of all oligarchies—to create a plutocracy to which the people are to be enslaved. The hon. gentleman may have been successful in promoting the growth of two or three cities in which a disproportionate amount of the wealth and of population of the Dominion is sunk, but so far as the people at large are concerned, the facts I have submitted leave no doubt in the minds of intelligent and honest men, that they have been tricked and plundered and betrayed. It remains to be seen whether, having been tricked, and plundered, and betrayed, they have been so far enslaved that they are not able to strike for their liberties when the time comes. Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance was good enough to tell us that he could see no reason for doubting that Canada was in as prosperous a condition as any country could be; while, had he looked abroad, he would have learned that I spoke the literal truth when I said that in the greatest and richest Province of Canada at any rate, if not in the others, one-half of our farmers were sinking rapidly below the condition of tenants at will, and when he knows that one-fourth if not one-third of the whole adult male population of Canada have had to seek homes in the United States, and in larger proportions by far since the hon. gentlemen returned to power than at any time before. When he knows that not only in Ontario have we been unable to clear more than 11,000,000 out of 115,000,000 acres of land, but that in Manitoba, after spending treasure like water, as he truly said, for twenty years, the rural population barely amounts to something like one family to three square miles or 2,000 acres of land as the result of the Government's policy of colonisation and civilisation in that country where we have spent so much. I say it is a good time to examine these observations of mine, Within one year we are about to have a census taken and I suppose we shall have the general elections within two years. Now, it is easy to verify the facts which I present as to the population; provided the census is properly taken, and provided there are no *de jure* frauds to vitiate the returns. I have no doubt what the results will be found to be as to the mortgage indebtedness and the depreciation of land. If there be any honest desire to get at the facts, an insignificant expenditure compared with the sums daily and hourly lavished by this Government for perfectly useless purposes, would obtain facts of the greatest possible value in estimating the real condition of the people of Canada. As to the other points, they admit of no dispute. I have quoted already the resolutions passed by the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario; I have quoted the remarkable evidence given by the hon. First Minister himself as to the prosperous condition of the Ontario farmers during the incumbency in office of my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie. I might go on to multiply these quotations, and show from extracts from papers supporting the hon. gentleman, that I have in no way exaggerated the statements I have made; but I will have some mercy on the House, considering the lateness of the hour at which it separated this morning. But, inasmuch as the matter was alluded to before by an hon. member of this House, I will just call attention to a statement which was brought to my notice a little while ago, made by a paper which I understand is very friendly to hon. gentlemen opposite, and which rejoices in the title of the Richmond *Guardian*. Speaking of a certain statement made by an hon. member in this House, it proceeds as follows:—

> "Outside of the born-with-a-silver-spoon-in-the-mouth fraternity every son of Adam, at least in this part of the the world, knows that business is very depressed that farming profits are at the lowest ebb, and that the banks are carrying half their customers. We cannot see what good object is served by keeping up this delusion about the prosperous condition of the country. No country can be said to be prosperous when the classes whose labor creates the wealth are living from hand to mouth; and it is of no use denying the fact that this is the condition just now of the producing class. * * * * The depression is from the very bottom, and is felt upwards in every avenue of industrial and speculative life; as it must be when the tillers of the soil are unable to 'make the two ends meet.'"

These are not my statements; these are the statements of one of the neighbors of my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), and I dare say that he could produce some valuable corroborative evidence. Meantime, in order that the country may have an opportunity of judging between us, I desire, before these resolutions are finally read, to submit my views and the views of my hon. friends in this House as to the real position in which the people of Canada stand to-day; and with that purpose I move in amendment:

> That all the words after the word "That" be struck out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—
> "The total ordinary expenditure of Canada chargeable to the Consolidated Fund in the fiscal year 1878 was..... $23,519,301

"That the total taxation collected in the same year was..... 17,841,938

"That the total ordinary admitted expenditure in the year 1889 was..... 36,917,834

"That the total taxation collected in the same year was..... 30,613,522

"That over and above the amount of the taxes actually paid into the Treasury an immense additional sum is annually taken out of the pockets of the people and is paid over to certain private individuals and corporations under pretence of protecting and encouraging certain special industries.

"That in the decade terminating on the 1st day of July, 1889, the sum of $262,812,878 has been raised in the way of taxes actually paid into the Treasury, independently of an immense additional amount extracted from the people for the aforesaid purposes.

"That the said taxation is enormous and oppressive in its incidence, and that it is so imposed as to diminish the value of lands used for agricultural purposes and to increase the indebtedness of the agricultural class in especial.

"That in fact the values of farm lands have greatly diminished and the amount of mortgages thereon have been much increased throughout a very large portion of this Dominion since 1879.

"That the additional taxation which it is now sought to impose will still further increase the burthens of the people and is likely still further to aggravate the distress unhappily existing among a large portion of the farming population of this Dominion, and that under such circumstances it is the bounden duty of this House, instead of adding to the existing oppressive taxation, to apply itself to the reduction of the burdens now impeding the progress and prosperity of the principal producing classes of the Dominion, and for this purpose to abolish or reduce the taxes now imposed on articles of prime necessity to farmers, miners, fishermen and other producers."

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Rumor has it that the hon. member for South Oxford was in Washington at the time the McKinley Tariff was proposed, and I should like to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to state to the House whether or not that rumor is true?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know nothing whatever about the McKinley Tariff. I never was consulted about it, or had a word to say about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have answered the question. I know nothing whatever about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who was there?

Mr. COLBY. The House is fatigued, and I am fatigued, and if the task, which I now propose to undertake, was a very heavy one I should certainly not undertake it at this hour. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. That hon. gentleman is always listened to with attention, whether he makes a Budget speech or whether he criticises a Budget speech. His long experience, his experience as Minister of Finance, his special course of study, qualify him perhaps better than almost any member of this House to discuss these fiscal questions with great ability, with great ingenuity and with very considerable effect. I have listened to him many times, but I have never listened to him—the hon. gentleman must excuse me for saying it—when he seemed to have accomplished so little as he has done in his criticism to-night. The Finance Minister proposed changes in the tariff. For some reason or other the hon. gentleman in the course of his speech made hardly a reference to those tariff changes. That hon. gentleman approved of the Finance Minister's calculations of revenue and expenditure and his estimates for the coming year, and the criticism he addressed to the very able, direct and unadorned speech of the Minister of Finance, was not, by any means, a searching one. The whole effort which the hon. gentleman seems to have made was to impress the House with the idea that the farmers in the Province of Ontario are in great distress. The hon. gentleman entered into that feature of his statement with very great care, and I might almost say with apparent satisfaction; but I do not understand the hon. gentleman to propose any particular remedy for that distress. I am not uncandid enough to say to this House that I believe the condition of agriculture anywhere on this continent of America is in a prosperous condition to-day. I do not think that agriculture in the civilised world is in a prosperous condition to-day. There are causes beyond the control of any Government, beyond the control of any fiscal policy, which go a long way to determine the prosperity or the failure of the agricultural class in any and in all countries. Happily for humanity we have been for many years at peace; peace has prevailed in the world for a considerable number of years. We have been free from the destruction and devastation of war. There has been no extraordinary waste or consumption of agricultural products or of the energies which are devoted to the creation of agricultural products. There have been for a series of years fairly good harvests, and in many sections of the world most abundant harvests. I think, so far as the productions of the soil are concerned, we have hardly a record of a more uniform abundance than has prevailed over the civilised world for a few years past. New agricultural fields are being developed in various parts of the world, the products of which come into competition with those of the older sections. These causes, apart from any fiscal policy whatever, have occasioned a depression among the agricultural class the world over. But I venture to say that the hon. gentleman may examine the condition of the agricultural class in any State of the United States, in any part of the Continent of America, or in any other country with which we are familiar, and he cannot find a record of so much prosperity and so little suffering as there is in the Province of Ontario to-day. The hon. gentleman blames the Government for not obtaining statistics, and yet when Governments do obtain statistics he, with his superior knowledge, attempts to explain them away. He is not content with the information obtained by Mr. Blue, statistician of the Province in which he lives, and appointed by the Government towards which he is well affected; he is not content with the representations made by Mr. Blue with respect to the agricultural condition of the country, but he goes back on Mr. Blue entirely; he makes private and individual and personal enquiries of his own, and gives this House the result of his own private information, gathered in certain selected counties, and on a basis which is peculiar to himself, and intended, if possible, to illustrate his views. I shall expect that intelligent members from Ontario will point out the fallacy, the absolute impossibility of the correctness of the figures with respect to mortgages which the hon. gentleman has made on his own private investigation. The hon. gentleman's statement shows that fully one-half of the Province of Ontario is mortgaged for more than it is worth, a condition of affairs

which certainly does not exist; and when the statement goes forth that the hon. gentleman has presented this as the condition of affairs, it will go very far among intelligent men to weaken his high authority among them. Speaking of the Province of Ontario, I do not know of any better test of the condition of farmers than the test of farm values, and I will quote from Mr. Blue, the statistician, the high authority in that Province. I differ entirely from what the hon. gentleman said just now with respect to the returns of farm values. The hon. gentleman stated that farmers are apt to return their farms and crops as being more valuable than was actually the fact. That has not been my experience, and I do not think it has been the experience of the census takers. If enquiries are made with respect to the values of the farms and crops, it always occurs to the mind of the farmer that this means taxation, and that it will not do for him to overstate the value. However that may be, Mr. Blue's figures are based on a series of years, and of tests taken in precisely the same way; consequently, if they are exaggerated in one case they are exaggerated in another. I challenge the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I challenge any hon. member in this House, and I challenge the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is not in his seat just now, but who professes to have more familiarity, and probably has more familiarity, with the condition of affairs of certain States in the United States than any other hon. member, to bring me a parallel in any State in the United States, the most favorable of all the States, where farm values have retained their steadiness as they have in Ontario. Mr. Blue takes a period of seven years, from 1882 to 1888, inclusive, and he shows that while the average value for those years was $637,732,000, the value for the last year, 1888, was $640,000,000, proving that there has been, from year to year during those seven years, a steady increase in farm values, and that the last year of which he gives evidence it gives a higher value than the previous years, or than the average of the seven years. And the same thing is true with regard to farm buildings. The average of the seven years is $172,000,000, and the estimate for last year, 1888, is $188,000,000. The same is true of farm implements, the average of the seven years being $46,000,000, whereas the value last year was $49,000,000. The same is true of live stock, the average value of the seven years being $99,000,000, and the estimated value of last year being $102,000,000. The same statement holds good with regard to the total value of farm property, the average for the seven years being $956,882,048, and last year's value being $981,368,094. Now, I throw down this gauntlet decidedly and clearly. Let any gentleman in this House or country—for I provoke a challenge, not only on the floor of this House to be taken up by members of this House, but by any body who may hear or read my remarks—point to me a single State of the Union which can show such a uniform, steady and gradual increase of farm values during the last seven or eight years as is shown by this much maligned Province of Ontario. I have in my hand a comparative statement of the values of certain farm products in Ontario and the United States which I made myself, and for the correctness of which I can vouch. It is taken from Mr. Blue's figures on the one side and from the official statistics of the United States on the other side, showing the average values of cereals per acre in the respective countries during the past seven years. I find that in the United States the average value per acre of wheat was $9.44, while in the Province of Ontario, this poor, distressed Province—what were his words? "murmurs of distress;" "extreme distress in Ontario;" "a great amount of distress"—in this exceedingly distressed Province—I am quoting the hon. gentleman's words—the value per acre was $15.78 as against $9.44 in the United States. I find that in the article of corn, in the United States, the value per acre was $9.32, while in Ontario, according to Mr. Blue—I do not know what private sources of information my hon. friend may have—but according to the provincial statistician the value was $18.90 per acre as against $9.32 in the United States. In the article of barley, the value in the United States was $12.67 per acre as against $14.98 per acre in Ontario. In oats, the value in the United States is $8.08 as compared with $12.88 in Ontario. In rye the value is $7.15 in the United States, as against $9.97 in Ontario. In buckwheat the value is $7.95 in the United States, as against $8.77 in poor distressed Ontario. These figures are taken from the "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1888," and from the "Annual Report of the Bureau of Industries for the Province of Ontario, 1888." I find in a recent article in the *Canadian Journal of Commerce* a similar comparison with some of the very best agricultural States. I came upon this article after I had made my own calculations. It is as follows:—

> "The average value of farm products in Ontario has been compared with those of the chief agricultural States of the Union by an Ottawa official statistician, greatly to the advantage of Ontario. The returns for the six years, 1882-87, published by the Department of Agriculture at Washington, are compared with those issued by the Bureau of Industries at Toronto, and the question to be solved was, what have ten acres in each of the eight chief crops of wheat, barley, oats, corn, rye, buckwheat, potatoes and hay, yielded in money value? The answer is, in Ontario, $8,640; in New York, $7,474; in Ohio, $6,457; and so on till we get to Iowa, with a return of $4,958. The average production of wheat in Ontario was two bushels an acre more than in Michigan, three bushels more than in New York and Kansas, five bushels more than in Illinois and Wisconsin, and six bushels more than in Missouri. The Ontario farmer with eighty acres in the above crops, would, at the end of the six years, have received more than the farmer in New York by $1,166; in Ohio by $2,183; in Michigan by $2,200; in Illinois by $2,798; in Indiana by $2,861; in Kansas by $3,215; in Missouri by $3,341, and in Iowa by $3,682. These figures do not include 1888-89, when Ontario did not make such a good showing, owing to drought and other causes. The returns we have given, however, are most gratifying and should tend to inspire confidence in the farming community."

Now, I refer the hon. member for South Oxford to that comparison, drawn between this poor, wretched, distressed, murmuring Province of Ontario, and the cream, the pick of the States of the Union, according to the evidence given to us—not by politicians, not by men speaking on the stump, not by men talking in Congress, not by men writing in free trade or protectionist newspapers—but by the officers of the respective Governments, under the responsibility of their officers, and, unless we know differently we must accept them, and that is the condition of poor, distressed, murmuring, wretched Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And yet they do leave by tens and hundreds of thousands for the United States.

Mr. COLBY. Yes, some do go to the United States. I did not intend to touch upon that point, but now I will—a little later on. The hon. gentleman was speaking of the sad case of the farmer in Ontario. Now, Sir, I am going to speak to you for a few moments of the condition of farmers in the United States, and I do not do so with any degree of satisfaction, but with a very great deal of regret. I am sorry that their condition is such, but it is an incontrovertible fact that all the older States—the northern and eastern of the United States—are in a condition as much worse than the hon. member pictures Ontario to be, and he pictures it worse than it really is, as one can fairly imagine. I would take, for instance, that good old State of Vermont. Some people may say : Oh, well, Vermont is not a good agricultural State ; but I say, with a full knowledge of the State of Vermont—for I know it from one end to the other—that it compares favorably with the farming districts of the Dominion throughout, and I think I might almost say with some favored districts of Ontario. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) need not shake his head. I know it, almost every inch of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) You do not know every inch of Ontario.

Mr. COLBY. I do not know every inch of Ontario, but the person who tells you that the beautiful valley of the Champlain is not one of the finest valleys in all the north—my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Wright) knows it, because I think he is familiar with that locality—tells you what is not correct. When a person tells you, Sir, that the valley of the Connecticut River, which is one of the most beautiful on the continent, comparing almost with that of the Shenandoah, one of the richest alluvial valleys, is not a fine agricultural section, he tells you what he knows nothing about. If he tells you of those beautiful pastures, those hill-side pastures in Vermont, which are unsurpassed in any part of this continent for dairy purposes, for pure water, for sweet and luxuriant feed, if he says we have better pastures in Canada than those for dairy purposes, I tell him he does not know Vermont as well as I do. Yet what is the condition of agriculture in that State ? I will give the hon. gentleman an object lesson. No later than the 1st of January, 1890, the commissioner of agricultural and manufacturing interests in the State of Vermont, under instructions from the State, published this circular, and this map, and this invitation :

" Showing the location of towns in which are unoccupied farms and lands occupied, which can be bought at about the same price as those occupied. Good farms with fair buildings and maple sugar orchards, can be purchased at from $3 to $5 per acre, others with better buildings and near railway or village, can be bought for from $5 to $10 per acre. None of these lands are far from a ready market, and all are adapted to dairy purposes. Payments made easy. Farm labor is in great demand at good wages. In many sections those desiring can procure work through the winter on wood and lumber jobs."

Now, where are those lands ? In what part of the State ? I ask hon. members opposite to look at the proportion of that map which is marked red, and there you see the proportion, in the Connecticut Valley, in some of the best counties and towns in Vermont, of lands that are to be sold from $3 and $5 an acre, and many of them unoccupied. That is the record put out by the Commissioner of that State, and it includes sixty townships in ten out of the fifteen counties which constitute the State.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the advantage of protection to agriculturists.

Mr. COLBY. Very well, the advantage of that system you wish to unite with. My hon. friend wishes to pool the farmers of Ontario with the farmers of the United States. I tell him that the farmers of Ontario are better off to-day. They do not want to go into partnership with the farmers of Vermont ; they do not want to come under any of those conditions which have brought Vermont to the situation in which she finds herself to-day. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to sneer, to sit there and show a great glee, as if he had superior knowledge to that of every other person, to look pompously down upon the opinions of other people, but I tell the hon. gentleman that if the farmers in Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada are in a better condition than the farmers in Vermont and in New York—and statistics show that they are—it is because we have protected our farmers ; I declare that boldly, it is because we have given protection to our farmers in our markets, so that the products of the farmer may be sold at fair prices in the local market. Hon. gentlemen opposite have the most singular faculty of misapprehending facts. It is only after an election, when they have been shown the true feeling of the country that they have any realisation of them, and that awakening only lasts for six or twelve months ; but the old fatuity comes back, the old self-conceit comes back again, they know more than anybody else, and they go again to their destruction, as they are going now. Sir, pork in my county, pork in the County of Missisquoi, in the County of Brome, and throughout the Eastern Townships, has been reduced in price more than a cent a pound, by pork coming in from St. Albans, and other places in the State of Vermont, paying one cent a pound duty and reducing the value of pork in our market. That being the case, if we are not inundated and overwhelmed by the products of the United States coming into competition with the products of our farmers, we owe it largely to the protective tariff, and to it is due, in a very large degree, the superior condition of the farmers in Canada to that of the farmers of the United States. Even now, does the hon. gentleman suppose that we for one moment could compete on even terms in the markets that are common to Canada and the United States, if we were one country ? Can we produce corn as cheaply as they can ? Can we produce the equivalent of corn as cheaply as they can ? I say we cannot. Our barley is the nearest equivalent to their corn for feeding purposes. The unrestricted admission of their corn would lower the price of our barley. That would be the effect also upon all the coarse grains which the farmers do produce, and will produce, notwithstanding the high scientific farming that is coming by-and-bye. The average price of corn in Chicago for seven or eight years past, has been 40 cents per bushel, while that of Canadian barley for the same period has been about 57 cents per bushel. The effect of an intimate relation with the United States, of being upon even terms with them, would be to bring down the prices of our

own coarse grains to the corn standard, and not only the coarse grains, but also the products of animals that are fed upon coarse grains. Our prices would be brought down to the corn standard of the United States as against the barley standard of Canada, if we were brought down to a level with the United States. Their prices would control our prices. They are the greatest agricultural country in the world to-day, there is hardly any limit to their production, and their prices would determine our prices, and we could not help ourselves. Our prices are better than their prices and will continue to be better, provided we continue to persist in those methods which we have adopted in recent years in order to keep those prices up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman is opposed to free trade in natural products?

Mr. COLBY. Most decidedly, from the farmers' standpoint. I know whereof I speak. The hon. gentleman has devoted many years to the study of philosophy; I have devoted many years to the study of agriculture, and when I first came to this House I was one of the largest agriculturists in my county. For many years I had studied agricultural problems from a farmer's standpoint, and I am sure the farmers of this country will endorse me when I say that free trade between Canada and the United States in all agricultural products, would be the worst possible thing that could happen to the farmers of Canada at the present time. I am ready to meet the hon. gentleman on any platform in Canada to discuss that question with him before the farmers. Now, what I said of Vermont is true of the State of New Hampshire. The Commissioner of the State of New Hampshire has put forth a similar address, inviting the people of the world to come in and buy farms which are for sale in the majority of the townships of New Hampshire. The farmers are no better off there than they are in Vermont. My hon. friend delighted his side of the House just now by quoting from a Township's paper, the Richmond *Guardian*. Now, I will quote from another paper. I am sorry the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) is not here. I will quote from a paper in that hon. gentleman's county, the Huntingdon *Gleaner*. Nobody doubts the thorough Liberalism of that paper, and here is what it says:

"We look across the lines, only a few miles distant from where we write, and we see farmers, skilful, industrious and shrewd men, with free access to that market of sixty millions we hear so much about, and what do we find? That they are not so prosperous as their brothers on the Canadian side; that their land, when of equal quality, sells for less, their taxes are higher and their profits smaller. When Mr. Wiman goes to Malone or Champlain and satisfactorily explains why the farmers of Essex and Franklin counties, with the market of sixty millions open to them, are worse off than those of Chateauguay and Huntingdon, to whom the market is all but shut, we will place some faith in what he says."

That is from the Huntingdon *Gleaner*, a very deserving newspaper, and that is penned by a very intelligent writer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is an equal righter, is he not?

Mr. COLBY. I think that is an authority that the hon. gentleman will not dispute. Then the New York *Post*, which I believe is recognised as a paper of authority and standing, says:

"Six years ago, a farm of 150 acres sold for $12,000; it was sold again about two months ago, bid in by the mortgagee who held a $6,000 mortgage upon it, and has since been in the market at that price with no takers. In other words, this shows a shrinkage of one-half in price in six years, and is a fair showing of the decrease of the values of land with us. Prices of farm produce are quoted by the Department of Agriculture as lower than ever before known."

Then we have an official report made to the New York State Legislature in 1887 (Vol. II, No. 24, page 16), and what does it say?

"It is an indisputable fact that the farming lands of this state during fifteen years have depreciated at least 20 per cent. and many agricultural localities are decreasing in population."

A despatch to the New York *Tribune* of the 8th February says of the farmers in New Jersey:

"Many of the best and oldest of them say they cannot make both ends meet, and that the outlook is not encouraging."

I am not going to continue these quotations at any length. The New York *Times* states that the farms in that State are mortgaged for over $700,000,000, and further shows that the greater portion of the money obtained on mortgages has not been expended in farm improvements, but to enable the farmers to live. I will not go into the question of farm mortgages at any considerable length, but, in the most prosperous of the States, their amount is enormous. These statements are not made up from localities selected by any hon. gentleman for his own private information without taking any account of the discharges, but we find that, in the three prosperous agricultural States of Illinois, Michigan and Indiana, the mortgage debt amounted to the following sums:—Illinois, $381,322,339; Michigan, $129,229,553, and Indiana, $106,855,884. These are reliable facts. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the rural population of Ontario, which he says is almost stationary. I am not surprised at that. I would be surprised if it had largely increased during these years to which he refers. What has happened since this Government came into power? New occupations have been found for men since that time. All through this Canada of ours there are manufactories which give employment to large numbers of men, railway construction has gone on enormously, and hundreds and thousands of our population are engaged on the railways, in the coasting trade and in moving the internal commerce of this country which had no existence before. Then the great North-West has been developed, and we know how many have gone there. One of the former members of this House is now Premier of Manitoba, and many young and older men, and many large families have been deported from Ontario to the North-West. Then look at the progress of our great cities. Look at Toronto, Hamilton, London, Montreal, and see how the urban populations have increased, and see the increase of population in the manufacturing towns. Of course that has absorbed some of the agricultural population, but we have not retrograded, and I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman admit that, notwithstanding all this, Ontario has not diminished in population. This is not the case with any of the Eastern States. Maine, New Hampshire, New York, and Michigan have decreased in population. So has Iowa, and even in Illinois a recent report of the commissioner stated that migration westward is going on from the best parts of that State. As to the exodus which is so much talked about, there was never a greater humbug

attempted to be palmed off on any intelligent body of men than this great exodus which has been exploded in this House from time to time. No evidence is ever given of it. Mr. Switzner, the United States statistician, says it is impossible to get any reliable data as to the movements of population until the census comes around. All these talks and wild imaginings that gentlemen indulge in as to the exodus I hope and believe are largely the figments of their somewhat excited imaginations. At all events, if there be an exodus from this part of the country, it is not comparable with the exodus from the Eastern States, and there are causes which govern that, and men are investigating them now. Among the causes of this movement of population, there are the great increase in education among the masses of the people, the diffusion of literature, the diffusion of the newspaper, the magazine and the illustrated paper, pointing out the beauties and attractions of this and that locality. I am sorry to say that young men on this continent, not only in Canada but in the United States, are getting reluctant to follow the avocation of their farming fathers. They show a preference for the professions or for trade, or for the mechanical arts and industries, instead of grubbing in the old-fashioned way on the farm. The general movement is westward, and they may go to the North-West of Canada or elsewhere. In the United States large sections are being depopulated. Among the other obvious causes, there are the new methods of agriculture to which people have to conform. Nowadays, the large farming is done on the broad prairie farm, with the mower and the self-binding harvester and all the modern implements, and the consequence is that from the older Provinces, where farms of that magnitude cannot be obtained, and these implements cannot be worked so advantageously, they move westward. Some will go to the States, and some will go to our North-West. Our Manitoba population will sway off to Dakota. There they are frozen out and starved, and then they come back to Manitoba. The land speculator is ubiquitous. You find him everywhere representing how fortunes can be realised somewhere yonder, and the young man goes to the unknown place, whether it be in the United States or in Canada. He is young, sharp, smart, conscious of his ability, and too often he finds that he has been chasing an *ignis fatuus*, but it is the character of youth to be sanguine and adventurous. This would be the same under free trade or protection, with unrestricted reciprocity or with no reciprocity. You cannot put up barriers to prevent young men from moving about, and endeavoring to improve their station in life. There is nothing at all in this cry about the enormous exodus which has taken place as being the result of our tariff policy. On the contrary, our tariff policy has retained so much of our population as is employed in the manufactures and associate industries which it has created. They are exercised about this matter in the Eastern States as much as we are. Why, the other day, I read in a Vermont paper that the Hon. Mr. Camp, I think, when discussing this very question before some agricultural society in that State, seriously advanced the idea that young men were getting to be dudes, and that their fathers and their mothers told them they did not wish them to work as hard as they had to work in their young days. He thought the way to thresh that crop of dudes is to thresh it before it gets ripe; and he thought threshing between the ages of 15 and 20 years would do these young men good. That is one of the methods they are considering in the good old Puritan State of Vermont—to spank the young fellows and put them to bed, and not allow them to be drawn off by these western adventures. I did hope that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would touch on some broader grounds in his speech, and I had prepared some answers to matters to which I thought he would refer, but he was in his congenial sphere of speaking of the distress of the farmers of Ontario, and I have merely given him something for his consolation, so that he may see that his poor distressed friends, as he thinks they are, are no worse situated than people elsewhere.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS

COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. MARA moved that the 49th and 51st Rules of the House be suspended, so far as they relate to the petition of the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their 17th report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MARA moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call the attention of the Ministers and the House to a question of parliamentary privilege which arises on the proceedings that took place here and in the other House on Wednesday, and I call attention to it at the earliest moment after the Votes and Proceedings have been placed before us. By referring to those Votes and Proceedings, it will be seen that you, Sir, reported to us a Message which you received from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General, bearing date 24th March, informing us that:

"The Honorable Sir William Ritchie, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Wednesday, the 26th inst., at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of giving assent to the Bills which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present Session."

And at a subsequent period, after the members of this House had attended the Senate, you reported to us that His Honor the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give assent, in Her Majesty's name, to certain Bills, numbering thirty-two or thirty-three. At the moment I thought that these did not comprise all the Bills passed during the present Session up to that time, and upon further enquiry I find there are several important Bills omitted—about seventeen altogether on which no action whatever was taken. The constitutional rule of old standing is that to all Bills which have passed through all the stages, and are, as far as the two Houses are concerned, ready to become law, the Royal Assent is due and should be given on the first occasion on which it is given to any Bills. A prominent and marked instance of a violation of this rule was one which occurred in the time of the first Charles, in the Session prior to the Oxford Parliament, when it formed the subject of a conference by a joint committee of both Houses. This conference agreed on the general principle, which is well understood, that the Royal Assent is due to all Bills which have passed both Houses ; and the modern practice in England is, owing to the length of the Sessions, to have numerous commissions during a long Session for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to Bills, from time to time, as they are ripe for assent. These English commissions are limited. The Commissioners are given power to assent to only certain named Bills, and, consequently, they can assent to no others. Therefore, to avoid the inconvenience and breach of the constitutional rule which might arise should a fresh Bill become ripe for assent in the few days between the appointment of the commission and the Royal Assent, it is the custom of both Houses not to press forward any such measures to the final stage in that interval. They are kept incomplete, in order that there may be no other Bill ready for assent on the day when the Royal Assent is given to the Bills named. It seems to me there has been, for some cause which I do not understand, and will not attempt to characterise, a violation of the ancient and wholesome constitutional rule on this occasion ; for which violation, of course, the Ministers who are responsible to the Crown, and to the people, must answer to us. I now merely bring this question before the House without further action ; and it seems to me it is important for us to consider whether we should not assert by resolution the constitutional rule, so that this infringement may not be drawn into a precedent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the first intimation I have had of this matter. Of course, not knowing it before, I am not in a position to give a definite answer to the hon. gentleman, but I will mention it to the hon. First Minister when he comes.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 129) to amend chapter 16 of 50 and 51 Victoria, intituled : "An Act to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," and to make better provision for the trials of claims against the Crown. He said : This is merely intended to remove doubts which have been expressed by some members of the Supreme Court as to the jurisdiction of that court in regard to claims which are referred by Departments of the Government to the Exchequer Court, instead of being commenced by actions against the Crown.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the Government, and especially the attention of the Minister of Finance, to the fact that virtually all meetings of the Public Accounts Committee appear to have been suspended. It is rather better than three weeks since that Committee has met. I called the attention of the Government to this some time ago, when the Finance Minister was not in his place, but the Prime Minister promised to mention the matter to him, as he is supposed to have the principal direction of that Committee. It seems to me unreasonable that a Committee of this kind, which had certain matters before it for investigation, should not have been called together for three weeks, and I hope the Minister of Finance will see that the Committee is called together at an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the delay arises from the great press of business which has come on us all, and particularly on myself, but I will see that that Committee is called to meet on the first available day, by which I mean that I will see how the other committees are arranged to meet next week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may say to the hon. gentleman that it will probably be imperative to have two or three committees sitting at the same time. Otherwise I do not see how the hon. gentleman can get a meeting of the Finance Committee. Progress cannot be made if one committee is everlastingly jostling another.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides, the large committees are not having long sessions now. If they meet, it is only for a short time.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like the Government to state what they intend to do in regard to the Easter recess. I hope they will let us know before to-day's sitting is over.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for second reading of resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In rising to continue the debate which has arisen upon the financial statement made by the hon. gentleman who is charged with the administration of our financial affairs, it would, perhaps, be courteous on my part first of all to reply to the arguments and statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman who immediately preceded me in this discussion (Mr. Colby), before entering into a discussion of some of the phases of this question to which I desire to call the attention of the House. I am sorry that that gentleman is not in his place at present. If he were, I would be glad to do in

public what I have already done in private, that is, to congratulate him on his elevation to a seat in the Ministry. I have to recognise that he has already taken a position of prominence in the councils of the party, that he has been entrusted with making the supporting speech for the Finance Minister, and his statements are, therefore, worthy of consideration, and I notice them, though I must notice them but briefly, before touching on other subjects. If I remember aright, there were but two divisions of his speech. The first referred to the prosperity of the country and combatted certain statements which had been made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on that subject. The second division was the declaration of his own opinions—which I take to be the opinions of the Ministry—as to reciprocal trade relations with the United States. With the latter I will deal later on, but, as to the earlier portion of his speech, where he attacked the hon. member for South Oxford in reference to statements he made, I have to express regret that, owing to the fatigue which I, in common with other members of the House, had suffered, having been under arms, as I may say, for twenty-two hours, and not having spent the other two hours in sleep, I found myself dropping into a doze while the hon. gentleman spoke. It was much against my will that I was unable to listen to the hon. gentleman, for he never had, while making either a financial statement for a Government, or making the leading speech in reply thereto, a more attentive listener than myself. But although I was under this disadvantage in not having heard the whole of his speech, and not having had an opportunity to read it, as our Official Debates are not yet out, I have had occasion to ascertain from those who did hear it, the line of argument that he took. I find that he gave the House statistics relative to the depreciation that he alleged existed in the Dominion of Canada, more particularly confining his remarks to the Province of Ontario, and the statistics that he gave, as I understood, were compiled from official sources, facts that they had taken in several counties that might be regarded as a sample of the whole. These figures were challenged by the hon. the President of the Privy Council, who quoted statistics compiled by the Ontario Government in refutation of the statements that had been made. Well, Sir, with reference to the statistics made use of by the President of the Council, there is this to be said: that those statistics are in a large measure voluntarily given, furnished by parties that are asked for them. I do not wish to attack their reliability, but there is no compensation paid for them, as I understand; it is probable that the more intelligent members of the community who are asked for information in reference to this matter, and when they are giving the value of their farms, they will place upon them a value such as they consider them to be worth, not what they would sell for on actual sale, provided the sale was forced upon them, or they found it desirable to put them into the market. I think the President of the Council, in using these statements, was, no doubt, through error, led to use them in such a manner as, I think, would not fully bear out the idea he sought to convey. I have not examined them particularly myself lately, but I remember that a statement was presented to this House, taken from the same statistics, that I have not seen controverted, that within the period between 1883 and 1887 there was a large depreciation of some thirteen million dollars, as shown by these statistics. The President of the Council, also, on reading them, overlooked this fact—he can correct me if I am wrong—in the comparison he was making, when he took the total of one year with the total of another year, entirely ignoring, however, the fact that there were hundreds of thousands of acres added to the cleared lands during those years, which he overlooked. I think I am correct in that. Well, the hon. gentleman will readily see that, taking the total value of one year and the total value of a subsequent year, in the intervening period, there has been many hundreds of thousands of wild land reclaimed which had become profitable, and if they were taken on the basis of $40 an acre, that would bring up the amount very largely, and would not bear the hon. gentleman out in his contention. But I need not say more on that point—that can be discussed at length, by those who follow. I proceed now, to notice the argument of the Minister with reference to the statement, that depreciation did exist in the agricultural portions of this country. He was forced to admit that, but his argument was this: There is a more severe depression existing in the States of the neighboring Union. Take the State of Vermont, he said: cleared land there is selling for, from $3.50 to $5.50 an acre, for land offered and finding no purchaser. He gave us to understand that this was in the fruitful valley of the Connecticut River, and other fruitful valleys of that State, and I was hardly able to understand how it was possible that in the fruitful valleys in the State of Vermont, a hundred acres of land, with the buildings and all, could be sold for $350. Why, I do not know what kind of houses or buildings could be upon 100 acres of land that would not themselves be worth more than that, and if that be so, the land was worth nothing at all. Then he told us that while it might be true, as the hon. member for South Oxford had said, that there were heavy mortgages on the encumbered farms of this Dominion, he held it was exaggerated; but it was nothing in comparison, he said, with the mortgages on the farms in those States to which he made allusion. Well, Sir, it is not my purpose to contradict the figures of the hon. gentleman—I assume they are correct; I assume the land there is depreciated to the terrible extent he has represented; I assume he is correct when he says those farms are burdened with mortgages greater than the people can bear; but I ask the hon. gentleman what has brought about that state of things, not only in Canada, but in the United States? There is no use saying that these things exist in the United States; there is no use at all in saying that he believes they exist here; the great question we want to solve, as far as our own country is concerned, is, what has brought about a state of things like that? The hon. gentleman will admit there must have been some great prevailing cause, and he stated that one of the causes was that there had been a long period of peace, but he did not propose that, therefore, we should inaugurate a war in order to raise the prices. He told us that during a large number of years there had been a great production, but he did not propose,

therefore, that we should cease to till the land. But these explanations will not explain the problem that is before us, taking it upon his own basis. Why, if the prices of land in the United States have fallen lower than the prices of land in Canada, proportionately, there has been a large number of farms in Ontario mortgaged; why are they mortgaged to double that amount in the States that he has mentioned? Sir, we cannot find a solution either in a long peace or an over-abundance of crops; we must find the cause somewhere else. Has there been a cause at work that the hon. gentleman has overlooked? Sir, I think there has been; and we want to ascertain that cause, and having ascertained it, we want to apply the remedy. It may be true that the farmers of the United States and the farmers of Canada have had less prices than they had in days gone by; it may be they have had less abundant crops than they had in days gone by; and that would account in part for the depression that is put upon them. But there has been another cause at work that has been making them poor, that has reduced their income; there have been laws enacted by the Governments of the two countries, and officers have been appointed by the Governments of the two countries, to take out of the pockets of these farmers, who have a less revenue from year to year, larger sums from their reduced incomes. That is the point. The hon. gentleman has only succeeded in proving that while an excessive rate of taxation in Canada is bearing upon agriculturists in common with all the other citizens of the Dominion, and impoverishing them, the same system is in force for nearly double the length of time in the neighboring Union, and has worked there its inevitable results, making them, according to the hon. gentleman's own statements, twice, even thrice, poorer than the Canadian farmer is at present. But should not that be a warning to the hon. gentleman? If twenty-five years of protection has brought the Vermont, the New Hampshire and the New York farmer to that condition, while ten years of it in Canada has brought the Canadian farmer to the position he is in, does the hon. gentleman wish to perpetuate for another fifteen years this system, in order that the Canadian farmer may be reduced to the same low level of the Vermont farmer to-day? Sir, I think I have answered the whole statement presented by the hon. gentleman so far as that division of the subject was concerned. Now, I desire to point out the cause of this, and endeavor to prove it. It is a common saying, that you cannot eat your cake and have it; and it is equally true, that you cannot take money out of the pockets of the people by way of taxation and leave it in their pockets at the same time. I, therefore, propose to show what the system of taxation inaugurated by this Government, and carried on by it, is, and that every change in the tariff is simply another turn of the screw to wrench more taxes out of the people, who are already overburdened with the taxes laid upon them. I propose to show by some figures I have prepared what the rate of taxation is. We were interested in listening to the Finance Minister, who, following the usual course, presented elaborate statements comparing the estimated receipts and expenditure with the actual receipts and expenditure for the past year; also presenting his estimated expenditure and receipts, and comparing them with the estimated receipts and expenditure for the current year, and, finally, giving his estimates for expenditure and receipts for the year 1890-91. The hon. gentleman succeeded in establishing that his estimates were nearly realised, and it was a very pleasant task, and in engaging in it he was only following the course of his predecessors. But I think that in this year, more markedly than in other years, there must have come to his notice the depression existing in the country, not only in agriculture, but in commercial affairs, and he should have presented some other tables that would have exhibited the current rate of taxation compared with what it was formerly, in order to ascertain whether this rate of taxation upon the people had anything to do with the state of depression at present existing. Let us look at this matter, and institute a few comparisons. We find, in 1889 the receipts from taxation reached $30,613,522. I say, the receipts from taxation: that means money actually taken out of the pockets of the people, omitting miscellaneous revenue derived from our public works. In 1879, the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, the taxation amounted to $18,476,613; or, in other words, the Government during the past year took by way of taxation from the pockets of the people, $12,136,909 more than was taken from them in 1879. But it will be replied to me, and replied with force, if I did not make allowance for that point: In 1879 there was a deficit of $1,936,999, and you ought certainly to add that deficit to the revenue raised that year, because the Government should raise an amount of income equal to expenditure. I say that is true, and, therefore, I add the deficit of 1879 to the amount of taxation, and the two sums come together amount to $20,414,612. But it might be replied to me again by hon. gentlemen opposite: You must admit there was a larger population in 1889 than in 1879, and you must admit that if the increase in taxation is not greater than the proportionate increase of population, the people are not in a greater ratio burdened now than in 1879. That would be a fair and legitimate argument, and I recognise its force; and, therefore, to the taxation of 1879 I have added the deficit of that year, and I now add 20 per cent. for increase of population from 1879 to 1889, and hon. gentlemen will admit that is a fair proportion. That would give an amount of extra taxation of $4,082,922. But taking the whole items together there would have been, on a basis of taxation that would have met all the expenditure, adding the deficit and adding the percentage for increase of population, a taxation of $24,497,534. Subtract that amount from the amount which the present Finance Minister actually took out of the pockets of the people, and you have $6,115,988 of extra taxation ground out of the people this year more than would be required, looking to our increased population and allowing for the deficit in 1879. And thus, I think, hon. members will have plainly before their eyes one great cause of the depression and the impoverished condition of the people, namely: that in a year, last year, the Government took more than six millions of dollars out of the pockets of the people than was necessary on the basis of the expenditure in 1879, providing for the contingency of increased population that has taken place since. This amount is 25 per cent. over what it should have been, after allowing the percentage

for increased population. Hon. gentlemen will understand that if we are going to take money from the people at the rate of 25 per cent. more per year than is necessary to conduct the affairs of the country in a prudent and economical and yet an energetic manner, there can be but one result, the impoverishment of the country. Let me strengthen this argument by a comparison of the total expenditures under the two Governments. In 1889, hon. gentlemen opposite expended $36,917,834. In 1879, the total expenditure was $24,455,381, an increase, comparing those two years, of $12,462,453, or 50 per cent. increase in the total expenditure of the country under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. But it may be replied to me again: Why do you not give fair figures to the House, why give the figures for 1889 and compare them with the figures for 1879, and make no allowance for the increase of population? Do you know that, as the population increases, it is natural to expect that the expenditure must increase? I recognise the fact. I have allowed for that, and, therefore, to the expenditure of 1879 I add 20 per cent. to cover increased expenditure owing to increased population, which will amount to $4,891,076. These two items together aggregate $29,346,457, while hon. gentlemen opposite have actually expended $36,917,834, or $7,571,377 more in a year. The question was asked, during the debate on the reciprocal trade, as to where we would obtain seven million dollars; but here are seven million dollars of expenditure over and above that which would have been necessary, on the basis of the expenditure of the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, adding 20 per cent. in order to keep pace with the requirements of the increased population. I think there is the secret as to why our people are becoming poor. I have thus shown that more than six million dollars has been taken out of the pockets of the country more than should have been taken by way of taxation. If the hon. gentleman opposite had said: "Although we have taken this, we shall thereby reduce the public debt of the Dominion, which will become less year by year, and, therefore, eventually your burdens will be less," there would be some defence for it. But how stands the account with reference to our public debt? Has it been reduced during these ten years, under these gentlemen? Is the taxation which has been wrung out of the people of the country, applied to the liquidation of our debt owed in the markets of the world? No; we have a statement of how our public debt stands. In 1889, our net debt was $237,530,041, and in 1879 our net debt was $142,990,187. In other words, in ten years the Government of this country have increased the national debt $94,539,854. So you have taken your six million dollars extra taxation, year after year, out of the pockets of the people of this country, but you did not apply it to the reduction of our public debt; for your public debt has been heaped up at the rate of ten millions a year, while you have been taking this very money. I have endeavored to present the case fairly, as far as I am concerned. I have added in the deficit of 1879; I have made provision for the increased population, and in bringing both up to a fair basis, I find that the result is that $6,000,000 of extra taxation, over what ought to be required, has been taken from the pockets of the people of this country every year. Let us prove this by another table. Let us take two periods of ten years each, nearly the entire period since Confederation. The last ten years is the time the hon. gentlemen opposite have been in office with their National Policy in force. I propose to bring before the attention of the House the total imports for consumption in the Dominion of Canada, and the duty collected thereon for two periods. The first period is the ten years from 1879 to 1889, the period of the National Policy under these gentlemen, and the other is the period between 1869 and 1879. The total imports for consumption in the ten years from 1879 to 1889, was $1,027,923,231, and on that there was a duty collected—which, hon. gentlemen will readily recognise as taxation, and as money taken out of the pockets of the people of the country—amounting to $204,731,298. In the ten years, from 1869 to 1879, under a revenue tariff, there were imported of goods for home consumption, valued at $103,006,507, on which there was a duty collected of $128,269,884. In other words, in the last ten years, under the National Policy, there was taken from the people by way of Customs and Excise duties, $76,461,414 more than there was for the ten years that preceded. Hon. gentlemen may say to me: But you have larger imports between 1879 and 1889 than you have between 1869 and 1879; and they will say so correctly, and I would not be dealing fairly with the House if I did not tell that the imports during the earlier ten years were less, to the amount of $24,916,724. But I will deduct that amount from the extra amount of duty collected, and it will then leave over $52,500,000 extra, that have been taken by way of revenue during ten years the Government has been in power. So that, taking it on the basis of goods imported, and comparing them for the one ten years with the other ten years, the Government has taken by way of Customs duties from the people of this country, between fifty and sixty million dollars more than was taken from them during the period of the revenue tariff. Let these hon. gentlemen ask themselves what fifty or sixty million dollars mean in ten years, to a population of between four and five millions. Why, Sir, they must see that it is a drain upon the country, which the country must feel, and which the country is giving symptoms of feeling at the present time. The hon. gentlemen should recognise these facts, and if they recognise them as I do, it seems to me that instead of the introduction of tariff changes, designed to heap still greater burdens on the people, there would have been tariff changes introduced which would tend to lessen their burdens; and that an era of economy and expenditure ought to be entered upon, so that the people, with less revenue coming in as a result of the sale of their crops, might have more money left in their pockets by the Government and its officials, who have taken the money from them. Some hon. gentlemen will not be disposed to agree with me, perhaps, that taxation is such a bad thing and that it impoverishes the country. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite applaud the Minister of Finance, one would think that taxation is a good thing for the country. I have noticed every time the Minister of Finance introduces his tariff changes, that when there is an increased duty proposed a glow of pleasure seems to pass over the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they rejoice and clap their hands as if a great

thing was being accomplished. They rejoice that there is more taxation proposed by the Finance Minister to be placed on every man who buys an article for use in his business, or for himself or his family. That is what they rejoice at. There was a time when the hon. First Minister, looking forward to the state of things that exists at the present time, but thinking he had found the means of averting it, declared, that if such a state of things existed as is existing at the present time in the country, it would be intolerable. I propose to read to hon. gentlemen opposite the words of their chief in reference to that matter. When the Government were contemplating the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, contemplating the great amount of expenditure it would involve, Sir John A. Macdonald is reported, at page 1053 of *Hansard*, to have spoken thus, in the year 1880:

"I believe that land can be made productive under the terms of this resolution to complete the whole of that road, to open that immense country and give us a magnificent railway from sea to sea, without adding to the burdens of the people, or without causing any necessity for an increase of taxation."

I ask hon. gentlemen to remember this fact: that at that date Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Government, recognised that the burdens of the people consisted in the increase of taxation. He viewed it at that time as a burden on the people, and he continues to say here:

"We can do it all by the sale of the lands which we hold as a sacred trust for the purpose of defraying the whole expense of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Again, he says, on page 1057:

"As the road progresses, the annual sales of land will more than be sufficient to meet all the possible cost of the railway. In addition to all that, we must remember we shall be pouring into that country an enormous population, which, on a prairie soil, will rapidly become—not with the painful toil of the people of Ontario and Quebec, who have had to clear the forest—consumers of dutiable goods, and contributors to the revenue. We shall be receiving a large revenue from that country altogether independent of the product of the lands. Where, then, is there any danger of this country being over-ridden by taxation or being oppressed? There is none."

That was the hon. gentleman's statement in 1880, when the Government were carrying on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work, and he was telling the people of this country that the Government did not propose to increase their burdens in order to accomplish it. But, Sir, two years passed, and the policy of the Government was changed. They had made that famous bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct the road. They had lifted, as they said themselves, that enormous burden from the shoulders of the people of Canada, and transferred it to a syndicate; and under that changed condition of affairs we had an expression of the views of the hon. First Minister on this question, whether or not taxation or increase of taxation is a burden on the people of this country. Pleasing, as one might be disposed to think hon. gentlemen opposite considered increased taxation, as they felt every turn of the screw, in 1882, after the Government had made the agreement with the syndicate, the hon. First Minister, in replying to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who had made a motion with reference to the manner in which the Government were disposing of our public lands, said:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

"Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says, that we had better settling lands, and not selling them. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that it was the policy of the late Government, as it is of the present, to appropriate a certain portion of these lands for the purpose of paying the expenses of building the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that this task was so herculean, and that the burden was so great for a population of 4,000,000 of people, that, while it had become a political necessity to carry out our good faith and open up and make useful our North-West, which we had bought for this end, if to build the Pacific Railway, at the same time it was part of the policy of the late Government—and as the records will show it—as it is the policy of the present Government to make that country pay for its own railway, why, in the name of Heaven—and I speak with all due deference—should the people of Ontario and Quebec, of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick and of Prince Edward Island, be heavily taxed in order to open up that western country to new settlers from all parts of the world. Why should they be ground down under that iron heel of the aristocracy, and that relentless grasp of the tax collector? Why should they be crushed out, when there was a fair country as large as the whole of Europe that did not refuse the sacrifices which the original settlers of Ontario—and to go still farther back—the original settlers from old France in the Province of Quebec, endured? Why, Sir, instead of being obliged to plunge into the forest, instead of being compelled with unskilled arms and old English broad-axes to hew their way through the woods before they could raise a potato or a cabbage, the immigrant can go now into the North-West, and if he has his agricultural implements, before the night, after the morning of his arrival has fallen, he can run many a long furrow. Then, why, Mr. Speaker, should our people be taxed under these circumstances? This was felt and known in all parts of Canada. It was understood, and it was the policy of the present Government, and of the present, as it was of the late Parliament, that that country should eventually pay for its own railway, and there was an appropriation, which still stands on the Statute-book, of 100,000,000 acres of land, which were to be sold, for the purpose of building this railway: and of these 100,000,000 acres, 25,000,000 acres were to be handed over the railway company, and 75,000,000 acres are to be sold—they are not to be used for homestead purposes,—for the purpose of relieving the people of the older Provinces, who, on the faith of this assurance and promise—and on this promise only—accepted the burden, and have at the polls recorded their sanction of this policy, which was settled some years ago, of building the Canadian Pacific Railway, of carrying out the pledge made to the people of British Columbia, and of opening the intermediate North-West, which was but for a price taken out of our own pockets—they endorsed this policy on the understanding, that eventually that country would pay the whole of the expense. Sir, I am glad to say, that for the persistence of speculators—as the hon. gentleman calls them—but of capitalists and gentlemen, desirous of investing in the North-West, as I would describe them—it is safe, it is certainly beyond the possibility of doubt, to say, that every farthing and every cent, and every dollar, that has been or will be expended in building the Pacific Railway, not one shilling of this burden will fall on our shoulders, or on the shoulders of the generation that will succeed us. We will be free from the whole amount of that debt."

The hon. gentleman recognised at that time that if this country was to face the task of constructing that road by taxation, we should be ground down under the heels of an aristocracy, as he phrased it, our life ground out of us by the tax collector; but he said he had a plan by which, if it worked, this country would be relieved of that burden. Now, I propose to show how the hon. gentleman's plan worked, and I will then ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether or not we have paid for this work out of the taxation which presses upon every vital part of this Dominion. What was the hon. First Minister's proposition? The scheme he brought before Parliament was this: From the sale of those public lands, by the year 1890, he assured us, we should have, of cash in hand, $38,593,000, and during the next ten years, coming in yearly instalments, we should have a sum amounting in the aggregate to $32,712,000; or in all, at the end of ten years, he said we should have, in cash,

or in the best securities in the world, a total of $71,305,000. From that we should have to deduct $2,400,000 for the cost of surveys and the cost of administering the lands, which would leave us, after paying expenses, $69,000,000 either of money in hand, or the best security in the world—the land itself. This sum is to be in our hands during the current year, 1890, and if we find it there, we must admit that the people have not been ground down under the burden of taxation which the hon. gentleman saw would be imposed upon them if they had to pay for the railway by taxation. Now, Sir, let us see how much we have realised. I have the Public Accounts only up to 1889, and the hon. gentleman has until the 30th June of this year to get in the balance of the money. Let us see how much he will have to raise between now and the 30th June next in order to have his $69,000,000. If you turn to page 16 of the Public Accounts, you will find the following statement of the account on the 30th June last :—

TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS.

North-West Territory Organisation.....	$1,460,000 00
do Purchase.....	1,460,000 00
Add—Dominion Lands Capital to 30th June, 1889.....	2,989,462 17
	$5,909,462 17
Less—Received from Dominion Lands Sales to 30th June, 1887.....	4,275,526 11
	$1,633,936 06

So that by the 30th June, 1889, instead of having any portion of these $69,000,000 in the treasury, we have a deficit. We have expended more than we received by $1,633,936. That is the position as revealed by the Public Accounts. But the hon. gentleman may reply: Well, you have added the purchase of the North-West Territories themselves; you have added the cost of organisation; you have gone back to the inception of the enterprise; whereas when I made my statement, I made it in 1882, and my calculation was based on a prediction of the results which followed 1882. Well, I will take him on that ground and see how the Dominion Lands account stands from 1882 to 1889. I find that the total receipts from the sale of Dominion Lands for the year 1882, when that speech was made, to the 30th June, 1889, were $4,922,208; and there has been expended during that time on capital account, $2,664,911, and out of the Consolidated Fund, $1,307,267; or, adding the two together, there has been expended $3,972,178. Deduct that from the total receipts, and you have a balance to the credit of $950,030. That is what we have. As I said before, the First Minister has to the 30th June of this year to make up the difference between $950,030 and $69,000,000; and we are warranted in saying that if he is able to make up even $1,000,000, by the time at which he said we would have $69,000,000, that will be the most we can hope for. There you have, Sir, a miscalculation in the receipts of $68,000,000; which has had to be met by taxation; and that in face of the statement of the First Minister that if such an amount of taxation had to be taken from the people, it would lay upon them burdens greater than they would be able to bear. But, Sir, you will remember, as I read to you from his speech, he had a double string to his bow. He said: Even if we do not sell that quantity of land, we will pour immigrants into that country, who will become settlers there and consumers of dutiable goods, in such a volume that the proportion they will contribute to the revenue will more than offset any additional taxation necessary. Let us look at the result of that forecast and see how far it has been accomplished. The hon. gentleman then calculated that in 1882, 35,000 settlers would come into Manitoba and the North-West; in 1883, 40,000; in 1884, 45,000; in 1885, 50,000; in 1886, 55,000; in 1887, 60,000; in 1888, 65,000; in 1889, 70,000; or a total estimated influx of settlers into Manitoba and the North-West during those years, of 420,000. Let us see what the actual number is of settlers who have gone into that country. I will give you the figures from the official leaflet issued by the Department of Agriculture in January, 1890. I find that the estimated population of Manitoba now is 120,000, and of the North-West, 80,000. Therefore, the Department of Agriculture estimates that there are at present in Manitoba and the North-West 200,000. There was in that country, when the census was taken, in 1881, before these new settlers were to come in at all, 122,400 people; and the natural increase of 2 per cent. per annum during the nine years to date, would, this year, amount to 22,032. So that you will find, taking the census of 1881 and the natural increase, there ought to be, without any immigration, 144,032 souls in that country. Deduct that from the number estimated to be actually there now, and we find the immigration during this nine years during which we were told that 420,000 souls were to flow into that country, amounted merely to 55,568. The estimate made by the First Minister was that, on an average of eight years, 52,500 souls would go in per annum to that country, whereas the actual net result is that merely 6,946 went into that country annually. The First Minister estimated that the influx in 1889 would be 70,000, whereas the actual immigration, as given by the Minister of Agriculture the night before last, amounts to but 14,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And nearly all Canadians at that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And nearly all Canadians at that. I have given these figures because I supposed, in giving them, I would be quoting an authority recognised on the other side of the House. I have shown that the Ministry themselves felt that if an increase of taxation was required to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, that would be an intolerable burden. I have pointed to the fact that the whole burden of the construction of that road is on the people of Canada to-day as a national debt, which must be paid for by extra taxes, and the interest on which has been wrung from the people in the shape of extra taxation. I have shown that in one case $6,000,000 more than the actual requirements of the country was taken, and that did not go to reduce the public debt, which went up by leaps and bounds at the rate of $10,000,000 a year. With reference to our whole immigration policy, I charge this upon the Government, that they are not statesmen. I charge that the calculations of the leading statesmen of that party have been utterly falsified. I have proved that these men do not grasp the circumstances of the country, that they are not able to comprehend the issues upon us, that the returns given demon-

strate the falsity of their predictions, and prove to every one their utter inability to grasp the condition of the country and to manage its affairs. This is true in every Department. When they introduced their National Policy, what did the Minister of Finance, then Sir Leonard Tilley, lay down as a cardinal principle? He laid down, with all the solemnity that characterised his utterances, as one of the great causes of depression in this country, the fact that the people were importing too many goods. And the way to remedy that evil, he said, was to add on taxes which would shut out those imports, which would keep the people from buying, and turn the balance of trade in our favor. Then he declared we would be rich, and prosperous. Hon. gentlemen opposite endorsed that proposition with a cheer, and that was laid down as the prominent plank in their platform. But turn to our Trade and Navigation Returns of to-day, and what do we find? We find that not only have we ground many millions of dollars by way of taxation out of the people, but that the balance of trade is still against us by $25,000,000 a year, being an amount against us greater than it ever was before. And this, despite the fact that Sir Leonard Tilley laid it down as a distinct proposition, and the cardinal principle of his policy, which was endorsed by the party and never since receded from, that if we imported more than we exported we were on the road to ruin. He said if a man spends more than his income, poverty will stare him in the face; and that so it was with a nation. If the balance of trade is against us, we are on the road to ruin. Therefore, according to his own declaration, according to the creed of hon. gentlemen opposite, this country has been going down the road to ruin ever since. They talked about their immigration policy. They told us that people would pour into the North-West, once we built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they got our people to agree to hasten its construction, and to bear the burden that would entail, with the expectation that they would be recouped by the millions which would flow into this country by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What did the Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin, say in 1881? He said:

"We want to people also the North-West; we cannot people the North-West otherwise. With all our exertions and with all the powerful machinery the Government can have at its disposal to bring emigrants to this country, we cannot bring more than 15,000 or 20,000 a year, but with this powerful syndicate having all their interests for the future in bringing emigrants to this country to co-operate with the Government, we shall certainly secure an immigration which will, at least, be equal to the immigration which we have seen flowing for years into the United States of America."

Sir, they were united on this. The First Minister, the Minister of Public Works, the combined genius of the Cabinet, agreed that the result would be to introduce a great population into that country, and to divert the stream of immigration which was flowing to another country. What has been the result? It has been, as they now claim, that they have added 50,000 souls to that population. I ask if there has been any exhibit made by any Government showing more incompetency to grasp the conditions of the country, than this which is before us to-day? I do not wish to allude to another matter which has been brought to us, or I might show that in every Department in which they have endeavored to exercise foresight, or to make the forecast of statesmen, they have utterly failed, and it is not using too strong language, in face of the facts, to speak of this country as being in a condition of drift, and carrying the Ministers with the drift, because they seem to imagine that the only thing to do is to increase the burdens of the people by adding to the taxation. We know on both sides of the House, that while public works which are the property of this Dominion are going to ruin because grants are not made to repair our own property, at the same time half a million of dollars is used for a machinery to prepare a voters' list which is a fraud, a delusion and a snare, and that amount would be sufficient to repair works in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which are going to ruin and decay. I must pass on now—because I do not desire to occupy the attention of the House too long—to another subject, one which should be a very important one if we are to judge of the policy of the Government, as we are bound to do, by the statements of the Finance Minister and the President of the Council. I come now to deal with the statement which was made in the latter part of the speech of the hon. the President of the Council. This would have been a revelation to us if we had not been prepared for it by the announcement of the Minister of Finance, that he intended to abrogate the friendly clause which was placed on our Statute-book by which we signified our willingness to enter into reciprocal relations with the United States when they manifested a similar desire. In this there appears to be a change in the policy of the Government. The President of the Council stated that he was utterly opposed to reciprocity, even in natural products, and that it was the worst thing that could befall our farmers. Taking that in connection with the action of the Finance Minister in increasing the duty on natural products, and proposing to abrogate the standing offer which has been on our Statute-book for years, it simply declares to the people of the United States that the policy of this Government is one of estrangement from them. The policy which is approved of on this side of the House is not one of estrangement from our neighbors, but one of reciprocity in regard to those interests in which we are bound up with them. Gentlemen opposite have always hitherto taken the ground that reciprocity, at all events in natural products, would be in the interests of this country. They have always professed to be anxious for reciprocity on the lines of the old Reciprocity Treaty. What was the amendment moved by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878, on which he went to the country? Was it a policy of estrangement? No; this was the effect of the resolution which he moved, that, having failed to secure reciprocity of trade, we should endeavor to obtain a reciprocity of tariffs. And why? It was in order that we might in that way bring about a reciprocity of trade. That was the argument which was used. What was stated by the present High Commissioner when he went to the people of the Maritime Provinces, who came into this Confederation on the understanding that they would not have any increased burdens to bear? It was that the policy of the Government involved only a readjustment of the tariff for the purpose of securing free trade. The President of the Council was in the House at that time, and I am bound to say that he made the

best and ablest speech that was made in defence of that resolution in this House. That is universally conceded. What were his views in reference to that resolution, which read as follows :—

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion. That such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen, now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home ; will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed ; will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market ; will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

The hon. the President of the Council then said :

"If every other member of this House should go back on the proposition contained in this amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston, I certainly could not do so without very glaring inconsistency."

Then he went on to point out that he had declared to the Government——

Mr. COLBY. Was that before or since the Flood? The hon. gentleman is reading ancient history.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This was at the inception of the National Policy, just when it was being hatched, when the hon. gentleman was its strongest defender. The hon. gentleman need not ask how long ago it was, because he declared in his speech that he held to the National Policy now just as he did when it was introduced into this House. Here is a strange inconsistency : that he held to it then, as declared by himself, because he believed that by the result of those duties we should secure reciprocal trade relations with the United States ; and now he says he still clings to the National Policy because reciprocity with the United States, even in natural products, would ruin our farmers. Yet he says he is in favor of the National Policy all the same—bound to maintain the National Policy which, in 1878, was used as a means to accomplish what he termed would be a blessing, that is, reciprocal trade relations. He holds to the National Policy, he says, as firmly as ever, that which was in the beginning designed, as he declared, to bring about that which he says now would be productive of disaster and of ruin to the agriculturists of this country. Sir, what did the Finance Minister of two years ago say in this House with reference to reciprocal trade relations with the United States ? What was the language of Sir Charles Tupper when he introduced his financial statement, in 1887 ? As late as 1887, the Finance Minister of this Dominion, speaking the views of the Government opposite, used these words :

"I think the interests of that great country (the United States) and the interests of Canada alike are bound up in close commercial relations, and in extended reciprocal relations. I have no hesitation in saying so. It would be, in my judgment, a great calamity and a misfortune if anything were to prevent reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States, which would be as they were when they existed before, alike beneficial to both countries."

That is the utterance of Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Finance in 1887. Now, we have a change of base on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and instead of viewing reciprocal trade relations with the United States as a blessing to both countries, it is officially declared by a member of the Cabinet that it would be a curse and a hindrance to the agriculturists of this country—he did not add, to the other interests ; but as it has always been maintained they will be benefited thereby, perhaps as much as any other class in the community, we may fairly infer that he believes it would be an injury to every one. That gentleman made a speech a little later on—it was made since the Flood—and perhaps he had as good an idea of the way in which trade relations between the two countries stood, and what the effect would be, as the President of the Council, or even the present Finance Minister. I want to quote now from what the present High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, said in February, 1888, when he was speaking upon the question of trade relations and the circumstances in which the two countries stood, after he had been at Washington, and after he had realised the position of affairs :

"I have told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been on the Statute-book by an unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that the Bill meant commercial war ; that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feelings and intercourse between two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war. No man who knows anything of the intimate commercial relations which exist between Canada and the United States should contemplate such an Act going into operation without feeling that it would tear up from the foundation those intimate social and commercial relations which exist between these two countries, which, in friendly commercial rivalry, are making rapid progress which has attracted the attention of the civilised world."

That is the expression of Sir Charles Tupper, who, after being in Washington, after understanding the position in which both countries stood, believed that in the interests of the people of this country there should be peaceable relations, friendly relations and reciprocal trade arrangements made between the people of the two countries. Now, we have, on the other hand, a Minister of the Crown declaring that to have reciprocity in natural products means ruin to the farmers of Canada ; we have a Finance Minister repealing a friendly clause in our statutes and re-imposing duties that may have the effect of being viewed by a certain portion of the people of the United States, as casting down the gauntlet, and as saying : We will enter upon a commercial strife with you, and, instead of having you for friends, we will enter into a commercial struggle which can only have the result of hindering the progress of both countries and proving damaging to both. Why, Sir, I have stated that this country is drifting, and I have shown, I think, from the views that have been enunciated by those gentlemen, from their record on this question, that they are unable to grasp the condition of the country ; they are vacillating, changing from what is desirable one day to what is undesirable another, drifting in a current, not knowing whither they are going, and following a current which, as I consider, is dangerous for the prosperity of this country. We find a Minister of the Crown rising and solemnly stating that he believes it would be the worst

thing that could happen to the farmers of this country, to have reciprocal trade relations with the United States in natural products. I would ask: What can you think of a Minister that has deliberately entered upon that course, in view of the records of our trade and commerce with the nations of the world? Where is the man who is possessed of ordinary business sense, who desires his best customer to be cut off his list? Where is the man with the least degree of common sense in commercial life who desires to have his customer estranged from him and his trade cut off? Yet the hon. gentleman declares that to have free intercourse with the United States in trade would be injurious, the worst thing that could happen to our farmers and to others. Out of $4,417,170 that we exported as the produce of the mine, the hon. gentleman asks that the country which takes $3,753,351 worth of it, should be cut off, and that we should not send any there at all. Of the total of our fishery products of $7,000,000, in round numbers, nearly three millions go to the United States, and the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall cut them off as our customers, that we will have no trade with them. What do you think of a Minister of Finance and a Government that have entered on a policy like that? What think you of a Government that have declared their belief that as regards the products of the forests, which amount to $23,000,000, in round numbers, of which the United States take $11,000,000, charging a duty of $2 per thousand, these products should not enter that market free, and it would be the worst thing that could happen if the market were free? What think you of a Government that as regards animals and their products, of which we export to the value of $23,894,000, of which the United States take the value of $7,000,000, imposing a heavy duty upon them, declare that it would be injurious if these animals and products were admitted free into the adjoining Republic? What do you think of a Government announcing a policy and declaring it on the floor of Parliament, that as regards agricultural products, of which we export to the value $13,000,000, of which $9,000,000 worth go to the United States, that the removal of these duties would be injurious to Canada and fatal to our farmers? I cannot comprehend such a declaration.

Mr. COLBY. I desire to say that I was discussing the question of the condition of the farmers of Ontario, as compared with the condition of the farmers of the United States, and whatever remarks I made had reference simply to agricultural products.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Natural products was the statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably there will be another policy on Tuesday.

Mr. BOWELL. We shall have to go to Washington first.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I said the hon. gentleman did not state that he included the other industries.

Mr. COLBY. Precisely.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But I said, I presume, as it has always been conceded, that the farmers would especially, as a class, benefit by this policy, that all other classes would share in it.

Mr. COLBY. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman drawing any inference he pleases.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what I said. But I want to read the words of the hon. gentleman, as I wrote them down: "He was opposed to reciprocity in natural products; it would be the worst thing that could happen for our farmers."

Mr. COLBY. Farm products. The hon. gentleman took it down correctly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman will admit that animals and their products, and agricultural products come in there, at all events.

Mr. COLBY. Quite so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And, therefore, the declaration that as regards animals and their products, of which we export to the value of $23,000,000, of which $7,000,000 in value go to the United States, it would be the worst thing that could happen to this country, if the American duties were removed, is one I do not understand. So it is with regard to our whole trade. Out of a total export of products to the value of $77,000,000, the United States take $36,000,000 worth, and is in fact our largest customer, taking one-half of our total exports. I fail to understand the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the people of this country will fail to understand it, that it is a wise thing to endeavor to promote estrangement between our best customer and ourselves, that it is best to enter on a course of legislation calculated to give aid and encouragement to men who view public questions and endeavor to frame public policy in the way in which the McKinley school are doing at Washington, rather than along the lines laid down by those members of the great community to the south, who are actuated by a broader and nobler spirit, who have introduced a resolution in the interests of peace and progress, as between these two great nations lying side by side, and who desire that each Government shall appoint commissioners with a view to devise some means by which we may cast down the barriers and open the gates and let the great flood of commerce circulate between the two peoples as freely as the blood circulates in the human veins. I am in accord with that school. Sir, they are meeting us with a generous offer.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman must pardon me; but I felt it was a sentiment it was not discreditable to approve, for it was a sentiment favoring trade with those who speak our own language, who are our next-door neighbours, with whose welfare and well-being our interests are bound up, and with whom more than one-half of our trade is conducted. I must apologise, if to speak too loudly is an offence, and my plea is that the sentiment is one worthy of our approval. It was not urged at length by the Minister of Finance, but it has been stated in this House, that to allow free corn would be a very great injury to our farmers. That statement was made, totally ignoring the fact that the Central Farmers' Institute, which recently met in Toronto, comprising representatives of the agricultural class of the country, passed a resolution in which they declared that free corn would be in the interests of Canada. But what say hon. gentlemen opposite? They say: If you permit free corn—and it would come in

under reciprocity trade with the United States—then the corn standard of 40 cents a bushel would be the standard of value for all your coarse grains, while now the standard of values is the barley standard of 57 cents a bushel. I will not pretend to know as much about farming as I do about commercial matters, as I have been trained to commercial pursuits; but I have heard intelligent farmers speak in this House, and I have heard them discuss this question outside of this House and I have brought what little commercial knowledge I possess to bear upon this subject, and the sentiment to which they gave expression, and which I endorsed, was this: that, as a business enterprise, it would be good policy on their part to grow barley (we will take the figures given by the President of Council in this argument) and sell it at 57 cents for 48 pounds to the bushel, and then turn round, and, with the money received from that barley, spend 40 cents for 56 pounds to the bushel of feed, better fitted for our cattle than that which we sold at 48 pounds to the bushel, and place the balance of 17 cents per bushel in our pocket. The farmers thought this was a good business transaction, and I was surprised to hear a Minister of the Cabinet declare that it would be inadvisable to adopt that policy, which the intelligent farmers have been pressing on the attention of the country. Now, Sir, it has been said that the United States grow more of natural products than they require, and that, therefore, that is not a market for us. I have not time to go into that discussion, nor will I delay the House by referring to it at length, but that, on the face of it, is very easily to be seen and very easily to be explained. What is the result? Why, Sir, you take the States that lie contiguous to Ontario, to Quebec, to Nova Scotia, to New Brunswick, to Prince Edward Island—take these States, comprising the New England States and the great States of New York and New Jersey, and you will find that at the last census they had over 10,000,000 people in them. Why, Sir, these States do not grow enough wheat to bread themselves. They only grow ten million bushels of wheat, when it would, I suppose, take fifty million bushels to feed them. There is a market right at your very door for forty million bushels of wheat. You could send it to them better than their wheat-producing fields, in far away Kansas and Nebraska, if there were free commercial intercourse between us. If we had that free intercourse, Canada would be the market from which these States would draw the supply of wheat, for the ten million barrels of flour they need per annum. Take the New England States, in which, on the testimony of the Ministry, the farms are forsaken, and where they are not growing what is needed for consumption;—there you have immense cities like Boston, Lowell; Boston, I suppose, with a population of over half a million. What are these immense cities requiring? They require all the commodities which we produce in this country. Potatoes are not grown in the New England States, or in New York, to any quantity like what they need for consumption; while little Prince Edward Island and the Annapolis valley grow them in abundance, and their market for potatoes is in the United States, notwithstanding the duty of 15 cents a bushel imposed upon them. In view of all these facts hon. gentlemen opposite say, that a proposition to knock off that 15 cents a bushel, which would go into the pockets of our farmers in Prince Edward Island and the Maritime Provinces, would be ruin and disaster to the country. Did any one ever hear before an argument like that advanced to intelligent men? If the hon. gentleman adheres to the National Policy, let me ask him to remember that one of the great principles laid down for the National Policy was, that it was essential to the prosperity of the farmers, and to the well-being of the country, that we should have a home market. A home market is a grand thing. I live myself in a busy manufacturing city, which affords an excellent market; Toronto has grown in wealth and population and mouths have to be fed. No one will deny that it is a desirable thing to have a home market, but we are getting it by slow progress. Adopt reciprocal trade relations with the United States, and see what an immense home market you will have for the farmer. Within one day's ride, you have gathered together in cities,—not to be built, but already peopled with a population greater than the entire population of the Dominion of Canada. You have these States for a home market, which are already inhabited with immense populations They need every product the Canadian farmer has to sell. There is your home market. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the home market is the best thing the farmer can have; but when a proposition is made looking towards the securing of a home market for the supply of five million people, congregated within cities already built and developed, in many cases a day's ride, and in some cases within two hours' ride from the homes of the farmers of the country; we are told that it would be a ruinous thing to our farmers to give them this market, and that the Government continue in a course of policy that will tend to keep these markets more closely shut and barred against us than they have been heretofore. I will not detain the House longer. I have spoken longer than I should have done, but I think it was necessary, perhaps, or it might be useful to point out these facts, which I have endeavored to obtain. I can only add, in conclusion, that the depression which exists in this country, as well as the depression which exists in the neighboring States of the Union—which has been referred to by the hon. President of the Council to console us—has been brought about in part by an excessive rate of taxation, and by the taking of money out of the pockets of the people of this country, and taking it out to a greater extent, year after year, although, year after year, the products of the farmers have been lowered and their revenue less; taking it out until—as the hon. gentleman pointed out— in the States of New England the farmers have left their farms and become impoverished; and until, as was pointed out by the member for South Oxford, and admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, it is pressing to such an extent on our farmers, that the proper policy for the Government to-day is, as is proposed in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, to devise ways and means whereby this excessive load of taxation may be lowered, so that the people of this country may be allowed to retain the hard-earned money they have honestly and fairly won for themselves; without the Government taking more out of their pockets than is absolutely necessary for the conduct of the affairs of the Government, in a wise, and prudent, and, at

the same time, energetic manner. Sir, I wish to stand here to take my position on this. If parties in this country are to be divided on the line; whether it is to be a desire for reciprocity, or a desire for estrangement between the two countries; as I judge, from the resolution introduced by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and as enunciated by the hon. the President of the Privy Council, is to be the dividing line of policy; I desire to express my sympathy in favor of those who wish to have unrestricted reciprocal relations—friendly feelings and commercial intercourse between these nations, and my opposition to those who wish for commercial warfare, which, as was pointed out by the late Finance Minister, is only removed one degree from a state of actual war. I would rejoice if this House had been unanimous in the reception of the sentiments of men of that noble line of thought in the United States who, I am glad to believe, are daily increasing, and which sentiments find expression in the resolution offered by Congressman Hitt. I wish that we should be permitted to go on in commercial friendliness with one another, that the barriers should be lowered, that there should be free intercourse, and that we might reap the benefits which will come to us, as they will reap the benefits that may come to them. Sir Charles Tupper has often pointed out here the necessity to the National Policy of an interprovincial trade, and I have always given him credit for his desire to promote such a trade. An interprovincial trade is a grand thing, if you can have an interprovincial trade without forcing the public to pay for it, as we are forced to do, situated as we are geographically in this country. Internal commerce carried on by a nation is a great factor in the prosperity of a people. Remove the commercial barriers which exist between you and the United States, and you will have in an eminent degree, not only the progress and prosperity which flow from a provincial and an interprovincial trade, but the progress and prosperity that would result to you from an uninterrupted flow of commerce and trade throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, and as well as throughout the length and breadth of the great Union to the south of us. Hon. gentlemen opposite fear to take this step, because they say: We will be outdistanced in the race. Sir, they belie the character of the Canadian people. Who are the men who are in foremost places in the United States to-day, and who hold prominent positions in every department of life there, professional, commercial or agricultural? Shining among the brightest names that shine in the United States, are the names of Canadians, born and bred in this country, and holding their own among the very best people of that country. Go into their factories and workshops, in the United States, and you will find, in many cases, that their foremen and machinists are Canadians. Look at the heads of their great railway systems and you will find among them Canadians born, Canadians bred, and Canadians trained in this country. Go into their monetary institutions, as I did in Chicago, and you will find that their bank managers, and the members of their financial boards, are, in many cases, Canadians. Go to their fishing fleets and there you will find, as my friends from the Maritime Provinces tell me, that the captains of their ships, and that almost all the men who are successful fishermen, are men drawn from the hardy mariners of our Maritime Provinces. And you tell me that these men, who are holding their own in the United States itself, which was to them when they went there virtually a foreign country, except in language, and under a different Government—and not only holding their own, but, with these things against them, working their way up to the highest positions—that these men cannot hold their own in their own country, not with any undue advantage given to the United States, but with a free, open competition. Where muscle is placed against muscle and brain against brain in equal contest, I say I have no fear of the Canadian muscle and the Canadian brain.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I confess to you that I consider myself especially unfortunate in having been selected to follow an hon. gentleman of the great eloquence, energy and logic of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. But, Sir, whilst I cannot pretend to emulate that hon. gentleman's logic, neither shall I attempt, as in a great measure that hon. gentleman has done, to quote the speeches of other hon. gentlemen delivered on former occasions in this Parliament and out of it; but I shall endeavor to present, as concisely and in as few words as I can, the views I hold in regard to the trade relations of this country; and the views I express shall be my own, and must not be taken as binding any other person in this House or out of it. It has been my good fortune, Sir, to have had the opportunity of listening to the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) during the last sixteen or seventeen years. In the first four or five years that I had the honor of a seat in this House, that hon. gentleman occupied the position of Finance Minister of this country, and it was his duty then to present the financial statements of the Government of which he was a leading member. Since that time, with the exception of one occasion only, on which my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), discharged the duty which would, no doubt, have devolved on the hon. member for South Oxford, but for circumstances over which he had no control——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An Act of Parliament, to wit.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Since 1879 it has been the duty of that hon. gentleman to criticise the financial statements made from this side of the House. The hon. gentleman says he was kept out of Parliament for one Session by an Act of Parliament. Let him rather, Sir, attribute the fact to the true reason, namely, that the people did not agree with the nostrums he was proposing to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The gerrymander.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Sir, I have listened to the hon. gentleman in this House during those years with a good deal of pleasure; but during all those years the hon. gentleman has been singularly unfortunate. Although I admit that his utterances have been eloquent and his financial genius great, and although he has a capacity of making the worse appear the better cause, yet that hon. gentleman's position, from the time I first listened to his utterances on the floor of this Parliament, has been exceedingly unfortunate. On

the first occasion that I listened to a Budget speech delivered by the hon. gentleman, he came down to Parliament with a proposition for a general increase of 2½ per cent. in the taxation of the people of this country, attributing the necessity for such increase in the tariff to the legacy that had been left to him by his predecessors when they went out of office in 1873. I had not the opportunity of hearing the hon. gentleman's financial statement in 1875; but in 1876, 1877, and 1878 that hon. gentleman was wrestling, year after year, with constantly recurring and constantly increasing deficits, without having the boldness—I will not say he had not the genius, because I think he had—to apply the proper remedy to bring about an equalisation between the receipts and expenditures of this country. At that time I sat on the Opposition side of the House. I followed then, as I follow now, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government to-day. The party of which I was a member, which was then in a minority in this House—although I believe not in a minority in the country, as circumstances showed very soon thereafter—suggested to the hon. gentleman a means by which he could overcome the difficulties that presented themselves to him during those years; but the hon. gentleman, with that great knowledge of public affairs and finance which characterises him, refused to accept the suggestions which were made, and honestly made, by the party then in Opposition, and went to the country on the principle which he and his party laid down, of a revenue tariff and a revenue tariff only. Sir, I need not remind you and the House of the result of the course which these hon. gentlemen pursued during the years they were in office; I need not remind you of the overwhelming defeat they met with when they submitted themselves to the arbitrament of the people of this country. I have heard my hon. friend from South Oxford, year after year, from 1879 down to the present Session, ascribing the defeat of his party, and their continuance in Opposition, election after election, to every possible reason but the true one, that is, that they do not possess the confidence of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman, the other night, in the course of the speech he delivered in reply to the Budget speech of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, said that the Government could gerrymander the constituencies, that they could pass an infamous Franchise Act, that they could debauch the constituencies and the Provinces, but that they had not the capacity to grapple with the financial questions which presented themselves for the consideration of the Government of this country. He also made the statement that the course which has been pursued by the present Government since they came into office has produced irritation in the United States. Sir, if the course of maintaining the dignity of Canada by the Government charged with conducting the affairs of the country produces irritation on the minds of the people of the United States, then I say, let that irritation be produced. It is the duty of this Government to conserve the interests of the people, whose interests they are charged to guard. I say it is no part of their duty to make any concessions to the United States that will be detrimental to the interests of the people of Canada. My hon. friend also stated the other night that he believed he reflected the opinions and the views of half the people of this Dominion, and, also, that he reflected the views and the opinions of the Local Legislatures throughout the whole Dominion. As regards the latter part of his statement, I have nothing whatever to say against it; but let me point out to my hon. friend that the logic of facts during the last ten or eleven years has had the effect of destroying the theories of the hon. gentleman, as they would the baseless fabric of a vision. If the hon. gentleman has the capacity, as I am sure he has, of understanding the logic of facts, he must by this time be convinced that the policy, or rather the no policy, the shifting policy, the attempt at finding out a policy for the party of which he is one of the leaders, will never secure the approval of the people. I heard my hon. friend lay down the proposition here the other night, that he and his party had subscribed to the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. Hitt in the American Congress. I would like to point out that there seems to be a process of retrocession upon the part, not only of those hon. gentlemen, but of their ally in the American House of Representatives. If you read the resolution submitted by Mr. Hitt last year in the House of Representatives, you will find that it reads as follows:—

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may likewise be designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a place for the assimilation of the import duties, internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts in a commercial union. And said Congress shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

Now, last year the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) submitted this proposition to Parliament:

"That, in the present condition of affairs, and in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity."

That resolution did not meet with the approval of the majority of the members of this House, and I think my hon. friend must have come to the conclusion, judging by the results of the elections held since, that it does not meet with the approval of the people of Canada. Mr. Hitt has modified to some extent, during the present Session in the United States Congress, his resolution, and the resolution now before the Committee on Ways and Means in that House, reads as follows:—

"Resolved, That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to enter into such commercial arrangements with the United States as will result in the complete removal of all duties upon trade between Canada and the United States, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be designated to represent the Government of Canada to consider the best method of extending the trade relations between Canada and the United States, and to ascertain on what terms greater freedom of intercourse between the two countries can best be secured, and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friends upon the other side say "hear, hear;" and one would suppose from the approval with which they receive that resolution, that it was in such a position that we would be certain, if we adopted a similar policy in this Parliament, to obtain reciprocal trade relations with the people of the United States. Well, last year I read to the House the opinions of Senator Sherman and Secretary Blaine as to the only means upon which the people of Canada could secure reciprocal trade relations with the people of the United States. These gentlemen said it was their firm conviction that unless we were prepared to cast in our lot with the people of the United States, unless we were prepared to enter into a political union with them, we could not hope to secure from them any measure of reciprocal trade. In addition to that I will read, with the permission of the House, an editorial paragraph which appeared in the New York *Sun* of Sunday last:

"That there may be no needless misunderstanding, we beg our Canadian friends to understand that they can have free trade with the United States—the only important system of real free trade in the world—on the same terms as the United States themselves enjoy it, namely, on the terms of political union."

Are my hon. friends opposite prepared to say "hear, hear," to that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Then the writer goes on to say:

"All other propositions, such as that of Mr. Hitt in the House of Representatives the other day, can lead to nothing but vanity and vexation of spirit."

If my hon. friends opposite are prepared to accept that dictum, if they are prepared to accept vanity and vexation of spirit as the outcome of their efforts to obtain reciprocal trade relations with the people of the United States, I, for one, am not prepared to make any overtures with such a result in view. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has always, ever since the present party came into power, and ever since he became convinced it was impossible to oust them from the Treasury benches, ever since he became convinced, as he must be, that the people of Canada are with the Conservative party and against the theories of my hon. friend, has been accustomed, on the floor of this House, to utter pessimistic wails when criticising the Budget speeches of Finance Ministers. In pursuance of that policy, he told us last night some very extraordinary things. In the first place, he spoke of the reduction of deposits in the Government savings banks as evidence that the country was retrograding; but I am sure my hon. friend, with his great knowledge of banking affairs and of the financial affairs of this country, must have known that the reduction of interest on the deposits in Government savings banks in November last had the effect of displacing a large portion of the moneys which had been previously deposited in the Government savings banks, and transferring them to the chartered banks. My hon. friend said last night that he had always contended that the Government had been paying too much for their money and that this result, the withdrawing of money from the savings banks, bore out to some extent that contention. Let me say that I do not agree in that view, nor do I approve of the action of the Government in reducing the rate of interest upon those deposits. I have always held, and I hold still, that it would pay the Government of Canada better to pay to their own people, through the medium of these savings banks, the 4¼ per cent. which these deposits cost, including their administration, than to pay 4 per cent. to people outside of this country. I have always held that view and endeavored to impress it upon the Finance Minister, but I am sorry to say, I was not successful. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows full well that very shortly after the Government had reduced the rate of interest in November last, the chartered banks raised their rate of interest, and, in point of fact many of them now pay 4 per cent. to their depositors, while the Government pay only 3½. I hold, therefore, that the reduction of deposits in the Government savings banks is no indication of poverty on the part of the people. My hon. friend went a little further and stated that although the deposits in the savings banks had increased from $9,279,000 in July, 1879, to $41,800,000 in July, 1889, there had been a large amount of money borrowed abroad, amounting, I think he said, to $36,000,000, against some $6,000,000 which were borrowed in the year 1879. And my hon. friend made the statement on his authority as a financial critic, that the difference between what we had borrowed abroad, and what we had in our savings banks at home, would account for the increased deposits. Surely, he must have concealed facts which were in his possession, for he must have known that the deposits in the chartered banks in 1874, when he came into office, amounted to $78,709,368; while in 1879, when he left office, those deposits were $71,368,502, or a decrease during the time my hon. friend occupied the position of Finance Minister, of over $7,000,000. I am sure he must have been aware that the deposits in the chartered banks had increased, from 1879 to 1889, to no less than $123,655,414, an increase of $52,000,000 in the chartered banks, in addition to the increase of $32,000,000 in the deposits in the savings banks. I, therefore, think my hon. friend was not ingenuous in his statement that, while we had increased the deposits in the savings banks by $32,000,000, we had increased our indebtedness by $30,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You increased it by a great deal more. That is only one item.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Then my hon. friend ought to have taken the House into his confidence entirely, and to have stated the whole of the facts as he understood them, and not to have concealed a part. The return I have shows that the savings banks deposits on the 30th June, 1889, amounted to $53,715,838, which was a considerable sum in excess of the amount stated by my hon. friend last night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know my hon. friend does not intend to be unfair; but I was speaking only of the Government savings banks, and not of the other savings banks, and I think he will find that my statement is correct.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I believe my hon. friend's statement is correct as to that, but, when he was endeavoring to create an impression on the House and the country that we were retrograding,

he should have stated the whole facts. We find that the deposits in chartered banks, in savings banks and in loan and building societies, on the 30th June last, amounted to $194,678,285. Assuming our population to be five millions, that would give an average of $38.93 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion, and yet we are told that this country is going to ruin, and that the Dominion is reaching a point almost of destitution. My hon. friend devoted a considerable portion of his speech to that large portion of our population which, to a great extent, controls the elections throughout the Dominion, and whose good graces, no doubt, my hon. friends on the other side would be exceedingly glad to secure. My hon. friend stated the condition of the farmers in Ontario was deplorable, that the growth of the rural population from 1872 to 1879 had been 84,000, while from 1879 to 1888 it had only been 11,000. My hon. friend, the President of the Council dealt pretty fully with that phase of the question last night. He pointed out to the House what, I think, everybody must recognise, that the opening up of these large areas of land in the North-West had the effect of withdrawing our surplus population from the rural districts of Ontario and Quebec, and, further, that the growth of manufactures under—shall I call it?—the fostering influences of the present Administration, had been so great as to draw a considerable number away from rural pursuits. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) looks on this matter from the pedestal on which he stands, high above the common herd, of whom I am one, and I am afraid my hon. friend does not take sufficient pains to inform himself, as he ought, as to the circumstances of the rural population of this country, and as to the causes which induce them to move from one part of the country to the other. If he had been brought up, as I was, in a wild part of the country, and had seen the labor which the people have had to undergo in preparing their lands for cultivation, he would understand why the sons of these men would naturally be attracted to the fertile prairies of the North-West, where they are able to put in their plough at once, and to obtain crops a year or two afterwards. Assuming my hon. friend's figures to be correct—and I think, as I shall be able to show in regard to some other of his statements as to the condition of the Province of Ontario, they are to be taken with some measure of doubt—I say there is no reason in them for the assertion of the non-growth of the rural population in the Province of Ontario, to which the hon. gentleman referred. Let me say, also, that my hon. friend was not ingenuous in the statement he made, that large areas of land had been opened up in Ontario since 1879, and that railways had been built through a large portion of that Province. It is true that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been of the greatest possible benefit to the Province of Ontario, but it has not been of such great benefit to the agricultural development as it has been to the mineral and timber resources of that Province. My hon. friend knows full well that, in that large extent of territory from Lake Nipissing to Rat Portage, there is a very small percentage of cultivable lands, and having our North-West prairies to go to, the young men of the Province of Ontario would prefer them to settle upon. Therefore, I say that my hon. friend was not ingenuous in making that statement to the House, any more than he was in making the other statements to which I have referred. He also referred to the fact that the statistics of Mr. Blue, which in former Sessions of this Parliament were quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite as being perfectly authentic were now unreliable——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew)—to some extent misleading, was the expression the hon. gentleman used, the hon. gentleman had taken the pains, with the view, I have no doubt, of elucidating the theories evolved in his own brain, to make enquiries as to the mortgaged indebtedness of the people of the Province of Ontario, and he had come to the conclusion which he announced to this House last night, that, in the Province of Ontario alone, there were no less than 300 million dollars mortgages upon farm lands. Now, Sir, my hon. friend is a financial genius, I am aware of that, and I feel a good deal of diffidence in criticising any statement he may make; but if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to examine those statistics furnished by Mr. Blue, upon which hon. gentlemen opposite have heretofore placed so much reliance—although I, myself, confess that I do not put the same faith in them that some of my hon. friends opposite do—but if he would examine Mr. Blue's returns he would find that in 1888 that gentleman reported that there were 20,823,426 acres of lands occupied by residents; that there were 1,234,853 acres occupied by non-residents, making in all 22,058,279 acres of occupied lands, of which the number of acres cleared was 11,314,725. Now, if my hon. friend had taken the pains to analyse the statement he made here last night, he would have found that, according to his own statement, there is a mortgage of $13.60 upon every acre of occupied land in the Province of Ontario; and if he were to take only the cleared lands in that Province, he would find the mortgage indebtedness, according to his computation, amounts to $26.87 on every acre of cleared land in the Province of Ontario. Now, I am a native of the Province of Ontario and I deprecate any such statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So am I, and I know whereof I am speaking.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I should be very sorry to think that the hon. gentleman himself believes what he states

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Make the investigation, if you dare.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have some further evidence of a disinterested character which may convince the House, if it does not convince the hon. gentleman, that his statements are not entirely in accord with the facts. I hold in my hand a report made by United States Consuls respecting mortgages in foreign countries, and I find, in regard to the Province of Ontario, that Mr. Consul Bridges, of Brockville—perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you may know something about him—reports as follows:—

"The value of property in my district has not experienced much change in late years, but is on the increase, if anything, owing principally to the increase of population"——

That does not accord with the views of my hon friend.—

—"and the healthy, industrious condition of this section of the country. People, as an average, are careful in incurring the responsibility of indebtedness, and there is plenty of money to be had on the market from 6 to 7 per cent. I do not think that recorded indebtedness is on the increase, if you take into consideration the continued change of ownership and the increase of population."

Mr. John M. Strong, American Consul at Belleville, reports as follows:—

"During the last three years recorded indebtedness has increased, owing to shortness of crops, Prior to that time it had diminished in proportion to value. This year, prospects being good, recorded indebtedness is again diminished, except in the case of small chattel mortgages,"

Mr. Hiram Davis, Commercial Agent at Collingwood, says:

"Recorded indebtedness is generally decreasing."

Mr. Roberts, Consul at Hamilton, says:

"The probable ratio which mortgages and judgments bear to total valuation of taxable and assessed property, is about 25 per cent."

Mr. Twitchell, Consul at Kingston, says:

"Recorded indebtedness, in proportion to estimated values, is increasing."

I give my hon. friend the benefit of that; William C. Hall, Consul at Prescott, reports:

"Recorded indebtedness is diminishing."

Mr. Farrar, Consul at Port Sarnia, says:

"The best opinion here is that recorded indebtedness has diminished during the past two years."

I give my hon. friend that testimony in addition to the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In opposition to the testimony of the registrars in the country.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend, I am afraid, has confined his investigations to the particular part of the country where he thought that the circumstances would support the theory he had in his own mind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Sir; I took good care not to.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Let us compare the condition of other countries with Canada. The President of the Council last night referred to the condition of the State of Vermont, and, perhaps, I may be permitted to say a word or two in reference to the condition of other States of the Union; and I do this because, from the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, this country would be led to believe that upon the other side of the line the people of Canada would find an Eldorado:

"Mr. N. J. Bachelder, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Immigration of New Hampshire, has sent out (under date October 14) a preliminary list of abandoned farms in that State, which shows a condition of things closely resembling that of Vermont. The list embraces 115 farms. 'These,' says the circular, 'are unoccupied farms, and have been reported by the Selectmen of the various towns to have fairly comfortable buildings. They comprise but a small part of the abandoned farms of the State.' He adds—and this is an important matter—that 'in most instances these farms have not been abandoned because the soil has become exhausted, or from a lack of natural fertility.'"

Then I find that another writer makes the following remarks:—

"To one conversant with the facts, it is evident that the reports of these lately appointed commissioners do not begin to show the actual extent of the decline. Their reports are supposed to show only the number of vacant farms having on them buildings in a fair condition—impossible after more than five years of neglect. Instead of the 887 deserted farms reported by Commissioner Bachelder of New Hampshire in 160 towns, three times that number would probably be a low estimate."

But our hon. friends opposite say that this condition of things is produced because the United States have followed the same "foolish system," according to my hon. friend from South Oxford, that has prevailed here since the present Government obtained power. One would imagine that there was no agricultural distress existing in any part of the world except in those highly protected countries to which my hon. friend has referred. Well, I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that the condition of things which has, according to the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for South Brant, produced such dire results to the agricultural population in Canada and the United States, does not exist in the United Kingdom—at all events, so far as protection is concerned. I will read for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, if the House will permit me, some paragraphs from a report made by a Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the depression of trade and industry in the United Kingdon in 1885. The commissioners make this statement:

"We should here state that in selecting the last twenty years for the period of comparison, we were influenced mainly by a desire, on the one hand, to avoid carrying back our investigation into periods in which the conditions of the trade and industry of the country differed too widely from those which now affect it to make any comparison between them useful; and, on the other hand, to include the years immediately preceding the events of 1870-71, which resulted in so serious a disturbance to the commerce of the world."

Then they go on to say:

"The industries which we selected were—the iron and coal trades, the textile industries, agriculture and shipping.

"We received from Sir James Caird and other witnesses ample corroboration of the serious effect which the great depression in the agricultural industry has produced upon the home trade of the country. There is but little divergence of opinion as to the cause of that depression. The extreme lowering of prices, brought about by the extension of American farming, appears to be the main factor of the present agricultural position, one witness, Mr. Druce, expressing the opinion that the cultivation of much of the inferior land in the country could not be remunerative, 'even if it could be had for nothing.'"

That is in a free trade country. The commissioners also make this statement:

"We see no indications that, taking the industries of the country as a whole, and having regard to the figures of a series of years, there is any diminution in the aggregate of commodities produced by British capital and British labor.

"In stating this general conclusion, however, there is one important branch of industry which must be excepted. We refer, of course, to agriculture. There can be little doubt that the quantity of agricultural produce raised in the country during the last two years has materially decreased, and that even the fairly good seasons of the last three years have scarcely compensated for the diminished production of the eight years which preceded them, while the steady fall in prices has, of course, affected the agriculturists even more seriously than the diminished yield of the soil."

I think hon. gentlemen opposite will find this is one strong reason why the agricultural population in Canada and the United States are not as prosperous as under other circumstances they might be. I could also quote to hon. gentlemen the statistics respecting the diminution in the products in the United Kingdom, but I presume the House knows what these are as well as I do. But I will

say this: if you examine the records I hold in my hands you will find that one of the reasons for the agricultural depression in this country, as well as in the United Kingdom, results from the extraordinary diminution in prices, which I will quote to the House. In 1877 the price of wheat per quarter in the United Kingdom was 56s. 9d.; in 1888, 31s. 10d. Barley, 1877, 39s. 8d.; 1888, 27s. 10d. Oats, 1877, 25s. 11d.; 1888, 16s. 9d. Beef, 1877, 5s. 9¼d. per stone of 8 lbs.; 1888, 4s. 6½d. Sheep, per stone of 8 lbs., 1877, 6s. 9d.; 1888, 5s. 7½d. So that I think the House will observe that, apart altogether from the maladministration of the present Government, the prices to which I have referred as prevailing in the United Kingdom have had much to do with agricultural depression, both in that country and in Canada. Let me draw the attention of hon. members to this important fact in regard to the depression in agriculture, such large areas have been brought under cultivation in India and other countries, and the facilities for transportation from the inland regions in those countries have so greatly increased, we must expect continued and increased competition in the markets of Europe. How are we going to meet that competition? We must meet it by more scientific farming, by producing cereals at a lower rate then we are producing them now. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do when in office? Did they attempt to improve the condition of the farmers; did they attempt in any way to teach them scientific methods? No. It was reserved to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, at the instigation of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), to adopt a system by which more scientific methods of farming can be taught to the people of this country. And, therefore, I say that the farmers owe to this Government, a debt of gratitude which it will take a very long time to repay, but which I think they will in part repay when the opportunity presents itself of casting their votes either for or against the party now in power.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). When the House rose at six o'clock for recess, I was endeavoring to point out that the only real interest that had been taken in the farmers of this country, since I have had a seat in Parliament, has been taken by the present Minister of Agriculture. That hon. gentleman has, with the assistance of this House, established experimental farms throughout this Dominion, with a view, as I understand it, of affording information to the farmers as to the best kinds of grain to be selected for growth in Canada, and as to the best methods of developing agriculture. I may add to that, Sir, the fact that it was my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, who incepted the model farm in the Province of Ontario; and so I say, that to the Conservative party belongs the credit of having endeavored to promote the interests of the farming community of Canada. There was one point which escaped me when I was speaking with reference to the allegations of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) respecting mortgages upon farms in the Province of Ontario. I endeavored to point out, and I think pretty successfully, that it was almost impossible that the hon. gentleman's calculations could be correct. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman still persisted in the statement that he had made an investigation himself that led him to the conclusions which he gave to the House last night. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman did not take one or two facts into consideration, which might materially affect the discoveries that he made by his examination of the registry offices of the Province of Ontario. In the first place, those gentlemen who are familiar with the mode of dealing with mortgages by land companies, especially in the Province of Ontario, will bear me out in the statement which I am now about to make: In some instances, when mortgages become due, a lower rate of interest can be obtained than that which the mortgagor has been paying, and the mortgage is transferred or perhaps it is increased or dealt with in some way by re-mortgaging the premises, either to the company that has already effected the loan, or to some other company. In many of these instances I have known, of my own knowledge, that these prior mortgages have remained undischarged for a considerable number of years, and that, in point of fact, where there was, perhaps, only $1,000 against a property, it might appear from the records in the registry office that there were two or three thousand dollars against it. I would also like to draw the attention of the House to this further fact, that in the Province of Ontario a great proportion of the loans that are made upon agricultural land to farmers, are payable in annual instalments. No record is made of the payments of principal upon these mortgages until they are finally discharged; and it is probable that my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his investigations, overlooked the fact that a large proportion of these mortgages that appear against the agriculturists in the particular parts of Ontario to which he devoted his attention, were paid, and that, instead of there being the large amounts which he discovered in the registry offices against these lands, the proportion may have been probably not more than one-fourth of that which the books of the registrars show. My hon. friend, in the course of his speech, in addition to the statement which he made, that the agricultural population of the Province of Ontario was stationary, or practically stationary, said also that there was only one family in the Province of Manitoba to three square miles of land. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), pursuing that subject a little further, drew the attention of the House to certain predictions which had been made by the right hon. the leader of the Government, and by the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, respecting the probabilities of the development of agriculture in Manitoba and the North-West. Now, Sir, I frankly admit that the forecast of these gentlemen, the hopes which they entertained at the time these statements were made upon the floor of Parliament, have not been realised; but I would like to ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to consider whether the statements that have been made by leading Liberal politicians, both in this House and outside of it, have not had some effect in deterring people from going into the North-West and Manitoba. They must take some portion of the blame for the failure of these predictions that were based upon data given to the Ministers, and they must see that the failure does not lie entirely at the door

of the Government. My hon. friend the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) devoted himself with a good deal of assiduity to prove that the present depression, which he and his friends allege has overtaken the agricultural population of the Dominion of Canada, is due to the fact that extraordinary imposts have been laid upon these people since the present Administration have come into office. That hon. gentleman endeavored to show that if the expenditure had been kept down to the point at which it stood when the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House vacated their seats, by the mandate of the people of Canada; the depression which now exists would not have existed to the extent it does. We have heard these stories year after year in Parliament; we have been told year after year—and it was repeated here by the hon. member for South Oxford last night—that the policy of the present Government was "to create five hundred millionaires and to impoverish 500,000 farmers." Whilst, as I have said, these statements have been made year after year on the floor of Parliament, we have had two general elections since they were first made, and upon both these occasions, the policy of the present Administration has been triumphantly vindicated by the verdict of the people. Not only that, Sir, but we have had since the last general election a number of bye-elections throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and I venture to state, that in no period in the history of Canada, has the policy of the Administration of the country been more fully, more effectually, and more decidedly endorsed, than it has at these bye-elections. So, Sir, I say, that whilst these gentlemen make certain statements in reference to the expenditure under the present Administration, and whilst they endeavor to create upon the minds of the farmers the impression that it is because of the policy, and because of the extraordinary expenditure of the present Administration, that the country is in the state of depression in which they declare it to be, yet they are stating something which neither the House nor the country will believe. I do not deny for a moment that the expenditure has largely increased since the present Administration came into office, but, Sir, it is only natural that there should be an increase of expenditure as the resources of the country develop and as the demands made on the Government expand from year to year. What has been the course pursued by the present Administration, as compared with their predecessors in office? When the Administration of the hon. member for East York came into office, they found, as they declared, a legacy left to them by their predecessors, involving extraordinary expenditures; there were certain public works requiring to be constructed for the development of the country; and yet when the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite left office, and were relegated to what the people of the country deemed to be their proper places, those hon. gentlemen had accomplished practically nothing in the development of this great Dominion. What has been the result of the administration of affairs by the present Government? We have now, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a great highway of commerce; we have enlarged and deepened our canals; we have extended to local railway enterprises throughout the length and breadth of this country a measure of aid which has developed the commerce of the country to a phenomenal extent; and whilst those achievements have undoubtedly increased the expenditure, they have not increased it in a manner to be oppressive to the people of this country. It may not be out of place for me, Sir, before leaving this branch of the subject, to point out the contrasts shown by the Public Accounts in the administration of the affairs of this country, between the present Government and their predecessors. I stated at the beginning of my remarks, that whilst I had the greatest admiration possible for the ability of my hon. friend from South Oxford, that hon. gentleman, in all the speeches he had delivered in Parliament on financial subjects since I had the honor of a seat in this House, he had been singularly unfortunate; and let me say that those hon. gentlemen who have held the position of Finance Minister since 1879 down to the present time have been correspondingly fortunate. The hon. member for South Oxford, when Finance Minister, was obliged, as I have already stated, to wrestle with constantly increasing deficits; and if we are to credit, as is customary, the administration of my right hon. friend with the results of 1874, the year in which they left office, and the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite with the results of 1879, the year in which they left office, we shall find this extraordinary condition of things—that from 1874 to 1878, during the administration of the hon. member for South Oxford, there were net deficits amounting to $5,551,114, whilst the net result of the administration of affairs under the leadership of the right hon. First Minister from 1879 to the present time, is an aggregate surplus of $13,382,095. While I do not pretend to say that these results are due to the extraordinary ability of the Ministers who have administered the Department of Finance under the present Government, nor to the lack of ability of my hon. friend opposite, yet I say they show that while that hon. gentleman has been singularly unfortunate, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have been singularly fortunate; and may we not reasonably deduce from this circumstance the conclusion that the result shown by the Public Accounts, has been due to the adoption of the policy which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House promulgated in 1877 and put into effect when they came into office? Sir, my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) took very strong exception to certain statements made by the hon. President of the Council in reference to a change of opinion which the hon. member for South Brant alleged to have taken place in the mind of the hon. President of the Council between 1878 and the present time. Well, let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that we are not Bourbons; we are ready to learn. The changed circumstances of the country may properly bring about changed opinions; and while, speaking for myself, I am in favor of an interchange of natural products between Canada and the United States——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A calamity.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). If my hon. friend chooses to characterise it as a calamity, then I am in favor of such a calamity, provided we can obtain an interchange of those products on terms that are fair and reasonable to the people of Can-

ada. But if my hon. friend the President of the Council has changed his opinion on that subject, there are, perhaps, some good reasons why his opinion should have changed. Sir, let us look at the condition of things in the United States. The avowed object of the hon. gentlemen opposite, in advocating the policy of reciprocity with the United States, is to benefit the farmers. Let us see how the farmers would be benefited by such an interchange of products as these hon. gentlemen propose. If agricultural depression exists in the Dominion of Canada, it not only exists here, but in the United Kingdom, and that also to so great an extent in the neighboring Republic that the House of Representatives have deemed it necessary to introduce a Bill for the appointment of a Commission to enquire into the causes of that agricultural depression. I hold in my hand a Bill which was introduced in the House of Representatives on the 21st of January, 1890, "to create an Agricultural Commission to investigate causes of present depressed condition of agricultural interests." This Bill enacts as follows:—

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a Commission is hereby created to be called the Agricultural Commission.

"That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorised and directed to appoint nine commissioners, who shall be residents of the United States, and not more than five of whom shall belong to any one political party, and of whom the first named shall be president

"That it shall be the duty of said Commission to take into consideration and thoroughly investigate all the various causes which in their judgment may relate to the present depressed condition of the agricultural interests of this country; and for the purpose of fully examining the matters which may come before it, said Commission, in the prosecution of its enquiries, is empowered to visit such different portions and sections of the country as it may deem advisable.

"That the Commission shall make to Congress final reports of the results of its investigations, and the testimony taken in the course of same, not later than ninety days after its appointment; and it shall cause the testimony taken to be printed monthly and distributed to the members of Congress by the Public Printer, and shall also cause to be printed for the use of Congress three thousand copies of its final reports, together with the testimony—one thousand for the Senate and two thousand for the House."

So that, whilst it is alleged that we have depression in this country, it has not here reached the point which it appears to have reached on the other side of the line. In addition to that, I should like to point out for the information of the farmers, whose interests these hon. gentlemen pretend to have at heart, the condition of prices in the United States. I hold in my hand an independent paper, the *Canadian Journal of Commerce*, in which I find the following statement of the condition of the American markets:

"In wheat, the situation may be summed up as follows: The crop of 1889 was 17·96 per cent. larger than in 1888, with the reserves on 1st July, 50 per cent. less. The supply on 1st March was 39·3 per cent. larger. Prices are 26 per cent. lower, neutralising the increase in the crop. The United States Department of Agriculture makes the following estimate of the supply of wheat and corn in farmers' hands, the percentage of the crops represented, and the prices in the Chicago market."

Now I would like to draw the attention of the House to these figures, and I will state them as briefly as possible:

Wheat, Millions of Bushels.			Corn, Millions of Bushels.		
Years. March 1	Per cent.	Price	Years. March 1	Per cent.	Price
1883.....143	28·5	$1.09	1883.....585	36·3	58c
1884.....119	28·4	92½	1884.....512	33·0	53½
1885.....169	33·1	75½	1885.....670	37·6	38½
1886.....107	30·1	80½	1886.....773	40·0	37⅜
1887.....123	27·0	75	1887.....603	36·0	36
1888.....132	29·0	78⅜	1888.....508	34·9	49½
1889.....112	27·0	1.04½	1889.....787	39·6	34⅜
1890.....156	31·9	77⅜	1890.....970	45·9	28¼

So that, although I do not entirely concur in the views of the President of the Council as to the disadvantages of reciprocal trade relations in natural products between this country and the United States, yet I say that hon. gentleman had some cause for the change of opinion which has been effected in his mind since 1888, in view of the circumstances now existing in the United States. I was not a little astonished to find that my hon. friends opposite, who, I supposed, had given their adhesion firmly to the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, who had submitted and ably advocated a resolution in that direction last year, should have receded so completely from their position as they have upon the present occasion. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said last night, in point of fact, that the Liberal party pinned their faith to the Hitt resolution, and I find that the leading organ of the Liberal party in the Province of Ontario also advocates that resolution as the basis upon which the Liberal party proposes to appeal to the country when the time comes to make that appeal. In addition to that, I find that the Young Liberals in Toronto have passed the following resolution:—

"That this Club herewith puts on record its belief that the message of good-will contained in the recent resolution of Congress of the United States, favoring the appointment of commissioners to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty at such time as the Government of the Dominion of Canada shall express a wish to secure closer trade relations with the United States, will result in the best good to the people of both countries; and we pledge ourselves, as free traders, to take all possible means to hasten the passage of reciprocity resolutions in the Parliament of Canada, as being in the direction of freedom of trade with all the world."

These three things indicate that the Liberal party still adhere, to some extent, at all events—although they have not put upon record this Session a declaration in favor of unrestricted reciprocity—to the views they held last Session. Sir, it is a singular circumstance that these hon. gentlemen on the other side, during the time which elapses between one election and another, advocate, both in Parliament and out of it, the views they really hold, but when the time comes for an election, these hon. gentlemen, as did my hon. friend the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in his Malvern speech, modify their views so as to suit what they believe to be the opinions of the electors for the time being.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend says "no," but I am sure that the evidence is rather against his disclaimer.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I shall not be at all surprised to find that these hon. gentlemen—although, I presume, they hold the opinions they have been advocating upon the floor of Parliament—receding, when the time comes for another election, from the position they have taken, because they know and feel that the country is not with them. We were told to-day, by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), that this resolution of Mr. Hitt is a friendly resolution, that it was submitted to the Congress of the United States with the best intentions, and that it was our bounden duty to accept the friendly overtures made by Congress to the Government and Parliament of Canada. Yet, I find that in the very same Session of Congress, a Bill has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, which will impose extraordinary taxes upon those particular classes of agricultural products we send to the United States. It will be said, no doubt, by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that that is a reason why we should make overtures to the United States for the free interchange of products ; but if our hon. friends opposite hold that it is improper on the part of this Government to maintain the dignity of Canada and their own rights, because in maintaining the rights of our people they are creating irritation in the minds of the people of the United States, how much more unjust is it for the people of the United States, by a Bill of that kind, intended to affect the interests of Canadian farmers, to endeavor to intimidate our people into adopting the policy they may desire us to adopt. For my part I hold that there is no condition of things existing in Canada which demands at the hands of this Parliament the making of overtures to the people of the United States, further than those we have already made, until the people of the United States give some stronger evidence that they are prepared to meet those overtures in a friendly and equitable spirit. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has submitted to you, Sir, a resolution. In that resolution, although he attacks the changes which have been made in the tariff in a general way, yet he does not specify what particular phase of that tariff or what particular clause of that tariff is, in his view, detrimental to the interests of the country. The resolution which the hon. gentleman has submitted reads as follows :—

"That the additional taxation which it is now sought to impose will still further increase the burthens of the people and is likely still further to aggravate the distress unhappily existing among a large portion of the farming population of this Dominion, and that under such circumstances it is the bounden duty of this House, instead of adding to the existing oppressive taxation, to apply itself to the reduction of the burdens now impeding the progress and prosperity of the principal producing classes of the Dominion, and for this purpose to abolish or reduce the taxes now imposed on articles of prime necessity to farmers, miners, fishermen and other producers."

I would like the hon. gentleman to specify what particular clauses in the tariff submitted by the Finance Minister he takes exception to as imposing additional burdens on the farmers. Surely he does not pretend that the addition of 25 cents on the article of flour is an additional imposition on the farmers ; surely he does not pretend that the addition of 2 cents upon fresh meat is an imposition on the farmers ; surely he does not pretend that the other additional impost upon agricultural products coming into Canada are an addition to the burdens of the farmers? We are told by these hon. gentlemen that it is a very desirable thing that we should have free trade relations with the people of the United States ; but, has it never occurred to them that, under the policy which has prevailed in this country since 1879, if we have not been able to create a larger trade with our neighbors to the south, we have, at all events, been enabled to retain within our own borders, a very large portion of the trade that otherwise would have gone to the people of the United States ? We have been able to create an interprovincial trade between the Provinces which compose this great Dominion, and, if we have not been able to get our neighbors to the south to agree to an equitable proposition for the interchange of commodities which would alike be fair to Canada and to the United States, we have been able to build up—if the information which I have is correct—an interprovincial trade which has been of great benefit to the several Provinces of the Dominion. I hold in my hand a leaflet compiled by Mr. Johnson, the statistician of the Dominion, in regard to interprovincial trade, and here is what he says as to the efforts we have made to establish that trade :

"In the first place, we may attempt to obtain a general view. Before Confederation, as all the Provinces stood to each other in the relation of outside countries, the returns of imports and exports from and to each other were noted in the Customs statistics. An analysis of these returns shows that in 1866 the Maritime Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island imported goods to the value of $40 per head of their population. Allowing for the increase of wealth in those Provinces since 1866, and placing the value of their importations at $41 per head, we have an import which would be now equal to $40,000,000 if those communities had continued in their pre-confederation status. (Per parenthesis, I may remark that in England the value of imports is placed at $50 per head, in Belgium at $62 and in Australia at $100). As, however, the actual imports of the Maritime Provinces now are only $13,250,000, there remains the sum of $27,000,000 to represent: first, the extent to which they provide for their own wants through the growth of their manufacturing industries ; and, second, the amount they procure from the St. Lawrence River Provinces in the way of interprovincial trade. One detail will have to suffice in respect to this eastbound interprovincial trade. If we take the annual consumption of flour, meal and coarse grains in the three Maritime Provinces at two barrels per head of the population—and this is not too high an average, because the fishermen consume more flour than any other class—we have an annual consumption of two million barrels. The imports of these articles average 65,000 barrels a year, leaving 1,935,000 barrels to be supplied by the millers of Ontario."

And an hon. gentleman told me to-day that a manufacture with which he was connected, the manufacture of carriages, carried on in one of the small towns in Ontario, has been enabled to build up a trade in the sale of these carriages with people in the eastern Provinces, which has reached the large amount of $120,000 a year. I say, therefore, that the benefits which have arisen under the policy which has been adopted by the Conservative party have resulted in establishing an interprovincial trade between these Provinces which, but for the adoption of such a policy, would have gone to foreign countries. I do not say that I am entirely in accord with all the details of the tariff which has been submitted to the House. As a humble follower of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, I suppose I shall have to accept these details, but I tell my

hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, that I believe they have made a mistake in adopting a policy of granting a rebate on corn brought into Canada for the purpose of milling for human food. I have stated that before in my place during the present Session; and I think the Government have also made a mistake in allowing the introduction of corn and other grains for the purpose of ensilage. While, however, I believe that, in those cases, they have done something which will not be beneficial to our farmers, still, taking the tariff as a whole, I cannot pretend to say that the interests of the farmers have not been fairly looked after.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They have been salted.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The farmers salted? I think not. I think their interests have been more looked after than the interests of some other industries in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. Are you not going to make a noise about that little bit of pork?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Let me tell my hon. friend that I am not a Jew, and, therefore, as the increased duty on pork will benefit the farmers in my constituency and throughout the country, I am content to accept the proposition. I have very little more to say upon the subject now under discussion. A sentiment was given expression to by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in the course of his speech to-day which has my entire concurrence. He said it had been alleged by those who opposed reciprocity in manufactures with the United States that the people of Canada would be distanced in the race, and he expressed it as his opinion that no such danger existed, but that Canadians were capable of holding their own with any people upon the face of the earth. Being a Canadian myself, it may be somewhat egotistical on my part to say that I entirely concur with the view expressed by the hon. gentleman in regard to that matter, but, while I believe that we Canadians are capable of holding our own with any people on the face of the earth, I entirely dissent from the conclusion at which the hon. gentleman arrived. Those conclusions, as I understood them, were that we would not be able to give effect to our energy, our perseverance and our talents, unless we had unrestricted trade with the people of the United States. From that proposition I entirely dissent. I believe we have, in this Canada of ours, all the elements of a great nation. I believe that we have all the natural resources which are required to build up a great nation, and, if we have the people here in Canada, as I believe we have, to develop our resources and to bring about the results which I believe we are capable of bringing about, then, I think, we should work out our own destiny without reference to the people to the south of us. I do not wish to say a word against the people of the United States. They speak the same language as ourselves, they are a people having, to a great extent, the same aspirations as we have, they are a people descended from the same stock as we are, and I glory in their greatness. But, while I glory in their greatness because they are an English-speaking people, I say that we, on this northern part of the North American continent, are capable of working out our own destiny, and, I believe, the people of Canada will show that they are willing to do that without any extraneous aid from the people of the United States or of any other country in the world.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can compliment the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) very cordially upon the able presentation of the case from his own standpoint, that he has made to-night. I can say, with equal truth, that I am unable to agree with the hon. gentleman in a single conclusion he has drawn. He had a good deal to say with regard to my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard Cartwright), as to his management of public affairs while he was Finance Minister of Canada, and as to the positions advanced by that hon. gentleman in his speech last evening, and I shall crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments in reviewing briefly some of the points made in this connection by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). He asks, almost at the outset of his speech, how it was that upon one occasion the member for South Oxford did not occupy a seat in this House, and he left the House to infer that the riding the hon. gentleman had represented had lost confidence in him, and had failed to return him; but the truth was that the Government had blotted out that riding by the infamous Gerrymander Act of 1882, and consequently a temporary derangement of affairs resulted in my hon. friend being out of the House, I think, for one Session. The hon. member for North Renfrew goes on to say that in the first financial statement that he heard from the member for South Oxford, my hon. friend advanced the Customs duties of this country from 15 to 17½ per cent. Well, that was a very moderate advance. It was my opinion at the time that it should have been 2½ per cent. more; but the slight advance made by my hon. friend indicated the conservative character of his administration of the finances. He chose to refrain from imposing burdens upon the country; and in connection with the strict economy in the management of public affairs which that hon. gentleman practised, I think it is greatly to his credit that so slight an advance was made. The Public Accounts of this country show that during the five years of the administration of the finances of this country by the Mackenzie Government the increase of expenditure was very small; for 1873-74 the expenditure upon Consolidated Fund was $23,316,000, and the expenditure in 1877-78, after five years of the administration of affairs by my hon. friend, was $23,503,000, an increase of about $184,000 only in the expenditure of this country, chargeable to Consolidated Fund, in five years, under the prudent, conservative and economical management of the hon. member for South Oxford—a management the character of which stands out in striking contrast with the management of the Finance Ministers who have succeeded him in this country.

Then the hon. gentleman states that the fact that my hon. friend and those associated with him on this side of the House, are still in Opposition, is proof positive that the country has no confidence in them, that the people refuse to repose confidence in the policy and in the character of those hon. gentlemen. Sir, when we take a survey of the political field of this country, when we take into account the influences used by the Government that now occupy the Treasury

benches, when we consider the Gerrymander Act of 1882, the Franchise Act of 1885, the timber limit scandals, the pasture lease scandals, the appropriations amounting to millions of dollars made by that Government from time to time to influence the elections in various ridings of this country, the purchase of ridings *en bloc*, the purchase of Provinces, the refusal of that Government a few days ago to allow the passage of a law that would curtail its own powers for evil, so unscrupulously used—I say, when we look at all these things it is folly to talk of hon. members on this side of the House failing to secure the approval of the people. They are bought out; bought out by the money resources and the corrupting resources employed in every possible way by the Government of the day for the purpose of influencing the elections in this country.

Then, Sir, the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) refers to the intimation made by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the policy of this country was only calculated to produce irritation in the United States, and that consequently the policy was one to be regretted; and he tells us that if to maintain our dignity is to produce irritation, then let the irritation be produced and we will stand upon our dignity. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great importance that Canada should set a good example to the world, that its progress and course in this matter should be dignified; but I think I will show a little later on, that I have good reason for the belief that Canada, in its intercourse with the United States, in the character of its policy towards the United States, has been more than dignified, that it has been captious, that it has been more than captious, that it has been insolent in some respects, that it has given good reasons for being considered so, and that a just cause has been given for the feeling of irritation towards Canada that exists; and I think I will be able to present, later on, the facts upon which this opinion is based.

The hon. member tells us that the party to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) belongs has no policy, and that it is useless to talk about a party asking for the confidence of the country when it has no policy to present to the public, that it just sits here and indulges in a course of factious opposition, attempting to pull down everything that is offered, without having anything itself to offer in return. Now, I have always imagined that the Liberal party of this country had a policy—in fact, the hon. gentleman has attempted to criticise the policy that the Liberal party advanced to-night. One of the points in the policy of the Liberal party is that it advocates reciprocity with the United States, it desires to extend our trade relations with that country. That is one point in its policy. Another point in its policy is the assertion that this country is unduly taxed, that the burdens resting upon the shoulders of the people are too great, and that these burdens should be reduced. Another point in the policy of this party is that the expenditure is too great, that the Government in expending money is reckless, that it betrays the trust imposed in it by the people, and squanders their money; that there should be economy introduced in the expenditure of this money; that is one plank in the policy of the Liberal party. Another point is the assertion that the debt is too great, that the accumulation of debt should cease, and that a policy should be adopted that will reduce that debt, rather than increase it. That is another plank in the platform of the Liberal Party. Then, with regard to the management of the public domain of this country, the Liberal party asserts that the management has been reckless; that it has not been judicious; that it has not been in the public interest; that it has been conceived in the interest of the friends of the party and of the Government; that it has been used to increase the Government influence and to give the Government power, and that in all these things the policy of the party now in power is wrong; and per contra, that the policy advocated by the Liberal party being in direct opposition to the policy the Government has pursued is right. I might indicate many other points upon which the Liberal party stand before the people with a clearly defined policy, a policy exactly the opposite of that pursued by the hon. gentlemen in power.

Then, the member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) proceeds to refer to the resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives last year by Congressman Hitt, and the resolutions this year reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which Mr. Congressman Hitt is chairman; and the hon. gentleman informs us that there is something very suspicious about that matter, that last year the resolution reported to Congress and passed by the House of Representatives was one favoring commercial union, offering to negotiate with Canada on the basis of commercial union; while this year, singularly enough and suspiciously enough, the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations to Congress is not definitely in favor of commercial union, but is a proposition that Commissioners should be appointed on behalf of the United States, when Canada indicates a desire to treat, for the purpose of considering the best methods to secure wider trade relations between the two countries, without any definition as to exactly in what way the details are to be settled—a resolution covering almost identically the ground occupied by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) when he moved his resolution last year. This simply shows, in my estimation, that Congressman Hitt, one of the most advanced thinkers in the United States, one of the most liberal-minded statesmen in the Republic, has somewhat modified the view he entertained last year, and he now believes that unrestricted reciprocity between these two countries can be secured on some other basis than commercial union, that it can be secured on the basis which my hon. friend from South Oxford proposed last year. In fact, it places us in a better position in this matter than before; it gives us a more liberal offer as to the basis on which negotiations shall be entered upon; it offers to us, if the resolution passes Congress, a basis for seeking to make an arrangement, which is one we may, with every confidence, enter upon and carry to a successful issue. But, the hon. gentleman tells us, that is all bosh; that this hope held out by the motion, introduced by Congressman Hitt, is perfectly delusive. He says, that Senator Sherman, last year expressed the opinion, that we could not have free trade relations between these two countries, except on the basis of political union. Then, the hon. gentleman takes up the

New York Evening *Sun*, a one cent evening daily, and he reads an editorial from that newspaper, in which the writer ventures the assertion, that if we want free trade, we must take it on the basis of annexation. Does that settle the question? Does the opinion of Senator Sherman, respectable and eminent as he is, settle the question? If the United States invite this country to treat with it, to appoint Commissioners for the purpose of negotiating as to freer trade relations upon the basis that Congressman Hitt's resolution indicates, shall we, because some New York newspaper or some individual member of the United States Senate, refuse to accept the proposition, made through Congress, inviting us to enter into negotiations with a view to ascertaining what results can be reached, refuse to accept the invitation to secure an acceptable treaty? To refuse to enter into negotiations is to show we do not want reciprocal relations on any terms whatever.

Then the hon. gentleman has told us about the pessimistic wails of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Well, I might speak of the optimistic cock-a-doodle-doo expressions of the hon. gentleman himself, and one would be as appropriate as the other. It may be pessimistic to point out clearly the dangers that threaten this country, to show that we are on the way to ruin, to warn the people of the result of the course we are pursuing. But I do not think so. I think it is patriotic in a public man, and he who has the courage to stand up and speak the truth and warn the people as to the natural outcome of the policy pursued by the Government is one who deserves thanks rather than condemnation.

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to talk about the small increase in our rural population. He does not admit directly that there is a decrease, but he admits, inferentially, that there is a very small increase, because he proceeds to account for it, and he says the drainage of the population to the North-West accounts for it. There is not a sufficient aggregation of people in the North-West to account for the drain from the older Provinces. The people go to the United States—they go in streams and in thousands.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. CHARLTON. Because there are better opportunities and openings there. I find Canadians wherever I go, and I find them satisfied with the condition of affairs there. I am bound to say that I never have found a Canadian in the United States who expressed any desire or intention to come back to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a bald statement of fact, and simply that. It is a fact that the increase of our rural population is at a standstill, and this is not accounted for by the drain of our population to the North-West, for, where one man goes to the North-West from Ontario, four or five cross the line into the United States.

The hon. member from North Renfrew (Mr. White) next comes to the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with respect to the mortgage indebtedness of Ontario, and he disputes the statement made. It is an easy matter to do so. Accurate information as to the matter is not probably available. What the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did was to name eleven ridings in the Province, and his statement was that a certain condition of affairs with respect to mortgage indebtedness prevailed in these ridings, and he said, if a like condition of things prevailed in the rest of the Dominion, then there was a mortgaged indebtedness in Canada of from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000; and, to satisfy the country that his calculations were correct, he asked that there should be a vote of money for the purpose of appointing a commission to examine into this matter, and decide whether these calculations with regard to the mortgage indebtedness were well founded or not. And if the Government have any doubt as to the conclusion, let them give us a small vote, and appoint a commission, and investigate the matter, and demonstrate whether the calculations of the hon. member for South Oxford are well founded or not. But whether we have a mortgage indebtedness of between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000, made upon mortgage loans less or more, I can assure the hon. gentleman, and the members of this House, that there is a certain mortgage indebtedness, the amount of which we can arrive at almost exactly. There is a mortgage indebtedness on the improved lands in this Dominion, amounting to over $10 an acre, due to the public debt of Canada. That mortgage indebtedness we have at all events.

An hon. MEMBER. Are there no assets?

Mr. CHARLTON. We have $237,000,000 of net debt, and we have 22,000,000 or 23,000,000 acres of improved lands, and it is, therefore, easy to figure up how much is the mortgage indebtedness on the improved lands of the Dominion.

Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) proceeds to give us some statistics, or not statistics exactly, but speculations, as to the depression existing in the United States. If all he asserts with respect to the United States were true, it simply points to the fact that protection, which has been the policy of that country since 1861, has not worked satisfactorily, and if protection in the United States has produced, or any other cause has produced, the depression in that country, which the hon. gentleman asserts exists there, it behooves us to see whether the policy we are pursuing is not one of a similar character and likely to produce similar results.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. White) refers to England under a free trade policy. Well, in England a great many causes have operated to produce agricultural depression. In the first place, the natural customers of England for the products of her looms and workshops are the countries that have adopted a policy which is calculated to keep her goods out of their markets. The result has been, to that extent, to reduce the purchasing power of England. These countries have a surplus of food to sell to Britain. The price of natural products in those countries is governed by the prices in England, and the protective policy which impoverishes their natural customer for food products, and reduces her purchasing power has its effect upon the reduced prices paid in America for farm products. Added to this there has been a great reduction in freights, both railway and ocean, and the opening up of new sources of supply, as in the case of India, all of which has tended to depress the agricultural interests in England. The most marked influences upon prices of farm produce in England and America have been exercised by the

construction of railway lines to reach the wheat fields of India, which bring our farmers into competition with the Coolie labor of that country. All these causes combined have reduced the agricultural prices in England, but that is a question quite foreign to the matter under discussion in this House at the present time.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. White) wants to know if we did not consider ourselves largely to blame for the slow settlement of the North-West. I hardly know what the hon. gentleman means. Perhaps, he means to insinuate that we have taken a course that is calculated to deter people from going to the North-West, and that we have sought to diminish the movement of population into that country. I do not think, Sir, that the North-West has better friends in this country than the Liberal members of this House, or friends who are more desirous of seeing the country prosperous. Of course, we have criticised freely various parts of the policy of the Government with reference to the North-West. We have criticised its land policy; we have criticised that colonisation policy which gave to speculators land at $1 an acre, for which the settlers were charged $2 an acre. We have criticised the pasture lease grazing policy, which puts in the hands of cattle kings vast tracts of land, on which a settler is not allowed to settle, unless the cattle king gives his consent, and by which the settler is shut out from some of the best agricultural regions of the North-West. We have criticised the policy of the Government in regard to timber limits; we have criticised its mineral lands leases; and we have criticised its railway policy, by which vast sums of money are expended uselessly in that country. All these things it was our duty to do, and if these criticisms in any way had an unfavorable effect upon the settlement of the North-West, why, we cannot help it, and it is really the fault of the Government that they gave ground for criticism by their improper conduct, and not our fault that we criticised what we found to be objectionable in their policy.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. White) then proceeds to a criticism of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration—really he has covered a wide range in his speech to-night—and he says that Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues accomplished practically nothing for the country. Did they not? They completed the Intercolonial Railway, they proposed to give to the North-West an outlet by constructing a road from Lake Superior to the Red River in Manitoba, and from the Red River to Pembina, to connect with the American lines; and further, as soon as the wants of the country required it, to continue the Canadian Pacific Railway west. They deepened the canals, they did various things that were beneficial to this country, and the best thing they did was to set an example of honesty and economy in the administration of the affairs of the country. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) wrestled constantly with deficits during his administration of the financial affairs of this country. Let us look at that deficit question a little. If the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) had examined the Public Accounts, I do not believe he would have said anything about deficits, and I rather think he would be disposed to let this matter rest. I have here a list of the deficits since Confederation, and during the five years my hon. friend, Sir Richard Cartwright, held office, the deficits were:

1875-76	$1,900,000
1876-77	1,460,000
1877-78	1,128,000

or a total deficit for the three years of $4,488,000. Now, are these the last deficits in our financial history, and did the deficits cease when the hon. gentleman left office? Let us see. The deficit was in:

1878-79	$1,937,000
1879-80	1,543,000
1884-85	2,240,000
1885-86	5,834,000
1886-87	810,000

or a total deficit of $11,365,000, as compared with a total deficit of $4,488,000 during the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright's) incumbency of the office of Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. We will soon pull the deficit down.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oh, yes, you will pull things down.

Fault has been found with my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard Cartwright) because he refused to raise the duties. Now, the deficits under his administration were due, not to extravagance, and not to mismanagement, but to causes entirely beyond his control. They were due to the world-wide depression which diminished the revenues of Canada, of the United States, of England, and of every country in the world, and my hon. friend knowing that this condition of things was temporary; knowing that when this depression passed away, the duties that were then being levied were ample to afford him all the revenue that an economic administration of the affairs of this country required, refused upon the pretext of scant revenues, resulting from this abnormal condition of things, to increase the burdens placed on the people. The revenue of the United States during this period of depression, and the increase of the revenue immediately after this period of depression, clearly show that my hon. friend's expectations would have been realised had he remained in office. The Customs revenue of the United States was:

1876	$148,000,000
1877	130,956,000
1878	130,170,000
1879	137,250,000

Then the depression passed away and in 1880 there was a leap from $137,000,000, the revenue of the previous year, to $186,500,000; and in 1881, the Customs revenue of the United States was $198,000,000 against $137,000,000 two years before, and that without the change of a single item on the tariff list. That shows that there was a rapid advance in the collections from Customs in that country as soon as the depression passed away, and it warrants the impression that had the tariff remained as it was in this country, and had my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) remained in the position of Minister of Finance, the increase in the revenue of Canada, when the depression passed away, would have been ample for all purposes and would have left him a surplus instead of a deficit.

My hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) says that he is in favor of reciprocity on fair terms. What are fair terms, and what does he esteem to be fair terms? In my opinion the proposal made by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) for unrestricted reciprocity, is a proposal for reci-

procity upon fair terms, and anything coming short of that falls short of being such a proposal. If we ask the United States people to grant us a treaty of reciprocity that will enable us to sell to them exactly what we want to sell, and not enable them to sell to us anything they wish to sell, that is not reciprocity on fair terms. That is a treaty by which we secure a decided advantage at their expense. A true reciprocity treaty must permit us to sell to them the products of our labor, and permit them to sell to us the products of their labor; what they naturally want to sell. Anything short of this, falls short of being a true reciprocity treaty. But the hon. gentleman says in effect it is not a matter of much moment after all; it is a very trifling matter whether we get reciprocity or not; it is hardly worth looking after; it might be advantageous, if we could get it exactly as we wanted it—if we could dictate our own terms; but, if we have to go into negotiations with our neighbors, and give them some advantage as well as secure some advantage ourselves, then it is not a matter of much consequence; he does not know as we care about it at all. But, the hon. gentleman infers that the Liberals are still in favor of reciprocity, and I am sure his inference is right. I can assure the hon. gentleman that that is one of the principles on which the Liberal party stand, and on which they will appeal to this country; and with that principle they have victory written on their banners if ever they can reach the people of this country and place that issue squarely before them.

Mr. SPROULE. You did not work it very well in Haldimand the other day.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the Government have to distribute their boodle among 215 ridings, and cannot concentrate it in one, we shall not probably have the result we had in Haldimand.

Now, the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) tells us that the farmers are not burdened by protection—that the Government have considered his case and are about to give him protection. Well, Sir, if we are going to have protection, I think it is about time the farmer had his share; if there is anything that can be done for the farmer, in Heaven's name let it be done. When he is bleeding at every pore for the benefit of a lot of monopolies it is but fair that somebody should bleed for his benefit; it is a case of blood-letting all round. But I do not know as you can give the farmer much advantage by bleeding others. There may be something in the duty on meat for him—he may get one or two cents back in return for the dollars he is losing, but the whole thing taken together is a bad policy. I do not know that I need weary the House by referring, at greater length, to the remarks made by my hon. friend from North Renfrew.

The hon. Finance Minister the other night made a few statements, and took a few positions to which I wish to refer briefly. He told us that the increase of the public debt of this country was a wise arrangement, that we had got value for it, that it had been beneficial to us in every respect. He told us that the increase of the expenditure was also an act of wisdom. Well, I have great respect for the judgment of the hon. Minister of Finance, and I have great respect for him personally—greater respect, perhaps, for him personally than I have for his judgment in these matters. I doubt very much whether I can agree with him in the position he takes with regard to the benefit this country is likely to derive from the vast increase which has taken place in its public burdens. For instance, in 1867 the net public debt—I deal with that entirely, not referring to the gross debt—amounted to $75,728,000; last June that debt had been increased to $237,530,000, an increase of $161,802,000. Now, how has this increase been applied? Have we got value to show for it? I suppose my hon. friend would say we have, but I shall be obliged to express grave doubts on that point. We have $51,000,000 sunk in the Intercolonial, and if we had a true statement of the management of that road, I believe we should find that it is costing us not only the loss of the interest on that amount, but about $1,000,000 more every year; so that certainly that is not a profitable investment directly, and I do not think it is a profitable investment indirectly. Then, we have about $70,000,000 in the Canadian Pacific Railway, including the $10,000,000 worth of lands taken from the company when we settled with it the $20,000,000 loan. I have the greatest respect for the promoters of that road. They were men of great enterprise and energy, and the construction of the road was a marvel in railway construction—a wonderful display of energy; but the action of the Government I do not think was politic or advisable under the circumstances. I do not think we required to push through that great work with such haste as we did. I believe that if the policy outlined by the Mackenzie Government—building the line first from Lake Superior to the Red River, with a branch to connect with the American roads for a winter outlet, and carrying the construction westward to the base of the Rocky Mountains, as the country settled—had been continued, by the time the line reached the Rocky Mountains, we should not have expended more than $30,000,000 or $35,000,000, and we should have had a paying road, which, given as a bonus, would have been more than sufficient to secure the construction of the remainder. By that policy, I believe, we could have saved from $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 and a land grant of 25,000,000 acres; we should have got the line as soon as the country required it; a better line, and by a better route; and we should have had a large population along the line when it was opened to furnish it with business. I believe the policy of this Government with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway was a gigantic folly. I do not look at the question from the standpoint of the company, but I look at it from the standpoint of the Government and the country. Therefore, I do not think this great increase of the public debt was in the interest of the taxpayer of this country, or in any sense warrantable.

Then, the hon. gentleman tells us—and in this I agree with him—that we ought not increase the debt after 1892. I more than agree with him. I say we ought not to increase the debt after 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I said.

Mr. CHARLTON. We ought to stop increasing it now; it is already too large. The hon. gentleman tells us he expects a large surplus in the next

three years. In that he may possibly be reckoning without his host. If the tariff policy of the Committee of Ways and Means at Washington, as embodied in the McKinley Bill, becomes the law of the United States, the hon. gentleman may find that his surplus will dwindle away and disappear, and that deficits will take its place. He may find a condition of things among the laborers and farmers of this country, brought about in consequence of that American Tariff Bill, that will dry up the sources of revenue, and be more disastrous and lamentable than any condition we have experienced in the recollection of any hon. member of this House. Therefore, I fear that the hon. gentleman's anticipations with regard to a surplus in the next three years are not likely to be fully realised.

Then the hon. gentleman alludes to a prediction which he says I made in 1879, of a reversal of the protective system in the United States, and a breakdown of the same system in this country. Well, perhaps, I have only put the realisation of that prediction at too early a date, It is my belief that the next presidential election in the United States will see the triumph of the Democratic purty, which in the last presidential election had a large majority in the popular vote. The Republican party to-day only holds the House of Representatives by a very narrow majority, and they hold the Senate also by a small majority. So that a slight reversal would give the majority in Congress to the Democratic party again, and there is evidence of a very rapid progress of free trade ideas in the United States. There is evidence that the farming population of that country are becoming aroused to the true condition of things, and that the operatives in manufacturing centres are becoming free traders. This was indicated by the gains made by the Democratic party in the last election in the State of Connecticut and in other manufacturing centres. We shall see within a few years a breakdown of the protective system in the United States. A highly respectable element among the Republican members of the House of Representatives favor tariff reform and a sweeping reduction of duties at this moment.

The hon. gentleman lauded the National Policy as having been the means of calling into existence new industries—of having in fact been the means of creating the manufacturing industries of Canada. We often hear this assertion made, and I wish upon this occasion emphatically to deny it. I believe that if the tariff of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), of 17½, had not been repealed in 1879, but had been continued until the year 1890, we would to-day see a healthier state of manufacturing industries in this country, a healthier development of those industries, and a development ample for the wants of the country. I am warranted in this assertion by the extent of their development in Canada, first, under the tariff of 15 per cent, and later under the tariff of 17½ per cent. It is not contended, for it cannot be, that manufacturers commenced in this country from the operation of protection and were not in existence before. Why, Sir, in 1871, we had $77,964,000 of capital invested and 187,942 men employed in manufactures in this country, and the products of these industries in 1871 reached the value of $221,619,000. And all this business was called into existence under a tariff of 15 per cent.—a strictly revenue tariff and a very low revenue tariff. In 1881, we had a capital invested in manufacturing industries in this country of $165,302,000, and 254,935 hands engaged in them, and their products amounted to $309,676,000; and very little, if any, of this development can be claimed as due to protection, because the protective tariff was not passed until 1879, and there was no time for it to produce any perceptible effect so soon as April, 1881. I assert, therefore, that in Canada, under a revenue tariff, and a very low revenue tariff, we had, in 1871, manufactured in this country, $221,000,000 worth of products, and, in 1881, $309,000,000 worth, showing a rapid development between 1871 and 1881 under a purely revenue tariff policy. It is an insult to the intelligence of men understanding this question for any one to stand up here or anywhere else and assert that the present policy of the Government has been the cause of the existence in Canada of the manufacturing industries we have.

Then we come to the question of the burdens imposed by this debt. Our net debt of $237,530,000 imposes a per capita charge of $47.50, taking the basis of 5,000,000 population, which I believe is more than we have. The gross interest last year was $10,148,931, but we received interest to offset this on investments of $1,305,392, leaving a net interest on our public debt last year of $8,843,539, or $1.76 per head. Now, there have been some allusions made to the United States. The President of the Council enforced his arguments by such allusions and so to some extent did the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) followed their course, and I shall, imitating the example set by these hon. gentlemen, draw a contrast, as regards the amount of debt and per capita expenditure between this country and the United States. The debt of the United States on the 30th June last was $1,050,034,000, or a per capita charge, taking the basis of 60,000,000 inhabitants—which I believe is less than the actual population—of $16.67, against a per capita charge in Canada of $47.50. Our debt obligation is threefold greater per head than that of the United States, and the interest on the public debt in the United States amounted to $41,001,484 last year, or a per capita charge of 65 cents against a per capita charge in Canada of $1.76. These are suggestive facts. They are facts it is well for us to pause and consider. If we owe three times as much as the United States per head, if we are paying three times as much interest per head, that is not a satisfactory condition of things. The burdens of the country are too great, because we necessarily come into direct competition with the United States, and to have a fair chance in the race we do not want to be encumbered to a greater extent than they are. The nation that has the lightest debt and the lightest burden is the nation that has the best chance to succeed in the race of progress. If we were to treat the United States debt on the same basis as we do our own; if we were to deduct from the amount of their debt the assets of the country in the form of securities held, we would take from that debt the Pacific railway debt due to the United States, which is said to be perfectly good, and which amounts, principal and

interest, to more than $120,000,000. If we did this, it would leave the debt of the United States last June at $930,000,000, or $14.76 per capita, against $47.50 in Canada.

I come next to the question of Customs taxation, and a comparison of the relative burdens under this head in the two countries. Our Customs taxation last year was $23,726,783, or a per capita charge of $4.74, on the basis of 5,000,000 inhabitants. I shall not make a comparison between the Excise taxes in the United States and in Canada, because it would take more time than is necessary, and because the Excise tax is a voluntary tax. The Customs duties are an involuntary tax, the people are obliged to pay it, but no man is obliged to contribute one cent to the Excise duties. It is a purely voluntary tax. The Customs tax then of Canada amounted to $4.74 per head last year. In the United States, the Customs revenue was $223,832,741, or a per capita charge of $3.55, so that we paid in Customs last year $1.19 more per head than the people of the United States, or a difference in their favor in the matter of Customs taxation of 33 per cent.

In the matter of expenditure, our expenditure last year, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, was $36,917,834, or $7.30 per head. In the United States, the ordinary expenditure last year was $281,996,615, or $4.47 per head, making a difference of $2.83 per head in favor of the United States, or our expenditure was 62 per cent. greater than that of the United States—comparing the ordinary expenditure of the United States with the expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund in Canada. But if we take the Consolidated Fund and the expenses chargeable to Capital Account last year, amounting to $45,700,960, we have a total expenditure per head in Canada of $9.14; and if we take the expenditure in the United States, corresponding to our Consolidated Fund and Capital Account, we find an expenditure of $387,050,000, or $6.14 per head, showing that the total expenditure in the United States last year was $3 per head less, or 48 per cent. less than the total expenditure in Canada. Then we have the fact that, in this total expenditure in the United States of $387,050,000, which I place against our Consolidated Fund expenditure of Canada, the former amounting to $6.14 per head and the latter to $9.14 per head, there is no less than $105,033,443 of a surplus which went to the reduction of the debt of that country and to rest, while we had no reduction of the debt, but on the contrary an increase of $2,998,090.

It may be claimed, and truthfully claimed, that this is scarcely a fair comparison, that we have in our Consolidated Revenue Fund expenditure an item for which the United States has no corresponding expenditure, and that is the subsidies which are paid to the Provinces, which would correspond with the expenditures of the State Governments in that country to which the United States Government does not contribute a dollar. I recognise the force of that contention, and I will make a comparison deducting that amount. Taking the Consolidated Fund expenditure at $36,917,834, and deducting from that the provincial subsidies of $4,051,427, we have a net expenditure of $32,869,407, or an expenditure per head of $6.57 against the ordinary expenditure in the United States of $4.47 per head, and still we have an excess of $2.10 per head in Canada as compared with the United States after leaving out of account the subsidies, or 47 per cent. more than the ordinary expenditure in the United States.

A comparison which is still more interesting and suggestive is that of corresponding items. Taking the United States ordinary expenditure to be $281,996,615, we may deduct from that the pension list, $87,624,779, the military list $44,435,270, the navy list, $21,378,819, and we have a total of $153,438,858 to deduct from the total ordinary expenditure, leaving an expenditure for all other purposes except reduction of debt, of $128,557,758, or an expenditure per head of $2.04. Treat our own expenditure in the same way. From the total of $36,917,834 expenditure on account of Consolidated Fund, deduct subsidies to Provinces $4,051,427, militia $1,323,551, mounted police $829,701, and pensions $116,029, making a total of $6,320,708, it leaves a balance of expenditure amounting to $30,597,126, or an expenditure per head of $6.11 against an expenditure in the United States for substantially the same purposes of $2.04, or an excess of expenditure per head in Canada of $4.07, or 200 per cent. more in Canada than in the United States when these items are left out. These are comparisons which are not only unfavorable but are alarming. They show our recklessness. This is a young country. When we expend in every Department and in every way more than an older and richer country, when we add three times as much per head to our debt, and expend three times as much, after eliminating these charges, it must suggest serious reflections to those who take a look at the future.

Let us for a moment look at the expenditure of this country now, and at the expenditure of the United States at various times in its history. The expenditure in the United States in 1810, when it had a population of 7,239,000, was $10,280,000. In 1820, when the population was 9,633,000, the expenditure was $18,285,000. In 1830, when the population was 12,866,000, the expenditure was $15,142,000. In 1840, when the population was 17,069,000, the expenditure was $24,314,000. In 1846, with a population 20,000,000, the expenditure was $27,261,000, or $10,000,000 less than our expenditure with the population we now have, theirs being four times as great, while their expenditure was only two-thirds of what ours is now. The first time when the expenditure of the United States reached the present expenditure of Canada was in 1847. In 1860, with a population of 31,443,000, their expenditure was $63,200,000. After that date we have not a fair comparison, because the war commenced and great drains were made on the treasury of the United States, but up to 1861, the comparison between the expenditure of the United States and that of Canada is startling. It is startling to see that a country with twenty million people should expend only two-thirds of the amount expended by a country with five million people.

The most interesting point of my case to-night is that which I am about to refer to, and that is the measure of the burdens of taxation. An ordinary person would say we pay $23,756,783 in Customs duties a year, and that is the measure of our burden. It is not so. That is only a part of the cost

of the goods. The wholesale merchant assesses upon that his profit of say 20 per cent. The retail merchant buys the goods and assesses his profit of 25 per cent. on the duty, and 25 per cent. on the profit of 20 per cent. made by the wholesale merchant which forms an item in the cost to the retail dealer. When the goods reach the consumer, they cost him $1.50 for every dollar which the Government receives. But, not to be accused of exaggeration, I will say that the cost to the consumer is only 40 per cent. extra instead of 50 per cent.; and in that case, the consumer pays $33,197,496 for the goods from which the Government has only received duties amounting to $22,726,783. But is that all? No; there is still a more serious charge. Every dollar's worth of goods manufactured in this country costs, within a fraction, as much more than the goods could be imported for as the amount of the duty. That is what is called incidental taxation. Mr. Springer, a Congressman in the United States, who is a recognised financial authority, made a careful calculation as to the amount of incidental taxation paid by the people in that country. The result of that was that he estimated that the people of the United States paid $539,000,000 more in the year the calculation was made than they would have paid for the goods if they could import them free of duty, while the amount of the Customs receipts that year were $200,000,000; in other words they were paying two and a half times the amount of the Customs taxes in the form of incidental taxation due to the higher prices of domestic goods than the same article could be imported for if free of duty. I will assume that we are not doing as badly as that—though I fear we are—but that the incidental taxation, the enhanced cost that we have to pay over that which would have to be paid if those goods were imported free is only one and a half times the amount of the Customs duties, and that gives us an incidental tax of $35,589,000, and it makes the measure of the burden of taxation on the people in consequence of the tariff which imposes a scale of duties realising $23,726,783, and including the 40 per cent. wholesale and retail dealers profits on the duty cost of goods of which I have already spoken, a total of $68,786,496, and it is probably more, or $3 that the people lose for every dollar that the Government gets. Can you conceive of a more wasteful system, or a more absurd system? Is it any wonder that the people of this country are poor, that business is depressed, when the Government adopt a policy that takes $3 out of the pockets of the consumer directly and indirectly, that it may get one dollar into its coffers? Our total exports last year were $89,189,000. It took three-quarters of this total volume of exports to pay the losses, direct or indirect, sustained by this country through this absurd policy.

Now, we come down to the question of the increase of the debt, and I wish to compare the percentage of the increase in that debt with the percentage of the increase in the population of this country, just to allow the hon. gentlemen who have charge of this matter to realise where they are going to, and how fast they are going there. We had a net debt, as I said, in 1867, of $75,728,000; last year it amounted to $237,530,000, or an increase of $161,802,000. The debt was 314 per cent. greater on the 30th June last year than it was 22 years ago. In 1867 the population was 3,371,000; supposing it was 5,000,000 last year, the increase was only 1,628,000, so that the population increased by 48 per cent. while the debt increased by 213 per cent., the increase of debt was almost five times greater than the increase of population. Is not that a nice showing for the Finance Minister to make, that the Government is increasing the debt five times faster than the country's power to pay has increased? Why, any business man whose agent would manage his affairs in that way, would turn him out, he would get rid of him as quickly as he could, and he would not stand upon the order of doing it.

The expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund in 1868 was $13,486,000, in 1889 it was $36,917,000, an increase in 22 years of $23,431,000; it was 274 per cent. greater in 1889 than it was in 1867. The increase was 171 per cent., against an increase in the population of 48 per cent.,—a nice showing! What do you think of a body of men who would manage the affairs of the country in such a way as to increase the debt nearly five times faster than population increases; and increase the expenditure over four times faster than the population? I should think the Minister of Finance would take credit to himself and say that the management of affairs had been satisfactory, that the increase of the debt was quite commendable, that the increase of the expenditure was just the thing, I should imagine that he would say so.

We will next take the Customs account. Here we have another beautiful illustration of the thrifty management which the Minister of Finance congratulates himself upon. In any other country in the world such a Government as we have would have been turned out by an overwhelming majority years and years ago; they do not deserve public confidence. Any man who would manage business in such a way would be called idiotic, he would be sure to go to ruin. In 1867, the taxation, from customs, was $8,578,000; in 1888 it was $23,826,000, an increase in 21 years of $17,148,000, it was 276 per cent. greater in 1889 than it was in 1868, an increase of 176 per cent. in those 21 years against an increase in population of 48 per cent. The increase in taxation was four times faster than the increase of population. Brilliant management! No wonder, I repeat again, that the Finance Minister congratulates himself and the country on this brilliant achievement. I should imagine that his judgment was scarcely as reliable as it ought to be, and I think I am warranted in saying that I have a higher regard for him personally than I have for his financial judgment

Mr. FOSTER. That will grow.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman means the expenditure no doubt it will grow; it has been growing; it has a thrifty growth. We are growing right on towards ruin, there is no question about that. No man can gainsay these deductions, they are unmistakable. There is an undue increase in the debt, an undue increase in the expenditure, and an undue increase in the taxes. Any Government or any party that would justify this recklessness is unworthy the confidence of the people of this country. What is the effect of all this when we enter upon the race of competition with the United States in seeking to obtain immigrants, when we are placing before intending immigrants what we have to offer to induce them to

come here? Is it likely to secure their settling in this country when we tell them that our debt is three times greater per head than that of the United States? Is it likely to secure their confidence when we tell them that we are increasing the debt five times faster than we are increasing our population? Is it likely to secure their confidence when they know that we are increasing the expenditure four times faster than we are increasing our population? Is it likely to draw them to us when we tell them that we are increasing the taxes four times faster than the population? Why, we have not the inducements to draw them here, we cannot get them to come here. Not only do we fail to get immigrants to come here, but our own people are forsaking us, and the result is that we have fear for the future, and the consequence is a great exodus of people fleeing from the wrath to come, realising that the country is going to ruin, and they are bound to get out of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Hesson) say?

Mr. HESSON. The people will let you know what they think about it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government has taken care of my hon. friend; I do not think the agricultural depression affects his sons very much who have snug government positions in the North-West.

Now, I am coming to the consideration of the agricultural depression. We have reported from the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives a tariff law, and its provisions are a little startling. We had hopes that the rumors that reached us were not well founded, but the result, if the Bill reported becomes law, is worse than our fears. Let us scan some of the provisions of the Bill, and I will first refer to the article of eggs. This article has been free of duty for a good many years, and an enormous trade has grown up, amounting to $2,135,000 last year. This tariff proposes to impose a duty of 5 cents a dozen on eggs, which will nearly wipe out the trade. The Minister of Customs says "Humph." If he was engaged in the hen business, I think he would have good reason to say "humph." We have a duty of $30 a head on horses—not 20 per cent., but $30 per head—a specific duty that my hon. friend is so fond of. That will be a dead shot. Then we have a specific duty of $10 per head on cattle; that is a dead shot too. There is a specific duty of 30 cents a bushel on barley. It is only worth 45 to 50 cents in Canada now, and 20 cents more duty will bring it down to 25 or 30 cents a bushel. There is 25 cents a bushel on potatoes, a duty of $4 a ton on hay. Your own Province, Mr. Speaker, is interested in that trade. The duty at present is $2, and $4 will be disastrous. There is a duty of 6 cents per pound on butter, and 1 cent a pound on fish, and so on through the list.

Now, I said a while ago that I was going to allude to the provocations that this country had given to the United States, inviting this very policy that has been adopted partly by way of retaliation, and partly for the purpose of throwing a tub to the agricultural whale of the United States, in order to pacify it. We have first as a provocation the fisheries question. I have no doubt the old treaty of 1818, that denies to a fishing vessel of the United States any of the usual courtesies which are extended to other mercantile vessels, that does not permit such fishing vessels to come into port for food of anything but wood and water, that does not permit it to supply itself with any tackling or to replace anything lost in case of distress, and the enforcement of these regulations have produced bad feelings. There is a party in the United States that takes this ground with regard to our fisheries. They say these fisheries were acquired by the joint action of Great Britain and the thirteen colonies, that the thirteen colonies had a proprietary right in those fisheries, and that contention, it is well to remember, was recognised by Great Britain up to 1818; and, further, they say that the provisions of that treaty are antiquated, and the more that common sense and courtesy and good neighborhood prevail with respect to commercial relations, the more antiquated and exasperating becomes an enforcement of those provisions. This state of things has provoked irritation and friction in the United States. That country grants to us the bonding privilege. Our railroads, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, carry products through the United States without interference, bonded in their cars to New York or Boston or Portland, or any of the other seaports which their lines or connections reach, while we have denied to the United States the privilege of sending fish in bond through Canada. This is another ground of serious friction and trouble. Then we have created the grievance of differential canal tolls, in violation of treaty stipulations, by giving a drawback of 18 cents a ton on the 20 cents a ton collected on the Welland Canal to all vessels bound for Canadian ports. Then we have refused to meet the overtures of the American people with respect to reciprocity. A resolution was passed in the House of Representatives, last year, offering us the olive branch. We might at least have exercised equal courtesy, and have passed a resolution providing that the Governor in Council might appoint commissioners to meet commissioners appointed by the United States in accordance with the offer of the House of Representatives, to enter into negotiations with respect to this subject. We would not have needed to consent to anything we did not wish. But this Government did not entertain the proposition. It was bound to maintain its dignity, and it would not deign to meet overtures from 65,000,000 of people and treat them with the same degree of courtesy with which they treated us. No, we would not have reciprocity. We had too many men like the President of the Council, who thought it would be disastrous to have reciprocity, and did not want it even in natural products, and so we refused to meet those overtures; and, accordingly, the United States feel that they have received, in a certain sense, an insult from the Government of Canada. Then we had the export duty on logs, a miserable little exaction, which is worthy of a Barbary state or a South American Republic, but not worthy of an enlightened Anglo-Saxon state, a miserable little half-penny affair which produces irritation. Last winter a very large and influential delegation representing the entire lumber trade waited on the Government, a delegation kept altogether apart from politics, which demonstrated to the Government that the removal of this duty was necessary in the interests of the country. This delegation pointed out that the removal of this duty would probably result

in the removal of the lumber duties by the United States; but the Government refused to surrender this income of $30,000 or $40,000, and this gives the lumber interests of the United States a lever to use against the lumber interests of this country. What is the state of the log trade? We imported from the United States from 1885 to 1889 logs to the value of $6,750,000, $4,675,000 of which went down St. John river from the State of Maine, and we exported to the United States logs to the value of $1,958,000. We, therefore, imported more than three times as many as we exported. There was no export duty on the logs of the value of $6,750,000 coming from the United States into this country, but we must impose an export duty on our paltry exportation, to create irritation and show our utter incapacity to deal with questions of international comity. The result is, that we see the lumber duties have only been reduced 50 cents per M., and before the various deputations are through, probably the duty will be back to $2, with some provision as to the export duty that will prove disastrous to this country. In all these respects we have adopted a policy calculated to produce irritation, and we have produced irritation, and the result will be that this country will suffer disaster.

The National Policy, we were assured, when it was adopted in 1878, would result to the advantage of the agricultural interests of the country; and I wish to make a comparison between the prices of the leading agricultural products on 1st October 1878, about the time the Mackenzie Government surrendered office, and 1st October last year. The figures are as follows:

FARMERS' PRICES.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Rye.	Peas.	Oats.
Oct. 1, 1878...	$1.10 to 1.24	50 to 65	63c.	70 to 73	36 to 38
do 1, 1889...	0.81 to 0.90	40 to 50	52 to 53	53½ 00	25½ to 27

I think the farmers were deceived in regard to this policy benefiting them. We see the result in this great decline of prices, or at least we see that prices have fallen greatly despite the National Policy.

It is said that a farmer down in Western Ontario died lately, and some spirit medium professed to say what happened after his death. He had gone to market and sold his little crop of wheat for 81 cents a bushel. He had gone to his storekeeper, and finding he had only sufficient money to pay one-half his bill, he gave his note at six months for the balance. He had saved a little money for the absolute necessaries of life, and he made a few small purchases. He bought a dollar's worth of sugar, and he found that between the government and the refiner they took 50 cents of the dollar he expended. Then he wanted a felt hat for his little boy, and on it there was a duty of 25 per cent. which, with the profits of the wholesale and retailer on the duty, brought its cost to 37 per cent. more than it should be. He bought a few nails to fasten a few boards on his barn, and on them there was a duty of a cent a pound and the profit of the merchant on the duty was half a cent, making the amount one and half a cents more than they could have been purchased under free trade. He bought a razor, and that was taxed 25 cents. Then he looked at some glass goblets for his wife, but as the duty was 30 per cent. they were beyond his resources. Then as to binding twine he found when he came to settle his bill for that article that it cost 25 per cent. more than should have been charged, in consequence of the duty, and he tried in vain to figure out how the Government had benefited the farmer in that matter. He wanted a cloak for his little girl who was attending Sunday school, but he found a duty on it of 7½ cents a pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and the cloak was beyond his wealth. Next he bought some yarn for his poor old mother-in-law to knit two pairs of stockings for herself, and on that there was a duty of 7½ cents per pound and 20 per cent. He looked at some kid gloves as his daughter was about to be married, but he could not reach them as the duty was too high; then he bought a sheet of paper to write his will on, and he paid a tax of 35 per cent. on that. He went home, and when he came to think over matters, he got gloomy, and he made up his mind that this world, with its combines, rings and monopolies, preying upon the producer, was no world for the farmer to live in, so he took that 25 per cent. razor, and he went out to the barn and committed suicide. We have the rest of the transaction only through the spirit medium, and I do not know whether it is true or not, but it is represented that the farmer went to Hades, and his Satanic Majesty met him and took him kindly and cordially in. He put him into a chamber where there were a great many Conservative politicians and Conservative editors, who had died in their sins, but the farmer did not feel at home there. Then he moved him to a place where there were a couple of deacons and a number of election agents, who had met together in a Conservative caucus to devise means for carrying the County of Haldimand and had not been allowed to live out half their days, but he did not like that association, and he went next into a place where there were a number of doctors and lawyers, but there he did not feel at home either. Then the Devil came around and asked him what he wanted, and said to him: "What are you?" and the other replied: "I am a farmer." "Where are you from," said the Prince of Hades? "I am from Canada," he replied, and "Who did you vote for?" enquired his Satanic Majesty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Charlton.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; he would not have been punished if he did that. "I voted for Sir John A. Macdonald and the National Policy," was what he said; and the Devil said: "Why did you do that?" "Well," said the farmer, "I did that under the impression that it was going to raise the price of produce." "Oh," said the Devil," then come along, I have a place for you;" and he took him to another large room, a thousand feet long, three hundred feet wide, and a hundred feet high, with lines stretched across it and a great number of people hung up, and the farmer said: "What does this mean?" "Well," said the Devil, "these are Canadian farmers who voted for Sir John A. Macdonald and the National Policy, under the impression that it would raise the price of grain, and as they are too green to burn I have hung them up to dry." Now, Mr. Speaker, the class of farmers who will be too green to burn after the next general election is, I believe, growing small. They are beginning to realise that all these promises were fallacious, and they are not going to take the assertions made by the friends of the National Policy as law and gospel hereafter.

We have heard something to-night about depression in the United Sates, and the hon. the President

of the Council told us last night, that the trouble with the world was we had not had any war lately; that we had, in fact, lived under the calamitous condition of a long period of peace, and that if we could only have a little blood-letting, the Conservative party would be, perhaps, in a better condition, and the country as well. He told us there is a plethora of production, that everything is out of joint, and that there is as much depression in the United States as there is in this country; in fact he said that there is more depression in the United States than here, and that it would not be safe to have intimate relations with that country, as we might be troubled with depression as they are, and suffer from the evils under which they labor. Well, Sir, if there is anything the matter with business in the United States, if land in Vermont, right in the centre of the protected region is only worth $5 an acre, as the hon. gentleman asserts, he neglected to say it was barren mountain pasture land, and if the further you go from the manufacturing centres, the better the price you get for land, I do not think it works very well as an argument in favor of protection. If depression exists in that great country, as he represents, it does not reflect very great credit on the policy that he recommends as a panacea for all the evils of this country. The fact is, that there does, to some extent, exist depression in the United States, but depression exists to a greater extent in Canada, and that fact is sufficiently shown by the movement in the exports of this country to the United States, and to other markets. Naturally, we sell to the United States that which we can find a better market for there than elsewhere, and although matters may be depressed there, yet there are a great number of the productions of the soil and of the forests of this country that find their best market in the United States. The duty imposed upon these various articles reduces their price to the purchasers here, to about the extent of the duty, for the reason that the production in the United States is so much greater than the imports from this country, that a small quantity, comparatively, going in, has little effect on the prices of the great mass there. If this was the exclusive source of supply, of course the consumer would pay the duty, but as we export but little compared to the great mass of the productions of that country, the duty is deducted from the price we receive. Now, Sir, we find our best markets in the United States for a number of important productions, and during last year the following statement will show the value of a list of articles which we exported to the United States, as compared with the value of the same articles which we exported to Great Britain:—

	Exported to United States.	Exported to Gt. Britain.
Eggs	$ 2,159,725	$ 18
Horses	2,113,782	26,975
Sheep	918,334	303,009
Poultry	110,793	1,127
Hides, &c.	454,105	7,070
Wool	216,918	470
Barley	6,454,603	3,838
Beans	405,534	.....
Hay	822,381	84,610
Malt	105,183	.....
Potatoes	192,576	245
Planks & boards	7,187,101	158,443
Total	$21,141,035	$585,885

This would show that the movement in these articles is nearly forty times greater to the United States than to England, for the simple reason that for all of these articles we find our best markets in that country, and if the duties were removed from these articles our market would be so much the better there. We have, therefore, a very great advantage to derive from the removal of the duties. In addition to these articles I have specified, we have exported last year fish, various kinds of lumber and other commodities amounting to sufficient to make our exports to the United States last year, $43,500,000. Upon this vast volume of exports, our direct interests lead us to desire that the duties may be removed, for if the duties were removed, that market would be better, the prices would be higher, and the prosperity of the country would be greater. Our trade with the United States is greater than with any other country; greater than with England, although we enter the English markets without any Custom house restrictions, while in the United States market these vexatious restrictions are calculated to reduce trade. Last year our trade with the United States, Great Britain and all the world was as follows:—

Aggregate trade—	
United States	$ 94,059,844
Great Britain	80,422,515
All world	198,862,614
Exports—	
All countries	89,189,167
United States	43,522,404
Great Britain	38,105,126
Imports for consumption—	
All countries	109,673,447
United States	50,537,440
Great Britain	42,317,389

These figures prove conclusively that we must trade with the United States, that we will trade with the United States, that even tariff walls cannot prevent us from seeking our natural customers; that, in spite of all the restrictions placed on our trade, we export more to the United States and import more from the United States than any other country in the world, even Great Britain herself.

Now, to show what would be the effect of reciprocity on our trade, let me for one moment refer to the result of the reciprocal trade relations which obtained from 1854 to 1866. Our exports to the United States in the first year after reciprocity amounted to $10,473,000, while in the last year of reciprocity they amounted to $39,950,000, an increase of 280 per cent. in eleven years; and now, twenty-three years after, our exports to the United States have only risen to $45,500,000, an increase of only about $3,500,000 in the 23 years, against an increase of nearly $30,000,000 in 11 years under reciprocity. These figures tell their own story; there can be no doubt what the result of reciprocity of trade between these two countries would be.

I will not detain the House by showing the advantages which would result to the various lines of trade from reciprocity; I will just refer to one branch of the subject. My connection with the Mining Commission of Ontario brought forcibly under my consideration the great advantages which would result, not only to Ontario, but to all sections of the Dominion having mining resources, from free trade with the United States. For instance, the only coal fields on the Atlantic coast from Florida to Greenland are in Nova Scotia. The consumption of bituminous coal

in the New England States and in the Atlantic seaboard cities of the United States amounts to from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons a year; and with free trade Nova Scotia could, in all these markets, compete with the bituminous coal brought from the interior of Pennsylvania, and the paltry export trade of about 63,000 tons which was the amount exported by Nova Scotia last year, could be increased indefinitely. Would that not confer great advantages on Nova Scotia? Then the iron foundries of the New England cities and other seaboard cities in the United States would supply themselves from the unlimited iron ore beds in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Those Provinces would receive enormous advantages from the removal of the duties on iron ore and coal. Then, along the shores of Lake Huron and Lake Superior, in the Province of Ontario, we have the finest structural material in the world. Marble, granite and freestone quarries are situated along the lake shores, where vessels of any draft that can pass through our canals could load. The United States last year used $25,000,000 worth of structural material, and the great cities on the lakes used a large amount of this structural material. From these quarries Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo could be reached with the utmost ease. The stone could also be sent down the Erie Canal to New York, Brooklyn and Philadelphia, with only one transfer from lake vessels to canal boats. A trade of millions of dollars a year in building stone would spring up in place of the paltry trade of $43,338 last year, only $10,812 of which was from Ontario. Then, if the duty, amounting to $5 a ton on the copper contained in copper ore were removed, I do not say that smelting works would be erected in Canada, but we should ship thousands of tons of copper ore every year to the smelting works of the United State. A similar trade would spring up in iron ore. The trade of the Lake Superior region in iron ore amounted last year to 7,000,000 tons—long tons, as they are called, of 2,240 lbs., and we have only shipped 60,259 tons from the whole Dominion, 24,329 tons only of which was from Ontario. We have as good iron ore on our side of the great lakes as the United States have on theirs, and there is no reason why we should not participate largely in this immense trade; it is only protection that shuts us out. Western Ontario, projecting like a wedge into the United States, brings the cities of New York, Buffalo, Albany, and many other great centres of population in the Northern States to our doors. We possess unlimited advantages for supplying them with everything we produce, and we are only prevented from enjoying these advantages by the tariff wall which exists between the two countries. Yet the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) considers it of very little consequence for us to adopt the policy which ran up our trade with the United States from $10,000,000 to $40,000,000 in the eleven years from 1854 to 1866. It is perfect folly that these hon. gentlemen talk. Here we are, with an increase of 18 per cent. in our population in the last decade against an increase of 30 per cent. in the population of the United States, although we received 60 per cent. more immigration proportionately than they received. We have lost of the population of this country over 3,000,000 souls directly and indirectly

in consequence of being debarred from our natural market by hostile tariffs; and the Government are provoking an aggravation of the evil themselves by moving in the very direction that will call down on their heads the disaster threatened by the proposed tariff legislation at Washington. I tell you, Sir, these are matters for grave consideration. The faults and follies of this Government, their mistaken policy, their recklessness in management, their refusal to seek that which is best for this country, and which this country must have, will result in their defeat, I believe, and I hope, when they next go to the country.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I must compliment the hon. member for North Norfolk on the admirable, eloquent, and I may say magnificent speech he has just made. I have thought to-night, as I have thought for years, that it is a great pity that that hon. gentleman should not confine his splendid talents to the interests of the country in which he lives. If those talents were devoted to these interests, I have no doubt that they would be productive of very great good to the country; but I am sorry to see them on all occasions devoted to an investigation and laudation of the country lying to the south of us. I do not know that I should have spoken on this occasion, had it not been that the community of which I am a member, the farming community, has been slandered by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. It has been depicted as being in a state of distress and want, and even semi-starvation. I would like to ask what farmer in this country could go to any monetary institution and get credit upon the certificate of his character and the condition of his affairs given by the hon. member for South Oxford. I will just follow on hastily through some of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and intend to give the House something they have not heard in all probability in this debate before. That hon. gentleman says that Canada has been captious and impudent towards the people of the United States. If the evidence we have had during the last few months bears that out, if the events which have occurred lately bear that out, I do not know what impudence is. Have we not had the newspaper men of this country going to Washington to lay plans and plots for the purpose of betraying this country, and time will show that men in high places, in political circles here, have devoted their labors within the past few weeks to that object. If that is dignified conduct, I do not know what is. In my opinion that portion of the conduct of the public men of this country is impudent, and to that extent I agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman says he has always imagined that the Liberal party has a policy. I quite agree that he has imagined so, but that policy has always existed in the imagination of these hon. gentlemen, for they have never yet given any tangible evidence of it to the country. The only plank in their platform is reduced taxation, and yet they are spending the whole of their talents in endeavoring to bring us under a system of direct and indirect taxation with the neighboring Republic, which, by their own showing, is from 40 per cent. to 50 per cent. more than it is here. He said that no Canadian he had ever met wanted to return from

the United States to Canada. I would like him to visit Dakota and give us some of the information he would get from that state. A gentleman in my town, Mr. Bamfield, and some others, visited Dakota last fall on a shooting expedition, and they said they met dozens of farmers there who would gladly return to Canada if they could find the means. But the difficulty with Canadians who have visited the far west of the United States is that they are in such a state of destitution and poverty that they are unable to get back to the land which gave them birth, and plenty while they were here. He says that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has very generously offered the Government to support a vote of some thousands of dollars in order to prove the accusation he brought against the farmers of this country, that the farms were mortgaged to the extent of from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000. What a generous offer! Why, if he were a true, loyal and patriotic Canadian he would not utter words from his seat that he did not know to be true; he would not come here to slander the farmers of this country and place them in such a position that they would be unable to go to any monetary institution and get credit. He said the farms were mortgaged to the extent of $300,000,000 and that he got this information from the registry offices. Now, there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who knows better than the hon. member for South Oxford that that statement must necessarily be false, because if you go to any registry office and investigate, you will find mortgages registered there running five, six, seven and eight years, and that the condition of nearly every mortgage is that so much must be paid off in one, two, or more years, and there is no evidence in the registry offices that these payments have been made, for they are simply endorsed on the backs of the mortgages and are known only to the mortgagor and the mortgagee. It will be remembered that much of the money loaned in this country years ago was lent by monetary institutions in Toronto and elsewhere, upon the condition that a certain amount of the principal, together with the interest, should be paid off every year. These mortgages have continued for years. I have known them to be drawn fifteen years ago, to run twenty years, and I know that fifteen payments have been made on them and only five remain to be made. Yet the hon. gentleman comes here and quotes a partially paid mortgage as a mortgage existing and fully due. It requires no knowledge, beyond that which a school boy of fifteen years ought to possess, to understand this, and the hon. gentleman must have known that he was giving information which was totally and absolutely unreliable. That is a sample of the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite fling into our teeth a lot of figures, and say, if they are not correct, disprove them. But that is no way to argue. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has argued in the same way as he has to-night, session after session. Ever since I have had the honor of a seat here, these arguments have been made and these figures quoted and disproved, and if they were disproved to-night he would still quote them again to-morrow night. The hon. gentleman says there is a charge of $10 per acre mortgage upon the improved lands by reason of our public debt. What a statement that is to make to this House and the country, and the world at large. It will do no harm in this country, because no man here believes it; it will do injury where the hon. gentleman's figures are not known so well as they are here. He said we started at Confederation at $65,000,000, and had now reached $236,000,000 of public debt. He had not the candor to state to this House that a large share of that increase is composed of the debts of the Provinces which were assumed by the Dominion, and in that case the debt of this country, on the whole, so far as the people are concerned, was not increased; but the condition of things was bettered and the debt actually decreased, for this reason, that the Provinces were paying a larger rate of interest while the Dominion is paying a smaller rate on these debts. If the hon. gentleman were candid, fair and sincere, if he were talking from a Canadian standpoint, he would not have made use of these figures nor uttered these sentiments. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Charlton) says, that our public debt has been increased from $65,000,000 at Confederation to $236,000,000 now by extravagance. Does the hon. gentleman not know that we have a valuable asset for every dollar of our public debt? Does he not know that the building of the Intercolonial Railway was a condition of Confederation, without which we could not have had Confederation, that this accounts for about $40,000,000 of our public debt? Does he not know that the Dominion Government has assumed $30,743,392 of the debts of the Provinces since Confederation? Does he not know that we have largely subsidized railways in the various Provinces to open up unoccupied lands to give our people ready access to the markets of the world? Does he not know that the Dominion has spent in opening up our water-ways, canals, $33,841,932 since Confederation? Does he not know that the Dominion has spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway to open up our North-West to settlement and gain access to the great and wealthy Province of British Columbia since Confederation $61,899,600? Does he not know that we spent on Dominion lands and other public works about $5,000,000? Does he not know that we have spent on our North-West Territories in surveys, etc., $3,912,000, and including other small items, a gross sum of $178,102,413, since Confederation? Mr. Speaker, if he does know all this, then, in the face of the statements he has made to-night, his position in this House and before this country is not an enviable one. It is the position of wilfully misstating and misquoting the public records of the country for the purpose of gaining a political advantage. If he does not know, he is grossly negligent of his duties as a public man and as a member of this House. He talked about the agricultural depression in England. Let me tell him that the agricultural depression in England away back in 1812 was very great. At that time it was impossible in England almost to raise a bushel of wheat. The land had become well nigh exhausted, it had become exhausted of all the essentials for the raising of wheat, when Sir Humphrey Davies, the great scientist, coped with that difficulty, and in a very few years, by instructions to the farmers, showed them how they could increase the fertility of their land from a state in which it could raise no grain to a state in which it could, and that a severe agricultural depression exists in free trade England, at the present time. To-day the agricultural

depression in Canada is due to the diminished prices in Liverpool very largely. When the hon. gentleman quoted to-night the prices in Canada during the Mackenzie régime and the prices now, he forgot to tell you, Sir, that the market which controls the price of agricultural products here and in other countries is lower by one-half than it was during that period, and this necessarily depresses prices in Canada, and has nothing at all to do with the Government's policy. He went on to state what the Mackenzie Administration did. They completed the Intercolonial Railway; they also commenced that amphibious scheme of transit to the North-West. I think if there is one subject more than another hon. gentlemen opposite should not refer to, it is that unfortunate Fort Frances lock business. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money, and all they have is a big tomb in which ultimately you might place all the gentlemen who had connection with it. That Fort Frances locks, and the whole of that scheme, was one grand scheme of wrongs and misdoings on the part of that Government. The deficits from 1874 to 1878 are said to be specially due to the depression which existed in Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said the other night that there never had been as great depression during the past 35 years as there is now. The depression in this country now is attended by a surplus, but the depression during the time of the Mackenzie administration was attended by a deficit, and yet the hon. gentleman said that the depression now is greater than it was then. The hon. gentleman has apparently changed his mind in regard to reciprocity. Last Session he was not in favor of reciprocity, but now he is. In his speech last Session, reported in *Hansard*, he was very particular in setting forth that reciprocity was not the great boon it was cracked up to be, and that the Mackenzie Government had practised a system of retaliation against the people of the United States. I will read you a little of his speech on that occasion :

"It happens that this matter of wrecking has been in the past in favor of Canada. This advantage was thrust upon us by the action of the American Government in 1874, by a regulation which was issued by their Treasury Department, that Canadian vessels were prohibited from taking hold of wrecks upon the American coast; and the enforcement of that regulation has been of the most stringent character. The Mackenzie Government followed that up by adopting the same regulation as to American tugs taking hold of wrecks on our coasts. A report by Under Secretary Fox, in 1874, shows that the condition of things which has since existed, existed by reason of the American Government, and that Government cannot accuse the Canadian Government of acting in any spirit of unfriendliness or in any spirit but that of the broadest and most liberal character. The Canadian Government were not responsible for that order. They were driven into the position by the action of the American Government itself. That being the case, I hold that, when the American Government approaches us with a proposal to reinstate them in the position they occupied before they issued the order, we are warranted in considering whether, under the circumstances, we shall surrender the advantage we possess without some *quid pro quo*, without some consideration beyond what they propose, which is really no consideration at all. There has been a large amount of investment of capital in wrecking companies in this country."

Further on he says :

"There is another wrecking company at Windsor, and there is another about to be formed at Windsor: and these have been induced to make their investments under the regulations of the Canadian Government. It is these regulations which have called these firms into existence, and have led to the investment of this money, and to

sacrifice those interests without good reason is something the Government should hesitate to do. I think it is only reasonable that some slight concession should be offered to the American Government, and I propose it in the belief that it will be accepted. I do not offer these amendments on the ground of factious opposition to this Bill or in order to prevent its passage."

Again, further he says :

"It is said, why not pass the Bill, and then ask the Americans to make this arrangement with you about reciprocity in towing? Why not give away every consideration that you possess, for the purpose of securing a concession, and, after giving away all the considerations, then go and ask for compensation? That is not a business way of doing business. I do not know that I need to engage further in this discussion. I say distinctly and positively that the object of this amendment that I am about to move is not to kill this Bill. I am prepared to accept reciprocity in the matter with a slight modification that will give reciprocity in towing to tugs, not reciprocity in the transportation of grain vessels, but simply a mutual reciprocity in towing vessels and rafts by the tugs of either country. This proposition would be mutually advantageous, it would be reasonable, and I am morally certain that it would be accepted."

So the hon. gentleman was not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, so far as that question was concerned. Now, while he says that the money invested in wrecking in this country was so invested under Government regulations and that, therefore, the people who invested it should be protected, and their investments should not be sacrificed, he turns round and says that the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been invested in the manufacturing industries of this country may be sacrificed at any time without any consideration on the part of the Government or the Parliament of this country. The hon. gentleman also says that the farming population of the United States is in favor of free trade. The subject of free trade has not been discussed in the United States at all except by a few individuals. During the last presidential election there I heard Mr. Mills, the author of the Mills' Bill, in Buffalo, and he was very careful to state that they must not imagine that the party he represented were going in the direction of free trade; all they wanted was a modification of the tariff. He took as an example the article of woollen goods, and said that the all-round duty was 46 per cent., that what they wanted to do was to reduce it to 36 per cent., and he would not go lower than that, because it was necessary that the manufacturers should have that amount of duty imposed in order to protect them against foreign competition. It was not a question of free trade, but it was simply a question of modifying what I think myself is a very high protective tariff. That question of modification of the tariff was the only question in regard to this matter at the last election in the United States. Strange to say, the Democratic party having adopted the scheme of modifying the tariff, the farming States supported the Republican party. If you take Dakota and the other States which have been since admitted into the Union, I think you will find they are all Republican, and they are specially agricultural States. The policy of the Republican party is high protection, and they are supported by the farmers, as the protective party of this country have been and will be supported by the farmers. I will not go into the subject of the per capita tax which I dealt with two years ago. The hon. gentleman did not enter into the question of the debts or taxation of the different States on the other side. I need not go into that matter again, but I may refer to speeches made in this

House for many years past on that subject for a full and complete answer. He was not fair in comparing the debt of Canada with the debt of the United States, and the expense of Canada with that of the United States, because we all know that the methods of the two Governments are altogether different. The Dominion Government grant subsidies to railways, and build the canals of the country, and these things are done on the other side by the State Governments. We also pay large subsidies (four millions per year) to the Provinces, which has no corresponding payment by the Government at Washington. Nearly $40,000,000 have been expended on the Welland Canal by Canada, while the Erie Canal on the other side was built by the money of the State of New York, and the United States Government has never granted a dollar for that purpose.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do not our Provinces spend money on railways as well?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). It would be quite fair for you to compare the provincial expenditure with the expenditure of the different States, but it is not fair to compare the expenditure of this Government with that of the United States. The last portion of the hon. gentleman's speech to which I will refer is the little excursion by which he took us into that unmentionable place, the lower regions, and I can only congratulate the House on having an hon. member here, an ambassador, who is able to give us exact information as to what is going on there. Now, I will draw the attention of the House to one or two tables of figures which I have here for the purpose of showing that if the farmers of Canada are in a bad condition, which I deny, the farmers to the south of us are in an infinitely worse condition. The hon. member for South Oxford talked about the two or three hundred million dollars of mortgages upon farms in the Province of Ontario. I have here some carefully prepared labor statistics for the State of Illinois, issued in 1888, not statistics got up by registrars or anybody else for a special purpose. I will be able to show you the condition of the farmers who live in the State of Illinois, in the very midst of which is that great market, Chicago, that the hon. member for South Oxford in his speech last Session said we should have for our farmers. I find that the number of mortgages in 1887 was 235,537; principal, $381,322,000; unpaid interest, $12,702,000, making a total of $394,000,000. Then we have to add to this the chattel mortgages, and if there is one thing more than another which shows the poverty of the people of any country, it is the number of chattel mortgages. When a man gives a chattel mortgage on his household furniture, his cooking stove, his horse, with which he has to earn his daily bread for his family, it shows destitution in its most marked aspect. In 1887 the chattel mortgages were 74,740, covering a sum of $20,730,000; interest unpaid, $1,623,000, making a total of $22,354,187. The total liabilities of the State of Illinois were no less in 1887 than $416,378,063, or a sum almost double the total debt of the Dominion of Canada. Now, we will take the mortgaged indebtedness at three different periods, to show how it has increased. In 1870 it was $304,433,760; in 1880, during the time when the hon. gentleman stated that universal agricultural depression existed throughout the world, the mortgaged indebtedness had decreased to $196,650,000; but from 1880 to 1887 it had increased to $402,033,118, over 200 millions in the short space of seven years, and interest is not calculated on that sum. Now, take the chattel mortgages at those three different periods. In 1870 the chattel mortgages amounted to $13,762,541; in 1880, $11,808,167; in 1887, $20,730,000, with interest added to over $22,000,000, or almost twice as much. Now, you will find that from 1870 to 1880 the chattel mortgage indebtedness in the State of Illinois decreased, while between 1880 and 1887 it almost doubled. In 1870 there were 145,468 land mortgages, and 30,455 on chattels, representing a sum of $304,433,000. In 1880, there were 137,666 land mortgages and 43,124 chattel mortgages, representing $196,656,000. In 1887 land mortgages jumped to the enormous number of 2,335,527, and the chattels to 74,740, representing a total sum, not including interest unpaid, of $402,053,000. This is the state of affairs existing where they have that great market which the hon. gentleman wants to procure for our Canadian farmers. Now, I will give you some startling facts in regard to these mortgages. There can be no error in regard to these statistics, as there might be an error in the statistics presented by the hon. member for South Oxford. In one year, 1887, there were executed and placed upon the mortgage records of 102 counties mortgages to the number of 125,923, given to secure a gross sum of $117,152,857, all in one year. This is a marvellous showing of poverty and destitution of the farmers, a country to secure the market of which our farmers are invited to sacrifice everything they possess. You will find these figures in the Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of Illinois, published in 1887. They are carefully made up by a statistician who is known to be one of the most eminent on the continent of America. Now, let us see the condition of the farmer in the State of Dakota. I have here two or three extracts, if the House will allow me to read them. First, there is a letter from a missionary in the State of Dakota, Father Claude, who, writing back to his friends, says:

"Well, my dear friends, I am back to Dakota. I did not fare well since I came here and have no hope of a change in the situation for months to come. The water is very bad and unfit for man or beast to drink. I was taken with typhoid fever a few days after my arrival and on All Saints' Day I thought my days were numbered. But with God's help I rallied and am now happily out of danger and gaining strength daily. The country around here is poverty-stricken and the inhabitants also. The little frame church is mortgaged for $400, and other debts to the amount of $200 present a financial aspect that is discouraging, when you consider the resources of the locality.

"My mission includes all of Sanborn and Zerubel Counties, part of Lake County, and as there is no priest in Buffalo County, I have to go there, too. The worst of all is that the people are poverty-stricken on account of the total failure of the crops. Many farmers have now to depend on charity to keep them from starvation."

This is an extract from the letter of a reverend gentleman in Dakota, and this is the grand country to which we are pointed for relief from what they call the abject distress which has existed in this country for some years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it a free trade country?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I might tell the hon. gentleman that in the free trade country of England the price of land to-day is not twenty-

five per cent. what it was fifteen or twenty years ago. The price of farm land all over the world has decreased from causes very well known to those who seek to ascertain the true causes, but for causes unknown to those who want to bend the public mind in the direction that best suits their political purposes. I desire now to read an extract from the "Internal Commerce of the United States," published in 1887, respecting the condition of things on the Mississippi River. The extract will be found at page 1567 of the report of the Commission, and is as follows:—

"It has been no unusual thing to hear of farmers in the west burning or otherwise destroying their grain because it was unprofitable to ship it abroad."

This is due to what?

Mr. LANDERKIN. To protection.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). It is due to the enormous freight rates charged by railway corporations, in which all kinds of trickery are resorted to in their management. I was in California last summer, and I visited the ranche of one of the directors of the Union Pacific Railway. I found while I was there that a commission had been appointed by the Washington Government to enquire into the Central Pacific affairs, to ascertain whether the company was in a position to repay a few millions to the Government which had been loaned to the corporation. I afterwards saw the report of the commission, and it appeared that the company declared they were not in a position to repay any sum, while at the same time four of the directors boasted of being worth one hundred millions each. That is the way the railways are managed in the west, and that is the reason why the farmers have to burn their corn. Next, as to the question of the decline in the farm population. I desire to refer to this subject, and to show that it is not peculiar to Canada; the object of hon. members on this side of the House is to prevent the farmers being slandered, not by all the hon. members opposite, but by some of those hon. gentlemen. I want to demonstrate that in the United States the farm population is decreasing, and that this is true of the whole world. I find the following figures as regards the United States:—

"In 1790 one-thirtieth of the population of the United States lived in cities of 8,000 inhabitants and over; 1800, one twenty-fifth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1810 and 1820, one-twentieth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1830, one-sixteenth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1840, one-twelfth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1850, one-eighth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1860, one-sixth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1870, one-eighth in cities of 8,000 and over; 1880, twenty-two and a-half per cent., or nearly one-quarter, in cities of 8,000 and over."

I take this information from what I consider good authority, a work compiled by Rev. Josiah Strong, D.D., general secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of the State of New York. My hon. friend to my right will accept this authority, and I believe the statement is a correct one. My hon. friend, when the Budget was brought down and the tariff resolutions were submitted, did not altogether like the increased duty on flour, but after hearing the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he said: I willingly grant it; I will endorse the resolution; you poor, unfortunate, poverty-stricken people in Ontario deserve something at our hands, and we are willing to give it. I only wish the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would give us a better character. From 1830 to 1880 the population of the United States increased a little less than fourfold. The urban or city population increased thirteenfold. During the half century preceding 1880 the population in the cities increased more than four times as rapidly as that of the villages and country. This is due, I suppose, to the civilisation of the nineteenth century. I desire now to compare the prices of lands in my county and in Erie County, in the State of New York, immediately opposite. I may tell this House that farms in my county—Welland—are of more value and will realise more money than the farms in Erie County, New York, in which county the city of Buffalo is situated, when you get outside of the farm property which has a prospective city value. I have taken the trouble to investigate this matter; I know something of the value of the land in my county, and land in my county is not mortgaged to any extent whatever, while the land in Erie County, New York, is very heavily mortgaged. I will submit to the House some figures furnished to me by a real estate agent in Buffalo. He writes:

"I offer a farm of 200 acres in the township of Collins, about 170 acres cleared, with fair farm buildings on it, for $7,500. This is about thirty miles from Buffalo and six from the town of Springville, which is in Erie County. This is a good dairy farm."

Mr. CHARLTON. May I ask the hon. gentleman if this is a mountain farm? I have been in the neighborhood, and I may say that Springville is at the foot hills of the Alleghanies, and it is a pretty poor section.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I will give the hon. gentleman some other farms. I can mention splendid farms that I have been over and inspected.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will you settle there?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). If I held the opinion the hon. gentleman holds of this country I would go there quickly, and not remain and expend my force and intelligence in trying to deprave the public mind against Canada, and turn it against the country of my birth and the country that I ought to love.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman says I have depraved this country. I should like him to point to one line in which I have done so. If he can point to one line I will take it back. Never in one speech have I done it, and the hon. gentleman who says so is not responsible for what he says.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). If the word deprave is offensive, I will let the hon. gentleman apply his own term, for my meaning is that he is distorting the public mind.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Apply it to your political condition and it is quite apparent.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). This letter also states that he offers a dairy farm in the township of Wales, Erie County, about 20 miles from Buffalo, of 300 acres, with a good residence, 3 tenement houses, fine barns and good orchard, well watered with running stream and wells, and good fences, for about $12,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. In what township is that, please?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The township of Wales.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a lot of very miserable land there. When the hon. gentleman compares that with Welland County he is comparing stone with gold.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman thinks that there is something bad in the United States and something good in Canada. It is the first time, since I have had the honor of having a seat in this House, that the hon. gentleman was ever willing to admit that there was anything wrong in the United States, for he has always accused the whole wrong of this continent on the people of Canada. This farm which I have referred to, and which is to be sold for $40 an acre, is about four miles from the town of Aurora, which has a population of about 2,000, and is a beautiful town, situated in a beautiful country, as I happen to know myself, and in a country where the great stock farms of the State of New York are situated. I have visited some of these farms myself, not with a view of living there, but I know it to be a fact that farms in Erie County, in the State of New York, can be bought at a less price per acre than they can be purchased in the County of Welland. It has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the manufacturers are of no use to this country, but I maintain that it is just as important for farmers to have a market, as it for them to raise grain. Unless there is some market home market, in which to enable farmers to sell their produce, there is very little use in farmers raising it. The principle is well recognised all the world over, that the nearer you can bring consumer and producer together, the better it is for both. It is a well known fact that if produce has to be exported, or imported from long distances in order to feed the people of the country, there is a great loss to both, and the closer you bring consumer and producer together the more profitable for both. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House longer. I can only say that I am glad to have an opportunity to enter my protest against the insinuations made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the farmers of this country are mortgaged beyond all chance of redemption. I do not want this statement to go to the world unchallenged. I do not believe that it is fair or just to the country for any hon. gentleman, on his responsibility as a member of this House, to advertise to the world that the farmers of this country are so mortgaged that unless they get reciprocity with the United States it is impossible for them ever to recuperate. Whoever heard before of people trying to make a bargain—as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be trying to make a bargain with the United States—decrying what they have to sell. It is a deplorable and an unfortunate thing that we should have such speeches made on the floor of this House, as have been made by members of the Opposition during this debate. Canada is bound to grow, Canada is bound to be a great country ; the people of Canada are as highly educated and as wealthy per capita as in any other country under the sun. Travel where you will, from Halifax to Vancouver, you find a well dressed and well educated people, possessing fine schools, fine residences, fine roads, fine carriages, fine everything, and in no country can you find a greater or better people than in this Dominion. We have spent the last twenty-three years in joining together the dissevered Provinces of this great Dominion, in harmonising the different religions, the different races, and the different people of which this country is composed. I say, Sir, we have accomplished that successfully, we have accomplished it brilliantly, and we have to-day a country that we may be proud of, as we ought to be proud of, and that we will be proud of, if we are only true to Canada. But, Sir, if we are untrue to Canada, she must cease to be great, and she must cease to continue to prosper as she is now prospering. It was stated to-night, that it would be better if the Canadian Pacific Railway had been built in sections, and I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman say that, because I am sure he does not believe it. There is not a man who has travelled across that railway, whether he is Canadian, American, English, German or Scotch, who does not say it is a credit to the country, and that it passes through the finest territory of any transcontinental railway on this continent. I had the satisfaction of travelling over that great national railway last summer, and everywhere I found a fertile and a productive soil, and evidences of prosperity. I returned by the Central Pacific Railway, and in Northern California, Nevada, Utah and Colorada, I rode for days and days through alkaline sand and dust, without a sign of vegetation putting its head above the ground. In the great Humbolt Valley, in Nevada, I travelled from early morning until the following morning, and so long as daylight served me I did not see a living thing, either vegetable or animal, except in the immediate neighborhood of railway stations. Travelling through Colorado, I found that unless they could bring water from the mountains and pour it upon the land it would produce nothing at all. It is the same in Nevada. There must be artificial irrigation there, and without it they can raise nothing. But, in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, without any artificial irrigation at all, I travelled through the most magnificent wheat-fields in the world. We have a country in this Dominion that is incomparably better in point of agricultural possibilities than any portion of the Northern States which I have yet seen. Any one who takes the trouble to look at the physical geography of this country will find that it must be a richer and a better country than that to the south. The physical geography shows that the fertile alluvial soil has been pouring into that valley since time began. Altitude has as much and more to do with climate than latitude, and the diminished altitude of Manitoba makes it a warmer and a better country than that to the south. They have not the deep snow falls or the great storms and cyclones that prevail farther south ; they live peacably, calmly up there, and they possess a soil which is not surpassed anywhere in the world. Now, it has been asked why we have a better climate in British Columbia than they have in California ? I believe I can state the reason, which is true both scientifically and by observation. The Japan current, carrying heat and moisture, strikes British Columbia at Vancouver, and the atmosphere overlying this current being laden with heat and vapor rushes into the mountains, where the vapor is condensed and falls in the form of rain and the latent heat which held it in the form of vapor set free, warming not only British Columbia, but passing over and through the mountain

passes, bathes and warms the whole district east of the mountains for hundreds of miles. The warm Japan current meets the cold Arctic current flowing southward along the coast off British Columbia. The Japan current being warmer and lighter passes over the cold current from the north and prevents it from chilling the climate of British Columbia. The cold current emerges from beneath the Japan current at the mouth of the Columbia River and flows southward along the coast of California as far south as San Francisco, chilling the atmosphere and giving rise to the cold winds for which Northern California is so noted. So that, examine this question as you will, we have in Canada one of the finest countries under the sun, and our future greatness and the prosperity of our people are assured if the sons and daughters, and the men and women of Canada are only true to their country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. CHARLTON. Allow me to suggest that, as the reporters have had a very hard time during the last two days, out of mercy to them we ought to stop now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will agree to the adjournment. We cannot get through the debate this evening, as there are several hon. members who yet want to speak. The House has had very heavy sessions during the last three days, and hon. gentlemen will accomplish nothing by forcing the debate at this time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is only half-past eleven, and the hon. gentleman himself the other day suggested two o'clock in the morning as a proper hour at which to adjourn. Evidently this debate will not finish this evening, but if we want to end the Session before the close of May we must do more work than we are doing.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman knows that when the House is in Committee of Supply it sits longer than usual, and then 2 o'clock is not an unreasonable hour ; but it is not an ordinary hour for adjourning on such a day as this. We have shown ourselves disposed to meet the views of the hon. gentleman, and I think he should try to meet our views to some extent ; and as my hon. friend is not prepared to speak this evening, I hope the hon. gentleman will agree to adjourn.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no doubt that we have sat late yesterday and the night before, but we expected to sit much later than this this evening. If hon. gentlemen are so tired that they do not think we should continue now, it should be understood that on future evenings we must sit later than this.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the ajournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CLAIMS OF PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS.

Mr. MACDOWALL asked, Whether the claims against the Government of Hillyard Mitchell, of Batoche ; Louis Goulet, of Battleford ; Widow Laviolette and Charles Thomas, of Batoche ; William Lyttle and John McNevins, of Prince Albert, have been considered ? If so, is there to be a sum placed in the Estimates to cover these claims ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These claims have been considered. The claim of Mr. Hillyard Mitchell was for compensation for advances made to freighters for carrying flour from Fort Qu'Appelle to Duck Lake, in the spring of 1885. After these advances were made, and before the freighters had reached their destination, the Rebellion broke out, and the flour was never delivered. Mr. Mitchell's account was sent in to me when I was Commissioner of Indian Affairs at Regina, and was forwarded by me to the Department of Indian Affairs, on the 14th July, 1885, with a recommendation that it be paid. The whole of the facts and papers were submitted to the Department of Justice, and the Deputy Minister, Mr. Burbidge, now Judge of the Exchequer Court, twice reported that Mr. Mitchell had no legal claim. The case was then presented to the Rebellion Losses Commission, and was rejected by them as not being within the scope of their authority. The claim of Louis Goulet is for loss of crop, as is also that of John McNevins. Goulet's claim was not submitted to the Commission, but if it had been submitted, it would, as were all others of the same kind, have been disallowed as an indirect loss. McNevins' claim was submitted to the Commission, and was disallowed for the cause mentioned. The claim of the Widow Laviolette was not submitted to the Commission, and all that was ever laid before the Department was a statement of the articles lost. It was not accompanied by any evidence as to the circumstances under which the loss was sustained or any evidence as to the validity of the claim, although such evidence had been asked for by the late Minister of the Interior. The claim of Charles Thomas is based upon the allegation that his horses were taken by Col. Scott, commanding the 92nd Battalion, for the purposes of the military force. It is quite clear, therefore, that it does not come within the scope of the Commission, nor has it any connection with the business of the Department of the Interior. William Lyttle claims $770 for Rebellion losses. His claim was considered by the Commission, and upon the evidence produced $163 was allowed and paid. In view of this statement of facts, the Government would not be justified in placing a sum in the Estimates to cover these claims.

MAIL SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to comply with the request made by the City Council of Nanaimo and by the

City Council and Board of Trade of Vancouver, for a direct daily mail service between those cities? If so, when will the service commence? If not, what are the intentions of the Government and the Department with reference to the said applications?

Mr. HAGGART. In December last, the Post Office Inspector was instructed to give to the contractor for the New Westminster, Nanaimo and Comox service, six months' notice of the termination of his contract, and to arrange for a tri-weekly service between Nanaimo and Vancouver, such tri-weekly service to commence on the termination of the present contract (30th June, 1890).

BELLE CREEK HARBOR.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Were there a survey and report made upon Belle Creek Harbor and Breakwater, last summer? If so, by whom was it made; and will the Minister lay copies before the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no survey in 1889. There was one in 1888. The report states, that to obtain eight feet of water would require an expenditure of $7,500.

SAVINGS BANK AT PETITE CASCAPEDIA.

Mr. TURCOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a savings bank at the post office of Petite Cascapedia (Joseph Cyr, postmaster), in the County of Bonaventure?

Mr. HAGGART. No application has reached the Department asking for the establishment of a savings bank at the post office of Petite Cascapedia. The question has not, therefore, been considered.

BRIDGE ON GREAT CASCAPEDIA RIVER.

Mr. TURCOT (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have received a petition signed by a large number of the inhabitants of New Richmond, and of the adjoining parishes, asking for aid towards the construction of a bridge on Great Cascapedia River; and if so, is it their intention to grant the said aid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I may say that in September, 1888, a petition was received. No action was taken on it.

APPOINTMENT OF A. D. C.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether an A.D.C. has been appointed to the General Officer commanding the Militia? and if so, his name; and whether a graduate of the Royal Military College or an officer of the Canadian Militia has been appointed? If no such appointment has been made, are Royal Military College cadets and officers of the Militia eligible to fill such position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. An A.D.C. being an appointment on the personal staff, and being necessarily brought into close social contact with the General, his selection has always, in every military service, been left to the General himself. The A.D.C. of the General Officer Commanding here has always been selected from the Imperial army, as he is required to have a fair knowledge of his profession, and of the interior economy of a regiment of the regular army. Major General Middleton, on his appointment—having previously made his acquaintance—selected Lieutenant Wise, of the Cameronians, who had been a graduate of the Royal Military College, Kingston, and he informs me that having been so fortunate in his choice, he would have taken another graduate from the Imperial army had he known any of them personally. Failing this, he has selected as a suitable officer Lieutenant Streatfeild, of the Gordon Highlanders.

MILITIA—DEPARTMENTAL SECRETARY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether a departmental secretary has been appointed to the Department of Militia and Defence? If so, the name of the person so appointed, and was such promotion given to the senior of the class; that is to say, was the person appointed the senior second class clerk in the Department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Alphonse Benoit has been appointed secretary to the Department of Militia, from the 1st July, 1889. He was not the senior second class clerk of the Department.

LONELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Until what date in the fall is the light at Lonely Island lighthouse, Georgian Bay, ordered to be lighted, and at what dates in the years 1886, 1887, 1888 and 1889 did it cease to be lighted?

Mr. COLBY. The light at Lonely Island, in common with other lights on the lakes, is ordered to be lighted until the close of navigation. The light was closed on the 18th December, 1884; on the 11th December, 1885; on the 6th December, 1886; and on the 1st December, 1889. The period of closing in 1887 and 1888 cannot be given at present, as the returns have been mislaid in the recent removal of the Department to new quarters. Enquiry has, however, been made of the lightkeeper in the matter.

DUTY ON MANUFACTURING MACHINERY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether duty has been paid on all the manufacturing machinery brought into Canada? If duty has not been paid, on what machinery is there a balance still due, and how long have such arrears been standing? By what manufacturing establishments are they due, and what is the amount in each case?

Mr. BOWELL. It will be seen that this question is of so wide a character that it would be impossible to answer it. It goes back to the time of Confederation, and how long before I do not know. If the hon. gentleman will move for the information, I will try to get it for him.

Mr. McMULLEN. With the consent of the House, I will move for a return comprising the information mentioned in the question.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN FLOUR.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, How many barrels of Canadian flour were brought by sea or directly, or through the United States of America, into the several Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, during the year 1889?

Mr. BOWELL. We have no record that will give the information the hon. gentleman seeks, and the only way to obtain it is by writing to the different ports and securing, in addition to the records they possess, the manifests of the ships that brought the flour. If the hon. gentleman will move for the papers, I will endeavor to obtain the information for him at as early a date as possible.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I move for:

Statement of number of barrels of flour brought by sea or directly, or through the United States of America, into the several Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, during the year 1889.

Motion agreed to.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. GUAY asked, 1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps to ensure the immediate completion of the first one hundred miles of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway? 2. Whether it is the intention of the Government to take the requisite steps to compel the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company to keep steadily in operation the twenty miles of that railway extending from Metapedia to Cross Point, and constructed by the Government as a Dominion work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To 1st question: The Government have taken steps to insure the completion of the first 100 miles by making the company deposit with them $200,000 of their first mortgage bonds as security for the completion under the terms of 52 Vic., chap. 3, sec. 2, viz., the 2nd May, 1893. To 2nd question: The sixth clause of the contract for the twenty miles referred to reads as follows, namely: "That the company will, upon and after the completion of the said line of railway and works appertaining thereto, truly and faithfully keep the same and the rolling stock required therefor in good sufficient working and running order, and shall continuously and faithfully operate the same." No part of this road was constructed by the Government as a Dominion work.

EASTER RECESS.

Mr. LAURIER. On Friday last I enquired from the Minister of Public Works, in the absence of the First Minister, if the Government were prepared to state their intentions with respect to Easter holidays. I renew the question, as the First Minister is now in his seat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have seen a good many members on this subject, and I find the general desire is that there should be as short an interval as possible, and the Government concur in that view. The proposition is this: that when the House adjourns on Thursday, it stand adjourned until Monday at three o'clock.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The announcement made by the First Minister is a severe disappointment to a number of members who had anticipated the usual Easter adjournment, and who obtained no benefit from the last adjournment, of which they were unaware until the day before, and who are now compelled to go home during the Easter recess. Seeing that Monday is a private day, we think it is not unreasonable to ask the House that an adjournment should take place until Tuesday, as it would not delay the progress of public business.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with the observations of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). The last adjournment for a few days was a surprise to a great many members. The previous adjournment took place because there was one day a holiday. Easter is the time when members look for an adjournment, and the proposition of the First Minister is, in fact, that there shall be none. It would only be reasonable that when the House adjourned on Wednesday night it should stand adjourned until the Wednesday following.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). While I am anxious that the business should be hurried through as quickly as possible, I think there might be an adjournment until Wednesday.

General LAURIE. I should like to add my influence to that of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), for, like him, I was unable to take advantage of the last recess. It might be possible to sit on the following Saturday and allow the House to remain adjourned until Wednesday. This would leave the same number of days for work, and would enable members to prolong their stay at home, if they desired to go there.

Mr. DICKEY. I hope the Government will take this view of it. The previous adjournment was practically of no use to us, because it was unexpected and only announced at the last moment. Many hon. members have made arrangements to go home at Easter, and have engagements there. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) would meet the requirements of the case.

Mr. McKEEN. I hope the Government will grant the concession asked by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). We have been in session almost three months, and we should have an opportunity of attending to our private duties.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I hope the Government will adhere to their proposal respecting the adjournment. The proposed adjournment would only enable some of us to get half way home. Members coming from west of Lake Superior will, no doubt, endorse the proposition of the First Minister, that the adjournment be made as short as possible.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The Government have already taken two private members' days, and only one is now left, Monday. The House should endeavor to sit on that day, in order that the business of private members may be proceeded with.

Mr. ELLIS. I think we might compromise on the concession that the House should sit on Saturday. I concur with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), that we were unable to take advantage of the last holiday, and I, with other hon. members, would like to have another day added to the recess proposed.

Mr. GORDON. If the members for British Columbia were to go home we would have to ask for an adjournment of four weeks. I support the proposition of the First Minister.

Mr. KENNY. It is very evident that we are not to have a holiday at Easter, but I hope that it will not be taken as a precedent. I trust the hon.

member for Perth (Mr. Trow) will arrange to give pairs to those who wish to go home.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Many hon. gentlemen who were unable to take advantage of the last holiday voted for it in order that others might benefit by it, and they did so under the impression that they would have a holiday on Easter Monday. It was impossible for me to get away last occasion, and I had previously made arrangements to go home at Easter. A number of other hon. gentlemen are in the same position, and I think it is unfair to now refuse us Easter Monday. I hope the Government will consent to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government is desirous of getting the views of the majority of the House on this question. The members of the Government remain at Ottawa all the time, and it is a matter of little or no importance to them whether there is an adjournment or not. I gather from a great many hon. gentlemen who spoke to me, that they are anxious to get away from this before the opening of the season, sometime in April, and it is with that view that I mentioned an adjournment from Thursday night until Monday. A good many of the members can make arrangements to pair if they must go home, and I think there would be few left who could not get pairs. I would really like to do what is the general wish of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that we made a great mistake in so hurriedly adjourning the other day. I think we ought, once for all, try and come to some sort of understanding as to the principle on which these interlocutory adjournments should be made. They ought, at all events, to be arranged some time before, so that hon. members who feel that they have to go home may arrange to take advantage of them. The next proposition I would make is this: I think we ought, as far as possible, to concentrate any adjournments we have to make; and that if there are to be holidays beyond those which are obligatory—and I hope that the number of these may be reduced—they ought to be taken together, so that the hon. gentlemen who live at a distance may have a reasonable opportunity to go home. I do not see that there is any reason at all why any of us who are within a few hours of our homes should object to the holiday being very short, because it simply involves a pair, as the right hon. gentleman said, and the loss of a day in Parliament. It is a much more serious thing for those who require a longer adjournment in order to visit their homes. I think there is force in what hon. gentlemen have said, that it is customary to have a longer Easter recess than from Friday until Monday; and as they had some reason to depend, at any rate, on an adjournment over Monday, it would be hard for us at this moment to say that we will deprive them of the Easter recess. Perhaps the convenience of the majority would be served by sitting on Monday; but it seems hardly fair that, after deciding on the last holiday at a moment's notice, so that hon. gentlemen who live at a distance could not avail themselves of it, we should now deprive them of the Easter holiday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we follow the usual practice we might adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and adjourn on Wednesday night, for the reason that most of the members who wish to go home during the recess would like to be at home with their families on Good Friday. If we adjourn on Thursday they will be travelling all day on Friday, and I am sure many of the members would not like that. I think we must adjourn on Wednesday night, if we wish to give members an opportunity of going home.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to the right hon. gentleman that the matter should be called up again to-morrow, and in the meantime it can be discussed among members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I propose that the two whips, Mr. Trow and Mr. Small, should ascertain between them what really is the wish of the majority of the House, and we will consider it to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. That will be satisfactory.

HARVEY AND SALISBURY RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the First Minister if he would lay on the Table the last survey made of the Harvey and Salisbury Branch, which, I understand, has been sent to his Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to lay it on the Table. I will bring it down.

TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to enquire of the Minister of the Interior about what length of time will probably be required to bring down the returns in answer to a motion which I made regarding the grants of timber limits since March 1, 1885.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are preparing it with all expedition. I will let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise, Sir, to propose, seconded by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that a Select Commission of Enquiry, having power to examine witnesses under oath, do issue, to enquire into the management of the North-West Mounted Police, and into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, from the date of his appointment until the 31st of December, 1889.

When six o'clock came a few Wednesdays ago, I was in the midst of a description of the North-West Mounted Police; their *morale*, their physical, moral, and intellectual character, and I endeavored to do justice to a body of men of whom the Dominion of Canada may be proud. When, last autumn, the Governor General visited the Territories, this force was massed at Regina, in order not only to honor him by the manœuvres and to give him some idea what the Mounted Police were, but also to give him some pleasure, for he has the eye of a soldier; and a man looking at that fine body of men might, without the least hyperbole, apply the words which were applied to the famous Six Hundred, and which so pleased Lord Palmerston that he raised their author from poverty and obscurity to wealth and position. I will only give three or four lines of that remarkable description, which competent critics have pronounced superior even to that of Lord Tennyson; and I say they might be applied without hyperbole to our own Mounted Police on that occasion:

"Six hundred men for statues fit,
Impatient in their saddles sit,
Whose pawing chargers champ the bit,
And sniff the sunlit air."

Well, Sir, Commissioner Herchmer had been drilled and coached how to manœuvre the men. Sergeant Mahoney, to whom I shall have to make reference shortly, had drilled him in the management of those manœuvres; but, when a body of men are mounted, and some of the horses are bronchos, various little *contre-temps* will arise in the movement of the horses, and, in that way, a got-by-rote command is sure to meet with some sort of disaster. Accordingly, the manœuvres on that occasion were not successful. Now, Sir, a light, and an instructive light, is shed on the character of the man whom I arraign before this House, by what occurred after the fiasco at Regina, when he went west to witness the movements of the western escort, which was commanded by a tried soldier, his own brother, Colonel Willie Herchmer, the second in command being Captain McIllree, also a very efficient officer. On that occasion, what did the Commissioner do? He turned around, and, in the presence of His Excellency, abused the western escort; but he was not out of earshot of the Governor General when he turned around to his secretary, and said: "Colville, I think that was a pretty good escort," and His Excellency showed his appreciation of the escort by making the commanding officer his A.D.C., an honor which, if he had been satisfied with the movements at Regina, he might have conferred on Commissioner Herchmer. Now, Sir, the offences which I charge against Commissioner Herchmer are no trivial offences. They are offences of substance. They are grave charges, some charges of defect of demeanor, some charges as to competency, some charges of going beyond what the law allowed him, charges of tyranny, charges of twisting the law to suit him, and forcing it beyond the bounds it prescribes. It must be remembered what the position of this body of men is. When I call the attention of the House to the Act, they will see that probably no human being could be more helpless than one of these troopers, in case the man administering that Act, and having such enormous powers, is not a just man. To begin with, the 11th clause, which relates to the articles of agreement to be signed by the trooper, says:

"Every constable shall, upon appointment to the force, sign articles of engagement, for a term of service not exceeding five years, and such engagement shall be made with the Commissioner, and may be enforced by the Commissioner for the time being; but such constable may be previously dismissed or discharged by the Commissioner."

The Commissioner, by his mere volition, can dismiss any constable from that force, and a dismissal of a constable from the force is a disgrace which brands him for life. In my opinion, it was unwise to put into the Act a clause giving the commissioner such enormous power, and the only thing that could make it tolerable would be that the man administering it would administer it with a rigid justice—would never be influenced by partiality or by his passions, but would be a man having command over his temper—having, in fact, some of the first qualities of a judge. When we come to the clause defining the offences, there is some limit, to be sure, if it can be called a limit, to the mere exorbitancy of power that the Commissioner possesses. A large number of offences are defined and declared to be breaches of discipline, and then sub-section 2 says:

"The Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner or Superintendent commanding at any post, or such other commissioned officer as is thereunto empowered by the Commissioner, may, forthwith, on a charge in writing of any one or more of the foregoing offences being preferred against any man of the force, other than a commissioned officer, cause the person so charged to be brought before him, and he shall then and there, in a summary way, investigate the said charge or charges, and on oath, if he thinks fit, and if proved to his satisfaction, shall thereof convict the offender—who shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one month's pay, or to imprisonment, with hard labor, for a term not exceeding one year, or to both fine and imprisonment in addition to any punishment to which the offender is liable, in respect of such offence, under any law in force in the North-West Territories, or in any Province in which the offence is committed."

Thus, you see that the Commissioner has power to punish, not only the offences committed under this Act, but any offence committed against any other Act of the Dominion of Canada. He is armed, so to speak, with the vast power of the criminal law, and also armed with this Act. But I wish to press upon the attention of the House that the Act prescribes the way in which a man shall be tried. It is true, it scarcely gives him a chance. It does not arm him with any code of rules such as those with which a soldier in the army is protected. For any of these offences mentioned there, for the most trifling offence that a soldier can commit, he will have to be tried according to certain army regulations. These offences are prescribed, and I will say here, what I have said before, that the power given to Mr. Herchmer, under this Act, is greater than the power which is vested in the Commander-in-Chief of the British army. But this much he is bound to do, and unless he does it he violates the law. He is bound, when a man comes before him, to have the charge written out and to take evidence—in a summary manner, it is true, but he is bound to take evidence. If I could bring forward no facts whatever, calculated to startle this House, calculated to alarm its sense of justice and of protection over these men who enlist in that one-sided way to protect and fight for Canada, I ought to be entitled to ask this House to consider whether some change should not be made in the Act itself. Take a man who has enlisted for five years; he can be dismissed at any moment, and the severest punishment dealt out to him; but, in any case, under that Act, you would expect that he would be arraigned before the Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner or some inspector. You would expect, anyway, that he would be tried according to the Act. Now, by-and-by I shall have to deal with other offences, but the gravest offence that I will charge against Commissioner Herchmer is that he has taken that Act in his hand which he is bound to administer according to its provisions, and at his royal will and pleasure torn it in tatters. For instance, in the case of the man Somerville, who was brought before him without any charge whatever, before any charge was made or any evidence taken, he was sentenced to three months' imprisonment and to be dismissed. That man was not dismissed, and was let out before his time. It is not necessary to enquire why. Whether it was because attention had been called to his case or not I do not know; but, anyway, the sentence was not carried out. Now, there were other grave cases of this character. Men

have been brought before the inspector at places sixty, seventy, aye, one hundred miles away from Regina, at the direction of the Commissioner, and the evidence sent on to him. The sentenced men he never saw. This has been done in three cases which can be proved, and I believe there are other cases, although I am cognizant of but three. The evidence was sent on to Commissioner Herchmer, and without having the men before him, as is required by the Act, without having the accused brought face to face with their judge, he pronounced sentence. In one case, when Captain Deane was at Regina, a man was sent down from Moose Jaw charged with drunkenness. Mr. Herchmer was going west that day, and what did he do? He actually gave instructions defining what the punishment was to be. Without hearing the charge, he gave these instructions to Captain Deane. When the man was brought before Captain Deane, that gentleman said: While there is no evidence of a character to warrant my punishing you severely—in fact, while there is no evidence to do anything but to dismiss the case, here are my instructions, which I must carry out. Is that a solitary case? No, it is not. I can take you to Calgary, when Superintendent Antrobus was there, and can show you a case in which Mr. Herchmer actually gave directions contrary to the decision of a judge on the previous day. The judge, that is to say an inspector, armed with all the powers and the authority of a magistrate, heard the evidence and decided to inflict a heavy fine on two men, citizens of Calgary. When the men were brought up, the inspector, after trying the case, told the men that he would have to inflict a fine; but, having remanded the case until the day following, although he had previously intimated what his decision would be, he said, under instructions from Mr. Herchmer: "I am sorry to say I will not have to fine you only, but to imprison you as well, because I have directions to that effect." If there was nothing more than this, it is a most serious matter. It is tearing to pieces this Act which he has to administer; it is depriving of the last shred of protection both the citizens and members of the Mounted Police. But Mr. Herchmer has not contented himself with that. He has actually attempted to punish without trial for offences not set out in the Act at all. One, probably, is as flagrant a case of tyranny as has ever been perpetrated out of King Bomba's realm. There was a concert given at the barracks. A young lad, who sings and plays very well, performed at this concert. The concert was to be repeated in the town of Regina, and the young lad refused to attend. Surely it was not in his papers that he must perform at a concert; nevertheless, when Commissioner Herchmer heard that this young lad determined not to attend that concert he had him brought before him, and said: "If you do not I will dismiss you." In fact, the strongest language which could be used would give no idea of the profligacy of the attempts that this tyrant has made to construe the Act, which he is bound to administer according to its provisions, according to his royal will and pleasure. He thinks there is nothing he cannot do under it. He has flaunted and strutted up and down the platform at Regina, and told the people: "I will have you know that I am the law." There was the case of Craig, of which the Postmaster General will know something. This man had money deposited in the post office savings bank, and he wrote to have the balance to his credit sent to him. The amount sent to him, he thought, was more that what he was entitled to. He was not sure, but he hardly thought he had so much money at his credit. The moment this was reported to Mr. Herchmer, what did he do? He sent a telegram to have the man arrested and put in prison. For what offence? What offence under the disciplinary clauses of this Act—what offence under the law, had he been guilty of? The Postmaster General's subordinates at Ottawa had committed an error in sending this man another man's account. There was not any great discrepancy, but there was some discrepancy, and it was in favor of the man who drew the money, but the moment Mr. Herchmer heard of it, he sent to have him arrested. This man took out a writ of *habeas corpus*, which was granted by Judge Macleod; but what did Mr Herchmer do again? He actually sent word by telegraph to have him re-imprisoned, and actually tried to prosecute him at Lethbridge. The prosecuting counsel, who was practically the counsel of the Mounted Police, refused to prosecute. And so the thing fell through. I believe Craig intends to bring an action for false imprisonment against Mr. Herchmer, and if he does he will undoubtedly get a verdict. Somerville might have brought an action in the same way. That is one phase of Commissioner Herchmer's misconduct in regard to the law which he administers. Here is another: In administering such a Draconian statute as this, a man ought to be a just man; but his judgments are as capricious as the movements of a weathercock. A man may be brought before him to-day for one offence precisely similar to that for which another man may be brought before him to-morrow, and what do you find? The one man gets three months' imprisonment and is probably dismissed, unless by-and-bye an order comes from Ottawa forbidding the dismissal, as occurred in Somerville's case. Then there was the case of Gordon, who was sentenced to three months' imprisonment and to be dismissed from the force; but, instead of that, the Commissioner was ordered to limit the term of the imprisonment, and Gordon was not only not dismissed, but obtained a position. I will give you another instance: There is a man who was guilty of what I consider a very grave offence. It was a man named Thompson. He broke into the Commissioner's cellar and stole the Commissioner's beer.

An hon. MEMBER. Was it four per cent. beer?

Mr. DAVIN. I believe it was rather stronger than four per cent. He took the beer away, and not only drank it himself but gave it to his fellow policemen to drink. What happened? When that man is to be taken before Commissioner Herchmer, he gets an intimation from a certain quarter, which it is not necessary for me to define, that he must not punish that man severely. The man is brought before him, and he fines him $10, and for what? For committing a complicated offence against the statute. It was not merely that he stole the beer, it was not merely that he gave it to other men in the force, but it was also that he broke into his commanding officer's cellar. He committed burglary, and also

the grossest breach of discipline. Nevertheless, Commissioner Herchmer fines him only $10. Next day, we will suppose, a man is brought before him for an offence far more trivial, and he is sentenced to three months' imprisonment and dismissed the force. As to the capriciousness of this officer, let me give another example. Sergeant Mahoney, the drill sergeant, who is one of the most capable men for drilling soldiers on the continent of America, goes before Commissioner Herchmer as a deputation from the sergeants' mess to ask that, instead of taking beer at the canteen, they may have the beer at their own mess. Herchmer breaks into a passion, and says he would not trust one of his sergeants or his sergeants-major, and that they could not have the beer at their mess. "Then," said Sergeant Mahoney, "I will drink no more beer at the canteen." "Come back," says Herchmer, "you are fined $30," and that is simply for saying that he would not drink beer at the canteen. The other man is fined $10 for breaking into Herchmer's cellar, stealing most of his beer, and taking it to his brother troopers. That is a great discrepancy in the decisions of this officer, but it is not so astonishing as this, that one man should be brought before him for an offence for which he would get two days' imprisonment in the army, and he is imprisoned for three months and dismissed the force, while another man is brought before him and is dealt with in the way this man Thompson is dealt with. There is another man there, and, while the Commissioner is on the spot, he does pretty well what he likes; but, when Colonel Willie Herchmer, the Commissioner's brother, came there, he gave this man notice that he did not care whether he sang in the choir or not, for that would not save him from going on the defaulters' list. Anyone who has observed the career of Commissioner Herchmer could not fail to come to the conclusion that either he was demented or that there were in him ingrained vices of such a character that the moment he got power they manifested themselves in such a flagrant manner as we have read of in the cases of tyrants endowed with unlimited and despotic authority. The point of view from which I have thus far dealt with the Commissioner is that of justice, because I think it the most important, because I think it the point of view that will most impress this Parliament, because I think it the point of view that should most impress this Parliament; for there is no helpless being over the wide Dominion of Canada, if there is the least oppression dealt out to him or her, whose case this Parliament should not be ready to investigate, and to punish the oppressor. I maintain that a more helpless creature does not exist than a man who enlists under the conditions of this Act, who yet wears the Queen's uniform, and may be called to die for his Queen and country to-morrow. Then, if any injustice is dealt out to him, this Parliament should see that in the future he gets protection, and that past offences should be condignly dealt with. I have dealt with this from the point of view of justice, but there is also the point of view of efficiency to be considered. Will any man tell me that, because there is a kind of terrorism exercised—because, after the men are enlisted, terrorism is used against them—the appearance of peace is a sign that peace exists? We, who live in the Territories, know that that is not the case. We know well that, if trouble were to break out to-morrow, events would occur that would seriously deteriorate from the efficiency of that force. You cannot make efficient men, men full of the feeling of discipline, of courage, and of loyalty, especially in a free country like this, if they are still treated as slaves. It is not in human nature. There is another point of view from which Commissioner Herchmer's conduct has to be looked at. He occupies a very important position, one of the first positions in the North-West, a position that any man in the country might be proud to fill. It is a position of great responsibility. Now, if his outbreaks of violent temper only related to the police it would be a grave thing, it would be a grave cause for enquiry, but he has to deal with the public in many ways. His authority and his duties touch the people of the North-West Territories at many points, and the people of those Territories have had to endure his injustice, they have had to endure his insolence, to endure his violence of temper, they have had to endure his overbearing arrogance. Even if everything were right in the force, yet if it could be shown that to the people of that vast territory, where he occupies so important a position, his demeanor is of a character offensive, insolent, arrogant, oppressive, it would be a grave cause for enquiry, and, if the enquiry established it, full ground for dismissal. But when you look at it from the point of view of justice, justice to the troopers, justice to those men who may be kept there trembling, as it were, under lash of this man's capricious injustice, when you look at it from the point of view of the efficiency of the force, and then from the point of view of the interest of the Territories, and the feelings of the people, why, Sir, you have a cumulative case made out against this man, and I hold that it is the bounden duty of the Government to throw no difficulties in the way of a full enquiry into his conduct. Now, I charge against him that he is incompetent. What I mean by saying he is incompetent is this: That, unless he has recently learned how to do it, he could not put a troop through its facings; and to have a man in that position, who cannot put a troop through its facings, means something very serious in its effect upon the officers and upon the men. Is it to be supposed that men who are in the position of soldiers, or of officers commanding these men, can respect the commanding officer who does not know his business? Now, I believe the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Mounted Police, and takes a deep interest in them, and who is proud of them, as he may well be, must have had, I know, the best grounds for promoting Commissioner Herchmer from a subordinate position in the Indian Department to be the head of this force. I have no doubt whatever that he had before him grounds that seemed to satisfy his mind, and that were calculated to satisfy any mind who applied itself to the facts which, no doubt, were laid before him. But it has not turned out fortunately, because there cannot be the least doubt that promoting him over the heads of the officers who were in the force hit the *esprit de corps* so hard that a very different management will have to be adopted in order to restore it. I charge him with tyranny to officers and men. Now, his tyranny to the officers in the Territories is gross as a mountain—open, palpable.

I will give you an instance of the way he treats these officers, to show how he is fitted to preserve their respect. When the Governor General went up to Banff a ball was given in his honor at the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel. After the ball Mr. Mathews, the proprietor of the hotel, gave a supper to a number of gentlemen, some of them well known to the head of the Government. Mr. Buchanan was one, Mr. Baker, I think, another, Mr. Pocklington another, and a number of civilians; but amongst the civilians were a few officers. Colonel Herchmer went to Mr. Mathews and said, that he thought they were disturbing the Governor General. Mr. Mathews said: "Well, I do not see how they possibly can, but I suppose if they are disturbing the Governor General he will send us word." Colonel Herchmer came in again in the most violent wrath, thundered at the door, and swore at his officers, and told them to leave the table, and that if they did not leave, they should send in their resignations. Now, it is to be remembered that these men have the position of gentlemen, they wear Her Majesty's uniform, they wear the uniform of the Mounted Police, and that is a very "crack" uniform; it would suit a hussar regiment. The idea of treating these officers in that manner! But that is trifling, compared with his usual treatment. The usual thing is to bully them before the men—to assail them, so to speak, with words before their own men. Now, if that should prove to be the case—of course I do not know anything about that—but if it should prove to be the case that these officers, up to this minute, have never sent in any complaint, what will that show? If they, up to this minute, have sent in no complaints, it shows that they fancy he is so strongly entrenched that, no matter what he does, there he remains, and his vengeance, sharp and sudden, may be dealt out to them when they least expect it. It is a common notion amongst them, and a common notion amongst the people, that if one of the officers offends him in the least way the colonel orders him off, even in the depth of winter; he will order him, probably, 200 miles away; probably he orders him off to live there permanently for three or four months, and the removal costs money. But I am not here to make any point about that. I will say, however, that it ought to be taken for granted, until proof to the contrary of the most absolute character is forthcoming, that when a commanding officer orders his subordinate officer away he has done it in the interest of the force. So I make no point about that; but I will say this: that, seeing his tyrannical conduct to the men, looking at his tyrannical bearing towards the officers, looking at his tyrannical bearing in a more delicate direction, to which I shall have to refer in a moment, it is fairly inferable, anyway, that in some percentage of the cases in which he orders officers away he has been guided, not by a desire for the efficiency of the force, but by a desire to wreak his own vengeance upon them. Now, I charge that he interferes, so as to cause grave suffering with the conduct of the medical officers in the hospital. It has been represented to me, on authority that I cannot question for a minute, that he will interfere actually with the prescriptions of these medical officers. One case was brought before me in which a few lemons were ordered for patients who were in the hospital, and who were, I suppose, somewhat feverish, and needed these lemons; and what did he do? He drew his pen through the prescription of the medical officer. So he is not only capable at a bound of being an equipped soldier, but he thinks he is an Esculapius as well. I charge him with unrighteousness in dealing with defaulters. I have already dwelt on cases that can be proved in support of this charge. I now charge that he has taken a course that was against the efficiency of the force, that was contrary to the interests of the North-West in establishing a canteen there, and in the manner in which he established it. How did he establish that canteen there? It is not the ordinary canteen of soldiers' quarters. They had every mortal thing at that canteen. I am not going to dwell on that point, but what I dwell on principally is, that he has inaugurated a system whereby the man who runs the canteen is certain to have large custom and no bad debts. And why? A man goes there, and if he has the cash he pays for his beer; if he has not the cash, he gets a ticket. There is no limit to the tickets given to and taken from the men, as I am in a position to prove, and sometimes when a man goes to receive his pay at the end of the month he finds he has nothing to draw. That is a serious matter, for it strikes severely at the efficiency of the force. Of course, one of the objects of Commissioner Herchmer in establishing the canteen was, I think, to keep the men in barracks. That may have been a good object, but the effect has been that an enormous quantity of beer has been drunk, as may be seen by reference to the returns of the Lieutenant Governor, which show that large quantities of beer have gone in for consumption by the Mounted Police. I am not dwelling particularly on what, after all, was a thing to be condemned, namely. that he made the canteen a general store—I think that was objectionable and undesirable—but I dwell on the fact that the management of the canteen was of a character not conducive to the efficiency of that force. I say that he uses the institution, of which he is the head, as if it were a private affair. Instances of that kind can be given *ad infinitum;* but I do not regard this, of course, as so serious a charge as are the other charges. I charge him with yielding to his prejudices against certain nationalities. I am in a position to say, I have it on undoubted authority, that when the Governor General was there he issued orders that no French Canadian officer was to be allowed to take any prominent part; and if there is an enquiry we will summon officers in the force to depose to that fact. The Commissioner gave directions that during the visit of the Governor General no French Canadian officer was to be allowed to take any prominent part—he was, in fact, to be supreme.

An hon. MEMBER. He is an equal-righter.

Mr. DAVIN. I charge him with forcing magistrates to act contrary to their duty, and contrary to the finding before them. So it was, I believe, at Maple Creek, for when there was only a timber partition between him and the judge, who was hearing evidence, he said: "If you do not go for that man, I will go for you." That was a good illustration of what was practically done in a good many cases. I charge him with illegally awarding punishment, and doing so on evidence not taken before him. I have already explained what I

mean by that expression. I have shown what the Act requires; and I have shown that he has not only done what I now charge, but that he punished for offences not within the Act. I will give an instance; it is a trifling instance in some respects, but a straw can show the direction of the current. A man named Garret was painting in the greenhouse. He did not know that the floor of the greenhouse was not to be painted, and he allowed one or two drops of paint to fall on the floor. At eleven o'clock he went over to his quarters for some purpose connected with his business. In came Commissioner Herchmer. He at once sent for Sergeant Hopkins, and said to him: "Make out two charges against Garret; one for leaving his work earlier than he should do, the other for messing the greenhouse." It would be difficult to find "messing the greenhouse" in the Act; but these were the two charges. He added: "Have these charges put before me, and I will fine him a couple of days' pay, and that will teach him to be more particular." The idea of a man saying, before he had heard any explanation, what he was going to do, shows, of course, that he is destitute of the very seminal principle of justice. I have already given other and greater instances. I charge the Commissioner with punishing men without giving them a hearing, as he has done in the case of Somerville. There is a motion on the paper that will bring the following charge home. I do not think there can be any misconduct in the case of a man not having power over his own movements, in having a pass on a railway. But there is when a man can order himself two or three times a month to Calgary, and he has a pass, and he pockets the railway fare and payment for travelling expenses; and I venture to say that, if there is an enquiry into that feature of Commissioner Herchmer's conduct, it will be found that he added from $1,500 to $2,000 to his pay. Another charge is one which, probably, the House may not think is serious, and it is one which I do not think is as serious as some of the other charges, but the people of the North-West consider that some attention should be paid to it, namely: that the Commissioner, to use their own language, is down on local traders. He can take the prices of jobbers at Winnipeg and compare them with the prices of the retail merchants at Prince Albert or Regina, and he can show a difference; but that difference is delusive, because you have to add the expense of transport, and in the Auditor General's Report of last year you find among the items: freight, $18,000; transport, $421; waggon hire, $303; Canadian Pacific Railway, on account of transport, $30,000; or a total of $49,313. The greater proportion of that amount must have been paid for freight. The freight rate is from 75 cents to $1 per 100 pounds, say for the railway up to the north, and, of course, the local tradesman can get as good freight rates as Mr. Herchmer, but he prefers, for some reason, to concentrate all his custom in the hands of the jobbers at Winnipeg. I will not discuss the statements that people make without authority; they have hinted this and that, but, in my opinion, they have not given any proof, and if there is no proof against a man it would be a ridiculous thing to press the charges.

Mr. MULOCK. It would be unjust.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; certainly it would be unjust and wrong, and I only mentioned this as showing that he is not very friendly to the North-West Territories. I charge Commissioner Herchmer that he has actually tried to suborn testimony, when these charges were put forward. After the charges had been made and published, he issued, on the 11th November, 1889, the following circular to his subordinate officers, who are also magistrates:

"A statement has been made in the Regina *Leader* that I have on various occasions interfered with officers of the North-West Mounted Police in the execution of their duties as justices of the peace, using my position as commanding officer in influencing their decisions as J.P.'s. Will you inform me officially whether I have ever interfered with you in such particulars, stating occasions, etc.

(Signed) "L. W. HERCHMER.

"HEADQUARTERS, REGINA, 11th Nov., 1889."

I might tell the House that more than three of those officers refused point-blank to return the answer that he expected to force from them by this circular, and by which, in case of an enquiry, he could manufacture evidence beforehand. I say that this is a very serious affair. The North-West Assembly took this matter up, not from the point of view of any charges made in Assiniboia, but from the point of view of offences that had been committed in Alberta. On the 5th November, 1889, Mr. Haultain brought the question of Commissioner Herchmer interfering with the magistrates in the discharge of their duties before the North-West Assembly. I may say that Mr. Haultain is a barrister in considerable practice at Macleod, and facts came before him which forced this matter on his attention. He said, in the course of his address:

"One of the chief evils of the law was that subordinate officers of the police force were dictated to in their positions as magistrates by the officer in charge of the force, who had no more right to do such a thing than any member of this House. He was prepared to prove, when the time came, that sentences had been changed at the dictation of the chief officer."

As I have said, Mr. Haultain is a man in large practice as a barrister; he was a member of the Advisory Council at one time, and he takes a prominent part in the Assembly, and spoke on the responsibility that attaches to his position—as I speak with the responsibility that attaches to my position here in urging that an enquiry take place. So indignant was the Assembly, that on the 6th November, on the motion of Mr. Ross, seconded by Mr. Secord, the following motion was proposed:—

"That, whereas, very serious statements have been made on the floor of the House, reflecting on the conduct of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police; be it resolved, that an humble address be presented by this House, through His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that the matter be enquired into."

That motion was carried unanimously, and one of the reasons for its being so carried was, that there was not a member of the House who was not himself cognizant of some act of gross tyranny on the part of Commissioner Herchmer. There is a barrister at present in this city, occupying a high position politically, who lives in the west, and he is also aware of Mr. Herchmer's tyrannical warping of the law, and tyrannical interference with his officers in the discharge of their judicial duties—not at Macleod, not at Lethbridge, where these matters

came before Mr. Haultain, but at Calgary; and I may add that every man who lives in Regina is fully aware of the condition of things that exist. I think I have made out my case in a moderate way, and that a *primâ facie* case has been established why an enquiry should be held, as asked for by this resolution. I will say here, and I speak the truth, I shall be glad if, when there is an enquiry, this man can establish so as to satisfy any reasonable mind that these grave charges have no foundation. I am afraid, however, that he cannot; I am afraid that the charges are only too true, and I am afraid that when the case is heard it will be shown that there are other charges more grave still than those I have alluded to. I believe that I shall be amply vindicated before the country and before the House in making the motion I have the honor to make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no right to dispute the motives of the hon. gentleman in making this motion. He is, of course, governed by a sense of duty, but I rather regret the tone of personal feeling towards Commissioner Herchmer which was evidenced by my hon. friend in making this motion, and I think hon. members on both sides of the House will agree with me in that regret. I may say, in the beginning, that I am opposed to this motion. I do not think there is any case made out, and I think it would be a great injustice to Commissioner Herchmer if this Commission were granted. The purport of the resolution is most extraordinary. It says:

"That it is expedient that a Select Commission of Enquiry, having power to examine witnesses under oath, do issue, to enquire into the management of the North-West Mounted Police, and into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, from the date of his appointment until the 31st of December, 1889."

From this it would appear that the Commissioner was to be considered a criminal from the very day he took command of the force, and that he had committed an offence before or on the day he joined it. Now, the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has stated that one of the first charges he brings against Commissioner Herchmer is that he is incompetent to take the command, and that he has got to be assisted, and he draws a comparison between him and the tried soldier, his brother. It so happens that the Commissioner is the tried soldier, and that his brother never was in the army. Commissioner Herchmer entered the army, and on joining the depot at Hythe his military capacity was so speedily acknowledged that in the first year he was employed as acting adjutant, and the position of acting inspector of musketry was given to him almost when he was a recruit. In fact, he was and is a soldier, though not, certainly, a cavalry soldier. He served in India and, I think, in South Africa, and returned to Canada after four years' service, in consequence of the death of his father. So that he had considerable experience, at all events, as a soldier. The hon. gentleman says the efficiency of the force has greatly suffered in consequence of his conduct. Now, Sir, he was appointed because he was a good disciplinarian, a man of great firmness of character; and it is known—I do not wish to speak of the force in days gone by—that there was great laxity of discipline in the force, and some rather unhappy occurrences some years ago in consequence of that laxity. The screw had to be applied to the force in order to bring it up to the right point of discipline; and Commissioner Herchmer had a most unpleasant, most disagreeable and most responsible task, in introducing order, discipline and subordination into a force where all these things had been neglected; and we have the testimony of the hon. gentleman himself, in the language he used before, and in what he says now, that for *morale* and physique there is no corps superior to it. He took occasion to quote language to show the efficiency of the force. Sir, it is a force that Canada has a right to be proud of. Every British officer of the regular service who has seen the force has pronounced it to be the very finest force he ever saw. It has also received the plaudits of the officers of the American army on the south side of the line, who are in constant and friendly co-operation with the Mounted Police in keeping the peace on the frontier and in putting down outrages that occur on both sides of the line. The Governor General, who is a soldier—it is in the report, and I may therefore allude to it—took occasion to address the force and speak of its efficiency. Now, much of this efficiency has been produced by the present Commissioner. The hon. gentleman says there is a system of terrorism in the force. What one man may call a due insistence on subordination may be called by another tyrannical. I believe that Commissioner Herchmer has the faults of his good qualities. He is stern, he is firm, he insists upon the strictest discipline, and I understand that he has certain faults of temper. Well, we cannot find angels in this world. He has done great service, and he has made some mistakes. Most of the cases the hon. gentleman has quoted—not all—are based on mere hearsay. He has gathered them from different persons up there, more or less credible I dare say. All the cases he has mentioned, or almost all, have been enquired into, and in most of them his conduct has been supported; in some of them he has been told that he has been a little too severe, and it would appear that his decisions have been reversed; but on the whole he has proved himself a good officer, his whole soul is in the efficiency of his force, and he has secured that object thoroughly well. The hon. gentleman says that the law should be changed—that he has too much power. Well, that is a question which I shall not enter into just now. It is a question that can only be discussed when the law concerning the Mounted Police is under consideration. If the law gives too much power to the Commissioner it can be altered, but it is the same power that has always been given to him since the establishment of the force, and I do not believe that the law can be altered or amended so as to relax that power without seriously affecting the discipline of the force. The hon. gentleman complains that in some cases the sentences have been too severe, and he complains also that in one particular case the Commissioner did not punish with sufficient severity a man who broke into his own cellar and stole some of his beer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Trying his own case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the man who committed the offence was caught in the act. I do not know whether the Commissioner was trying his own case, or whether he handed the case over to some other person to try it. The hon. gentleman says, that the officers are a high-class

lot of men. I believe they are a select and picked body of men; and do you suppose these men are so abject, so utterly devoid of gentlemanlike principle, that if they suffered in their positions or were trampled upon or oppressed in the manner the hon. gentleman has described, they would be such cravens or cowards as not to complain? Now, Sir, they do not complain. I have heard rumors of some being discontented at the hasty language of their commandant, but they have not complained, although they might be well assured that if there were good grounds for their complaints they would be completely justified and supported. So with the men. The hon. gentleman says the efficiency and *morale* of the force are destroyed in consequence of the terrorism with which the men are afflicted. Well, Sir, the term is a short term. They are enlisted for five years, and at the end of that time they are free men. This very season there were 122 men who had completed the whole of their five years' service, and of those 75 applied for re-enlistment for a term of five years. Why, Sir, this is a favorite service. It is an open-air service. The men have good pay, they have good appointments, it is a very interesting service, they are roaming over that country, and the young men like it. Some of them settle in the country, and it is very proper that they should. It is advantageous to the country that, after serving four or five years in the service, they should take out their lot if they wish to become farmers or settle into other trades or avocations, and this has had the effect of distributing men thoroughly disciplined all over the country. But it must be a favorite service when you find that out of 122 men, whose time has expired, 75 re-engaged without leaving, and 17 of those who took their discharge have since rejoined. So that, in fact, only 33 out of 122 of time-expired men actually severed their connection with the force. That, I think, is a sufficient answer to the charge that the corps is oppressed and the men trampled upon. Besides the efficiency introduced into the service by Commissioner Herchmer, he has administered it with great economy, so much so, that with an increased force the expenditure has decreased. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the canteen. Well, I can only say that the canteen is managed by the men themselves. Formerly, they were allowed to go out to the village, which is some distance from the barracks, and get all kinds of abominable drinks, and this had the effect of demoralising the force. By having a canteen managed by the men, where they can get a certain quantity of beer instead of buying forty-rod whiskey, or Perry Davis' Pain Killer, the force has been greatly improved. The canteen is on the ground, under the eyes of the officers, managed by a committee of staff-sergeants, and is in every way an improvement on the old system. I cannot consent to this commission of enquiry being granted, but I will see that any charges brought up are carefully considered, and I must ask the House to reject this motion.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the House will hardly endorse the criticism of the First Minister upon the motives which have induced the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to bring up this motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say anything about motives.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood him to say that the hon. gentleman had spoken with such warmth that he must naturally have some personal motive. True, he has spoken with a good deal of warmth in tone and manner and even substance, but if the charges he brought are true, there is cause for his warmth of feeling. The First Minister has said that the force is very efficient. That has been admitted by the hon. member for Assiniboia himself, and it was an admission he need not have made, because every man in this House is proud of the Mounted Police, and, so far as that goes, Commissioner Herchmer is entitled to all the credit he can gain from it. But although Commissioner Herchmer may have displayed considerable administrative ability, if the charge brought against him, that he is subject to violent fits of temper, be true, that would go very far towards impairing his efficiency as commandant of the force. I do not understand the hon. member for Assiniboia to have made any special reference to the canteen with the view of finding fault with the manner in which it has been conducted; but what he found fault with was, that one of the officers, because he ventured to request Colonel Herchmer to have some of the regulations altered, had been summarily fined $30. That is a case of absolute tyranny—that for having made a simple remonstrance, and for having simply asked for an alteration in the regulations of the force, the officer who did so should have been treated as a culprit and summarily fined; and no man in this House can tolerate such conduct on the part of the Commissioner. I do not pretend to pass any criticism at this moment on the conduct of Colonel Herchmer. I assume that he is innocent of the charges brought against him, and that, if a proper enquiry were made, he would clear his character; but when a member of Parliament, from his seat in the House, brings charges against the Commissioner, on his responsibility as a member of this House, that fact alone ought to be sufficient to warrant an enquiry being made. I do not say that the present motion should be granted, and I will come to that question in a moment; but when such charges are made by a member of Parliament, on his responsibility, it seems to me they cannot be treated lightly, and there is cause for an enquiry. True, the service may be popular. It may be true that no member of the force has made any complaint; but it is also true that the North-West Legislature passed a resolution asking for an enquiry.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the hon. member for Assiniboia to have quoted a resolution passed by the Legislature, asking for an enquiry into the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer. If that be true, and it cannot be denied, there is cause for enquiry, and it seems to me the Government are not discharging their duty properly if they do not pay any attention to the motion. Why is it that we have a Local Legislature? It is because it is impossible for us to administer the Territories properly from Ottawa. The members of the Legislature are supposed to be more familiar, and they ought to be, with the doings of the North-West Mounted Police than we can be at such a distance, and when such a body, without a dissentient voice, express the desire to have an investigation, I, for one, am disposed to give that desire some attention. I do not say that I will be prepared to fully

endorse the resolution, for it seems to me to go too far. The resolution is:

"That it is expedient that a Select Commission of Enquiry, having power to examine witnesses under oath, do issue to enquire into the management of the North-West Mounted Police."

I do not see any cause for enquiry into the management of the North-West Mounted Police at large; but, if the resolution had been confined to asking an investigation into the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer, I would be disposed to favor it. Under these circumstances, if my hon. friend does not succeed in having a proper investigation this year, he ought to come back next year with a motion asking Parliament to have an investigation into Commissioner Herchmer's conduct, and if the Government fail to grant such an investigation, they will be failing in their duty.

Mr. MACDOWALL. When the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asked me to second the motion, it was not my intention to say anything on the subject, but, after what has transpired, I desire to explain the reasons why I consented to second it. In the first place, I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is a very good one, and I should recommend the mover of the resolution to adopt his advice and strike out the words "into the management of the North-West Mounted Police."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Because I do not think there is any fault to be found with the management of the North-West Mounted Police. I will state the reasons why I seconded the motion. In the first place, several serious charges have been made against the commissioner in the press of the North-West, and that is a very good ground for appointing a commission of enquiry. In the second place, the Legislative Assembly of the North-West have unanimously passed a resolution asking for an enquiry into the conduct of the Commissioner of the Mounted Police. Another reason is that the commissioner himself is anxious that an enquiry should be made into his conduct, and he has stated that, if he is given the opportunity of appearing before any commission that may be appointed, he can disprove the charges and clear himself. In that way, I think, he has taken a manly course, and, as we have had two committees of enquiry appointed during this Session, I think he should be treated in the same fair way. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has spoken very highly of the officers who serve under the commissioner and the men who compose the force. I believe these gentlemen are everything he describes, but I do not think they can be called craven if they do not make complaints against the commissioner. I know myself that there is a feeling throughout the North-West Mounted Police force, not only among the officers, but among the men, which I should say will not take a very long time, unless it is stopped, to destroy all *esprit de corps*. I do not support the charges which have been brought by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He has brought those charges on his own responsibility, but, when I consider that these charges have been brought by almost the whole of the press of the North-West, that they have been brought by the North-West Assembly, and that they have been brought by a member of this House in his place against the commissioner, and when the commissioner is anxious himself to have an enquiry into his conduct, and when the *esprit de corps* of that fine and valuable force is likely to be destroyed, perhaps by the fact that the commissioner has not that tact and that touch with the men and with the officers of his force, which is absolutely necessary to maintain the proper status of the force, I think these are all good reasons for supporting the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), especially if it is reduced in the way which I suggest.

Mr. WATSON. I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macdowall). I think it is of the utmost importance that the people should have the greatest possible confidence in any one occupying the position of Mr. Herchmer, as commissioner. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made similar charges a year ago, and the Government cannot justify any one holding the position which Mr. Herchmer holds without investigation, after such charges are made in this House by a member on his responsibility. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is in a position to know of what he speaks, and, as has been stated by the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), these charges have been made in the press. It is nothing new that such charges should be investigated by a commission. The charges which have been made against Mr. Herchmer are almost as severe as those which were made against General Middleton, in regard to which the Government have authorised a commission of enquiry. I do not see why they should not grant the proposition contained in this motion. I would suggest that the management of the North-West Mounted Police should be omitted, according to the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition. As far as I am aware, there has been no charge made against the management of the North-West Mounted Police, against their efficiency, or against the way in which they discharge their duties; but there have been grave charges made against Mr. Herchmer, and I have heard gentlemen from the North-West repeatedly complain in regard to his actions. I do not know personally whether these charges can be proved or not, but I think the House should allow a commission to enquire into those charges, more particularly when a resolution has been passed by the North-West Council, asking that a commission should be appointed to enquire into them. I, therefore, move in amendment, that all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—

It is expedient that a Select Commission of Enquiry, having power to examine witnesses under oath, do issue to enquire into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, from the date of his appointment to the 31st December, 1889.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is pleasant to note that all the gentlemen who have spoken on this subject testify to the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police. They corroborate all that has been said by distinguished officers and others who have gone to the North-West, and have seen that body of men, that the force we have in the North-West is a credit to Canada, that they are possessed of a fine physique, that they are well drilled and well equipped, and that they are in all respects a

fine body of men. That is the case to-day, but how long has it been so? It was only a few years ago that we were told that the force was not in such a state of efficiency, and I think you will find that it is since the appointment of Commissioner Herchmer that the change has taken place and the force has attained the high state of efficiency which it has to-day. Then we should give the commissioner some credit for that. We find that greater economy has taken place in the management of the force, and that the expenditure has been less than it was before the appointment of this commissioner. That is another point in his favor. But it is said that he is a great disciplinarian, that he is too strict. The hon. member who moved this resolution indulged in a great number of adjectives to describe the commissioner's conduct. He spoke of him as arrogant, and insolent and overbearing. I have known the commissioner for many years, and I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The commissioner may have faults like the rest of us, for we all have faults. His temper may not be of the best, but I believe that he is desirous to secure the efficiency of the force, that he is solicitous for the welfare of the men placed under his charge, that he is desirous to procure their welfare in every possible way. But there are complaints made against him, and that is natural. Where do we expect to find a man who is placed in charge of 1,000 men against whom no charges will be made? If complaints against commanding officers are to be ventilated here, and if commissions are to be issued to enquire into them, there will be no end to such commissions. I will undertake to go to every military school in this country and get complaints against the commanding officers. I will guarantee that, if these people will go to the first newspaper office whose editor may stand with mouth and ears open to receive complaints, any number of complaints will be made. This motion for a commission of enquiry is not so much a motion to enquire into Commissioner Herchmer's conduct, in my opinion, as it is to enquire into the management of the Department to which that force belongs.

Mr. DAVIN. No, no.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; it is a commission to enquire into the management, by the right hon. Premier, of his Department. If that right hon. gentleman has allowed those complaints to be made, and has never investigated them, I say he is to blame; he is the man we ought to try here; it is the conduct of his Department that is arraigned here to-day. Commissioner Herchmer is but one of his officers, and any complaint, such as the hon. gentleman made here to-day, should have been sent to that Department; and if any such complaint has been made to the Department, and it has not been investigated, and justice has not been done, then it is the right hon. gentleman and the administration of his Department that we are called upon to enquire into. Let the hon. gentleman move for any papers in any particular case that he has complained about, but let him not take mere gossip, mere rumor, up there, that this man has said something, the other man has said something, and base his complaint on these. I say that any complaint that is worth being brought forward in Parliament, is worth being sent to the Department, and if it is not investigated there, then the head of that Department is responsible. It seems to me that the attack which the hon. gentleman has made here to-day, is really made upon the Minister who has charge of that Department, and it is a question for the House to consider whether they will take the management of that Department out of the right hon. gentleman's hands and turn it over to a Committee of Enquiry. If the right hon. gentleman is not fit to enquire into it, let us know it. I think that these charges that have been made are all capable of explanation; some of them, I believe, are utterly baseless and frivolous—the charge that the hon. gentleman makes about the canteen, for instance. Why, every one who has had anything to do with men know that there is nothing more subversive of discipline, more calculated to bring the force into disorder, and to make it most difficult to govern the men, than to allow them to go out into the town and get what little supplies they want, whether a glass of beer or lemonade, or a pipe and tobacco, or anything of that kind. It is most desirable that this canteen should be under the control of the commanding officer, subject to his orders, closed and opened at certain hours, and only men of good record should be allowed to enter them. There is always a non-commissioned officer on duty to see that no man whose name is posted upon the canteen door for misconduct, is allowed to enter there. It is most desirable, in the interest of discipline and in the interest of the force, that these canteens should be established and maintained under the control of the commanding officer. For the last few weeks I have had an opportunity of seeing some of the officers of that force, and from not one of them did I hear any complaints against the commissioner. I have heard them all stand up for him, and state that his management of the force has been very good indeed, and that these charges are either all capable of explanation, or else that they are trumped-up charges. I was in that country myself about eighteen months ago, and saw a great many of the officers and men, and from not one of them did I hear any complaint against the commissioner. I presume I was just as likely to hear of them as was the hon. gentleman. It is known that his paper at Regina—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is editor of it—but it is known that this paper is, unfortunately open, to hear complaints and to make charges against the commissioner, to listen to anything and everything that can be said against him. Let that paper, or the proprietor of that paper, instead of printing these charges, collect the evidence and send it down to the Department, and then, if the complaints are not investigated, let him attack those persons who are responsible for keeping that commissioner in his place; then justice would be done, and the great wrong, which he says the people of the North-West Territories are suffering, would be righted. For my part, I do not think there should be any commission granted in this case.

Mr. MULOCK. Last year the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a motion before this House for papers in connection with the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer, and on that occasion he referred to some of the matters to which he referred to-day. On that occasion, I deprecated the action of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, in making that motion without asking for a com-

mission, because that motion led to nothing. I did not think that the occasion of the motion for papers should be taken advantage of to make an indirect attack upon any person in the service, in the discharge of judicial duties, for the charge last year was made against Commissioner Herchmer, more particularly in reference to the discharge of his magisterial duties. To-day, the hon. gentleman has made certain specific charges against this officer, and has asked for an enquiry into the conduct of that officer. Therefore, I consider his action to-day is in the right direction, that is, if a charge is made against an officer, it ought to be followed up by a motion, giving that officer an opportunity to acquit himself in case he be innocent, and an opportunity for the member that is making the charge to establish it if he can. Now, there must be some way in dealing with offenders in the public service. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in his argument. I think it is to be regretted that on this occasion he has endeavored to appeal to party support of the Administration in order to vote down a motion in itself not in any sense a party motion. That is a favorite trick which is resorted to in order to dispose of inconvenient and unpleasant motions. This, he says, should have taken the form of a complaint to the Department The First Minister has assured the House that complaints have been made to the Department, and that the Department has enquired into these complaints, or is enquiring into them. He says that, so far as the Department has enquired into these complaints, it has found them without foundation. The Minister makes a statement as to what he found to be the result. The member for Assiniboia takes issue with the Department distinctly. The hon. member makes a motion appealing, as it were, against the decision of the Department, and asking for an enquiry under oath. Now, what means had the Department of obtaining evidence as to whether these charges were true? They are of the very gravest kind. The Commissioner whose conduct is attacked is accused by the member for Assiniboia of one of the highest crimes that a judicial officer can be guilty of—he is accused of being untrue to his trust, of debauching justice, of being personally corrupt, of abusing his position, of not only failing to recognise the sacred position which he occupies as a judge, but also of using his office to put money into his own pocket. Could more serious charges be made against a person under such circumstances? I think these charges are sufficient to justify an enquiry, inasmuch as they are made by an hon. member representing the district largely affected by the conduct of this officer; by an hon. member supposed to be familiar, more or less, with the public opinion in the district, and who not only gives his own opinion in support of his motion, but purports to represent public opinion in the North-West. The motion is moved by a supportor of the Administration and seconded by a supporter of the Administration; it is also supported by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson); and these gentlemen speak from their positions in this House, as representatives of the country more or less affected by the conduct of this officer. Now, as a matter of justice to Commissioner Herchmer, the fullest opportunity should be given him to disprove these charges. So the hon. member making this motion has assumed a great responsibility. He has made these charges on the floor of the House and before the public, and unless they are publicly investigated and disproved, Commissioner Herchmer's usefulness will largely be impaired. It is due to the administration of that portion of justice with which he is charged, that his character as a judge and as an officer of this Government should be investigated; and if the charges are found to be untrue, he should walk forth enjoying the well merited confidence of the public; but if the charges are established, there must be but one verdict. I, therefore, think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has sought to evade by a ruse a proper investigation into the charges. He has endeavored to prove that they must be untrue because the force is efficient. I do not understand that the entire efficiency of the force depends upon the conduct of the commissioner, nor that, however efficient the force may be, the fact would excuse the commissioner were these charges proved to be true. I ask the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) whether, if the force were as efficient as it is possible for such a force to be, that would authorise or justify the commissioner doing the acts he is said to have done? Would it justify him in committing embezzlement? I ask the hon. gentleman, in his place to state to this House whether the efficiency of the force would be an excuse for the commissioner violating every law that bears upon him?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If there is any charge of embezzlement, there is a proper court to investigate this charge, and not this House.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question. The hon. gentleman has objected to an investigation because the force is efficient; and if this contention were sound, the commissioner might plead it in justification of all possible offences. I do not take such a view of the situation. The two things are separate and distinct. And in view of the charges made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), supported as they are by the North-West Council, and also by public opinion in the North-West, it is essential to the administration of justice, by the commissioner, that these charges should be publicly investigated—investigated with all the surroundings of a proper court of inquiry, not a Star Chamber investigation, not one made in private by the Department, where hearsay evidence, or improper evidence, may be admitted, and where there is no public demand made for evidence, in fact an examination made by the Administration largely with a view to exculpate the accused. It is true, as was said by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), that if any blame attaches to the officer, it may in some extent attach also to the Department. But it is not in that sense and spirit the enquiry is asked; but if the Department insists on holding an investigation of its own, then it will have the appearance of an accusation against the Department, and one which they are not willing to allow to be investigated. It has not been presented in that light, and I am not urging it in that light. So far as the charges are made I am assuming the Department is wholly blameless, but if they prevent enquiry they must assume the portion of the responsibility of the officer in question. I, therefore, feel it is my

duty on this occasion to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson).

Mr. BLAKE. I hope this matter will receive further consideration from the responsible head of the Department, than it appears to have received up to the present time. I cannot help feeling that we here, whether we act executively or legislatively, who are dealing with the affairs of a country so remote as that in which this force is situated, and in which these transactions are said to have occurred, have a special and peculiar responsibility, as we are under a special and peculiar difficulty. In those who are far removed from the centre of power and from the centre of investigation, it is well known, it is human nature, that there is a very much greater disposition to abuse that authority and power, from that sense of security which exists in the officer, and also from the difficulty, on the part of those aggrieved, of bringing forward and of establishing charges. The circumstances and the peculiar relations which a person in the position of commissioner occupies towards those under him, render it a difficult matter for charges to be brought. So that we have every element which should make us peculiarly jealous of the situation, and should lead us to hold to our power to see that enquiry is made ; this is a power which we ought not lightly to abandon. This officer, of whom I have no warrant to say one single word in derogation of his character or conduct, of which I know nothing whatever, except what we heard to-day, holds a position of very great authority. He is in a position of very high command as commissioner of the force, of almost despotic authority, power and control ; and he has besides very high and exalted magisterial functions. The hon. member who has brought forward these charges has submitted them in a speech, not taking the course of submitting them in a written form beforehand. He has laid a very great number of charges, some of which are of a general character, extremely difficult to be enquired into, but proper to be considered, proper to be carefully looked into by the departmental head, proper to be enquired into in that manner in which such general charges alone can be enquired into, but, perhaps, hardly fitted for judicial investigation ; others are of an entirely different description, specific, plain, pointed, and which, if they be true, are of such a nature that whatever may be the merits of the officer otherwise, whatever good he may have done in the way of the restoration of discipline and efficiency in the force, he is not suited to remain in that position, or in any position of public trust whatever. However, as I have said, the form in which these charges are brought forward is not one satisfactory to my mind. I think some course should have been adopted which would have given the officer in charge, through the medium of his superiors, of the Department which presides over the force, the opportunity of giving his answer to such of those charges as he might think fit to answer, so that an explanation of them might have been presented, if the Minister in charge thought proper to present it on the floor of the House, at the same time as the charges themselves were presented. Particularly do I think so with respect to such charges as affect the magisterial office, in which, I think, we ought to adopt, as nearly as we can, those analogies which prevail when this House exercises one of its highest functions, its inquisitorial function into the discharge of the administration of justice by those who are the depositaries of justice in the land. But we have to deal with the case at it is, in one form or other ; and we have to consider what the effect is of these statements, they having been made upon his responsibility by a member of Parliament here, and this motion having been sustained by another hon. gentleman representing the same region of country, and by his declaration of opinion, apart from any personal acquaintance with the particular charges, that the condition of the force and the state of affairs demand investigation. We have to deal also, with the statement of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who is also more or less familiar with the situation. We have to deal also with the statement and resolution of the North-West Council, the local body on the spot most familiar with the matter. We have to deal with what the hon. gentleman who seconded the motion has announced to us, with this additional circumstance, that the commissioner himself claims and asks that there shall be some enquiry into those charges. All these circumstances, to my mind, add to the difficulty in which we are placed in adopting such a summary disposition of this matter as the First Minister has proposed to us. I would ask in what position this House is to stand, and in what position Colonel Herchmer himself is to stand, if this matter is dismissed by a simple negation of this motion, and without any arrangement whatever for some enquiry into the affair. The House stands in this position : It is said we should dismiss altogether all that we have heard here to-day, and those additional facts to which I have just alluded, and that because the Minister calls upon us, and because a supporter of the Minister turns this—differently from what, I think, is the intention of everybody else—into an attack on the Department, or on the Minister himself, we should consider it is not fit that anything should be said about it at all, and that no action whatever ought to be taken. What would be our position ; in what position would Colonel Herchmer stand, in what position would the force stand, and in what position would those towards whom he occupies that special relationship stand, if, after these statements made and heralded as they will be broadcast all over the country, we should take no action whatever ? I say, Sir, that our position, as having the charge and the responsibility in this matter, and the position of Colonel Herchmer, alike require that some further consideration should be given before such a disposition as that is made of it. I do not myself admire the proposition of the hon. gentleman, even as amended. The same objection which I have taken a moment ago, to the absence of a statement in advance of what the charges were, applies, in my mind, to the form which even the amended motion takes. I think there ought to be very grave circumstances to justify the proposition to issue such a wholesale commission of enquiry generally, as is now proposed, into the conduct of this officer. I will not say that there are no circumstances which would justify it. I do not say, that this House may not be called upon to say, we find such a case made out on *primâ facie* proof and otherwise, that a general enquiry is justified or demanded. But, I think the circumstances

ought be much more exceptional than they are now, to render such a commission at all proper. At the same time I do feel, that when specific charges of the gravity and character of these which have been made to-day, have been made in this House, we ought to receive some assurance that these charges —however objectionable the form may be, or the spirit may be, as the right hon. gentleman has put it—will be efficiently investigated before we let go our own power of enquiry, and before we agree that this motion shall be negatived. Now, what I have to suggest to the hon. Minister is this: that this matter would be best met—under all the circumstances, and having regard to all that has taken place, the statements of the member, its support from other members of the locality, the attitude of the North-West Council, and the attitude of Colonel Herchmer himself—if the hon. Minister would undertake that a departmental commission should issue to enquire, on the spot, into the merits of such of these charges as have been specifically made, and are, therefore, capable of being specifically answered. If an intimation were received by us that such would be the course which the hon. Minister would feel it his duty to take, I, for my part, think that, upon the whole, that is the best disposition that could be made of this matter this Session, and if the results of such an enquiry were satisfactory, it would, of course, end the matter upon the specific charges for all time. It would leave the general questions which the hon. gentleman has adverted to, of demeanor and conduct, and so forth, to be dealt with as, I think, alone they can be dealt with, namely, otherwise than by such an enquiry, unless the case is much graver even than the hon. gentleman has put it. It would dispose of the specific and very grave charges which I have referred to in a manner more suitable to the dignity of this House and to its efficiency as the great inquest of the country, and to the position even of Colonel Herchmer himself, than would result from the refusal of the motion without any arrangement for enquiry. If such a suggestion as I have made were accepted, I, for my part, would vote against the amendment and the motion; but unless some such suggestion is agreed to I must vote for the amendment, or for some amendment of the amendment which will include a more specific statement of the charges to be referred to the commission.

Mr. DALY. I rise for the purpose of saying that I have had occasion to come into contact with Mr. Herchmer himself in his official capacity. In my constituency alone has that force anything to do with the Province of Manitoba. Members may not be aware of the fact, but, it is, notwithstanding, true, that the duties of the North-West Mounted Police force are, with the exception of what they do on the frontier in the Province of Manitoba, confined to the North-West Territories. I have had occasion to come into contact with Colonel Herchmer in his official capacity, and I have asked him to look into certain matters connected with the men under his charge in southern Manitoba. I have always found him ready and willing to meet any views I have laid before him which he could reasonably give his adherence to. Now, Sir, I have also had occasion to see the Mounted Police force in the years 1881 and 1882, and again in 1887, 1888 and 1889. I must say that any person who has seen that force in numbers, such as they can be seen at Regina and at any of the other posts, cannot but come to the conclusion that the efficiency of that force has been so much improved in recent years that one would scarcely recognise them to be the same body of men. It may be that the physique of the men was as good before Mr. Herchmer was commissioner, as it is now, but I am borne out in my statement by the mover of the resolution and by the other gentlemen who have spoken from the North-West Territories, in saying, that the force to-day is in as highly efficient state as it could possibly be. I have no hesitation in saying that that efficiency is due to Mr. Herchmer and to the manner in which he has conducted the duties of his office. It should be remembered that a great many of the charges brought against Mr. Herchmer are matters of rumor, and that, so far as we know, there is no foundation for them. Mr. Herchmer, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, occupies a very responsible position. He occupies a position which brings him to all portions and parts of the North-West Territories. It has been said, and, I believe, very truly, that Mr. Herchmer has certain infirmities of temper, but I have not the slightest doubt that some of the gentlemen with whom he has been brought in contact also have their infirmities of temper. I believe firmly that a great many of the charges brought against Mr. Herchmer have been brought by men, who, if their true mind were known, it would be ascertained that Mr. Herchmer did not agree to certain propositions which these gentlemen had made, or, that Mr. Herchmer did not do what these gentlemen asked him to do, and which, probably, it was not within his duty to perform. Any person occupying the position that Mr. Herchmer does must naturally make enemies in the discharge of his duty. It has been stated that the North-West Assembly passed a certain resolution. It may be that nearly every member of the North-West Council has come into contact with Mr. Herchmer, and that probably they have asked him to do what Mr. Herchmer did not see fit to do.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I must rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman should bring such charges against my colleague from West Assiniboia or myself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not bring any charges against you.

Mr. DALY. I brought no charges either against the hon. member or against the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but if the cap fits the hon. gentlemen they can put it on. I have no doubt that, in the course of the performance of his duties in the North-West Territories, Mr. Herchmer has come into contact with gentlemen who are now making the charge against him, and that he has not seen fit to do what these gentlemen have asked him to do. Now, the hon. member for North York says that the logic of the hon. member for Frontenac is not true—that this is really a direct charge against the right hon. Premier, who is the head of the Department controlling the Mounted Police. He said that the hon. member for West Assiniboia and the right hon. Premier were at issue on this matter, and the logical sequence is that the responsibility for the conduct of Mr. Herchmer must rest on the right hon. head of the Department. The resolution as framed would seem to go into the conduct of Mr. Herchmer

from the time he joined the force to the present time; but I understand that the charges of the hon. member for Assiniboia do not go back to the time Mr. Herchmer took command of the force. To my mind, the most serious charge brought against him is that he had a pass on the Canadian Pacific Railway which he used on his trips to Calgary, and then charged the fares. If hon. members will look at the Order paper, they will find that after this resolution the next order is:

"Mr. Davin—Order of the House—Copies of form 93, North-West Mounted Police returns, in which payments were made L. W. Herchmer, Commissioner North-West Mounted Police, by paymaster at Regina, for contingencies from 1st July, 1887, to 1st July, 1888, and from 1st July, 1888, to 1st July, 1889."

If this return is brought down, it will include all payments for contingencies made by the paymaster to Mr. Herchmer, and the House will then be in a position to know whether the charges the hon. gentleman has brought against him, in regard to charging railway fares, are true or not. I certainly agree with the position taken by the last speaker, that the appointment of a select committee would not be a proper mode of investigating the charges. Mr. Herchmer, and others, who would be called to give evidence are at a great distance from the city of Ottawa. The investigation should be made through the Department. The right hon. Premier has stated that an investigation has been made by the Department into all these charges, and that they have not been proved—that all that was found against him was that he had been guilty of infirmity of temper on some occasions. I have no doubt the right hon. Premier has reproved him for that; and until such time as the hon. member for West Assiniboia, or some other hon. member, comes to this House and places on the paper specific charges against Colonel Herchmer, we have no right to enquire into them in the manner indicated.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

EXTENSION OF PATENT.

Mr. SMALL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 98) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if he has looked into this Bill and come to any conclusion about it?

Mr. WALLACE. I think, as a general principle, we should look very carefully into applications such as this for the renewal of patents. The case of the George T. Smith Company with reference to its patents on the middlings purifier and mill machinery is notorious throughout the Province of Ontario. It is a well-known fact, that many millers and manufacturers of mill machinery have been subjected to a species of blackmail by this company. They started originally by claiming a patent to which the best legal authorities declared they had no legal right. They sued the manufacturers of middlings purifiers, among others the Grey Company and the Barter Company of Toronto. They sued the Grey Company for the infringement of their patent in manufacturing. The Grey Company, having gone to great expense, I believe, made preparations to defend their suit, which was protracted over a lengthened period, and they had such a strong defence, that the Smith Company not only withdrew the action, but paid them $10,000 for the trouble to which they had been put. But before this was done, the Smith Company went to all the millers who had purifiers in their mills of the country and extorted from them what can only be called blackmail. In every case these mills obtain these purifiers at very large expense. In cases, where three or four purifiers were introduced into one mill, the proprietors have had to pay $80 to $90 for use of each machine. It is easily understood that a man having a claim of this kind, and being prepared to put it through all the courts, those who have used these machines, although they have a good case, would not care to be dragged into the expense of a lawsuit, involving, perhaps, an appeal to the Privy Council, which would cost thousands of dollars. It is estimated that in the Province of Ontario there are a thousand of these machines in use, and that this Geo. T. Smith Purifier Company have extracted from the millers no less than $100,000 cash, to which they were not at all entitled and had no legal right, and which was paid under the circumstances I have related. But now they come here asking to have their patent renewed. The circumstances they relate may or may not be true, but knowing the record of these people in the matter, knowing the fact that this company has no right to make the claims they do, knowing that the legal fraternity of Canada who have examined into the matter declare that they have no legal right as regards these mills to which I have referred, I think this House should not grant them the privilege they ask. I have here a letter from Goldie & McCulloch, manufacturers, which I have their authority to read. It is written by John E. Wilson, and is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—The enclosed sketch will show you what both patents cover; the object to be attained being the same in both cases, namely, to get a clear bolting surface the full circumference of the reel. Prior to the making of my machine, all flour bolts had the rod or bar marked 'A' in the sketches close to the outer surface, or silk, the result being that quite a space of the silk, longitudinally with each of these bars, is covered with the bar and with the stock that accumulates alongside of it, thus reducing the bolting capacity fully twenty-five per cent. from actual practice of what it will do, constructed under my patent.

"You will observe that the only practical difference between the two is in the wording, because he sets the rods 'A' in from the circumference the very same as in mine—using a band of hoop iron for the silk to rest upon; in mine the silk rests upon the round bar, in preference to a flat band.

"You will observe that my patent was issued June 7th, 1884; Smith's on January 22nd, 1885. Had there been flour bolts in use prior to the date of my application, embodying the specific features which are claimed in both patents, I would not have been entitled to a patent; but it being the fact that mine was the first to have a clear bolting surface the full circumference of the reel, is it right or just that the House should, by special Act, renew a patent that has lapsed, and ought never to have been granted, and will be worthless when renewed, except to cause litigation and annoyance to other manufacturers, who have undertaken the manufacture of Patent No. 19,509, believing that the certificate of the Patent Office was a sufficient protection? Had there been any proper check in the examining department, the Smith patent would never have been issued, because with the subject-matter of my patent they were thoroughly conversant, as they had the application before them for two months, and I had several times been before the examiner, giving explanations of my machine, before they issued the patent; so I think you will agree with me that there was,

to say the least, very loose work in issuing another for the same matter.

"You will observe I send a sketch of mine in blue and Smith's in black.

"I hope you will use your influence to prevent this Act being passed, which can only be of service to cause litigation and annoyance to the manufacturers under the prior patent, No. 19,509.

"Yours respectfully,

"JOHN E. WILSON."

Under these circumstances, these people object to the renewal of the patent now before the House. In the case of a great many of those patent rights, their manufacture and the circumstances attending them are all legitimate and proper, but in this case, as you will see by his letter, a previous patent had been issued for the same principle, only a better principle; I would, therefore, move that this Bill be read a third time this day six months.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman is very much mistaken in reference to the patent in question. It is over an entirely different patent that litigation took place, and I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's statement. The patent in dispute was carried from court to court, and the various industries throughout the country were satisfied that it was an entirely different principle. In reference to the Wilson's claim in the letter just read, I was in the Patent Office the other day and saw that the patent was an entirely different affair from the one he speaks of. When this matter was last discussed it was left to the Minister of Justice to decide, and he was convinced that Mr. Smith was perfectly innocent in the matter, and that his claim was perfectly good.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. TROW. He had a patent for five years, which he should have had renewed for another five years. He resides in Michigan himself and sent $20 to solicitors in Toronto, Messrs. Howland & Co., to deposit with the Patent Office in order to renew his patent. The solicitors cashed his cheque, and sent their clerk to get a post office order, but the clerk, instead of sending $20, sent only $10, and a few days after the error was found out. Mr. Smith was perfectly innocent, and, goodness knows, has been punished enough for the negligence and carelessness of his solicitors in the city of Toronto, whose negligence will cost him $300 or $400, instead of the $20 which he sent to Toronto. Messrs. Howland & Co. are a very respectable firm, and Mr. Howland says all the trouble was due to the negligence of his clerk, whom he reprimanded and dismissed from his service. I do not see why this man should be deprived of his just rights. He has a large firm in the city of Stratford, which I know employs 160 or 170 hands all the year round, and they are only asking what is right and reasonable.

Mr. SMALL. In addition to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from North Perth, I would say that I have a letter from the solicitor in this case, stating that his books have been investigated since this matter was brought before the House, and irregularities found which were committed by the articled clerk who has been dismissed.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Before the Committee on Private Bills the same line of opposition was taken to this Bill as has been taken to-night. I fail to see why it should be disposed of in the improper manner suggested by the hon. gentleman who has just moved the six months' hoist. I think we have very little to do with the disputants in this matter. This man had a patent in existence for the last five years, until it expired the other day. As the hon. member for North Perth has explained, and as was thoroughly and satisfactorily explained to the committee, by the negligence or something worse of the clerk in the solicitors' office, the sum of $10 was remitted instead of $20 to the Patent Office here, on behalf of the present applicant. There is no disputing the fact that $20 were remitted to the solicitor by Mr. Smith, and that it was only through the negligence or improper conduct of the clerk that half that amount was sent to the Patent Office, and when an answer came back from the Department that $10 was too little, by some peculiar negligence or misconduct of the clerk, this letter was laid aside and the matter allowed to stand over until the five years had expired. The circumstances, so far as Mr. Smith's coming to this House to obtain a renewal of the patent is concerned, are apparently fair and straightforward; he is not in default in any sense of the word, and has not been guilty of any negligence himself at all. In the case of Mr. May, a short time ago, this House passed similar legislation to that now before us, and I think it would be very unfair if this Mr. Smith were debarred of the right to have his patent renewed in consequence of a slight mistake. The only objection made in Committee was of this character, that this man Smith and some other person had some dispute. The courts are open to any people who have disputes of that kind. This patent was held for five years, and if it is now invalid the courts can set it aside; but now these parties ask us to try the question in dispute. This is a side issue altogether, and, if we were to allow ourselves to try the question by a side wind in this way, our time would be taken up for a great deal longer than it is now. All we have to deal with is the question whether Mr. Smith has been guilty of any negligence or not, and whether there is any reason why he should not be allowed a renewal. The Committee has taken every precaution to protect any other claimants, and we have no one to deal with except Mr. Smith. If the other person desires to go to law, he can do so, and I, for one, should be sorry to prevent any one doing that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one can be more strongly opposed than I am to a renewal by Parliament of a patent which has lapsed; even through negligence on the part of the holder. I felt some reluctance in agreeing to the passage of a Bill in regard to renewing another patent this Session, but I think this is a case in which we should allow the patent to be renewed, if we renew it in any case. I do not see that the patentee was himself guilty of any negligence whatever. If he had been, I would say that the House should not give him relief. Moreover, I understand that there was no negligence even on the part of the solicitors whom he instructed to have the patent renewed. I go further, and say that there was no negligence on the part of his clerk, but I think the patent was not renewed in consequence of a breach of trust, and probably in consequence of a fraudulent breach of trust on the part of the clerk. This patent expired, subject to renewal, on the 22nd January, 1890. On the 22nd December—one month before—the patentee's soli-

citors, Messrs. Howland & Co., received from the patentee instructions to renew the patent. Some correspondence ensued in order to get the patent itself. On the 4th January, eighteen days before the patent expired, Mr. Howland wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Patents in these words:

"We beg to enclose patent to George Thomas Smith for renewal for another period of five years, for which we enclose post office order for $20."

—that being the sum required. This letter was given to the clerk, with a cheque for $20. The clerk cashed the cheque, and, instead of sending $20 to the Commissioner of Patents, he sent only $10, and a reply was sent to the firm of Howland & Co. informing them that the sum was not sufficient to secure a renewal of the patent. If that letter had not been suppressed, but had reached the hands of the solicitors, they would have had ample time to send the amount necessary, but it went into the hands of the same clerk who had embezzled the money, and he suppressed the letter until after the time expired to renew the patent, and then—judging from the evidence—he made up the $10 and sent it to the Commissioner of Patents, who very properly stated that it was too late. It appears, therefore, that neither the patentee nor his solicitors were in fault, both having made provision for the renewal of the patent in ample time. The only ground now taken is that this is an interference with a previous patent, and, therefore, should never have been issued. I agree with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) that we should not try that question, because it is for the courts to deal with. It is useless to talk of blackmail or extortion in a case of this kind, as one hon. member did, because, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) says, the other party has only to test the question in the courts. However, I have asked my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, to enquire of his officers, who are experts in these matters, in reference to this, and they adhere to the opinion that the patent was properly granted and is not an interference with a previous patent. The memorandum given to me on this subject says:

"Patent 9,981, granted May 26th, 1879, to A. Crabtree, is for a silk cylindrical reel of a peculiar construction, involving longitudinal bars and cylindrical rings, to admit of complete brushing over the whole surface—hence its cylindrical character. Patent 19,509, granted to J. E. Wilson, June 3rd, 1884, is for an uninterrupted annular bolting surface around the reel, to prevent accumulation of flour, *i.e.*, two heads, cylindrical in form, connected by slats, over which a series of rings, cylindrical in charater, overlying the longitudinal slats, leaving a free cylindrical space between the rings all around the bolt. G. T. Smith was granted a patent, 20,935, January 22nd, 1885, for a means of constructing a reel to prevent accumulation of ground material by the usual slats. The two bolt heads are connected by round bars, over all of which are fitted hoop carriers to receive a series of flat hoops at intervals on the length of the bolt. On these hoops is placed the bolting cloth, which arrangement does away with accumulation on both bars and rings."

So far, the report is, perhaps, a little too technical for most of us to follow, but now the reasons are given:

"The reasons for the issue of the Smith patent, 20,935, are very obvious. The Wilson patent, 19,509, prevented the accumulation of ground material along the bars, but the accumulation took place at each of the rings to a certain extent; whereas the Smith patent, 20,935, not only prevented the accumulation of ground material along the bars, but also made the hoops so thin and placed them so far off the bars by the carriers that no accumulation took place at either bar or hoop; the flour passing all around the reel without obstruction from one end to the other of the bolt. Hence the justification of the office in granting the patent for a valuable improvement over all preceding machines."

That is the claim, that the present patent of Smith is an interference with the other for an improvement to prevent the accumulation of flour. According to the report of this expert Wilson's patent was defective in this particular, that it only prevented the accumulation of flour in one part of the apparatus, whereas, the patent now under consideration prevents its accumulation in all parts of the apparatus. Whether these conclusions are right, I do not pretend to say, but they satisfy me that this is a matter upon which this question ought not to turn. If we find it to be a case in which the party himself is not at fault, that his solicitors are not at fault, and that he lost the patent after using all possible diligence, I think it is a case in which we ought to give relief to the extent of permitting the Commissioner of Patents to receive an application for renewal. But if the commissioner, after further investigation, is advised by the proper officers that it ought not to be renewed for other reasons, he will still have power, notwithstanding the passage of this Bill, to take all these matters into consideration. It seems to me in that case that the jurisdiction of the courts is the proper sphere in which questions as to the fact of the patent infringing the rights of others can be investigated, instead of the Department.

Mr. WATSON. We have had very full explanations from the Minister of Justice and his views in this matter, and also from the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) in favor of passing this Act on the ground that it may give rise to litigation. I think that this House ought to guard against all possibility of litigation of that description. As has been stated by the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace), this company have had a great deal of trouble in connection with bolting machines and purifiers. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) is accurate in stating this particular machine is not the one about which there has been a good deal of litigation. It is my opinion, after having carefully examined the model in the Patent Office, that the Smith patent should not have been granted; I have an exact knowledge of these machines and know whereof I am speaking. I can see no advantage in the Smith machine over the Wilson machine. The Wilson patent includes the same principle that is involved in the Smith patent. That being the case, I think this House should consider very seriously any proposition to pass an Act to renew a patent that had practically lapsed on account of what I would call negligence on the part of the solicitor, if not of the patentee. Now, I do not suppose this patentee will do any great good to the company. Smith is a man who was carrying on business until recently in the State of Michigan. True, there is a firm manufacturing this machine in Stratford, but that firm have had to pay Mr. Smith a royalty for the privilege of doing so. The Minister of Justice does not fully realise the difficulty that exists in the way of a miller who has been using a machine, and a man comes round and says: I have a right to the patent of that machine, and I demand a royalty. I know that large sums of money were extracted from the millers of Ontario on account of a patent over the Brush machine referred to by the member for

York. The firm of Goldie & McCullough, of Galt, had to fight a case from court to court, and it was finally decided in Smith's favor in the Supreme Court. The public is greatly interested in the use of all these machines, and I consider that Smith has had a greater benefit than he has been entitled to in the past for simply making a machine which had the same principle as the Wilson machine, which was patented six months previous to the Smith machine. At the time the Smith patent was granted, Wilson had some nine machines in operation, and he tells us in his letter that if these machines had been in existence and employing the same principle prior to his application for a patent, he would not have been entitled to the patent. On that ground, I consider that Smith had no right to the patent. As stated by the Minister of Justice, the patent of Mr. Crabtree, which was granted in 1879 and lapsed in 1884, included an iron band in place of the wooden rings used by Wilson; consequently Smith should have no right to that iron band. The only difference between Wilson's patent and that of Smith was that the former used an iron band that is reported by the Patent Office to have been patented in 1879. That being the case, I shall second the motion of the hon. member for York, because I thoroughly believe, after an examination of the model of this patent, that the Smith patent should never have been granted, as it involves the same principle, without any improvement, that Wilson's patent involved. I can easily understand that the officers who furnished the information to the Minister of Justice wished to carry out their contention, that they were right in issuing the second patent. That is quite natural, but I do think that the resolution proposed by the member for York should be adopted by this House.

Mr. HESSON. Representing the city in which these machines are being manufactured, I think I ought to know something about this case. I think, with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), that it is scarcely fair for the hon. member for York to try to impress this House with the feeling that the Smith Company have not been honest with dealing with the millers of Ontario or Canada. The fact of the matter is, that the patent which created the trouble between the millers and the manufacturers was an entirely different patent. It had expired some years ago, and was renewed from time to time, as long as the law permitted them to renew—I think three different times. They had no alternative but to allow it to expire. This is an entirely different patent, and there has been no loss over it and no expense to the millers.

Mr. WATSON. There will be.

Mr. HESSON. I am not speaking of this patent; I am speaking of a previous patent, the Smith Purifier, manufactured by Goldie & McCulloch and by others. Other firms were manufacturing it precisely upon the same line that they are. I do not think the millers have any right to complain, whatever. If they purchased from other parties who had no right to manufacture, they simply placed themselves in the hands of the manufacturers, and they had no right to interfere with this Purifier Company in obtaining the passage of this Bill. I do not think the firm should be put to any inconvenience or disadvantage. They are entitled to their patent; the commissioner makes the distinct statement that they are entitled to the privilege, and, so far as the benefits are concerned, he is of opinion that this is an entirely different patent from that of the parties who are claiming that the right should not be conceded. I hope the House will not object to the passage of the Bill. I speak from a knowledge of the facts, and from an interview I had with the manager of the works a week ago in Stratford, when I visited the office to get the necessary information; then I found that the fault rested entirely with the solicitor in Toronto. The House is not likely to create any difficulty, as has been suggested, in the direction of causing litigation; on the contrary, we will prevent it by renewing the patent, which should be renewed.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. members who oppose the Bill are directing their arguments to the fact that, because there was a dispute between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Smith, a dispute which was settled long ago either by litigation or by compromise or otherwise, over a patent, this House should refuse to pass this Bill. It is, however, a matter of little concern to us what differences or contentions existed between Smith and Wilson, whether they both had the right, or whether either had the right to the patent, so long as the matter was settled outside of the House, and it was settled. The result was that Mr. Smith was entitled to all the rights under the patent. The other line taken by hon. members opposing the Bill is as to whether we should or should not grant a renewal of the patent because there might be something in the private character of the person making the application which we do not approve. That is an unheard-of principle to adopt. Mr. Smith may be an honest and honorable man, or the reverse; it is a matter with which we have nothing to do. The question to decide is whether he has or has not a right to get renewal of the patent, because it lapsed through the action of a subordinate over whom he had no control, and over whom his solicitor had no control. I hold that we are fully entitled to pass this Bill. If not, as the Minister of Justice has said, no case could possibly be brought forward where we would be justified in granting relief to any man in connection with the renewal of a patent.

Mr. BLAKE. I think there is no ground on which we can possibly entertain the consideration of the question as to whether this patent was the original invention of Mr. Smith or not. We are, moreover, not competent to deal with the question as to whether this patent is a good patent or not; and I agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that we have nothing whatever to do with the question as to whether the issue was proper or improper. But, personally, I have felt exceedingly averse to sanction the view that the House should interfere with the law in this matter on other grounds. The law provides, as I understand it, that a patentee is entitled to obtain a patent for fifteen years, on payment of the fee, and he is given the privilege, if he chooses, of taking out a patent for five years, paying a proportion of the fee and renewing it for other two terms, paying a proportion of the fee each time; and it is upon the condition of that payment being made, that the patentee acquires his rights. It seems to me to be legislation which ought to be most

exceptional, and ought to be most carefully guarded against, when you propose to interfere with the operation of the law, and to relieve a man who, for whatever reason, has failed to pay the fee at the proper time, and so to keep alive his patent. But while I say that, and feel great reluctance to interfere, yet the very clear statement of the Minister of Justice, as to the wholly exceptional circumstances of this case, has led my own mind to the conclusion that they are such as ought to induce us to interfere as he proposes; and, therefore, I intend to do what I had been indisposed to do, to vote for the passage of the Bill. But I suggest to the Minister of Justice that it would be convenient to look at the preamble and adapt it to the circumstances which he has just now stated, it order that it may not afford a precedent for further invasions of the general course of the law. We may have a case of fraud, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Justice, but it is very unlikely; and the preamble should be limited so as not to afford a convenient precedent for other kinds of cases. It is of the highest consequence that patentees, who avail themselves of the privilege of not paying the fee all at once, should learn that it is only under circumstances of which it is almost impossible to expect a repetition, that they can be relieved from the consequence of non-payment in due time of the renewal fee.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I cannot agree with the Minister of Justice that the evidence was sufficient to establish the fact that the lawyer who had charge of a renewal of the patent was wholly blameworthy. The Minister stated that a clerk embezzled the funds; that having received $20 with which to buy a money order and send to the Department for the renewal of the patent, he used only $10, appropriating the other $10 to his own use; that the $10 was received at the Patent Office, and that the Commissioner of Patents wrote a letter stating that the funds sent were not sufficient and, therefore, the patent would not be renewed, and that this letter fell into the hands of the clerk, although it was sent to the firm, and was concealed for some time from the view of the solicitor. This might be an accidental circumstance, as the Minister has represented. If the clerk was guilty of embezzlement, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if any proceedings have been taken against that clerk to punish him for the crime committed. If this has not been done, no good ground has been offered for the renewal of the patent. Mr. Smith had a perfect right to take out his patent for five years instead of for ten or fifteen years He took it out for five years, and long before December he was aware that the patent would expire if it were not renewed. He had plenty of opportunity to renew the patent, but he neglected to take any step until almost the last minute, and he then made application for a renewal. The patent not having been renewed, it became the property of the State, and we have no right to interfere between the rights of the State and the patentee. Mr. Smith's patent is virtually dead, and we have no right to revive it, unless we have good cause to do so. The principal office of this firm is in Jackson, Michigan, and the institution at Stratford is only a branch, of which Mr. Smith is the sole proprietor, so that this is merely a renewal of the Canadian branch of the firm. If the Minister of Justice will examine into the proceedings which have taken place in the courts in Detroit recently, he might come to some conclusion why the application for the renewal of this patent was not made sooner than it was. It appears that this firm have placed the whole of their affairs in the hands of an assignee, and from an extract which I find in a newspaper I take the following:—

"ASSIGNEES APPROVED.

"Geo. T. Smith's Motion to Appoint a Receiver Denied by Judge Reilly.

"DETROIT, March 3.—Judge Reilly this morning denied the application for the removal of the assignees and the appointment of a receiver for the Geo. T. Smith Middlings Purifier works of Jackson. The application was made by the Preston National Bank and Geo. T. Smith. In commenting on the case Judge Reilly said that the assignees had been chosen by a large majority of the stockholders of the concern and with the consent and approval of many of its creditors. They were under heavy bonds for the faithful performance of their duties, and he could see no reason why the court should interfere."

It appears from this that the firm in Jackson, Michigan, has failed, and this may account for the reason that the application was not made sooner. I feel that we ought not to grant this application as it is establishing a dangerous precedent that may be followed up hereafter. If we have a right to renew a patent after it has expired on account of neglect, we may renew patents irregularly after they have expired years. Therefore, I hope the amendment will carry.

Mr. GUILLET. It seems to me that the House is in great difficulty with regard to this question. I have listened carefully to the hon. Minister of Justice, but I am opposed to the motion that the House should go into committee, because it will be difficult to assume that the solicitors themselves are not fully responsible for this patent not being granted. If we assume that this young man is guilty of fraud, I think we are doing that for which we have no sufficient warrant. Every man is supposed to be innocent until he is found guilty. If the young man has been guilty of fraud, we must remember that the solicitors in whose employ he was when he committed that fraud had compounded the felony by simply dismissing him, instead of taking proceedings to punish him for so grave an offence. I do not think the House can take that view of the question. If there has been a fraud committed, the penalty should fall where it belongs, and the solicitors themselves should bear the responsibility. If certain rights have been lost by the application not being made at the proper time the solicitors are to blame, and the people should retain those rights which have been forfeited and which they now enjoy. As regards the patent itself it is evident that there is litigation, and I should like to have had the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to whether it is an infringement or not. The Minister, however, has expressed the desire not to give an opinion upon that, and although the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has stated that the Commissioner of Patents has given an opinion, we are informed that he has given no opinion, and that it is yet open to him to decide the question, I think this question can stand over, very properly, until a later period of the Session, or until next Session if necessary.

Mr. McMULLEN. After the very lucid explanation given by the Minister of Justice with regard to the manner in which this unfortunate occurrence happened. I do not think it would be at all creditable to this House if they declined to renew the patent. It is quite clear, that the owner of this patent took all the necessary steps to secure its renewal, and his solicitors evidently performed the duties devolving upon them by putting the money in the hands of the clerk to deposit. Because that clerk happened to act dishonestly, I think it would be derogatory to the dignity of this House if we took advantage of a small matter of this kind and declined to renew the patent. The very clear and explicit explanation of the Minister of Justice ought fully to satisfy any man, that it is the duty of the House under the circumstances to renew this patent.

Mr. MULOCK. The objection that I take to the renewal of this patent is that the Bill itself, as amended by the Committee, does not cover all possible interests in the country. I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the abstract question, as to whether the patent should or should not be renewed. I admit there is no notice before the House in this particular case, of any interest having arisen since this patent elapsed which would be affected by the renewal, but we have to bear in mind that the publicity given to the Act of Parliament is, after all of a very limited character; two months advertising in the *Gazette* and two months in a local paper is all the notice which is given to the people of Canada from ocean to ocean; so that it is possible that an interest may have arisen which is not covered by the Bill. It is to be borne in mind that these Bills form precedents for future legislation, the text of this Bill will be considered as a satisfactory text to meet all other cases; but there is one class of cases which are not covered by the saving clause of this Bill. Supposing it has happened that some person, knowing that this patent has lapsed, has made financial arrangements to enter in the manufacture of the article. He has, perhaps, contracted for the construction of buildings, or has purchased machinery, or has made other arrangements, which would be entirely set at naught by the renewal of this patent. Does the hon. Minister of Justice think that is an interest that ought to be protected or indemnified? To-day the patent belongs to the public; there is no monopoly about it; and any person who has expended money with the view of manufacturing this article, would, the moment this legislation took effect, be injured.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He would probably save his money.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be, but we will assume that there is money in the article. I presume the applicant could only get a patent on the ground of it being a useful article, of which the public will gladly avail itself. I ask the hon. Minister of Justice, if he is prepared to protect that interest. I am sure that the sense of justice of this House is such that on its being informed that there is such an interest which would be jeopardised or wiped out by the passage of this Bill, it would require that the patentee should indemnify that interest or else he would not get the relief he asks for. The saving clause of this Bill does not meet the case. It only saves rights that may have been acquired in the interval in the patent itself. There can be no right acquired in the patent because there is no patent to-day; and to acquire a right in the article simply means that some person may have bought this article from some other person. I have drafted an amendment to meet the case, and unless this amendment or something equivalent to it is adopted in Committee, I will oppose the Bill:

Provided always that said extension or renewal shall only take effect as against any person or persons who may have expended money or entered into any contract with a view to the manufacture of the patented article, upon his or their being indemnified to the satisfaction of said Commissioner, in respect of the money so expended or of any contract so entered into.

If this amendmend is made, I am prepared so far as my vote goes, to allow the Bill to pass.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for Private Bills has expired.

THE SAFETY OF FISHERMEN.

On the Order,

House in Committee on Bill (No. 96) for better securing the safety of certain fishermen.—(Mr. Jones, Halifax.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understood that the hon. gentleman was content to let this Bill stand until the hon. Minister of Marine comes back. He has had to be absent in Montreal to-day. He may, perhaps, be here later in the evening.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is the third or fourth time that I have been asked to allow the Bill to stand, and I am apprehensive that it might not be reached again. I certainly have no objection to let it stand if the Government will assure me that it will be reached, or if they will place it among the Government Orders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, as the hon. gentleman has postponed it on several occasions on account of the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries—the hon. gentleman probably knows that he was obliged to leave to-day to attend the obsequies of a relative—the hon. gentleman will have a full opportunity of moving the second reading of the Bill on another day.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Cook) moved second reading of Bill (No. 30) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: This Bill simply provides that any person applying for a position in the Civil Service, or applying for an examination, must have been a resident in Canada for five years previous to the time of his application. I think this is a Bill which should be passed, and it is intended to keep the Civil Service of Canada for those who are, and have been, residents in Canada for five years. I cannot see how any objection can reasonably be taken to the adoption of this measure. Based, as it is, on the principle of Canada for the Canadians, I may be permitted to add that almost all the labor organisations in the Dominion have passed resolutions urging its passage. I have here a list of those who passed such resolutions, and it comprises:—Local Association, 7,025, of St. Catharines; Local Association, 2531, of Merritton; Bricklayers' Association, of St. Catharines; Typographical Union, of Hamilton; Trade Council of Hamilton; District Association, of Toronto; District Association, of

Hamilton; Builders' Association, of London; Local Association, 290, of Belleville; Local Association, 542, of Lindsay; Local Association, 570, of Bowmanville; Districts 1 and 2, of Montreal. So that almost the entire Labor Associations of this Dominion are in favor of this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that the observations which the hon. gentleman has made in support of this Bill show that he is moving with the times, and is adopting the protective principle. His Bill, no doubt, has a good deal of value, in so far as it embodies the principle that this country ought to be for Canadians, but goes to an extreme in that direction which I think no public necessity calls for. The recommendations of the labor organisations to which he has referred are no doubt entitled to a great deal of respect; but I fail to see in what respect those organisations are affected by applications for positions in the Civil Service. I understood the hon. gentleman to quote the Bricklayers' Association, and several other industrial organisations of this country, not one of which can have any interest in connection with applications for the Civil Service, not one of whose members belongs to the Civil Service, or are ever likely to enter it. The principle embodied in the Bill is one we should no doubt recognise and act upon on every possible occasion, and that is, that positions in the Civil Service should be given to Canadians having the necessary qualifications in preference to persons of any other country. But to propose that no person shall, under any circumstances, be eligible for admission to the service, or eligible even for examination, unless he has been five years in the country, seems to me to be carrying that principle far beyond what is warranted. The Government, in exercising their powers of appointment to the service, are, at all times, open to the censure of this House, if they exercise that patronage unduly, or disregard any principle which ought to be observed in regard to the residents of this country, or in regard to giving preference to any persons not being residents. But to enact by statute that no person shall be eligible to be examined for the service, unless he shall have been five years in Canada, seems to be carrying that principle far beyond what public necessity requires.

Mr. BARRON. I observe that the mover of this Bill has referred to the labor organisation of Lindsay, and I may tell the House that I have received a very strong letter from that organisation, asking me to support this Bill. I was not aware of its details, until a very few moments ago, and while, perhaps, it may be that five years is rather a long time to require any gentleman from the old country, or elsewhere, to reside in Canada, before he can be qualified for the Civil Service, there can be no possible doubt, but that a good deal of feeling has been created throughout the country, from the fact, which undoubtedly exists, that Canada is not for the Canadians so far as the Civil Service is concerned. There is no doubt, whatever, that any gentleman coming from the old country, who happens to have influential relations in the old country, can more easily get a position in the service than can a Canadian whose parents came out years ago, and at a time when they had to hew out a home in our forest and build up Canada and make it what it is to-day. There is no doubt there is a good deal of feeling in the country, at all events in my part of the country, against the present system, arising from the fact that no one need apply for a position in the service in the face of the applications which come from people of influence in the old country. And although it is, perhaps, carrying the principle of protection a little too far, I think that greater care should be exercised than has been exercised in the past, and that preference should be given to young Canadians over those who have come out from the old country for the first time. I make these remarks in consequence of a request coming from my own town, and I am only sorry that the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) who also, I believe, received a similar letter, cannot be here to-night, owing to an unfortunate accident we all regret, for he would have said, only in much stronger words, what I have just remarked to the House.

Mr. CURRAN. I have very few words to say with reference to this Bill, which I regret is drafted in such a way as to necessitate a reference to the statute in order to make it intelligible. However, there is one observation which fell from the Minister of Justice in which I can hardly concur. It is, no doubt, perfectly true that members of labor organisations have not, as a rule, occasion to apply for positions in the Civil Service, and to that extent I should say they are in a very much better position than those who do apply for them. But though they may not have occasion, one thing is perfectly clear, that, as citizens of the country, having many of them young sons growing up, who may become candidates for some of those positions, they have an active interest in this question. They have a right to look to the interests of their families, they have a right to look to the future of these young men whom they are educating, and to see that a fair field for competition is open to them for positions in the service, if they think proper to seek for them. To that extent it is quite natural that members of all labor organisations should be interested in seeing that those who live in this country should have the first preference in the choice of positions in this country. On the other hand there is this to be said: If we make this rule absolute, we may require in the Civil Service persons possessing technical knowledge, and a Bill of this kind should be drawn with a great deal of care in order to avoid trouble in the future. Then, recent arrivals may be members of the families of those who have years ago come to this country from the old country, and prospered here, and made a home here, and helped to build up this country, who come out to join their relatives, and it might be unjust to close the doors to them if the term were extended to five years. A great deal has been said in certain parts of the country, and in certain sections of the press, about employment being given to young men who have been sent here directly to enter into the Civil Service. If that were true, that would be greatly to be deprecated, but I have never had any such case brought under my notice by labor organisations or by any other organisations. Up to this time, I think the Civil Service employment has been fairly administered. I do not know any one who is employed in any part of the Civil Service who has not undergone the Civil

Service examination, and I think that in most instances the reports in this matter which have been published are unfounded. I approve of the principle of this Bill, but I think five years is too long a time.

Mr. MULOCK. What would be the proper time?

Mr. BERGIN. In common with the gentlemen who have spoken, I think this Bill is in the right direction. Perhaps, as the Minister of Justice has said, five years may be too long a residence previous to admission to an examination, but I do not think it would be too long before an appointment should be made to the Civil Service of this country. There is a very strong feeling throughout the country, whether rightly or wrongly, that men from the old country have a preference in these appointments, particularly when they are backed up by strong friends in the old country. I am not willing to believe this, but, as the feeling is abroad, it would be well to set that feeling at rest by putting on our statute-book a measure which would prevent these appointments within so short a time. I would not object to such men being examined the day after their arrival, but I think they should not be appointed before they have been here for at least five years.

Mr. BRIEN. I agree with the two previous speakers in regard to this measure, and I think the time is a mere matter of detail. It is only fair that our own Canadians should have a preference over any others for the Civil Service. In regard to the efficiency of the service, we know that Canadians who are brought up in this country, and have a knowledge of their work, will be able to perform their duty more efficiently than any foreigner can do, and everything should be done to keep Canada for the Canadians, as far as that is concerned. I am disposed to support this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Bill, which is specious in its nature, is very far-reaching, and may have effects which we do not at all contemplate or anticipate just now, and which I am sure it is not in the mind of the hon. member who introduced this Bill to bring about. The basis for the Bill appears to be the impression—as I hear from the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) and my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Bergin)—that there has been undue preference given to strangers coming to this country, especially if they are backed by strong influence from abroad. That impression, as my hon. friend has said, whether it be true or false, has got abroad and is affecting some portions of this country. I know perfectly well that there is no impression more unfounded than that. I know that, in the Civil Service, as far as I have had anything to do with the administration of public affairs, Canada has certainly been kept for the Canadians, and the fact of a man being a newcomer, even when he was peculiarly adapted for the service, has operated to his disadvantage and has kept him out. There cannot be anything more unfounded than the impression which the hon. gentlemen say has gone abroad in reference to this, and I can challenge the most minute investigation of the Civil Service List as bearing out in every respect what I have just said. But we must consider what the effect of this measure will be. We are a portion of the British Empire. Every British subject has the same right when he comes to this country as he would have if he remained in that particular portion of the British Empire where he was born; and I would call the attention of my hon. friends on both sides of the House to the effect of the announcement in England, Ireland and Scotland that their people were to be considered foreigners and aliens here unless they had been in this country for five years. I would not like to prophesy as to what might be the effect of that exclusion. We hope to see the bone and sinew of the old country come to Canada. We hope to see them settling in the North-West. We hope that they will consider when they transfer themselves from England, Ireland or Scotland, say to Manitoba or the North-West, that they have the same right when they go to Regina or to Winnipeg as they would have if they had remained in the heart of England, Ireland or Scotland. It would be an unfriendly act on the part of the Dominion of Canada towards their fellow-subjects in the old country to declare them aliens. It may have a most unhappy and unwholesome effect on the connection with England, it will have the effect of loosening the tie which binds Canada to Great Britain, and loosening the interest of Ireland and Scotland in Canada. Therefore, I would strongly call upon hon. members on both sides of the House to consider well before they make this announcement. Look at the North-West for instance, it is scarcely settled yet. Before five years expire we hope to have there a large influx of people from England, Ireland and Scotland and other foreign countries. They go there and form a community, and, to all intents and purposes, they become Canadians. There may not be a native Canadian among the whole of them, but for five years not one of them can hold any office in the Dominion of Canada. It is a *reductio ad absurdum*. If this Act passes it will render it impossible to govern or to administer the affairs of the great North-West. If there can be a just charge brought against this Government or any other Government that, for any reason whatever, they have neglected the rights of native Canadians and given preference to British subjects coming from without the bounds of Canada, then let the Government be met with all kinds of censure. But until that is proved, I think it would be only a mistake that we should declare that British subjects coming to this country are not to be considered on the same footing as other British subjects, that they cannot even compete for public employment, that they cannot even ask for public employment; even if they are specially qualified for some employment, they must be set aside for five years. Why, it is surprising that such a measure should be thought of, especially by an hon. member, the promoter of this Bill, who is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but is in favor of the restriction of the employment of his fellow-subjects.

Mr. LAURIER. I am surprised at the warmth of tone of the hon. gentleman in opposing this measure. Is it not in accordance with the principle he himself laid down many years ago, that Canada ought to be for the Canadians? Now, if Canada is to be for the Canadians in the matter of manufactures, why should it not be so in respect to men? The hon. gentleman also urges as a rea-

son why this Bill should not be adopted that it might loosen British connection. Now, if the principle at the bottom of this Bill is right, I should suppose that it would be in accordance with Conservative doctrine to say, "so much the worse for British connection."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not suppose the leader of the Opposition is serious in supporting this Bill on the ground that Canada must be for the Canadians.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not our principle; it is yours.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We say that Canada should be for the Canadians, because we want to keep our own people at home; we want to give them employment at home, instead of adopting a fiscal system that would drive them to the United States. That is what we call the National Policy. But nobody ever dreamed of saying that the principle of Canada for the Canadians should operate to discourage immigrants from coming to our shores, and to refuse them equal rights with native Canadians after they got here. When an immigrant becomes naturalised he becomes a Canadian, and has all the rights of a Canadian. We invite all the world to come to this country. We pay large sums of money, we should pay larger sums of money, to induce people from abroad to come and make Canada their home, and it is absurd to say that those people who come here should, for five years, be debarred from obtaining any employment in the Government of this country. If the Bill is intended as a warning to the Government to give as little employment as possible to our fellow-subjects from Great Britain who may come to this country, there is no need of such a warning. There are now over three thousand young men and women, who have passed their examination, and are qualified for employment, and are entitled to the first consideration. But to prevent other people who come to make Canada their home, from getting positions in the Civil Service, would be nonsense, and would be a measure that no civilised Parliament in the world would think of passing. We are asking for good commercial relations with our neighbors, but shall we refuse to encourage immigration from among our neighbors? On this point I will not appeal to the hon. gentleman from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), whom our friends opposite are taking as being opposed to every kind of exchange with our neighbors to the south of us, but I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. A man may come here from France, or Germany, or any other European country, and he may have special qualifications for some particular employment, and is it to be said that we are precluded from employing him even after he has become a Canadian by naturalisation? I do not think that there is any serious pretension to support this Bill, and if I am allowed to do so I would move that this Bill be not read now, but that it be read this day six months.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken says, that he does not agree with his colleague on the subject of reciprocity. I am glad that hon. gentleman still entertains the opinions that all the hon. gentlemen on that side entertained upon that subject a few years ago. We may congratulate the hon. gentleman on his conservatism, and on the liberal character of that conservatism, which is different from that expressed by the President of the Council. I think there is no great difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen on this side upon the subject that is now under discussion. I apprehend that all who are British subjects and who are settled in this country with the intention of remaining here, and becoming citizens, are entitled to stand upon a footing of perfect equality, and that when people come from the continent of Europe or other countries and become Canadian subjects, they should be entitled to exactly the same consideration as those who are born in the country, or who are born in the United Kingdom. Upon that subject I fancy there is no difference of opinion; but I apprehend that the abuse or practice, or whatever you may choose to call it, real or fancied, which is pointed out by the Bill now under consideration, is this: That we do not favor the practice, if such a practice exists, of persons being brought here from the United Kingdom for the purpose of entering the Civil Service. We do not think it is right and proper that a man who would not be here at all if he were not promised a situation in the Civil Service should be brought here for the purpose of placing him in that service. Whatever the prizes may be, whether valuable or valueless, so long as they are so regarded, they ought to be those which pertain to the citizens of this country. I do not say that the citizen who was born in the country should stand in any better position, except from that superiority which his qualifications for a special office may give him. Apart from that, he should not stand in any better position than any other party; and, I think, before we undertake to pass a measure of this character we ought to be practically certain that there is a real abuse existing which it is necessary to remedy.

Mr. CASEY. I am in thorough accord with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I do not think it necessary to say much on the aspects of this question. I am sure this Bill is hardly needed, for one reason, that the constituents of the leader of the Government, of the Secretary of State, and of the other Ministers, are quite capable of looking after this matter, and I am quite sure no one who has no political influence in this country will secure a position in the Civil Service.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may, perhaps, be allowed to add that I am glad to hear the First Minister say that the Government have been exceedingly cautious in giving positions in the Civil Service only to those who are virtually Canadians. I am quite willing to accept the right hon. gentleman's statement, and no doubt it is true. Undoubtedly there must have been a suspicion in the public mind, that some men were admitted to the service who had been a very short time in the country. A case might arise when, as regards a particular position, the Government might find it necessary to employ such an individual, but I am glad to know that the Government are anxious to reserve the positions in the service for those who are residents here, and that this course will be followed. With respect to the statement of the Secretary of State, that three thousand young men and women have passed the Civil Service examination, I think it is a mistake to keep that system in force as it now exists, and that a Civil

Service Board of Examiners should go round once a year and invite candidates to come and be examined, and obtain certificates. In a great many cases the young men are induced to wait during several years in the hope of securing positions, and they even reach a period of life when it is almost too late to apply themselves to learning a trade or profession. The whole system of examination should be changed. The Government should be willing to accept a certificate issued by a school board or other body, such as would admit a man to a high school or collegiate institute, and if the persons holding these certificates were eligible for admission into the service, the Government would not be responsible for many young men waiting for several years anticipating engagements. Some change should be made, because, if it is continued, the number of young men waiting for employment in the service will certainly increase, and men will postpone learning trades or professions, which they should acquire, in order to become more useful to themselves.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Young men are well aware that they are not going to obtain situations in the Civil Service simply because they have submitted themselves for examination ; but the fact of holding these examinations is not at all conducive to injury to the young men. They prepare themselves for a very severe examination. Every year the examinations are made more and more severe as the number of candidates is increasing. If we accepted other certificates, outside those of the Board, we would only increase the number of those qualified to be employed in the Service. I do not object to certificates from high schools being accepted, but it would not remedy this supposed evil—I do not so consider it—of so many young men having passed the examination. In the United States, thousands of young men and young ladies take certificates entitling them to be employed as teachers or to hold positions in the Civil Service. It is the same here. It is perfectly well known to the candidates, and they are so warned, that, because they obtain a certificate, they are not entitled to a position in the Civil Service.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister said that the young men are perfectly well aware that the mere fact of passing examinations for the Civil Service does not entitle them to positions in the service. They do not know that, as a matter of fact. The hon. Minister's Bill, and the discussion which took place in the House, have led young men to expect, that if they pass the examinations they will secure positions in the service. I do not say it is the hon. Minister's fault. I think he means that they shall know what they do gain by passing the Civil Service examination ; but it ought to be known, and is not known, that passing the examination does not entitle a man to a place in the service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps, after the general expression of the House, the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill will withdraw it. I think that would be the better plan after this discussion, and after the assurance given by myself on the part of the Government, and after the invitation I have given for any hon. gentleman to look over the Civil Service List, and see in what respect we have given undue preference to strangers. I think my hon. friend ought, for this Session at all events, to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. After the assurance that has been given by the First Minister that the Government will in the future, as they have in the past——

Mr. LAURIER. Oh no ; not the past.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, after the assurance that Canada is to be kept for the Canadians, and after he has stated that when places become vacant the preference will be given to Canadians and not to those from outside, I have no objection to withdraw the measure.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand that the Government guarantee is that they will only do as well in the future as they have done in the past ?

Mr. MITCHELL. They are going to do better.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that the complaint about this Bill is that they have not done well in the past. They must do better in the future than in the past.

Motion withdrawn.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT.

Mr. DOYON (Translation) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 42) to amend chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : "The Indian Advancement Act." He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I wish to make some observations. Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : "The Indian Advancement Act," was applied a year ago to the Caughnawaga Reserve. That Act provides that the Indians to whom it shall apply shall have the right to elect councillors. Section 10 of this Act states the objects as to which the council shall have the right to pass by-laws, but it also provides that these by-laws shall be binding only when sanctioned by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. This is the section I wish to amend. The object of the amendment I propose is to extend the powers of the council of the Caughnawaga Reserve, by providing that the by-laws of the council shall be valid without requiring the sanction of the Superintendent General. I am seeking to introduce this amendment to the Act in respect to the Caughnawaga Reserve only, because I know the Indians on this reserve more particularly, and I think they are more advanced than a good many other Indians. Indeed, the neighborhood of the towns of Lachine and Montreal with which they have daily intercourse, has greatly tended to their rapid advancement ; their daily relations with the inhabitants of the Counties of Laprairie and Chauteauguay have also greatly tended to their advancement. There are to be found among the inhabitants of the reserve well-educated people. There are doctors, lawyers, law students, and they generally, a good many of them, speak the French language and the English language as fluently as their own language. There are even some who have taken to farming, and a good many are farming with the implements used by the farmers of the adjacent counties. The report of the hon. the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs mentions the fact that this Indian tribe is far advanced and supports my state-

ment in reference to their farming with improved implements. I quote from the report for 1889 the following paragraph :—

"The Iroquois of the adjoining County of Laprairie experienced also a year of prosperity, but the crops of 1888 were, with the exception of oats and hay, inferior in their yield to those of the preceding season. The increase in the number of new houses and barns and in their supply of farming implements and cattle indicates healthy progress. They own among them as many as twenty threshing machines."

This is, among others, one reason that goes to show that these Indians are comparatively more advanced than a good many other tribes. Mr. Speaker, I am not concealing to myself the importance of the amendment I am seeking to introduce. But should I entertain doubts as to the justice of what I claim, the fact that the Government passed an Act granting them the right to vote for a member of this House would be sufficient in itself to warrant my present request. In fact, they were granted by an Act of Parliament, in 1885, the right to vote for a member of the House of Commons, and they were recognised as capable, like any other citizens of this country, to manage the public affairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask whether, after that, it would be fair to maintain the restriction contained in this section 10 of the Indian Advancement Act which reserves to the Superintendent General the right to decide whether the by-laws passed by the Indians through their council shall become law or not. Mr. Speaker, I think I am warranted in saying that the management of local affairs requires less capacity and knowledge than the management of public affairs. And I take it for granted that it requires less skill for one to manage his own cooking than to manage that of the whole country. No one supported more than I did the Government when they granted to these Indians the right to vote. No one, moreover, wishes more earnestly than I do, that the affairs of this reserve be carefully and wisely managed, and that harmony should prevail among them. But one must remember that the powers granted to this council with respect to the objects as to which they have a right to pass by-laws, are not as extended as those which are granted to our ordinary municipal councils. Under the present system, it is the agent who, so to speak, exclusively manages the affairs of the reserve, for I think the Department interferes only on the advice of the agent, and, if I am not mistaken, I believe the Superintendent General never went there once in order to ascertain for himself how the affairs of the reserve were managed. I have here the resolutions which were passed a year ago by the council of the Indians, and a whole year's experience must be sufficient to enable us to judge whether these people are fit to properly manage their own affairs. Allow me to read a proof of these resolutions for the purpose of showing whether they know their interests and their needs, and whether they are qualified to properly manage their affairs. The first thing the council did, as soon as it was properly organised, was to ask for the appointment of a health committee. Here is the resolution :—

"Resolved, no one dissenting, that Dr. Patton, Michel Delisle and Joseph Barnes, be appointed to take charge of the sanitary affairs of the reserve, as sanctioned at the last sitting of the council held on the 23rd April last."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter the Department never thought of, and yet the Caughnawaga Indians, up to last year, were exposed, like any other citizens, to contagious diseases. The House must remember that in 1885, when an epidemic of small-pox was raging in Montreal, several Caughnawaga Indians died of that disease. There was then no council, and had there been one it would not have prevented them from dying. But, by order of the constable and by order of the Government, children and adults were buried in the fields near the residence of their relatives. I, myself, saw the places where these people were buried, and the corpses are there still, enclosed with fences, in the heart of pastures. I think that, had the Caughnawaga council existed at that time, they would not have allowed that members of their tribe should be buried in the fields, for there was there, as everywhere else, a graveyard ; and I am not aware that in any other parish in the Province, people who died of this disease or other contagious diseases, were buried in the fields. I know, as a matter of fact, that their being compelled to come to the Government, for the approval of by-laws passed by the council, is the cause of delays that are detrimental to the good management of the affairs of the reserve. Thus I find that on 3rd May the council passed a resolution asking for the appointment of a turnpike man, his predecessor having gone away. This resolution was passed at the time when the animals are generally sent into pastures. This toll-gate is situated over the common which intervenes between it and the quarries. Well, the answer of the Government did not come but a month later. The council also passed resolutions asking for the erection of fences to enclose the reserve. Answers were very slow in coming. I do not say that that is owing to the bad administration of the Government ; it is rather because the agent was compelled to draw up the resolutions, and forward them here, in order that the Department might consider them previous to their being carried out. The council passed another resolution, asking for the removal of the organist of the Catholic church, and the Department answered, a month afterwards, that they allowed the removal, and authorised them to deduct a month's salary, because the answer had been delayed a month's time. They also passed a resolution recommending a man named Murray as a measurer of stones ; the Department would not allow the appointment. Mr. Murray was formerly chief of the tribe, and the present measurer of stones on the reserve is also a policeman ; and, moreover, he is a mulatto. Were there no other reason than patronising a member of the tribe, I think the Government ought to have complied with the request of the council, even had that resolution only been passed by way of a petition. The council also appointed special constables, and the Government sanctioned the resolution passed to that effect. Subsequently, on 27th September the council passed a resolution recommending the removal of Mr. Moïse Lefort, as policeman, and the appointment in his stead, with a reduction of $200 in salary, of Mr. Louis Beauvais, a former Indian chief, an Indian who had held a chieftainship during thirty-four years, and the same party who had been removed as organist. That is to say, Mr. Lefort received a salary of $365 a year, and Mr. Beauvais was willing to do the same service for $165. The Department would not approve of this resolution ; not only did they not approve of it, but instead of

complying with the wishes of the council, who were unanimous in asking for the removal of Moïse Lefort—for the six councillors were unanimous in requesting that he should be replaced; some were recommending Mr. Beauvais and some Mr. Stacey; but the whole six wanted another man at a reduction of about $200 in the salary—the Government, I say, not only would not approve of the resolution, but they also increased the salary of the policeman. By referring to the report of the Indian Department for 1888, I find that the salary of Mr. Moïse Lefort as policeman, at Caughnawaga, last year, was $233 and that he was allowed an extra sum of $19 for clothing. And in the report for 1889, I find that his salary has been increased to $396 and that he has been allowed for clothing a sum of $54.75. So that it can be seen that the Department not only would not yield to the wishes of the council by approving the appointment of another policeman who would have cost a good deal less, but that they also increased the salary of Mr. Lefort. Well, Mr. Speaker, this same policeman has been in Caughnawaga for more than ten years. Ten years ago, the Indians were not recognised as voters in the country, and I think they must have been less civilised than they are now. Last year, the council appointed two additional policemen to assist in the preservation of order on the reserve. I think this was a reason that should have impelled the Government to comply with the request of the council. But what reason did the Department allege for not allowing the replacing of Mr. Lefort? I think the answer of the Superintendent General concluded by saying: "So long as Mr. Lefort shall discharge his duties as he now does, the Government shall not deem it expedient to have him replaced." Well, this policeman holds two offices at the same time. He is both a policeman and a measurer of stones; so that he sells his time twice to the tribe, and he receives two salaries, although he cannot possibly be in two places at the same time. I think this is a serious evil. Moreover, I cannot well see how the hon. the Minister of the Interior can reconcile his answer to the council by which he declines to allow the replacing of Mr. Lefort, by an Indian, with the following statement contained in his report for 1889, pages 13 and 14:

"The presence on an Indian reserve of an officer of the law cannot but have a good moral effect on an Indian band generally, and by one of the members of the band filling that position the detection of crime will, it is considered, be rendered more certain, and proof of guilt will be more easily obtained than it could be were a white man to hold the office; besides, the expense is very much lessened by employing Indians as police."

Well, Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary was done. The Superintendent General of Indians Affairs states the expense would be very much lessened by employing an Indian as policeman. I agree with him, and I am of the opinion that the employing of a negro is more expensive. It is a well-known fact that the present policeman is not an Indian. He is a mulatto. This is what the council understood last year, when they asked for the replacing of Mr. Lefort by an Indian, which the Government would not allow. The Department, by refusing to allow the resolution of the council, caused serious dissatisfaction among the tribe. Since the Department would not approve of the last resolution—that is since the 27th September—certain councillors would no more attend the sittings of the council; if they ever went there it was for the sole purpose of enquiring whether the resolution passed at the last sitting had been approved of or not. This has been a source of difficulty, and I might say that the affairs of the reserve have been neglected. If I am to judge by the report of the hon. the Superintendent General, unfortunate reports were made to the Department. I quote again the following from the report for 1889:—

"The Indian Advancement Act was last year applied by order of Your Excellency to this band, but owing to the obstructive conduct of some of the councillors, notoriously of one of them who acts as their ringleader, the beneficial effects of the same upon the community, which were so hopefully looked for, have not been as yet experienced."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know who can possibly have brought the hon. Minister to such a state of mind. By referring to the report of the very agent of the Indians where the Department take their information, I notice that, on page 32 of the first part, after referring to the births, the sanitary condition of the tribe and the crop, he concludes by saying:—

"The Indians of this reserve are prosperous, and I can say that in general they are progressing."

So that the agent says they are progressing, and the hon. the Superintendent General says they are retrograding. I am sometimes led to presume that there might be some secret correspondence between the agent and the Department that does not appear in the report. Mr. Speaker, after what I have just stated, I hope the Government will not be unwilling to accept the amendment I am seeking to introduce. We might perhaps be told by the Government that it would not be wise to extend the powers of the council. Allow me to relate a few facts recorded in the debates of this House which will enable us to decide as to the manner in which the Government have managed the affairs of the Indians and whether the council themselves could more unwisely manage their affairs. There is a large quarry at Caughnawaga, and the lease of it is one of the best sources of reserve for the tribe. The quarry was leased to the Indians. Some time ago I enquired from the Government, as to the names of the parties to whom the quarry had been leased; whether the Government had taken sureties, and whether those who worked the quarry were indebted? It appears from the answer of the Department that these quarries were leased without any surety being taken, and that the lessees are indebted to the amount of nearly $4,000. Those who are familiar with the law relating to Indians know that it is difficult to have their property sold, and I think judgments were rendered in Montreal, by which it was held that it was impossible to have the real property of the Indians or their houses sold. When I made that enquiry, I never intended to be informed as to the private affairs of the parties who had leased this quarry, but I thought it my duty to comply with the wishes of my constituents, and to ascertain how their affairs were managed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Indians, left to themselves, would not have leased their quarry without taking some additional surety besides the word of the parties who leased it. Here is another fact. In 1882, the Government had the Caughnawaga reserve surveyed. The survey lasted from 1882 to 1888. The work was given to a man named Walbank. I know him only by name. I think he may be an estimable

man, but the Department appointed him on his own recommendation, as recorded in the *Hansard* of 1887. According to his report, the reserve contained 12,327 acres of land, and the Government paid for the survey of that reserve out of the funds of the band, the handsome sum of $22,250, that is to say, a sum of $1.80 per acre. Some time ago, the hon. member for Huron enquired from the Government, as to the cost to the Government of surveys in Manitoba and the North-West, and the answer came that they cost a little over four cents per acre, including office expenses. Now, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly feel that the Government was not warranted in taking so large a sum out of the funds of the band to cover the survey of that reserve. I am not an expert in surveys, but all the surveyors to whom I have spoken about that matter agreed that it was an enormous sum ; and they would not believe it, until I showed them the answer of the Minister as recorded in the debates of this House. There is a difference of $1.76 per acre between the cost of the survey in Caughnawaga, in close proximity to Montreal, and that of the surveys in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. All these facts show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Department do not manage the affairs of the reserves with much care and saving, and that it would not be unwise to grant to the Caughnawaga Council the object of my request. I have shown, moreover, some days ago, that there was a sum of $3,333.33 which belonged to the Indians, the interest on which they had a right to, and of which nothing was heard for these last ten years. I have no news of it yet, and, if I judge by the answer the Minister gave me, he is not quite sure of finding it out. Still it exists, and the Indians are losing the interest on it. Another matter which was not managed with much care—I have referred to it a few days ago in this House—is shown by the carelessness with which the seigniorial rents of Caughnawaga were collected. These rents are paid by the farmers of the Counties of Chateauguay and Laprairie. The Indians have been losing the benefit of these rents, which should have been paid annually, and the *censitaires* paid nothing whatever these last twenty-five or thirty years. While the Indians were incurring this loss no good service whatever was rendered to the inhabitants of those counties, who could easily have paid two, three, or four dollars rent each year, while they are now sued in sums ranging from two to three and four hundred dollars for the payment of these rents. This is another instance of the carelessness with which the affairs were managed by the Department, and they cannot plead now that there would be danger in granting to the Indians the management of their own affairs. Indeed, I think the latter could not do worse than that. But what is more, Mr. Speaker, if I am to believe the report of the Auditor General, there is nothing left in the funds of the Indians but a sum of $85.75. I have always heard that the traveller whose pockets are empty has no fear of singing out in the midst of thieves. And if they have nothing left there is no danger in freeing them. I shall, therefore, conclude these remarks by saying it would be fair to extend the powers of the council as asked for in my amendment, and I hope that my request will have the support of the whole House.

Mr. DOYON.

Mr. CASEY. Having a few Indians in my county, I have an interest in this question, and as nearly as I can understand the principle of the Bill proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Doyon) is that the Indians shall have full municipal powers to carry on matters concerning their tribes, to the same extent as the powers given to township councils. At the present time, the powers of the Indians in regard to their municipal affairs are subject to revision from headquarters at Ottawa, or from the agent in charge of the tribe. I think, as my hon. friend does, that if the Indian is qualified to vote for a member of this House, he is qualified to manage his own municipal affairs, and, to put it briefly, for this reason, I support the Bill of my hon. friend.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry I am unable to accept the Bill of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon). The Act which the hon. gentleman wishes to amend has only been in force for some two years, and very few of our Indians have taken advantage of it. From what has been reported to us, if there is one band of Indians who should not get the advantage proposed to be given to them by the hon. member, it is the band which that hon. gentleman has been advocating. The reports we have had in reference to the business which has been transacted by the council of the Caughnawaga tribe, has been anything but satisfactory. In fact the hon. gentleman himself in his speech has indicated that that has been the case, because he read a paragraph of my annual report of this year, which goes on to say : "that the council of this band has been the cause of a good deal of trouble, and that the good results we expected from the Franchise Act being extended to them had not resulted." Before this Act was extended to this reserve, a petition was sent to the Department signed by a majority of the band. There was a large minority who were opposed to it, and when the election took place, the leaders of the obstructive party were the ones who were returned as members to the council. They passed several by-laws, and they were submitted in accordance with the Act to the Department. One of these was thought to be objectionable, and on its being returned to them and their being notified to that effect, two or three of the members of the council commenced to obstruct the business of the council, and from that day to this no business has been transacted. As the hon. gentleman has said, the by-law to which the Department took exception recommended that a man named Beauvin, I presume one of the Indians of the reserve, should be appointed to fill the place of the Dominion policeman on the reserve, who had for years occupied that position with satisfaction to the Department and to the restoration of order, which had hitherto been very much disturbed. The bill also recommended a man named Murray as a measurer of stones. Both of these recommendations were reported very strongly against by our agent. The man recommended for the position of Dominion policeman was reported by the agent as notorious for drinking to excess at times. It was on that report that assent was refused to the by-law. This is the first case in which any by-law passed by a band of Indians, which has taken advantage of the Enfranchisement Act, has been refused assent, and I think it would be a great pity at this

early date, while the Act is still on its trial, to take this power out of the hands of the Superintendent General. To show that there is a very strong feeling on the reserve in reference to the manner in which these councillors have carried on their work, I will read the following petition, which I received a few days ago :—

"The humble petition of Thomas Kanatsohare, Ennias Ohahakete, Louis Kenwenderhon and others, respectfully sheweth :

"That, according to the Indian Advancement Act, the first election of councillors for the Reserve of Caughnawaga was held at Caughnawaga, the twenty-sixth day of March last past, eighteen hundred and eighty-nine.

"That, at the said election, one Louis F. Jackson was elected councillor for section six (6), which comprises the village of Caughnawaga.

"That ever since said election, said Louis F. Jackson has unworthily discharged the office of councillor.

"That said Louis F. Jackson has worked openly against the best interests of the Indians of the Reserve, by continually obstructing the business of the council for said Reserve of Caughnawaga, he being assisted thereto by two other councillors, to wit: Mitchell Bourdeau and Mitchell Daillebout, whom said Louis F. Jackson induced to absent themselves from the meetings of the council in order to cause want of quorum.

"That out of twelve meetings of the council called for by the Indian agent from the twenty-second day of April, eighteen hundred and eighty-nine, to the twenty-seventh day of January, eighteen hundred and ninety, they the said Councillors, Louis F. Jackson, Mitchell Bourdeau and Mitchell Daillebout did not assist at seven council meetings, and at three other council meetings, they assisted but immediately left before any business could be transacted, thereby preventing the council to proceed for want of a quorum.

"That these proceedings, to which said Councillors, Louis F. Jackson, Mitchell Bourdeau and Mitchell Daillebout resorted, are inimical and detrimental to the welfare and prosperity of the Indians of the Reserve of Caughnawaga.

"That said Louis F. Jackson is unworthy to sit as a member of the Council, being an habitual drunkard, which, according to the hereinabove mentioned Act, is sufficient to disqualify a member of the council.

"That all these facts mentioned in the premises are well known and public.

"That the election for new councillors will take place on the twenty-sixth day of March, instant, at the Village of Caughnawaga.

"Wherefore your petitioners pray that the disqualification of said Louis F. Jackson, Mitchell Bourdeau and Mitchell Daillebout be immediately proceeded with and that, at the coming election for new councillors, they be not allowed to become candidates.

"And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

"CAUGHNAWAGA, 18th March, 1890."

This petition is signed by ten of the principal Indians on the reserve and by one councillor. I have no doubt, as the hon. gentleman states, that there are a great many sound and intelligent Indians on the reserve, but they do not appear to take an active part in the municipal affairs of the reserve, and while that is the case, I think we shall have to continue the very wise provision which gives the Superintendent General the power of approving the by-laws which have been passed. The reports that have reached me compel me to come to that conclusion, and I think any one who knows the Indians and remembers that this Act is really on trial, will see the wisdom of continuing that provision at present.

Mr. LAURIER. The Act which it is now sought to amend by this Bill is entitled "The Indian Advancement Act," and it provides that the municipal councils on the reserves shall have the power to pass by-laws, which, however, may not become law on the reserve until they have been approved by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. The powers given to the councils are not of a very high order. They provide for the maintenance of schools, the care of the public health, the preservation of public order, the repression of intemperance, the sub-division of the land in the reserve, the prevention of trespass, the construction and repair of schoolhouses, the construction and maintenance of roads and bridges, the construction and maintenance of water-courses, and so on. Now, the object of this Bill is simply to provide that in the reserve of Caughnawaga the by-laws passed by the council shall become valid without the sanction of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. In my judgment the Bill of my hon. friend only lacks in one respect, that it does not go far enough and apply to all the reserves. At present we have this anomaly : this Parliament, influenced by the Government, passed a law some five years ago giving the suffrage to the Indians ; so that though you allow them to participate in the affairs of the country, though you give them the right of exercising the highest privilege of civilised men, yet you do not allow them to dispose of their own petty affairs on their reserve. In the name of common sense, I ask the hon. Minister who now resists this Bill, and in whose opinion the Indians of Caughnawaga have a right to vote in parliamentary elections—a right to pronounce on his conduct as a Minister—on what principle can he defend this anomaly or refuse to allow them to conduct their own municipal affairs ? If there is any reason whatever why the franchise should be given to the Indians, I cannot conceive how, in the name of common sense, this amendment should not be adopted. The hon. gentleman says that the Indians have not shown themselves fit to exercise the powers given them on the Caughnawaga reserve. He said that the councillors have been obstructive, and charged one of the men known to the whole world as Capt. Jackson, who commanded the Canadian boatmen in Egypt, during Lord Wolseley's campaign, with drunkenness. I was surprised to hear this man charged with drunkenness by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is from his own friends.

Mr. LAURIER. This is from his enemies. The hon. gentleman was all the less warranted in making that assertion since he knows that Captain Jackson, whom he was asked to disqualify by ten men of the tribe, has been elected as councillor no less than three weeks ago. In the face of such a certificate given to Mr. Jackson by his own fellow-countrymen, the hon. gentleman has no warrant in charging him with drunkenness, and I lay against the hon. gentleman that he did not discharge his duty as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs towards this man, who is his ward, and that Mr. Jackson deserved better treatment at his hands. The hon. gentleman has received a petition demanding the disqualification of Jackson as a councillor, but that petition is signed by only ten men of the tribe, and, if I am not mistaken, the hon. gentleman has in his hands a petition coming also from the tribe, but signed not by ten men, but by 110 men, approving of every act of Mr. Jackson as a councillor. I do not know whether I am wrong or not, but I am informed that the hon. gentleman has such a petition in his hands, and if he has, how in the name of justice and fair play could he rely upon a petition of ten men only, in charging him with drunkenness

especially when the conduct of Mr. Jackson as a member of the council has been approved by his election by a handsome majority over his adversaries. I may also state that Capt. Jackson is an interpreter in the courts of Montreal appointed by the Quebec Government. The hon. gentleman has also said that the council have not discharged their duties properly. I cannot see that from anything that has occurred. If I followed the speech of my hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Doyon) correctly, he stated that one of the first acts of the council was to appoint a board of health; a resolution, by the way, which received the approval of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Then, they passed a resolution with reference to a toll-gate, which also received the approval of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; then, they passed a by-law to compel parties to erect fences, which also received the Superintendent General's approval. In fact all the by-laws and resolutions received his approval, until the resolution was passed dismissing Lefort, who was receiving a salary of $360 a year, and appointing another in his place, who was to cost the tribe only $165 a year. This resolution did not receive the approval of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. No valid reason has been given by the hon. gentleman for his refusal. It is the opinion of the Department that wherever possible a full-blooded Indian should be appointed in preference to a white man or a half-breed, and in proposing Beauvais as constable to replace Lefort, who is a half-breed, the council acted on this principle, and showed a proper economy in the expenditure of their own money; for by appointing Beauvais, who was approved by the Indians, they saved $200 a year. Unless, therefore, some very good reason can be given by the Department for interfering with the action of the council, they cannot be justified in acting as they did. If I am to believe, and I have no reasons for not believing, the statements of the hon. member for Laprairie, the Indians would have administered their own affairs infinitely better than they have been administered by the Department of Indian Affairs. What do we hear? My hon. friend brings this charge against the Department, that a survey was made, under orders of the Government, of the reserve which contains 12,000 acres, and yet this survey cost no less than $22,000. It cost $1.80 per acre, although the reserve is at the very door of Montreal, within five miles of that city, and in face of the fact that, in the North-West Territories, the survey of the wild lands there cost but four cents an acre. Under such circumstances, what reason can be given by the Department in defence of their own action? There was at one time a lump sum in the hands of the Department to the credit of the band at Caughnawaga, and there is now left, I understand, but the small sum of $85; and this is due to the squandering of $22,000 on a survey of 12,000 acres of land. Under such circumstances, the Indians are justified in believing that they would have managed their own affairs better than the Department has managed them, and that is a good reason why the amendment of my hon. friend should pass. I find only one fault with the Bill of my hon. friend, and that is that it does not go far enough; but he takes the interests of those whom he has in charge, and the reasons he has given should induce the House to accept the Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not rise with the object of adding anything to the discussion of this Bill, so far as it applies to the reserve of Laprairie, with which my hon. friend from that county is more particularly acquainted; but I do rise for the purpose of saying a word in connection with the effect of the Indian Advancement Act on the Indians in the reserve in the county which I have the honor to represent. Let me say at once, that the proposition of the leader of the Opposition is a very debatable one, namely, that this Bill should apply to all the reserves that come under the operation of this Act. On the other hand, the Bill of the hon. member for Laprairie, applying as it does to only one reserve, does not seem to me to be one which we should deal with very seriously. It seems to me that the question which the hon. gentleman discusses is this: That there has been a dispute in the reserve of Caughnawaga recently, such as might arise in a township council of any municipality in any of the Provinces, and on account of that dispute and the evil effects arising therefrom, the hon. gentleman asks us to pass a measure, an Act in this House, which shall apply to that reserve and no other. It appears to me, Sir, that such is not the kind of legislation which is the rule in this Parliament. I do not for a moment doubt the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statements that the Indians whom he has the honor to represent are an intelligent tribe, but the expressions of compliment and eulogy which he has used in regard to them, apply also, and perhaps in a stronger sense, to some Indians in the Province from which I come. I know that as to the Mississaugas of the Credit, who have their reserve in the County of Haldimand, anything which he has said may be said more strongly in regard to their intelligence. They are cultivating the soil extensively; there are many of them highly educated; they live in good houses, and one of them occupies the responsible position of Indian agent on the reserve. They are one of the few bands, I believe, in the Province of Ontario who have been, at their own request, allowed the operation of the Indian Advancement Act, and no difficulties have arisen in the operation of that Act among them. They have not at all objected to their by-laws being supervised by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and I am not informed of any reserve, except the one to which the hon. gentleman refers, on which the Indians have asked that they should be relieved from the revision of their by-laws. It seems to me that it is necessary to have an Indian agent, representing the Government, resident on and in practical control of the reserve, because he must be the means of communication between the Indians and the Department of Indian Affairs. Not only that, but he must be the officer of the Department in connection with the reserve; and as long as the Indian agent is admitted to be a necessity, he remains the adviser of the Government, and the Government must follow his advice in relation to matters connected with the reserve. It appears to me, that the Indians not having asked for this change, must, therefore, not need it or be very anxious for it. That is, Sir, so far as the reserve with which I have more personal connection

is concerned. There are certain amendments, which I think, though they have not been very strongly agitated, are, nevertheless, necessary to the successful operation of this Act. Hon. gentlemen who refer to the Indian Advancement Act will notice that the reserve has to be divided into wards for the election of councillors. I believe hon. gentlemen from Ontario, at all events, will admit that the division of rural municipalities for the election of municipal councils did not receive very great support, and that, where that system was once adopted, it was ultimately dropped in many municipalities. That is true in regard to the Indian reserves, and the necessity of dividing them into wards should be amended, so that the members elected from the reserve to the council may be elected by the reserve as a whole. Another amendment which is required is that there should be one day for nomination and another for polling, as there is in the other municipalities. Another amendment asked by the Indians particularly, is that those who become members of the council of the reserve shall be empowered to have pay voted to them, if they have the funds, as other municipalities are empowered. While these amendments are desirable and some of them necessary, I do not think the one proposed by the hon. gentleman is necessary, as the Indians have not asked for it, and there has been no question raised in regard to it, except in the reserve which he represents, and no voice to this Parliament but his own, and I am inclined to think he is entirely influenced by the dispute to which I have referred. I shall, therefore, oppose this measure.

Mr. BURDETT. While I have pleasure in agreeing with a good deal of what the hon. gentleman has just said, I do not understand why he and others on that side of the House do not treat the Indian as they speak of him, and talk of him, and talk at him. Then he is an intelligent and refined gentleman, but, when they deal with him here, he is a ward of the Department, and must be looked after under the protection of the Royal Court at Ottawa; and, as in the case of a good many improvident guardians, I think the infant's estate has suffered from these to a great extent, to the benefit of the guardian and the loss of the infant and his friends. I happen to know something of one Indian reserve at any rate; and it appears to me to be very extraordinary, if these Indians are so well educated, and so intelligent, and so well informed—and many of them are—and if, by the persistence of the Government, they have been given the power to vote at Dominion elections, they cannot be allowed to pass a by-law to appoint a constable without its being liable to be set aside by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Their resolutions and by-laws must be dealt with by the Government here while no other municipality is so dealt with. The by-law passed by any other municipality must be dealt with by the courts of law. Why not treat with these highly educated and intelligent Indians as you do with any other intelligent gentlemen, and why not allow the councillors elected by the Indians to have the same power to pass by-laws which others have. I have a great interest in the Indians? I was born on an Indian reserve, and can claim some interest at all events in the locality.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You were enfranchised.

Mr. BURDETT. When the First Minister did me the honor, before the last election, of visiting that reserve with what, I think, was called the chestnut combination—a company composed of many members of the Government, and others—he was received at Deseronto, a flourishing town which was formerly a part of the reserve, with great kindness and cordiality, and he was presented by the head chief of the Mohawks with a fine cane. I am glad to see that he has not been called upon to use that cane in consequence of any failure of his physical power. I was not invited upon that occasion, possibly because of my political persuasion, but I was informed that the hon. gentlemen said Sam Burdett claims to be a half-breed, but I am a full-breed. Well, I now ask this full-breed to give the other full-breeds the full municipal power to manage their own affairs, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will do so when it is called to his attention. Now, with respect to this question of giving the Indians the right to vote, although there may or may not be any objection to it—I was not here and did not take a hand in the argument—it appears to me that it is hardly consistent with the liberty a man ought to enjoy when he votes, that you should say to him: I control your moneys, I control your lands, I control the appointment of your officials, I control the power to remove your councillors for intemperance or almost anything else, although I cannot do it in other municipal councils; in other words, I have you tied hand and foot, so now you are free, go and vote as you see fit. If you give these men the power to vote, also give them the liberty to vote freely as they see fit. If you give them the power to elect councillors, give those councillors the same power as you give to others. I do not look upon the Indian as a ward, I look upon him as an ally. I do not understand they are subjects by subjugation. They came in by treaty. The Six Nations claim that they came in by treaty, that they are independent nations, that they are allies, and when they address the Governor General or any other superior, they address him as brother, because they claim that they are equals in a national sense, although under the protection of this Government, because the Government gave them that right in our original treaties. But by law and by statute they are allies of the British Crown, and any liberty that has been taken from them, or any rights that have been taken from them, have been taken by Act of Parliament, and they now ask to have some measure of those rights given back to them. I quite understand the objection to this Bill being limited to one tribe only. It ought not to be so limited, but it ought to apply to all tribes in the same position, and in the same condition. I, therefore, respectfully submit that as the Indians are growing in intelligence and in prosperity, they ought to be further enfranchised, they ought to have greater liberties allowed them, in fact they ought to be treated as equals and not as wards.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a very important Bill, and it is in a great measure the necessary outcome of the legislation of the Government. A few years ago the hon. gentleman, who now leads the Government, made a report upon the subject of establishing municipal councils amongst the

Indians, and he stated that upon enquiry he did not think they were qualified to discharge the duties that devolved upon an ordinary council in reference to municipal affairs. But the hon. gentleman very shortly afterwards thought those people who were not qualified to discharge the duties of ordinary municipal councillors, were qualified to discharge the important duties of the elective franchise; while not capable of judging with regard to their local and municipal matters, they were capable of judging with regard to the affairs of the nation. Now, it seems to me that it is impossible for the Government to stand still; they must either resile from the position they have taken on the subject of the elective franchise, or they must go further and grant to the Indians full emancipation. The hon. gentleman has, in the report relating to the political enfranchisement of the Indians, recognised the principle of property qualification. Now, so far as the white population are concerned, property is regarded as an indication of thrift and industrious habits, and the party who possesses property is, *primâ facie*, supposed to be qualified to exercise the electoral franchise. But that rule does not apply to the possession of property by the Indians. The Superintendent General controls his property, he cannot put it in jeopardy; in effect the Crown holds it for him, and no matter how unthrifty he may be in his habits, no matter how extravagant or idle, he still retains the qualification upon which he is entitled to vote. No white man stands in that position. The Indian is not a part of the body politic, he does not assist in the administration of justice, he does not act as a juror, he is not called upon to discharge any military duties, he is an isolated individual so far as the general population is concerned. He is simply a member of a tribe, and so far as the Six Nations are concerned, they no doubt stand by treaty in the exact position which the hon. gentleman who has preceded me has stated. They claim to be the allies of the Crown, they are so recognised by treaty. The Six Nations and the Cherokees in the colonies took a particular position and never claimed to be subjects of the Crown. They were always spoken of and treated as allies, and in the Treaty of Utrecht, by Article 15 these Indians were expressly recognised as allies, and the land of which they were in possession was held in trust by the Crown on their behalf. Of course, by the action of the British Government and by the decision of the courts, this principle has to some extent been departed from. But it would not be difficult for the Indians to discharge the duties devolving upon them with as much success as they are discharged by the Superintendent General in this particular. Now, my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) tells us—I think it is a matter to which this House ought to give some attention—that 12,000 acres of a reserve was surveyed, and that the survey of that reserve has cost upwards of $22,000—that it has cost about $1.80 an acre. It does seem to me that was an improvident expenditure of the Indian fund, and it ought not to pass without the serious consideration of Parliament, and the Superintendent General ought to bring down to the House the papers which would enable the House to form some judgment with regard to this particular transaction. Now, my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Doyon) has called attention to the

condition of things that exists in this particular reserve. This House, upon the advice of the Government, has conferred upon these Indians the electoral franchise. You have said they are capable of exercising judgment, not merely with regard to the qualification of councillors, but with regard to these important questions that are put in issue in every general election, questions of free trade and protection, the question of the independence of Parliament, the question of elective franchise—all these are questions upon which the Indians are asked to pass an opinion, and if that is so, how can the Government come down to the House and say that these people are not capable of electing a council without our interference, that they are not capable of judging of the simplest matters without having to refer to the Superintendent General? I do not say that we ought not to exercise a supervision over the Indians and protect their interest, but if the intellectual and social condition of the Indians is such as to require an interference from the Superintendent General, and require his supervision, they are not in a condition to exercise the elective franchise properly; neither are they in a position to exercise the elective franchise properly if they are made wards of the Government. If the Government is capable of supervising their acts and interfering with their liberties at every step, you must either withdraw from that position and give to the Indians complete control over their own affairs, whatever the consequences may be to them, or you must withdraw from them those elective privileges which you have conferred upon them, by which you undertake to make them part of the community if they are not part, and of which they never were a part. He has stood separate and apart from the rest of the community, recognised, as the Congress of the United States has said, as a dependent nation; he is no more a member of the community than a member of a tribe of gypsies is a member of the body politic. That being so, the Government cannot, on any fair or just principle, resist the measure which my hon. friend has submitted. They must either consent to abandon their supervision over the Indians and give them full emancipation, or withdraw from the position they have taken, and withdraw from them the elective franchise. The ordinary course of proceeding is to begin to confer these rights which are regarded as the most elementary. No one in his senses will undertake to teach a boy the integral calculus before he has learned arithmetic, and become acquainted with the more simple elements of mathematical calculations. He will not undertake to teach Greek before English. And who would undertake to confer on an Indian the very highest mark of modern civilisation and withhold from him those provisions which every civilised community permits to be exercised by members of the community. But that is what the Government have been doing, and they must either go further or retrace their steps and leave the Indian as he was before, to become a member of the community and enjoy the rights that pertain to every other citizen when he is prepared to assume the responsibilities which belong to every other man. If he has control of his own property, if he is capable of holding it and disposing of what he possesses, then he stands in the same position as the rest of the community; but if the Government

take charge of him and his property and treat him as incapable of taking care of himself, why ask Parliament to confer on the Indians the power of controlling the destinies of the country, as was done by the Act considered some time ago? The position of the Government is a most illogical and absurd one, and they must either give up the ground which they formerly took, or they must give up their protection over the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has addressed to the House an argument, full of his usual acuteness and ability, against the Franchise Act which was passed some years ago, and some of the arguments, I fancy, have been used on a former occasion. But this is not a question at all connected with the Franchise Act, it is not connected with it in the slightest degree, and the circumstances are quite different. I remember perfectly well that hon. gentlemen prided themselves on the persistence with which they opposed the Indians receiving the franchise at all, and by their persistence they forced the Government to limit the franchise to those particular Indians who were able to show that by their position, prudence and acquisition of property they were worthy of the franchise. There is a wide distinction between voting by an Indian under the Franchise Act and voting by an Indian with respect to tribal affairs. In the latter case there is no limitation. Every Indian, including the wild and dissolute Indian, has a right to vote in the council of the tribe as well as those who have not earned under the Franchise Act the right to vote in elections to this House. The hon. gentleman says he is in favor of the Superintendent General having supervision over the Indians. He and I agree on that point, and he agrees with the law as it is to-day. It may be if we resist this motion, if he and I vote together against this Bill, that I may be inconsistent. But that is not the question. The question is, whether, under this Bill, the law should be altered so as to allow the Indians to act without any supervision. The hon. gentleman will not agree that they should be allowed to act without any such supervision, and he will not agree that the present law should be altered. After that Bill is defeated and the present law remains, then my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may come forward with a Bill to alter the Franchise Act, so far as it affects the Indians.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What will you do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The arguments of the hon. gentleman might have some weight then, but they have no bearing on this issue now before the House, which is simply this: whether the Indians should have unrestricted power in regard to disposing of property on their several reserves. When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) introduces his Bill for an amendment of the Franchise Act, I will give him permission to hit as hard as he likes against us for the so-called inconsistency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman voted us down on that question. I hold that we must go on, but the hon. gentleman is prepared to go back.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These are quite different subjects; the one affects tribal relations of the Indians among themselves, the other confers on certain Indians the right to vote for members of this House. They are quite different subjects. I move that this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Bill now under discussion for second reading does not go quite as far as the First Minister said. The mover asks in this Bill that so much of section 10 of the Indian Advancement Act as relates to the approval and confirmation, by the Superintendent General, of the by-laws, rules and regulations made by the council, shall not apply to the council of the Indian reserve of Caughnawaga, in the County of Laprairie in the Province of Quebec. I understand that my hon. friend has been induced to introduce the Bill at the request of the Indians whose interests are involved. That is a point which weighs on my mind. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has spoken about the Bill being deficient, in that it does not take in other bands of Indians, but for my part I think we are warranted in dealing with this Bill when it comes at the request of the Indians themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There never was a request forwarded to the Government. Some of the Indians may have asked the hon. gentleman, but the tribe has never expressed the desire to have this law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister was not in at the time the previous part of this discussion went on, but I presume the hon. member (Mr. Doyon) is warranted in bringing in the Bill from the well understood wishes of the band. The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs has read a petition signed by ten names against the chief councillor on the reserve, but that was replied to by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who stated that he was informed and believed that a petition signed by more than a hundred names had been forwarded in favor of Jackson.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That does not refer to the Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; but I instance that as an answer to the statement made that my hon. friend has been asked by only some few of the Indians. If he had been asked by the ten, and 110 had spoken in another way on another question, it might be inferred that he was not advocating the wishes of the band; but when he is advocating the wishes and desires of the council elected by that band, and by whom the chief councillor was re-elected we find that four out of five who constitute that council, that council are in accord with the chief whose conduct has been censured here, and who has been denounced as unworthy. I cannot give full credence to the view that has been indicated by the Superintendent General as to the character of these Indians. I think that if the Minister felt strongly with regard to this matter he ought to have used the power he has under this Indian Advancement Act to have him removed from office.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I consulted the Department of Justice, and I found I had no power to remove him. That is the reason I have given notice to bring in a Bill this year to amend the Act in order that I may take that power.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Amendment Act says that every member of a council elected under the provisions of this Act, and who is proved to be an habitual drunkard, may be removed.

Mr. BURDETT. Drunkenness is one of the causes for removal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think there is a case of one being removed for drunkenness on the reserve in the county of my hon. friend from Hastings. If I understand the Superintendent General correctly, he has charged drunkenness against this man at Caughnawaga, and the Department has either acted outside the law in the case of the Indian on the Hastings reserve, or they have the power to remove this man here.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The accusation of drunkenness was not made against Jackson until in the petition which reached me some three days ago. The proposition I submitted to the Department of Justice was that he should be removed for obstructing the business of the council, and the Act does not give us that power.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand the only obstruction to the business of the council, was that the council made some regulations, and that when these regulations were disapproved by the Department here, the members of the council then took the not unreasonable ground of saying: "What is the use of our meeting in council and passing by-laws and regulations which are right and proper in themselves, and in the interest of the band if they are to be disallowed?" They took that not unreasonable view of the situation, and, as I understand, they have simply abstained from going to council?

Mr. LAURIER. That is all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Here is a council composed of electors of the Dominion of Canada, and they are passing by-laws dealing with their own reserve, their own lands, and their own moneys, and they in their wisdom see fit to appoint an individual at something like $165 a year to discharge a duty for which another was being paid some $350. One would have thought that was a matter that was clearly within their competence, and that it was a matter, as we should term it in a municipality of white people, that was a wise and economical transaction. However, that is disallowed by the Department, and the obstruction, as it is termed, simply arose from the fact that when they attempted a matter of economy of this kind in the internal affairs of the tribe, it was disallowed at Ottawa, and they said: "There is no use attempting to do anything at all." That being the case they have asked my hon. friend to introduce this Bill, which leaves considerable power in the hands of the hon. Superintendent General yet, but does away with so much of the section of the Indian Advancement Act as requires the approval and confirmation of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs of the by-laws, rules and regulations of that council at Caughnawaga. I think this state of things has been brought about by the First Minister leading the House in the direction of giving the Indians the right as citizens to vote. When that proposition was made, I expressed my opinion that it was not desirable that should be done without the Indians themselves first having asked for it. The First Minister assumed the responsibility of doing that and he has brought upon himself complications in connection therewith. It seems to me that in giving the greater power to them to vote on national affairs, and to withhold from them the power to say whether a man shall be paid $360 of their own money for discharging the duties of an office when they could get a man for $165 to do the same, is treating them as wards, without even intelligence enough to determine a small matter of this kind. Naturally those Indians of Caughnawaga reason to themselves that it having been admitted by the Parliament of Canada and by the Government that they were able to judge of national affairs, and that they were able to judge of great questions of State that agitate the Dominion, it is simply ridiculous that they are not given equal power with other white people to have the entire control of their own internal affairs. The question is not as the First Minister views it. He has taken the point that this is not manhood suffrage to allow them to vote for members of this House, but that every one over the age of 21 years on the reserve can vote for members of the municipal council. In the Province of Ontario, all over the age of 21 years can vote for members of the Local Legislature; but they cannot vote for members in this House; but it does not follow that because all over 21 years of age and not entitled to vote for a member for this House, they are, therefore, not possessed of character and ability to fit them to cast as intelligent a vote as others who are permitted to cast that vote. So with regard to the Indians on the reserves. It is not to be argued, simply because they happen to be over 21 years of age and have not the qualification necessary to vote for this House, that they are necessarily dissolute characters and lacking in the capacity for the guidance of their own affairs. The Indian Advancement Act, it seems to me, will have to go further than it does go in the light of recent events. The First Minister cannot fail to see that the circumstances were changed when he introduced that provision into his Franchise Bill, and I do not see how he can well hesitate, when an Indian band, having been given the right to vote in all rational matters, asks for the same privilege in municipal matters. I think it is evident that that Act shall have to be extended to the extent now proposed, so that the assent of the Superintendent General to the by-laws of the councils shall not be requisite. This is asked by the representative of the Indian Reserve at Caughnawaga. I do not take exception to the amendment on the same ground as my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague). If the Bill is considered in committee, the hon. member for Haldimand could then move to include other bands if he saw fit. With reference to my own Indians, as the hon. Superintendent General knows, they have not adopted the Indian Advancement Act. I believe they are as advanced a body of Indians as any to be found in the Dominion; but they have always taken the position that they are not subjects, but allies of the Crown, having come here under a treaty; and they are very fond of speaking in that way. They hold to their old system of managing their affairs by chiefs, and the chiefs seem to have the confidence of the band. I have myself always taken the ground that we should not force anything on the Indians—speaking more particularly for my

own—which is contrary to their own expressed desire. I took this position with regard to the Franchise Act. They had not asked for the privilege of voting in Dominion affairs, and I thought it was not wise to force the suffrage upon them. But it was done, and many of them abstained from voting simply because they thought it might lead to a condition of things of which they did not approve. As they are not under the operation of this Indian Advancement Act, I cannot speak of the working of that Act on the reserves to which it has been applied. I heard the testimony of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that it works well among the Indians of the Credit. They are a very advanced band of Indians, as are also the Caughnawagas. But the fact that this Bill is limited to the Caughnawagas is not, to my mind, a reason for rejecting it. I hold to the principle which I laid down before, that it is better not to force anything on the Indians for which they do not ask. I take it that this amendment has been asked for by a majority of the Indians on the Caughnawaga reserve, because a majority of them have re-elected, apparently, those Indians who are condemned as obstructionists, simply because they refused to attend a meeting of the council, because their acts were disallowed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The fact that the Indians have the right of voting under the Franchise Act cannot be accepted as a reason why they should be allowed to exercise legislative powers; these are two things distinct from each other. The hon. gentleman might as well say that because the white people of Ontario have the right to vote for the members of the Legislative Assembly, that body ought to have the right to pass statutes irrespective of the assent of the Crown or the Lieutenant Governor. He might as well argue that it is inconsistent with the right of the people of Ontario to elect members to the Legislature of Ontario to pass statutes, that these statutes are subject to disallowance by the Federal authority. He might as well argue that it is inconsistent for the people to exercise the franchise for members of this House, and yet have this House, when it passes an Act, require the assent of the other two branches of Parliament. That is the argument the hon. gentleman advances to the House. The question is not whether the Indians in their councils should be controlled in their decisions as to whether they should appoint a man receiving $160 or a man receiving $360; but the question is whether an Indian band should have the right to pass any by-laws they please, or whether there should be any power to control them or keep their legislation within proper limits. Surely there is no parity of reasoning between by-laws passed by a municipal council and by-laws passed by an Indian band; and to say that the validity of a by-law passed by an Indian council should be decided only by the courts, is to say that the affairs of a little Indian band shall be in a confused state until they get litigation before the courts. Time and again it has occurred that they have attempted to pass by-laws entirely beyond their authority—by-laws dealing with the criminal law, or imposing penalties on people outside of the reserve altogether; and when it was called to their attention that these were matters beyond their authority, they were of course prepared to be controlled by the Superintendent General. But the proposition is that any of these bands, when they ask for it, shall have the right to pass any by-law they please, irrespective of any control whatever—that because the Indians have the franchise, they ought to be allowed to pass any legislation they please without any control.

Mr. LAURIER. The question is whether these Indians shall have the right to pass by-laws which the statute gives them the power to pass, untrammelled by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. The law provides that certain powers shall be exercised by the councils of the Indians. Is there any reason why they should not have the power of any municipal council, and that their by-laws should not become valid by the mere fact that they have been passed by the council? Any other council can pass by-laws which cannot be affected one way or the other by the interference of the Government. The argument which is used is that if these men are allowed to vote in national affairs, *a fortiori* they should have the right to vote on their own local affairs. Certainly, if they have the right to pass judgment as to who shall be the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, they should have the power to decide who shall be the toll-keeper on their own reserve. If they can vote as to who shall be Prime Minister, they should have the power to appoint a constable. It seems to me if they have the greater power, they should have the lesser power also. The Indians have reason to believe that their affairs have been mismanaged by the Department, and that they would manage them better themselves. Whenever the Department have interfered with the by-laws of these Indians, the Department has been in the wrong, and a striking instance of the mismanagement of the Department is the manner in which the money of the Indians has been squandered by the Department in surveying the reserve. If they are so advanced in the opinion of the Government that they can exercise proper discrimination and judgment in relation to their own affairs, it seems to me, as a matter of sequence, they should be allowed to manage their own business without the interference of the Government, and that is the object of the Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Justice surely does not mean to say that the by-laws and regulations passed by municipal councils require the assent of the Crown?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was speaking of legislative assemblies and not of municipalities. The argument of the hon. gentleman was that the people who exercise the franchise should be allowed to legislate without control, and I said that did not exist with regard to legislative assemblies, in respect to which the people of the Province exercise the franchise, but the legislation of which is subject to the assent of the Crown.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one point to which the Government has not replied, and that is with regard to the expenses of this survey. It is most singular to me that a piece of land containing only 12,000 acres should cost for its survey $1.80 an acre, or $22,000. When we see the money of the Indians squandered in this way, it is high time they should be permitted to conduct their own affairs. In looking over the expenditure in connection with Indian affairs, it seems to me that there is an enormous amount spent in connection with that

service, not only in Quebec but in the North-West Territories. A few days ago, before the Public Accounts Committee, during an investigation into the travelling expenses of agents in the North-West, we found that some men were allowed to draw under this head $2,500 to $2,800 a year, besides their salaries. That is undoubtedly an abuse, and this survey appears to me to be in keeping with such extravagance and mismanagement.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This question has already been brought up on the motion of the hon. member for Laprairie, and I told the hon. gentleman I was preparing a copy of the plan, which he insisted on having, and which will cost between $300 and $400; and I said further, I would bring down all the papers in that connection. The survey was a most intricate one. Whether it was necessary it should be made so intricate I am not aware. The plan is some eight or ten feet in length and five or six feet in breadth, and shows not only the boundaries of the reserve, but every field and building on it. This work was done at the request of the Indians, for the purpose of seeing what amount of land belonged to each Indian family on the reserve. It was then determined to sub-divide the reserve into rectangular sections, in order that the Indians might be allowed to locate on these different sections; and it was understood that if any Indians were disturbed in their own holdings, they would be compensated for their improvements. The survey took some time to make and cost a good deal of money. It was done at the request of the Indians, and is not yet completed.

Mr. LISTER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1889.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 126) respecting marriage with a deceased wife's sister.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE LATE MR. PERLEY, M.P.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, it is my painful duty to announce the sudden death of one of our hon. colleagues, Mr. Perley, the senior member for the city of Ottawa. I believe that every member of this House who has known him will join me in feelings of deep regret at hearing this announcement. Mr. Perley was a man of sterling qualities. The fact that he attained the position which he held in this House until his death, shows what he was. Coming from the United States, where he had been a citizen, he was at first a stranger here, without the advantages of a British-born subject, but by his sterling qualities he soon acquired a position of confidence and trust among those who knew him in this city. He was one of a class of whom we hope to see many more coming to this country from the United States, who have sought their fortunes here, and who have, by honest industry and ability, acquired positions here, and have identified themselves with Canada and become, in every sense of the word, Canadians. In his commercial pursuits he was singularly successful. By patient industry, by enterprise, by attention to his business, and by the confidence that he had earned through a uniform life of honesty and integrity, he rose, as he deserved to rise, high in the estimation of the people in this vicinity, and among all who knew him. That confidence enabled him, I am happy to say, for the sake of his family, to acquire a competence which provides for them, I believe, in all comfort. The character that he had won, socially and commercially in business, was so high, that he was invited by those whose political opinions accorded with his to become their representative in this House. The hon. members of this House all know his demeanor in it. In no way obtrusive, in no way attempting to take a position which he felt, perhaps, that in his inexperiences he ought not to claim; he was always a careful, a thoughtful, and a conscientious member of Parliament. I can say no more, and desire to say no more, with respect to him. You have all known him; you have all seen him; and I believe all the members of the House who have come in contact with him must have appreciated his good qualities; even those, if there are any in this House, who did not come into contact with him socially, must have observed the uniform propriety of his demeanor, and must have observed, also, that he worthily represented the important constituency which had selected him as their representative.

Mr. LAURIER. I heartily endorse every word the right hon. gentleman has spoken, in regard to our late colleague. I can well understand the feeling with which the Prime Minister has spoken of one, who was not only a faithful follower, but, as I understand, a faithful friend. The tribute which the right hon. gentleman has paid to our colleague, is fully deserved in every way. Mr. Perley was endowed with all the good qualities, which the right hon. gentleman has claimed for him. Those who were opposed to him politically, will, I am sure, be most ready to pay him an equal tribute to that which has been paid to him by his leader. As the First Minister has said, Mr. Perley was unobtrusive in his manner; he was a party man, and an upholder of the principles of his party, but, at the same time, he had the rare gift, of never making himself offensive to any one. He was endowed, also, with many business qualities; but, and this is not so well known, except to his friends, he was, also, endowed with great social qualities, and many of us have pleasant remembrance of visits to his house, thanks to his personal qualities and to the qualities of the amiable woman who was his companion in life, one of the most

charming women to be found in the capital. Every one will agree with the statement made by the First Minister, and every member, on both sides of the House, will join with his family in their sorrow and bereavement.

EASTER RECESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are reached, I desire to call the attention of the House to the question of the Easter adjournment. There is a little difference of opinion on the question of adjournment. From memorandum given me I find as follows:—In favor of adjournment from Wednesday night to Tuesday, 38; from Wednesday to Wednesday, 5; Thursday to Monday, 20; Thursday to Tuesday, 45; Thursday to Wednesday following, 1; Thursday to Friday following, 1. The largest expression of opinion is from Thursday to Tuesday, 45; but that in favor of an adjournment from Wednesday to Tuesday, closely approaches it, 38 votes. So it is very difficult to come to a conclusion. As I said yesterday, the Government are quite in the hands of the House. They are obliged to be here, and they will have no holiday, whatever holiday other hon. members will enjoy. The decision, so far as the Government can decide the question, will depend very much on the debate on the tariff. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will allow that it would be very unfortunate if we should discuss the tariff to-day, to-morrow, and Thursday, and adjourn with the debate unfinished, to recommence after Easter recess. Hon. gentlemen who have been long in Parliament know that when an important subject is being discussed, no matter how long, and an adjournment then takes place, the whole debate is opened *de novo*, and the discussion goes on as if it had never been commenced. I would throw across the floor the suggestion that if we could make an arrangement by which the debate would close to-morrow night, in so far as the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is concerned, and we could have the Tariff Bill introduced, and read the first time, with the understanding that the discussion would go on with the Speaker in the Chair, just as if we were in committee, we would make very considerable progress and greatly shorten the Session. If that were agreed upon, I, personally—and I have no doubt my colleagues would agree with me—would agree to an adjournment to-morrow night, so that hon. members leaving to-morrow night would spend Good Friday with their families, at all events those who are within a reasonable distance of Ottawa. Many hon. members like to be with their families and enter into their religious duties on Good Friday. If we adjourn on Thursday, they are travelling on the day when they would prefer to be with their families and attending to their religious ordinances in the bosom of their families. So my proposition would be this: If we could come to an arrangement by which the debate on the amendment would be closed to-morrow night, and the Tariff Bill introduced, and read the first time, with the understanding that the whole discussion could go on as if we were in committee, I think we would make great progress and shorten the Session.

Mr. LAURIER. Whatever day may be selected for the adjournment, whether to-morrow or the day afterwards, it is difficult to see in advance whether the debate will close or not. It is impossible to lay down, in advance, any rule as to the course the debate will take. For my part, I am very much disposed to favor the closing of the general debate before the adjournment; but the right hon. gentleman must remember that we are afterwards to take the resolutions into consideration. They are numerous and important, and will, no doubt, require a good deal of discussion by themselves, and it will be impossible to proceed with that discussion before recess. The only point we can settle is whether we can close the general debate on the amendment to-morrow or the day afterwards, but it is impossible to say in advance, and I would not even express any opinion at this moment without hearing from other members of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very much afraid, judging from what has been said to me by hon. members on this side of the House—of course for the other side I cannot speak—that there can be no possibility of closing to-morrow night; that, in any case, Thursday night will be the earliest time that can be fixed for the closing of the debate. But I will make this suggestion to the First Minister and to the Finance Minister. I understand the First Minister to say that his proposition was that the Bill founded on the resolutions, should be introduced, and we should go into committee on it. Looking at the very much larger number of changes which are being made than I had anticipated from the speech of the Finance Minister, and looking at the possibility, to say the least of it, that he may find it necessary to modify some of those propositions, I would say to the First Minister that time would be saved by our treating those resolutions *pro formâ*, and taking them back into committee and having a discussion there. The First Minister will understand that if it is required to modify these resolutions, there will have to be new motions in committee, and the rest of it. I doubt whether time will be saved. The safest plan will be, to take all the resolutions and have a searching discussion in committee upon them.

Mr. BLAKE. After the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that he does not think the principal debate can close until Thursday, I think the question is settled. I agree with the First Minister that the present debate should be disposed of before the adjournment, and as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is of opinion, from what he has learned, that the debate cannot be closed on Wednesday, I do not see how an adjournment can take place until Thursday. Even if it were possible, I would, as a private member, very strongly object to the course which the First Minister suggests, namely, that we should so expedite matters as to pass the whole tariff of this country through all the preliminary stages, introduce the Bill, pass it, give the second reading and get it into committee. These various stages are for a purpose; they are for the purpose of avoiding too rapid action, for the purpose of giving time for consideration, and for the purpose of giving an opportunity for representations being made from various persons all over this broad country with reference to the proposed changes, in order that no mistakes may be made.

What the hon. gentleman proposes is that we shall proceed, first of all, and forthwith, to almost the last stage. Now, Sir, the regulations of the House give us a Committee of the Whole upon these resolutions, which, for the moment, we waive in order to afford the hon. gentleman the convenience of putting them in force, provisionally, at the Customs houses at once. That opportunity we should have at this stage, of a full and free discussion, and on the concurrence and on the stages of the Bill we shall have opportunities for presenting our views formally by motion. It is likely, and I hope it will be the case, that there will be upon the Bill itself very little discussion, but there may be discussion, and the opportunity should be afforded for it. Certain considerations may be brought to our attention before the later stage, and in the interval, which may make it very important that we should bring them forward. It is to be remembered that even the Government itself, when it frames these tariff changes, acts under very considerable difficulty. It is utterly impossible for the Government to obtain at first that thorough and full advice on these subjects which it is important that it should obtain. It cannot indicate its intentions on these matters beforehand, without the grossest frauds being perpetrated at the Customs houses, or without its intentions being made use of for private purposes. Therefore, those who are framing the tariff require a certain interval after their proposition is elaborated, just as much as the House and the country does, to consider the various bearings of this proposition. I feel now, as I have always felt that it would be a monstrous thing to impute serious incapacity or neglect to a Finance Minister, who, bringing down propositions for a change under these difficulties, should say frankly at a subsequent date different views were presented to me after I brought down those resolutions which do modify my opinion upon them. My view is, that the difficulties of the case necessarily require that that degree of elasticity should be readily accorded, without comment or observation, to the Finance Minister, so that he, like the rest of us, may have an opportunity, in a country which stretches 3,000 miles across, to get at public opinion upon this subject. Therefore, without the slightest desire to protract the Session, I must protest against what, I think, are the evil and dangerous consequences of hurrying through all the preliminary stages, and at a very early date getting towards the final stages, in a matter which it really does require time and consideration and general information to properly mature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I may be allowed to say a word again, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the tariff ought not to be hurried through, and I quite agree with him, also, that it would be the duty of the Minister of Finance, and of the Government, to make alterations, if, during the course of discussion, he or they saw occasion to vary the propositions originally made. No doubt the House will receive such modifications, with the reasons for them, in the spirit in which they will be offered. We must understand, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition I made was for the purpose, if possible, to meet the varying views of the hon. members in the House as to the length of the recess. I was struck with the remark made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I would like much, if it could be done without any undue delay to the public business, that the House should adjourn on Wednesday, if we do not adjourn on the original proposition from Thursday until Monday, for the reason I have given already. Suppose these hon. members on both sides, who feel it their duty to debate this subject, would agree to it, I think it would be well that we should come to the conclusion to end the debate on the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to-morrow night, and then that we would adjourn over, either until Monday or Tuesday; Tuesday, I think, would be the better, because the majority of members will not be back until that day, as they will not wish to travel on Sunday, in order to be here on Monday. Then we can go back into committee again.

Mr, BLAKE. Yes; re-commit the resolutions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Re-commit the resolutions, and discuss the whole of them as fully as in the inception of the proposition of these resolutions. If that were understood, and I have no doubt, unless any hon. member shall object to it now, we may consider it arranged, as these arrangements are made across the floor, that a vote should be taken on the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to-morrow night, then we could adjourn until the following Tuesday, and the House can go into committee again on the resolutions.

Mr. MITCHELL. I, of course, pay very great respect to anything that the right hon. gentleman says——

Mr. WALDIE. Louder.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know there is great anxiety to hear me, and I do not think I have often to be charged with speaking in too low a tone. As I said, I have the greatest respect for the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, and for his desire to advance the business of the country, but I think the course he now suggests does not recommend itself to the general sense of the House. It does not recommend itself to me, at all events. In discussing so important a question as the tariff, we should not limit or restrict ourselves in any particular to anything but the fullest discussion of a matter which so deeply interests the public at large. No harm can be done by a lengthened discussion on so important a question as the tariff of the country, and particularly so, where these tariff changes involve very serious consequences to certain classes of the community and affect almost every man of that community, both in city and country. I have very great objections to the tariff as proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance, because it affects very peculiarly the people I have the honor to represent, and it affects a class of the community who are not so generally represented here as the wealthier and richer classes—I mean the poor people of the country, the laboring men, and the producers who employ the laboring men. I, for one, have the very greatest respect for the opinion of my hon. friend who leads this important body of men on this side of the House (Mr. Laurier), and for my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and my hon. friend from

West Durham (Mr. Blake), and many of the suggestions they make are, no doubt, very good. I shall only be too happy to aid them and the Ministry in getting a full and free discussion on this matter, but I do protest against any arrangement being made which will affect the freest and fullest discussion on such important questions affecting the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend does not see that the tariff can only be discussed in the committee.

Mr. FLYNN. I rise to protest against any lengthened adjournment at Easter, and I cannot see why there should be a longer adjournment this year than there was last. We are here now going on three months, and if we should have a short adjournment any Session it should be this one. We had to adjourn for a holiday a fortnight ago, and it was understood, if a certain number of days were taken then there would be the shortest possible adjournment at Easter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FLYNN. That was the proposition that was made to me, and on this understanding I did not oppose the adjournment then. I find several hon. gentleman are, as the Prime Minister says, anxious to worship at Easter in the bosom of their families. Well, if that be the case there are plenty of facilities for them to worship here, if they choose to worship. There are plenty of churches for them here; but what about the minority who object to this adjournment? What of the members from British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton? Are they not entitled to some consideration? Those gentlemen who want to have a long adjournment want it at the expense of those who remain. I question their right of compelling me to put my hand in my pocket to pay my expenses here while they are away. I care not how small the minority is; I care not if there were only two, but there are forty, and it is not fair to impose this upon us. We had a long adjournment at the time of the last holiday, with the understanding that we should have a short one at Easter. I am willing that there should be an adjournment from Thursday evening to Tuesday at 3 o'clock—that is as long an adjournment as we had last year; but I think any longer adjournment would be unfair to those of us who should be compelled to remain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, I suppose my hon. friend who has just spoken expresses the feeling of the House, and I give notice that I will move on Thursday, that when the House adjourns on that day, it shall stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, for second reading of Resolutions reported from Committee on Ways and Means, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. McMULLEN. In rising to continue the debate on the Budget, which has been so ably conducted on both sides of the House, I feel that I am, perhaps, assuming a serious responsibility in undertaking to follow the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) dealt very fully with the statement presented to this House by the hon. Finance Minister. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) followed with a very exhaustive speech dealing largely with the different phases of the hon. Finance Minister's statements. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) also delivered a very able address, dealing with the whole question of protection as it affects the people of this Dominion. Under these circumstances, I should have considered myself quite justified in leaving the question to go before the electors of this country without offering another word, were it not that I represent a rural constituency, and one that is deeply interested in the fiscal policy which has prevailed in this country for the last ten years. Now, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister made one statement to which every member on this side of the House has taken exception so far. That statement was that the general condition of the business of the country is fairly satisfactory. I should be glad, indeed, if I were in a position to endorse that statement, but I am sorry, that my knowledge of the real condition of the people of the country will not permit me to do so. Had the hon. Finance Minister endeavored to gather from the people themselves a correct idea of the condition of the business of this country, I think he would not have ventured to place upon the records of this House a statement to that effect. If he had, for instance, consulted the bankers of the country, I think they would have told him, although, no doubt, they are always anxious to present the best possible side of the case to the public, that the experience of the banking institutions of this Dominion for the last year has not been fairly satisfactory. If he had consulted the wholesale trade, I think they would also have confessed to him, privately and confidently, that the wholesale trade of the country has not been in a healthy condition during the past year. If he had also consulted the retailers of the country—if he had even gone down to Sparks street, in this city, and had asked the business men from one end of this city to the other, their opinion of the general condition of business, I think they would have said to him: "We are not satisfied with the year's transactions, because they have not been as good as what we have experienced in years past." I think he would have received that answer everywhere. If he had also consulted the manufacturers of the country—a great many of them, I do not say all—they would also have stated to him, that the manufacturing business had not been as satisfactory, as it had been in some previous years. Then he might have consulted another larger class, to which he has paid very little attention in the last year; had he called a meeting of the farmers, I care not where—in the city of Toronto or in any other trade centre, or in any other portion of the Dominion—I venture to say, that they would have told him that their experiences during the year, had been of a very unsatisfactory kind. In view of the condition of all these classes, it has been a matter of surprise to me that the hon. Finance Minister should have made the statement to the House that the business of the country has been fairly satisfactory. I am not one of those who wish to cry blue ruin; I have no desire to say a word with regard to the general condition of business in this country, that would

tend in any way to injure the general trade of the country ; but when hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in making the statement to this House and the country, that the general trade of the country is in a healthy condition, it is our duty in the interest of those who are suffering financially, to present what we conceive to be the true condition of things throughout this country. There is another point to which I would call the hon. Finance Minister's attention. If he will examine the public records, I think he will find that there have been in the past year more business failures in Canada than in any other year for the last ten years. That certainly is not an evidence that the business of the country is in a satisfactory condition. I would also call his attention to the general condition of the business in the rural sections of the country and in towns that are largely dependent for their trade on the farming community. If he makes an investigation, he will find that in the rural districts there is a great deal of discontent and disappointment on the part of business men. Of course, being largely dependent on the farming community for their trade, as the resources of the farmers are curtailed the receipts of the retail merchants are reduced. I contend that if he had consulted that class, they would have told him very plainly that the affairs of this country are not in a satisfactory condition. Another statement of the Finance Minister was that this $36,500,000 collected from the people is a princely gift. It is wrong to call it a gift. If the hon. gentleman had called it an extortion, he would have given it its proper name. It is by far more money than should be collected from the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite, years ago, when on this side, shouted themselves hoarse in protestations against the hon. member for York (Mr. Mackenzie), because he had allowed the expenditure of the country to run over $22,500,000 ; but the moment they took office, they started increasing that amount from year to year, and it has gone on rapidly increasing, until to-day we, a population of only 5,000,000, are under an expenditure of $36,500,000. Now, this is not the only extortion to which our people are subject, because, in contributing that sum of money to the Treasury, they contribute, under the operations of our pernicious tariff, a corresponding amount which goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. The people are not only called upon to pay enormously towards the general revenue, but an enormous sum towards keeping up a number of manufacturers who have been in the past years reaping a very rich harvest in this country. I contend that the introduction of this protective system was an unfortunate event in the history of this country ; I contend that had we followed the system we formerly pursued from the time of Confederation up to 1878, although a few years of that period were not as prosperous as we would have wished them to be, our people would have been in a much better position to-day, for the true, the solid, the honest system whereby revenue should be exacted from the people, is a revenue tariff levied according to the necessities of the country. Any other tariff is a dishonest tariff. The Finance Minister, this year, has endeavored to give some little consideration to the farmers. During the last ten years this class has been in the position of the way-

faring man, who, travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among thieves. They have fallen among thieves and have been badly stripped during all that time ; but, to-day, the Political High Priest of the Dominion, the Finance Minister, who passed by on the other side during the last ten years and gave them no consideration, has, at the eleventh hour, drawn near and looked at their miserable condition. He does not, however, propose to take them out of that condition in which they have been and are being robbed of everything they have, but he says to them : I will give you license to rob some one else ; I will give you the privilege of adding one cent per pound to your pork and a little more to your beef. This is all the relief he is willing to give to the farmers, who are at present struggling with embarrassments and difficulties. The National Policy, inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite, is an unjust policy. Any tariff which unfairly weighs on the resources of any class of the community is an unjust tariff ; and in the framing of this tariff, as I will show later, the poorer classes have not received that consideration and attention to which they were entitled. The rich, those who are in a position to pay taxes, are not reached by the operations of this tariff as they should be. Look at England. There revenue is collected by means of the income tax largely, which reaches the people in proportion to their means and annual income. That is an honest way of levying taxes, as under it every man is called upon to pay proportionately to his ability, whereas our taxes are levied on the very opposite principle. There are many features of our National Policy which are very objectionable from the standpoint of the poorer man, and I contend it is a most pernicious law which imposes upon one man the necessity of contributing to the well-being of his neighbor without giving him a fair consideration for his earnings. No law should be placed upon our statutes which declares that one man shall, by the sweat of his brow, contribute to the well-being of his neighbor without receiving a proper and fair return for the money he contributes. Any such law is a dishonest law, and I contend that our tariff law operates in that way. Take a farmer who has three sons, and who makes of one a farmer, of another a lawyer, and of the third a doctor. Would that father be acting fairly towards his family if he put a clause in his will declaring that his son whom he made a farmer should contribute out of his means to the support of the lawyer and the doctor? I do not think any judicious, honest, conscientious, loving father would ever deal with one of his sons in that way. We are here to deal with the people of this country honestly, and if we continue in existence a statute which unfairly taxes one class of the community and compels them to contribute out of what they have earned by the sweat of their brow to the well-being of any other, we are upholding a law which is unjust by the decrees of God, and cannot be made just by the decrees of men. This so-called National Policy has three legs to stand upon, namely, deceit, treachery and fraud. When it was introduced, the First Minister was telegraphed from the Maritime Provinces as to what his intentions were, and he replied that he had no intention of increasing the duties, but only intended to readjust them. In this he was deceiving the people. Then he said to the farmers : I am going to give you a home

market for your products; there are many things you have which are now of little use to you, and I am going to give you a home market for your products. Has he done that? No; the promises he made to the farmers have never been fulfilled, and to-day they are beginning to realise that they were treacherously deceived. We have evidence of this in the resolutions which have been passed by the different farmers' institutes throughout the country. We never had in this country such a demoralising condition of the public expenditure as we have to-day. Up to the time of the introduction of the National Policy, hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House felt it was their duty to husband the resources of this Dominion, but, after the policy had been in force for a few years, hon. gentlemen opposite were so elated by the enormous amounts which were brought into the Treasury in 1885 and 1886—I believe in one year it brought to their coffers six millions, and in the other about eight millions of a surplus—they were so elated by the possession of these amounts of money taken from the pockets of the people that they began to be extravagant, and that extravagance has continued to the present time. When the manufacturers commenced to draw more largely from the resources of the people, and, as a result, the coffers of the Dominion did not receive the amount which had been expected, as the money went into the manufacturers' pockets in place of the Dominion Treasury, the Dominion Government commenced to borrow from the people through the Post Office Savings Banks, and then they commenced to borrow from England, until we have now a national debt of about $234,000,000. We have borrowed from the people about $40,000,000, and we have to pay interest amounting to about $10,250,000 annually. This is a very serious consideration for the people of this country, that they should be under the enormous drain of ten millions and a quarter a year in order to pay the interest on their national debt. I will now deal with a question which has not been dealt with, so far, in this debate, and that is, the increase of our duties by the then Finance Minister, Sir Charles Tupper, with the view of bringing about the production of pig iron and of all kinds of iron in this Dominion. At that time he pictured to us in glowing terms the results of the policy which he then introduced. He pictured our enormous resources in iron. He travelled from the Straits of Belle Isle to Vancouver to show us the value of our iron deposits. He told us that, by the adoption of the policy he was about to introduce, we would have enormous developments in a very short space of time. He stated that he believed there would be an influx of 200,000 miners and smelters, and that would give an additional home market to the farmers, besides enabling us to produce all the iron we required without importing any from abroad. He stated that we would have smelting furnaces at Kingston, Pembroke, Peterborough, Cobourg, Port Hope, Owen Sound, and all along the line to Vancouver; and he told us how our iron mountains would be honeycombed by miners and how the people would get rich in the development of this industry. What have we realised out of all these promises? He declared that the money was ready to be invested in these enterprises, and that nothing was wanting but the sanction of Parliament, and the assent of the Governor to that Bill, in order to have the best results of a National Policy realised. What has been the result? Have we produced any more pig iron during these three years than we did before? I will give you the imports for those three years. In 1887, we imported 46,295 tons; in 1888, 48,973 tons; and in 1889, 73,844 tons. In order to show the increase in the duty we paid on iron, I will give the entire volume of iron of all kinds imported during those three years, and also, for purposes of comparison, I will give the quantity imported in 1886. It is as follows:—

	Amount.	Duty.
1886.....	$8,000,400	$1,720,659
1887..... ..	9,746,667	2,168,392
1888.....	8,757,204	2,632,151
1889.....	9,680,967	2,950,890

In all these years, you will notice the large increase that took place each year in the amount of duty that was paid. In addition to this, we have imported steel rails free of duty to the extent of $2,544,995. In order to show the increase of duty which has been paid by the consumers of this country, I will give the amounts of pig iron we have imported and the duty paid upon it. In 1887, we imported 46,295 tons of pig iron, and paid a duty of $93,373. In 1888, we imported 48,973 tons, and paid a duty of $195,275, or, in other words, on about the same quantity of pig iron imported, we paid about $102,000 more duty. In 1889, we imported 73,844 tons, and paid a duty of $288,459.21. The third year after that tariff went into operation, we paid a little less than $200,000 more duty on the iron imported into this country than we did in 1887. You will notice that, instead of our imports decreasing, they have increased. During the time to which I have referred we have collected, in that way, from the consumers of the Dominion a total of $7,751,433. In the distressed condition of the farming community, I think I am justified in making a proposition to hon. gentlemen opposite. Four-fifths of this amount have been collected from the farmers of this Dominion, and the policy has failed in the object which the hon. gentleman had in view when it was introduced. No one occupying a responsible position can say that it has accomplished what was promised. Under these circumstances, I think it would be only fair that hon. gentlemen opposite should devote a considerable part of that money to giving a bounty to the large amount of produce and of stock which our farmers have to export to the United States, which is their only market. As I said before, they have collected $7,751,433. We exported last year to the United States 17,277 horses. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the Government of the United States are imposing an additional duty on horses. I would like to ask them under the circumstances—and the farmers of this country will require an answer from them—where are you going to get them a market for those horses? They have a right to look to the Government of this country to give them a market. Now, Sir, we have sent to the United States 9,934,501 bushels of barley, upon which we paid, in order to get it to their market, $993,450 in duty. We sent them 308,583 sheep, on which we paid a duty of $168,425 to get them across the border. We exported 82,308 tons of hay, on which we paid $164,616 to get it across the border. We exported to the United States 717,668 bushels of potatoes, on which we paid a duty of $107,650 to

get them over there. The farmers of this country have paid, during the last year, $1,856,897 in order to get their produce to market. Multiply that sum by three, and we have $5,570,671 paid by the agriculturists of this Dominion to find a market for their produce during three years. An unreasonable sum has been collected from them in point of duties, and I propose that the Government should contribute that $5,570,671 by offering a bounty equal to the amount of duty the farmers will have to pay for the next three years, until such time as the hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to find the farmers a better market. They know well that there is no other alternative, they must jump the fence that has been erected, and in order to enable them to do so, I think the Government of this country ought to go half way. We cannot possibly send these animals to Great Britain; they are not wanted there. There is no other country, that I know of, where we can send them in the meantime, and I contend that, in order at this time to help the farming community over the financial embarrassments with which they are surrounded, it is the bounden duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to grant them that relief, and I do not see how it can be granted in any better way than by offering the bounty I propose. Now, Sir, I say to the farmers, that it is absolutely necessary that they should combine in their own interest. I am glad to see that they are combining. I am glad to notice that farmers' institutes are being formed throughout this country, and I am glad to see the farmers taking an interest in these institutes. I am glad to notice that the political complexion of those who form these institutes is Reform as well as Conservative, and Conservative as well as Reform. I believe that if they combine, as they ought to do, in their own interest, and send their deputations to Ottawa to wait upon the Government, I am quite sure, from the experiences of the manufacturers in pressing their views upon the Government in their own interest, that the farmers will find that they will be listened to; I am satisfied the Government would have to give an ear to them, because they would realise that if they did not do so, the farmers would depose them from power, as they would be quite justified in doing so. Now, one may ask: Is there any precedent for carrying out the proposition I make? I contend that there is. We have been giving a bounty on pig iron for years; the producers of pig iron in this country have been receiving a bounty of $1.50 a ton, and I say that, when the Government have been paying a bounty on pig iron, it is just as reasonable and as just, yea, it is more so, that they should contribute to the well-being of the farmers in their present embarrassment by offering a bounty upon those things I have mentioned. We have also been giving a bounty upon fish. I ask in the name of all reason, is there anything improper or unjust in contributing to the well-being of the great class in this country known as the agriculturists, when we have year after year been contributing to the welfare of our fishermen by granting a bounty upon fish? I think this proposition is worthy of consideration by hon. gentlemen opposite. I contend that it has been an act of deception on the part of the Government by their policy to draw out of the pockets of the people of this Dominion the enormous sum I have mentioned in the way of duty, with the hope of producing iron in this country. The hon. gentleman who presented that statement to the House did it with all the evidences of sincerity and positiveness that used to characterise his utterances in this Chamber. Well, Sir, that hon. gentleman is no longer here to explain why he misled the House and the country. Why did he say that we might depend upon those promises being carried out? We have no person to answer that question. That hon. gentleman is now basking in all the gaieties and pleasures of London life, at a cost of $15,000 or $16,000 a year to the people of this country. That has been his reward for the deception and the treachery that he practised upon the people of this country when he introduced that policy. But the deception has not been confined to the High Commissioner; it has been practised by other prominent individuals in this Chamber. Why, Sir, not many years ago, when the members of this House were asked to consent to a loan of $30,000,000 to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway, we can well remember the glowing and prophetic utterances made by the First Minister and by Sir Leonard Tilley with regard to our North-West. On that occasion we can also remember the very glowing statements that were made by the present High Commissioner. Sir Leonard Tilley pointed out the probability of our having an export of wheat from the North-West, by the year 1890, of 59,000,000 bushels. Sir Charles Tupper went into a calculation that took this House by the ears for a moment. He said: Let us make a calculation. Supposing 200,000 farmers in the North-West cultivate 400,000 acres, and they grow forty bushels to the acre, we would be able to look forward to the shipment of 80,000,000 bushels of wheat out of that country by the year 1890. Well, have we realised these promises? Have all these prophetic utterances been fulfilled? No, Sir. Well might the prophets say, if there were any of them living in these days, that they are neither prophets, nor the sons of prophets. Every single utterance that they made, with regard to that question, has utterly failed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They promised us 640,000,000 bushels.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know it was a very large amount, but I do not sport so much cheek as the hon. gentleman who made the statement, else I would have said 640,000,000. Now, he stated to us at that time that, owing to the progress of the production of iron in the United States, there was nothing to hinder Canada from following in the same line. But we must remember that in the United States they have 60,000,000 of people and we have only 5,000,000. In the United States they had 37,000,000 of people before they commenced to produce iron to any extent. Their population rapidly increased, and the result was they had a demand for their products. How did they do it? In the United States they encouraged the production of iron by a bounty. I contend that if it is thought desirable, in the interests of this Dominion, that we should become great producers of iron, we should produce it by a bounty and not by a duty; for this simple reason I hold, if it is looked upon as a national necessity that we should become great producers of iron, the entire people should pay for it. It is unfair to put the responsibility of encouraging the production of iron in

Canada entirely upon the consumers of iron. Every man, however wealthy, would, if the bounty system were adopted, contribute to the development of the iron industry, the same as the poor man who handles his shovel and spade. That would be a proper system to adopt, rather than to encourage it by a duty which strikes directly at those who cannot very well afford to pay it. I now come to deal with a few of the changes in the tariff proposed by the Finance Minister, and I want to point out how unfairly they will operate on some of the people, while they will allow others to escape. Take, for example, cottons of all kinds used for summer wear. It is proposed to levy a duty of 2 cents per square yard and 15 per cent., which virtually means from 32 to 35 per cent. Next, it is proposed to impose a duty on drain pipe of 25 per cent. This pipe should be admitted into this country at as low a rate as possible, for nothing tends to improve the condition of our farms so much as underdrainage; but this duty is imposed for the purpose of giving a few manufacturers of drain pipe in this country an advantage over those who import the pipe. While a duty equivalent to from 32 to 35 per cent. is imposed upon cottons and denims, which are largely consumed by the poorer classes, the Finance Minister proposed to allow ostrich feathers to come in at 15 per cent. I fail to understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can justify such a discrimination. Again, 30 per cent. is to be charged on lamp glasses, which are used more particularly in poorer houses, and at the same time the hon. gentleman admits ornamented, figured and enamelled glass at 25 per cent. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can justify a tariff of that kind. Again, there is a duty of 30 per cent. on gloves. I contend that all gloves should not be charged at the same rate of duty. The finer class of kid gloves, sold at $1.50 and $2 a pair, should bear a higher duty than the Lisle and cotton gloves used by the poorer classes; but there is no distinction made. I contend that this is not a right principle. A change is also proposed in regard to felt hats. It is suggested to impose a specific duty of $1.50 per dozen. All specific duties are unjust, I care not in what way they are levied. When you levy a specific duty on a commodity, the finer class of goods does not pay its proportionate share of duty as compared with the lower class, and, accordingly, a specific duty of that kind is not fair. You charge $1.50 a dozen on felt hats and 20 per cent., or equal to 35 per cent. On hats and caps, the duty has been raised from 25 to 30 per cent., but, at the same time, ladies' hats and bonnets are only charged 25 per cent. Again, the duty on saddlers' hardware is placed at 35 per cent., while that on fire-arms is 20 per cent. Another change, which is an exceedingly unjust one, is the duty on strap hinges, 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent., which is virtually 45 per cent. These hangings are used altogether in the erection of farm buildings, and the imposition of such a duty is nothing short of gross injustice. Ground paints have been placed at 5 cents per pound and 25 per cent., or 45 per cent. They are used by farmers in the country, who desire to improve their buildings and houses and vehicles, and who do the work of painting themselves. It is unfair that an increase of that kind should be imposed upon paint largely used by them. Another change to which I object is this: Silver and German and nickel plated watch cases are 10 per cent., while a duty is imposed of 35 per cent. on tinware, japan, iron and galvanised ware. It is well known that japan ware is largely used by the farmers. I notice also shovel and spade blanks, iron or steel, cut to shape, $1 per dozen and 25 per cent., or at 45 per cent. The duty on clothing is changed to 10 cents per pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, or virtually 45 per cent. It is unfortunate that this duty of 10 cents a pound is placed on cloth, which, perhaps, costs not more than a dollar a yard, and which is imported for the purpose of making heavy winter coats for the laboring classes, while on the article used for black frock coats, which costs, perhaps, $4 or $5 a yard wholesale, the same duty of ten cents per pound is charged; and this, I contend, is unfair and unjust to the poorer classes. A specific duty is always unjust, because when it is imposed by the pound or the yard the quality of the article is never taken into consideration. The result is that the poorer classes, buying the cheaper quality, pay a higher rate of duty, while the richer classes, buying the best quality, pay a less rate of duty. While you charge upon cloth a tariff that virtually is 45 per cent. to the poor man, you admit Brussels carpet at 25 per cent., and the poorer classes do not use that luxurious commodity. I ask now, why is it that you admit Brussels carpet at 25 per cent. and charge 35 per cent. on the poor man's tinware, and 45 per cent. on his clothing? I say that is unfair. I will now call the attention of the House to some of the tariff charges that have not been altered by the Finance Minister. You admit silk at 30 per cent., while you charge the poor man 32½ per cent. on his cotton dress stuff. You admit German and nickel silver cutlery, which is not used by the poor at 25 per cent., and you charge on nails, tools and implements of iron, 35 per cent. You admit gold and silver jewellery at 20 per cent., while you charge on agricultural implements and trimmings for harness, 35 per cent.; you admit kid tan for ladies' shoes at 10 per cent., and you charge the poor man for his upper leather 20 per cent.; you admit kid gloves at 30 per cent., and you charge the poor man on his cotton batting 35 per cent.; you admit the finest quality of table cutlery for 25 per cent., and you charge the farmer for his harrows, mowing machines, spades, forks and other articles which he uses on his farm, a tariff of from 35 to 40 per cent. You admit linen canvas for ship sails at 5 per cent., and you charge for the canvas that is used for the bedding of the poor farmer, 25 per cent. Twine used by sailors you admit at 5 per cent., and you charge the farmer 25 per cent., for his binding twine. You admit silk hats for the city gents at 25 per cent., and you charge the poor man on the goods with which he wants to clothe his wife, 32½ per cent. You admit bamboo rods for fancy walking canes free, you admit strings for musical instruments free, you admit raw silk for manufacturing purposes free, and you charge the farmer 25 per cent. on his binding twine. I now wish to say a few words with regard to the cotton printing business. Some years ago we increased the duty for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of a printing business in this Dominion. I notice that we imported into this country last year, printed cotton to the value of $1,662,348, on which was paid

a duty by the people of 32½ per cent., amounting to $540,308.80. Deducting the amount that is now paid over and above what was paid in 1878, when the rate of duty was 22½ per cent., I find that the poor people of this country contributed, for the purpose of keeping alive one printing establishment in this Dominion, during the last year, $166,234.80. I know whereof I speak in this matter, because I have stood for about thirty years behind the counter, and I can say that enormous quantities of this particular class of goods are used by the poorer people. Let us now consider the article of sugar, which should be sold to the poor at the lowest possible price. We imported of sugar, last year, $5,857,993 worth, on which we paid in duty $3,675,724, or an average duty of 61¼ per cent. Of woollen goods we imported last year $10,414,963, on which a duty was paid of $2,963,937, or about 30 per cent. I contend, Sir, that it is soaking it into the poor classes of this Dominion pretty fiercely by the manner in which this duty is levied. We imported, last year, cotton wool waste to the amount of $3,835,516 free. I contend that this is unfair to the producers of coarse wool, to admit these things into the country free, because, if we are to have duties at all, they should be subjected to a duty, so that the farmer who grows wool may be protected. We admitted into the country, last year, hemp to the value of $1,201,999, and then the farmer was taxed 25 per cent. for his twines. Now, Sir, I will make a short allusion to the condition of the farmers as brought about by the opening up of the North-West Territories. We admit that the opening up of the North-West was a necessity, in order to develop this Dominion. We do not deny that; but we contend that it has caused a very serious drain upon the resources of the farmers of the older Provinces. It has tended largely to add to our debt, which will be a burden to the entire Dominion, in the first place, and it has drawn away a great many of those who otherwise would have remained in the older Provinces, to develop the undeveloped resources of these Provinces, and to add to the resources of the farmers there. I say it was unfair that these farmers should be asked to contribute so enormously by an annual revenue, towards the construction of a road that is virtually injuring them in place of doing them good. We admit that it was a necessity from a national standpoint, but we contend that it should not have been constructed in such a way as to compel the farmers of this country to pay such an enormous sum. Now, something has been said with regard to the mortgage indebtedness of the farm property in the several Provinces of this Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken very pointed exception to the statement presented by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have made some little enquiry myself, and I find that in one township of the county in which I live, having 70,000 acres, the registered mortgages amount to $640,340. It has been said by some hon. gentlemen that in some cases these mortgages have been paid off. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that some years ago an Act was passed in this House to do away with the consolidation of the interest with the principal in mortgages; and since that Act was passed nine-tenths of all the mortgage encumbrances have been put in such a shape that the interest is payable annually and the principal is payable at the end of the term. The people had got so fleeced under the operation of the consolidated system, that they made up their minds to get rid of it as soon as they could. In obtaining these figures I only took the mortgages last recorded, so that I am satisfied that they are under the mark rather than over it. At 6 per cent. that township would have to pay on that mortgage indebtedness $38,420.40 of interest annually. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have challenged the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford. All I would say in reply to that is this: The hon. member for South Oxford has thrown across the House a very fair and reasonable challenge. He has said that the records of this Province are open to hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they will vote a small sum in comparison with what they have squandered on the Franchise Act, and apply it to secure from the registrars a correct list of the recorded encumbrances on properties, they will then be in a position to see whether the hon. gentleman has exceeded the actual facts or not; and I would say to them, in the language of the sportsman: Either put up or shut up; you have no right to challenge the statement if you are not prepared to accept the terms he has proposed; until you do so, it is mere wind to challenge the hon. gentleman's statement, after he has gone to the trouble he has to get possession of the facts and present them to this House. I wish, also, to refer to the duty on flour. I dare say hon. gentlemen fancy they are pleasing the farmers of this country by imposing that duty, but I can tell them that in the changed conditions of milling in the country, the duty on flour is not an advantage, but an injury, for this simple reason: There is not a mill in this country that will receive a man's wheat and grind his grist as formerly. The custom is that a man takes his wheat to the mill and exchanges it for flour, so that the miller will give him the ordinary current price for his wheat, and will then turn around and sell him the flour with the 75 cents of duty added to the price. Under these circumstances the duty on flour is of no advantage to the farmer, but an injury. It would have been very much better, in my opinion, if the hon. gentleman had decided to reduce the duty on wheat to a point that would bring it to an equality with the flour. There is another point to which I would call the attention of this House. I am sure that everybody will agree that the United States is our market for horses; it is quite clear that if we had not sent them there, we could not have found a market for them. Last year, although subjected to a duty of 20 per cent., we sent 17,277 horses to the United States, while we sent to Great Britain only 164. I think it has been clearly shown that our market for sheep is in the United States; we sent 307,775 sheep and lambs there last year. Hon. gentlemen opposite insist that if we entered into commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, Canada would fairly flood the United States with sheep and horses. To dispose of that statement, one has only to draw the attention of the House and the country to the enormous consumption of these animals in the United States. Horses are largely used in the cities for street cars and other purposes, and sheep and lambs are in great demand in the large cities. The city of New York alone consumes over 2,000,000 lambs in

he year; and when you consider that we sent to the United States last year only about one-fifth of the quantity consumed in the city of New York alone, you will see how impossible it is for any man who studies the fact to make the assertion that if we had unrestricted reciprocity we should be likely to flood the United States with sheep. The United States is also the market for our eggs. It has been clearly shown by our experience during the last few years that there is no other country to which we can send them. I do not know what may be the motive of the United States Congress in putting a duty on eggs; but there is a Canadian duty imposed on egg boxes, which, I think, is exceedingly objectionable. An American cannot come to Canada and bring his egg boxes with him in order to fill them with eggs and take them back to the States without paying a duty on the boxes. When the United States were willing to take all our eggs without imposing any duty on them whatever, I think it was a small and shabby piece of business, simply for the purpose of promoting the production of eggs boxes in Canada, to impose 25 per cent. on American egg boxes, when they admitted our eggs free. I believe it is the existence of pernicious exactions such as this, that has brought about the condition of things we see in the United States to-day. Instead of treating them with courtesy, we have annoyed and worried and badgered them with our duties on egg boxes and fruit baskets and other little things, in a way that is unworthy of one nation to treat another. We know that Great Britain is our market for fat cattle, for butter and for cheese, and also, I am glad to say, it is becoming a largely increasing outlet for our export of fat sheep. But, in the face of all this, our farmers must not confine themselves to the production simply of these commodities. Mixed farming is the only farming which will pay in this Dominion, judging from the experience of the past, and if our farmers do not resort to that they will be sure to suffer. In considering this whole question, having regard to our relations with the United States, had hon. gentlemen opposite, before they decided to increase the duties on commodities coming in from that country, given weight, fairly and justly, to the whole circumstances and history of the case, they would have been more prudent and cautious than they have been. When we consider that we have unrestricted liberty to send everything to Great Britain, while we have a tariff against us of virtually 20 per cent. on our exports to the United States, it is most humiliating to us to find, by the Trade Returns of last year, that we exported to the United States $38,490,571 worth, while we exported to Great Britain but $38,088,051 worth, and that we imported from the United States to the extent of $50,537,440, and from Great Britain $42,317,389. Virtually, we exported more to the United States than to Great Britain, and also imported more. In view of that fact, and in view of our close proximity to that great nation of 60,000,000—although I am not prepared to say that they have displayed in all their transactions with us that generosity and high spirit of honor we were entitled to expect from our powerful neighbors—it does not suit us to deal with them in a scanty, illiberal spirit. In this connection I think it my duty to point out the necessity of our having the power to make our own treaties with foreign nations. Our experience with the United States for a number of years past has shown most clearly that Canada should ask to have conferred upon her the right to send her own agent to Washington, and the right to negotiate her own treaties. Did we enjoy that right we would have avoided a great deal of the bitterness which, I am sorry to say, exists in the minds of many people towards us, arising from the fact that we are a dependency of Great Britain. Nothing gave me more pleasure, on a former occasion in this House, than voting for the resolution introduced by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in which it was declared that we should have the right to exercise this power freely; and until such time as we secure from Great Britain that right, I do not think that we will have the trade relations with the Americans which otherwise we would be able to secure. I was sorry, Sir, to hear the President of the Council declare that even if it were in our power to go back to the old condition of things, and have reciprocity in natural products, it would not be advisable to do so. But I was glad to hear another prominent member of this House, and, I think, a member of the Government, state that he did not consider himself bound by that expression of opinion, and that he held the contrary view. I think it is of the highest importance that we should bring these people to understand that we are willing to enter into the freest trade relations with them; and if they have passed the resolution, as I believe they have, in Washington, declaring their willingness to instruct the President, at any moment our Government are willing to enter into negotiations to that effect, to appoint a deputation or a committee to meet at Washington a similar deputation from this Government, in order to discuss this whole question, it would be a suicidal policy on the part of our Government to decline to accept a proposition of that kind. The developments which have taken place in India ought to make it clear to the mind of every man in this House that we are not likely to be successful in our attempts to compete with the people of India in the British market, and will, therefore, have to seek consumers on this continent for a very large amount of our products. When we consider the enormous volume of wheat produced in India, and when we regard the developments that are taking place in that country with the view of bringing its commodities to England, we cannot fairly look forward, with any reasonable degree of hope, to our being able to maintain in the British market the position we have there enjoyed for some years past. It is quite clear that the English people, owing to the policy of the United States—a policy which, in our humble way, we are imitating—in shutting out English manufacturers, feel driven to the necessity of seeking other outlets for their goods, and, consequently, are expending vast sums of money in developing India in the matter of railways, canals and other public works, their expenditure so far amounting to over £9,000,000. It is, therefore, quite clear that, in the future, we will not find in England the market for our produce we have hitherto enjoyed. As a result of that, I contend we will have to seek a market upon our own continent instead of in England, for a large amount of the produce we are now exporting. It is another unfortunate fact that

our trade with England, instead of increasing, has diminished in the last few years. If we divide the fifteen years which have elapsed since 1873 into three periods of five years each, and examine the trade aggregates of each period, two things are at once made manifest—first, that the National Policy, introduced in 1879, has injured British trade; secondly, that instead of helping British at the expense of American trade, it has had a directly opposite effect. From 1873 to 1877, both inclusive, our gross trade with Britain amounted to $478,000,000; in the second period, from 1878 to 1882, it amounted to $424,000,000; in the third period, from 1883 to 1887, it amounted to $441,000,000. On the other hand, while our trade with the States from 1873 to 1877 amounted to $415,000,000, and to $377,000,000 in the second period, it rose in the last period under notice to $438,000,000. That is to say, our trade with the mother country from 1883 to 1887 was $36,000,000 less than the trade from 1873 to 1877, whilst our trade with the States was greater by $23,000,000 in the former than in the latter period. A further examination will show that British exports to us have been seriously affected, the aggregate from 1873 to 1877 having been $272,000,000, as compared with only $222,000,000 between 1883 and 1887. American exports to Canada have, however, held their own. From 1873 to 1877 they amounted to $249,000,000, while from 1883 to 1887 they aggregated $244,000,000. Striking as they are, it is doubtful if these figures show the whole amount of our trade with the States of late years, for since 1879 a large smuggling trade has been done from the States into Canada. It is also evident from the British official figures for the half-year closing on June 30, that our trade with Britain has not yet reached the bottom rung. From those returns it appears that, as compared with the corresponding half-year in 1887, British exports to Canada have declined by £490,000, or over $2,400,000; while British imports from Canada have fallen off to the extent of £180,000, or about $900,000; showing for the six months a total decline of $3,300,000. It is quite clear from those figures that our trade with the mother country has not been growing, while our trade with the United States has been growing. Another point is, that it is clear that we are going to be subjected to an enormous annual expenditure in order to protect ourselves against smuggling. As the price of goods goes down in the United States and increases here, the result will be that an enormous amount of smuggling will be carried on. There is a large amount of smuggling now along the frontier. I remember the time when the smuggling was all from Canada into the United States, but then goods were dearer there than they were here, and that was not under the present policy of the Government. Since the establishment of the National Policy, goods have continually been going up in price in Canada, while the price in the United States has been going down. In one establishment in Buffalo with which I have some acquaintance, it is a very common thing for Canadians to go across, and to go a considerable distance, to buy goods, and those goods are smuggled across into Canada. I notice that the Minister of Customs has asked for an increased staff of preventive officers. I look forward with very grave apprehension to this country having to protect a frontier of 3,000 miles in length, with a population of 5,000,000 people, in order to keep out the goods of a country with 65,000,000 people. That of itself is, to my mind, a reason why a closer and an unrestricted relation in trade should exist between us and the people to the south. In the United States recently, for example, they have taken off the duties on cigars and tobacco. I should like to know how the Minister of Inland Revenue expects to protect this long frontier against the importation of those articles. I desire to show that our relations with the United States are a necessity. If we had closer relations with them, the material benefits of unrestricted reciprocity would be very great. Take the case of the farmer, for instance. He knows very well, that unrestricted reciprocity would mean money in his pocket every year—money saved by buying in the cheapest market, and money gained by selling in the dearest. First, look at some of the articles which he buys. We imported last year from the United States baking powder to the value of $91,786, on which the duty paid was $19,502. We imported from the United States books to the value of $418,095, on which $62,725 duty was paid. Of cotton goods we imported from the States over $700,000 worth, on which over $200,000 duty was paid. Of proprietary medicines, which are very largely used by farmers, we imported from the United States $100,000 worth, on which $25,000 duty was paid. Of lamp shades and lamp chimneys we imported $170,000 worth; duty $51,000. We imported $526,000 worth of hats, caps and bonnets from the same country, and paid $137,000 duty thereon. Of house-furnishing hardware we imported $2,741,000, and paid $82,000 duty. We imported sewing machines to the value of $117,000, and paid $39,000 duty on them; boots and shoes $164,000, duty $41,000; harness and saddlery $21,092, duty $7,361; floor oilcloth $15,000, duty $5,700; seeds $239,700, duty $35,900; sugar $719,000, duty $459,000. Let us now look at some of the things the farmer has to sell. According to Mr. Blue's report for 1887, we sold to the United States in the year ending June 30, 1887, 18,225 horses, at a price of $2,214,318. Had it not been for the American duty of 20 per cent., the returns would have been some $400,000 more. We sold them, also, 45,765 horned cattle, value $887,756; and 363,046 sheep, value $974,482. I will not detain the House by reading all these items, because it must be quite evident to any one who takes our returns as they are furnished to this House, that it is useless to attempt to shut out our people from obtaining what is absolutely necessary to them from another country. Now, I know the argument that is usually used with regard to the results that would follow if we entered into unrestricted reciprocity with the United States—it is said that our manufacturers would be ruined. Well, if you take up our last census and look over the different classes of this country, I think every man will come to the conclusion that a policy that is virtually laying hold of a considerable percentage of the people of this Dominion and placing them in an advantageous position, while it reduces the others to a disadvantageous position, is a most suicidal policy. We are going very soon to have a new census, and I

earnestly hope that it will be taken in such a way as will enable us to form an opinion as to how this tariff affects the different classes. Now, there is another thing. I am sure that every man who is unbiassed in his own mind, will not deny that we must have the American market for our surplus products. It has been stated by Senator Cullom in the United States :

"That that market is worth to the American farmer, $3,330,000,000 a year? They are fond of telling the Canadian farmer that his best market is to be sought in Great Britain, and not in the United States. Can they break the force of the argument that England is going, in the future, to draw almost her entire supply of wheat from India, where labor is cheap, rather than from the United States (or Canada), where labor is highly paid."

Now, I think it is quite clear, and must be patent to every unbiassed mind, that it is an absolute necessity for us to have liberty of trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. In olden times, it was said that it was the privilege of kings to sweat the people. It appears to me that in Canada, the Government of the day have decided that it is their privilege to sweat the farmers of this Dominion, and they have been doing so for the last ten years. It has become a matter of great necessity that our Government should devote, themselves earnestly and honestly to the task of taking the farmers of this country out of the financial embarrassments that have overtaken them, and of doing something to assist them, because, I am satisfied, in my own mind, that if the condition of things which we are now in should continue, before long we will be in the most deplorable condition that has ever been witnessed since Canada became a people. Our *per capita* debt, at this moment, has reached $60 per head, while across the border they have only a debt of $25 per head. I stated to this House some time ago, with regard to the increase of our indebtedness, that the Government had increased our responsibilities by a million a month. I am quite satisfied in my own mind that it will be found upon investigation that they have increased the responsibilities of the people of this country by a full million a month. I speak with authority when I say that there is a feeling in this country that this thing cannot go on much longer. When we consider the amount of money we have borrowed and spent in this country for the last number of years, the amount that has been borrowed by mortgage associations and loaned to people for the last number of years, it will be seen that our borrowing capacity is about used up, and we cannot expect to go on for the next ten or fifteen years and borrow and spend as we have been doing in the past. Where has all this money gone to? Where is the enormous amount of money spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway and other roads? Look at the enormous and extravagant expenditure in connection with the enlargement of canals, in connection with the construction of railways, in connection with the subsidising of lines in every direction where the Government could possibly spend money that would be of any use to the Tory party. The Government has spent money most shamefully in every direction, and, as a result, we have arrived at the present unfortunate condition of things in this country. I say that, in looking over the whole case, and regarding the future from this standpoint, it seems to me to be fraught with the gravest dangers, and it is my honest conviction that unless an agreement is come to by both parties on both sides of this House to go to work systematically and determinedly to cut down the annual expenditure and bring it within some reasonable limit, doing away with all extravagance on the public works, railways and matters of that kind, the future of this country is going to be such that the people will positively be enslaved, and they will find themselves in such an embarrassed condition financially that they will not get over it for many years to come. The experience in the United States has been somewhat similar to our own. I have before me a short recital of a speech delivered by a member of the United States Senate with regard to the unfortunate condition of the farming community under the operation of a policy of protection. The speech was delivered by Senator Voorhees, and it was delivered at Washington, March 19, of this year :

"The resolution offered by Senator Voorhees, as to the agricultural depression, was taken up, and Senator Voorhees addressed the Senate in relation to it. He spoke of the deep, strong current of anxiety, discontent and alarm prevailing in the farming communities, and said he proposed to aid them in the enquiry as to the causes of the existing depression.

"It was now nearly thirty years since the close of a terrible war had given to unhallowed avarice an opportunity to prey upon the self-sacrificing patriots of the country such as had never before been presented to the passions of vice. The measures then resorted to for the taxation of one class of citizens and for the enrichment of another class had been the legislation by which the burden of the public debt had been doubled and a high protective tariff established. He characterised the protective tariff as a curse and not a blessing. He was dealing not with a theory, but with a condition which even a blind man could look at and draw from it an unerring conclusion. The farmers of the United States to-day did not receive, on an average, more than 10 cents a bushel for their corn, 50 cents for their wheat, and from 2 to 3 cents a pound for their hogs.

"The time would come, at no distant day, when the farmer would look on the proposition to tax him and his wife and children for the protection and benefit of other people besides himself, as he would look on a law of Congress to establish the army worm and weevil in his wheat, to infest his cattle with murrain and his hogs with cholera. Every pretence of a home market for the farmer was a fraud, and every pretence of taxing wheat and oats and potatoes for his benefit was a cheat and sham. It was a notorious and self-evident truth that the tariff as it now stood increased the farmer's expense account from 35 to 100 per cent. on every implement of industry with which he toiled, and last year binding twine had been enhanced to 18 cents a pound by the tariff and twine trust. He did not believe that the hands of the farmer would hold a Republican ticket at the next presidential election. He declared that not only had there been no increase in the value of land for the last quarter of a century, but there had been an absolute loss of 33 per cent. If the improved farm lands of the United States were put to sale to-day, under the most favorable circumstances, they would not, he said, on a general average, realise more than two-thirds of what their value had been twenty-five years ago. The farms of the State of Ohio were now under mortgage to the amount of $300,000,000. In the State of Illinois things were no better, the mortgages in that State amounting to $402,000,000.

"Twenty-three per cent. of the whole face of the State of Illinois was under mortgage. The State of Michigan was still worse. Forty-seven per cent. of the whole surface of that State was under mortgage. In the States of Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska and the whole North-West, from 20 to 50 per cent. of the farm lands were under mortgage at such rates of interest as the farmers could never pay out of their crops, to say nothing of the principal. The farmers were thus brought face to face with the loss of their homes, with ruin, and hundreds of thousands of them were standing in that attitude at the present day and hour. Nor were the farmers of New England different in that respect from those of the Western States. There was the same decadence in Vermont and New Hampshire, where there was a movement to re-colonise them with Scandinavian immigrants, and where farm lands could be purchased

at from $1 to $2 an acre. In the face of such appalling facts who, he asked, would eulogise the workings and results of a system of tariff protection which had, for a continuous term of twenty-eight years, accomplished nothing save the concentration and amassment of wealth in the hands of a few protected people. He went on to speak of the recent Carnegie banquet in Washington, reading some of the newspaper headlines—such as 'Gorgeous dinner that outrivalled an ancient Roman feast,' 'A menu which almost the world furnished.'"

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. Is an hon. member allowed to read his speech, or to read lengthy extracts?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is reading a quotation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I continue:

"That banquet brought to his mind that other historical feast which Belshazzar, the king, gave to a thousand of his lords, and when the king saw the fingers of a man's hand write on the wall 'over against the candlestick' the 'Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin,' his earnest prayer and belief was, that the handwriting on the wall of the Carnegie banquet would presage the overthrow of a system of extortion and robbery more wicked in the sight of God and man than all the sins of Babylon, when her robes were scarlet with iniquity. The remedies to be applied were: First, tariff reform. Summing up, he said: 'In the face of these things (referring to the subsidising of the press, the purchasing of votes in blocks of five, official patronage, &c.), and with a full knowledge of what is before us, we will gird up our loins like men and go forward to the fight. The battle may be long and weary, but the sun will go down on a great final victory, of the eternal right over legalised wrong, of freedom and equality over caste. Hail mighty day of the swift coming future.'"

That is virtually the experience of the people of this country also. Those words uttered by that hon. gentleman with respect to the condition of the farming community in the United States will find an echo in the breast of every farmer in this Dominion. The man who will read these words will realise that their experience is identical with that of the farmers in the United States since its protective tariff was introduced, where the people have been ground under exactions by the operations of the tariff. In the inception of the protective tariff in this country the farmers asked nothing from the First Minister. He promised them many things, but they asked nothing. His promises were, however, not fulfilled. He promised them a home market, prosperity, Canada for the Canadians, and everything that he thought would secure their votes and influence at the election. He promised them fish, but for a fish he gave them a serpent. He promised them an egg, but he gave them a scorpion, in the shape of the National Policy, which has ruined them, deprived them of their rights, made them slaves to other people, and placed them in a position so that they are getting poorer every day. I come now to examine some of the causes which have largely conduced to bring about our present financial condition. I believe that the extravagance which has characterised the action of the Government during the last ten or eleven years has resulted in our enormous national debt. When we examine the expenditure of the Departments, we must come to the conclusion that extravagance reigns in every Department. There has been added to the annual extravagance since 1878 no less than $16,000,000. An increased expenditure appears in every Department. Take the Department of the Interior for last year. When the question of the expenditure connected with this Department was before the House last Session, I took exception to the statement made by the Minister, and I claimed to be able to show that the expenditure was far in excess of the statement presented. This year I have further examined the expenditure of that Department. The expenditure, without charging the item of surveys to the annual expenditure, was $325,011; the entire receipts from the North-West, from North-West lands and all sources of revenue, were $288,250, leaving a net loss, without including surveys, of $36,760, and a net loss, including surveys of over $167,000. An investigation of the accounts of the Department with respect to the extravagance there observable is sufficient to make any honest-hearted Canadian blush. There has been expended in connection with that one Department $167,738 over and above the entire receipts we drew last year from all sources in the North-West. This result must be compared with the estimate made by the Minister some years ago, that by 1890 there would be a revenue of $59,000,000 out of the land and other resources of that country; and further, the statements made by other hon. gentlemen that it would prove a mine of wealth in the future, and that the lands of the North-West would recoup this country for every dollar expended, and the statement of the First Minister that we should, on the faith of that estimate, grant $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have also had a similar experience with regard to many other matters, and I could present to the House other items showing the extravagance of the Government in other Departments. From the first pages of the Auditor General's Report it appears there are 631 civil servants, drawing an average salary of $1,200, who, during 1888-89, by a system inaugurated and encouraged by this Government, drew $190,224 for extra services. In view of the fact that a civil servant is employed but a few hours a day, such a system should not be encouraged. Last year only 481 civil servants drew extra pay. I desire now to direct the attention of the House to payments for interest in London. I observe that we paid $7,348,450 for interest in London. I ask the House to go back to the time when Sir Charles Tupper was appointed High Commissioner. Hon. members will remember that the First Minister stated that we would save more money in commission, by having Sir Charles Tupper in London, than it would cost to keep him there. Notwithstanding that statement, we paid, last year, to two agencies in London, for receiving money and paying interest, a sum of $36,416. Sir Charles Tupper is there, and he has a large staff, as we can see from the Auditor General's Report, but the labor performed in this way would be too slavish for a man who wants to enjoy his time luxuriously; and he is not there to serve his country in that capacity. Last year an appropriation of $185,018 was appropriated for handling the public debt, but I find the expenditure was $202,000, which is $17,258 more than the appropriation. Now, Sir, I will come to another item. Early in this Session I asked the House to consent to a return being brought down that would show the House the amounts spent by the several Cabinet Ministers, from Confederation down to the present time, on account of travelling expenses and cab hire. The House refused me that return, on the advice of the First Minister, but I took the trouble to have it prepared at my own expense, and I have it now before me for the last ten years.

I notice that the Ministers of this country have down for cab hire and travelling expenses, over and above their salary and sessional allowance, $71,297.65. Now, I say that this shows the system of extravagance that has prevailed in this country for years past. I contend that, on the face of such statements as I am now presenting, it is quite clear that extravagance has ruled in every Department. I notice that our legal expenses are largely increasing each year. Last year, according to the Auditor General's Report, there were spent for legal expenses, $117,825, and for advertising and printing, $243,815, an amount which has already been criticised by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. All these items go to show the extravagance which prevails in every Department of the Government, and the manner in which the expenditure has been run up from year to year. Another extravagance is the enormous increase of the cost of running the Intercolonial Railway. That line was originally built as an independent outlet to the sea-board, but in place of utilising that line properly, and trying to work it in such a way that the people of this country would not be called upon to contribute annually towards its being operated, the Government have, for purposes best known to themselves, gone to work and duplicated that line in several sections, with the result of decreasing its earning powers. We have the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway running virtually alongside of the Intercolonial Railway, and taking trade away from the main line. We have millions of money sunk in such railways; and for what purpose? Is it because additional lines are wanted? No; but because it was looked upon as a necessity, in the interest of certain persons, that these constituencies should be kept in line by the Government, at the expenditure of an enormous amount of money. We can well remember in what glowing terms the High Commissioner presented to this House his scheme in regard to the construction of that road. He pronounced it the great European Short Line to the sea-board, and one of the greatest things the country had undertaken. He portrayed how it would be the means of shortening the distance between the coal-fields of Nova Scotia and the consuming centres in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. He also went on to show that the grades on the Intercolonial Railway were such that it would be impossible to get up a coal trade between the Upper Provinces and Nova Scotia; but we got from the Chief Engineer the condition of that line when it was built, that in place of that line being 43 miles shorter than the Intercolonial Railway, it is only 7 miles, and in place of the grades being lower they are higher. All these things show the manner in which the affairs of this country have been conducted. I should have liked very much, as I intended, to reply to some remarks made by the member for Renfrew (Mr. White), but it is, I know, desirable that the debate should close, and I do not wish to keep the time of the House longer.

Seme hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. That hon. gentleman, in reference to our paying 4½ per cent. for money, said it would be better to pay our people 4½ per cent., than to borrow in England at 4 per cent. If there is any one thing which has tended to keep up the price of money to the borrowing classes, the farming community particularly, it is the fact, as already stated by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the Government of this country have been in the market in opposition to the borrowing class, and the result is that the rate of interest is higher.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). How do you account, then, for the banks raising their rates of interest almost simultaneously with the reduction of the rate on the part of the Government?

Mr. McMULLEN. Simply because the Government were competitors with the banks. The banks required a certain amount of deposits, and the Government had been competing with the banks for years past in the handling of the surplus money of this country. The Government have had millions of that money at an interest of 4 per cent., and recently they have reduced it to 3½ per cent. I say, that if the borrowing class in this country had the advantage of this money being thrown on the market to seek permanent investment, instead of the Government borrowing it, it would have been much better for those that were under the necessity of borrowing money. The hon. gentleman (Mr. White) also boasted with regard to the construction of local lines of railway. There has been some aid granted in Ontario to local lines, but I contend that in a great many instances that money has been virtually squandered. In some cases you can see lines running parallel to each other—one road built by contributions, in the Province of Ontario, from the municipalities, and the other built solely and only because it was in the interest of parties who occupy the Treasury benches that these roads should be subsidised. I say that is wrong. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Renfrew should have supported the expenditure of money in the Province of Ontario for the construction of roads at a subsidy per mile, while he supported the same Government in building up, at a cost to this country, roads in the Maritime Provinces where the people of the locality have not been called upon to pay one single farthing towards their construction. The people of the Province of Ontario have contributed enormous amounts towards the construction of their railways, while the people in the Maritime Provinces have in some places got their roads built absolutely at the cost of the Government, especially in Nova Scotia. I will close my remarks by expressing the regret that I have been called upon to present this statement to the House. I do so honestly and conscientiously, and with a sincere desire for the welfare, and prosperity, and the future of my country. We are sent here by the people to legislate for them, and we should look to our country with the desire to benefit its condition financially. We should look forward to its future as a great and growing country, and do everything we can to place the people in a happy, comfortable and contented position. The Government, for the last ten or twelve years, has done exactly opposite to this. They have been legislating in such a way that to-day, the agriculturists of this Dominion are in a worse condition than they have ever been in for thirty years before. I am sorry to have to confess this; but I earnestly hope that some change will take place, that will light up the future of this country for the poor agriculturists. If it does not, I am seriously and honestly afraid, that

their future will be that of an enslaved portion of this Dominion ; that they will not have that prosperity to which their honest efforts entitle them. Many of them came to this country with their parents, who assailed the forests as pioneers and turned them into fertile fields, and it is too bad that they should be obliged to struggle as they are doing now, without getting any aid or consideration, except the privilege of charging the lumberman a little more for his pork. Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologise to the House for the length of time I have occupied, but I considered it my duty to present this statement in the interest of my constituency.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. BROWN. In the course of this debate we have been treated, first, to the old original blue ruin speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with a revised edition since the pilgrimage to Washington ; then we have had a repetition of the blue ruin speech usually delivered by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), embellished with the first contribution of his letters from the hot regions ; and we have just had a long oration from my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in which he has chosen to decry the credit of the country and to speak ill of the position of the farming community. He seemed to labor very hard in endeavoring to prove his position, because I feel assured that no one knows better than he he does that the state of the farming community in Canada, as regards their indebtedness, and in fact as regards their general prosperity, is the very opposite of what he represented it to be to this House. Any one hearing or reading the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite who have so far addressed the House could come to no other conclusion than that Canada is in a state of ruin, that the farmers of Canada are in a state of hopeless depression, that their farms are so encumbered and mortgaged that there is no extrication of them from their difficulties, that, in fact, Canada is the country of all others in the world which offers no attraction to immigrants and no hope to the people who live in it. I propose, Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks I have to make—and I promise the House that it will not be wearied by me with a long speech I will not follow my hon. friend in his long criticism of the various items of the tariff; there will be an opportunity afterwards in committee of discussing those items in a proper way. Suffice it to say, speaking from my own standpoint, that I regard the tariff as a whole as conducive to the best interests of Canada; and I sympathise deeply with my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) in the difficult position in which he is placed, to get speakers enough on the opposite side of the House to come out with any energy in opposition to this tariff, because in their hearts they must know that the tariff which is submitted to this House is one not only conducive to the best interests of the whole of Canada, but more particularly to the farming community, and they dare not attack the Government. The hon. member who last spoke indulged in the old cry of high duties for the poor man and low duties for the rich man ; he spoke of the woollen glove and the kid glove.

When the hon. gentleman speaks of the heavy cloth required for the poor man, does he not know—yes, he does know ; because he has had experience—that the duty is put on for the purpose, and has had the effect, not only of encouraging the industries of the country, but of giving to the people of Canada cheaper materials than they had before, and giving employment besides for the labor of the country and better prices for all the products of the soil ? It is not true that the protective duty of 10 cents a pound which has been put on tweeds instead of 7½ cents adds to the price of the material or the price of a suit of clothes. The experience of the last ten years has shown that the articles which have been protected in this way have been produced to the people of Canada at a less price than they were before or could possibly be. But, Sir, twelve long years ago hon. gentlemen then sitting on this side of the House heard the doleful predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition declared that within six months every mother in every cottage of Quebec would curse the day this tariff was put into execution, for adding to the anxieties of her life. Those six months have passed—six years and double six years have passed—and prosperity has beamed on the country and happiness has filled every cottage in Quebec and every home in Canada, instead of being, as before, filled with despair and hopelessness. My hon. friend from North Norfolk, who is as great in predictions as he is in the marvellous letters which he gets from the hot regions, said : "Let the people go to the polls, and they will hurl from power the men who have placed so iniquitous a tariff as this on the statutes of the country." Well, they went to the polls, and they came back sustained by the people, who saw that they had saved the country from hopeless despair. The people have learned by experience the benefits and advantages of the National Policy, and on almost every occasion, when asked to give a verdict, they have returned the Liberal-Conservative party to power. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has, ever since he has been in the House, been predicting the downfall of the Government, and although those predictions have been singularly unfulfilled, he still, hoping against hope, clings to the delusion that some day what he ardently desires will come to pass ; and to-day, he says that in a year or two more, very likely there will be a disaster to the country. But let me tell the hon. gentleman that the farmers of Canada know what is to their interest as well as the next man. They are not to be deluded, and they know better than to pin their faith to the nostrums of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the statements they circulate throughout the country of the tremendous indebtedness of the farming community, thus attempting to destroy the credit of the farmers of Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a statement the other night, regarding the mortgage indebtedness of the farmers, and when called to book in his statement, he said : Go to the registry offices of the country. Why, Sir, we know that these offices do not contain a proper record. We know that, while there may be mortgages upon farms running for five or ten years, and payable in annual instalments, the full indebtedness of the mortgage appears on record in the registry offices until the last instalments are

paid and the mortgages cleared, and to make up a statement from such records, and give that as a true statement of indebtedness, is a slander on the farmers of Canada. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) proposed, and I wonder he was not ashamed to make such a proposition, that a sum of money shall be voted by this House for an investigation into the registry records, in order to determine the amount due on mortgages. I would like to know what the farmers of Canada will think of a proposition of this kind, to hold an inquisition into their business, and to enquire minutely into the condition of every one of them. I will tell the hon. gentleman something about farm mortgages, which, perhaps, he does not, but which he ought to know: The mortgage indebtedness encumbering the farms of Ontario is equal to about $3 per acre of the occupied land. The farm lands, with houses, in Ontario are worth an average of $38 per acre. Farm mortgages have increased in the past five years about $15,000,000; in the period during which farm mortgages have increased $15,000,000, the cultivated lands have increased 800,000 acres, the partially cleared 400,000 acres, and the value of buildings about $25,000,000. Are these indications of a healthy state or otherwise? It is a very good showing that nine-tenths of the value of the farms is practically free from mortgage encumbrance, less than one-tenth of the value being required to meet the face value of the mortgages. Questions pertinent to this discussion are: 1st. Are the farmers paying off their mortgage indebtedness? 2nd. Are they unable to pay interest, thus becoming delinquent borrowers in arrears of interest and principal? 3rd. Are compulsory proceedings of one kind and another multiplying? 4th. Are enforced sales increasing? The position of affairs is this: It appears that during the past few years the amount of old mortgages paid off (at the end of 1888) about equals the total amount loaned on real estate security on the 31st December, 1883. A portion of this is book-keeping payment. That is: A. goes to the loan company on the expiry of his mortgage term and gives a new mortgage. In the books of the company the old mortgage money appears as money received on the one side, and, on the other, it appears as a loan made on mortgage during the year. The returns do not give the proportion, but it is understood that a very fair proportion of the clearances consists of money actually paid in. I mention this particularly, because hon. gentlemen opposite—God forbid I should say all of them—are seeking to make the people believe that it would be far better for us to ally ourselves in commercial union with the United States; and I wish to show that the farmers of Canada are in a better position to-day than are those of the country to the south of us. The following table is an exhibit of what has taken place during a period of ten years in Ontario:—

Per cent. of principal and interest overdue and in default to amount secured by mortgage.

Year.	Per cent.
1879	5·0
1880	8·0
1881	5·9
1882	3·0
1883	2·7
1884	3·0
1885	4·0
1886	4·5
1887	3·9
1888	2·9

So that our farmers have been able during the last ten years gradually to reduce their mortgages, and, besides, many of them have mortgaged their farms for the purpose of increasing their farm buildings and stock. I make this statement without fear of contradiction, and I make it in the interest of the farmers. I know that our farmers will thank us on this side of the House for standing up for them, and seeing that their credit is not decried without protest. Hon. gentlemen opposite will stick at nothing in the hope of getting office. To achieve that end, they picture the farmers of Canada in such a state of depression and inability to meet their debts, in such a condition of blue ruin, that one would fancy we were on the verge of great national disaster. Everyone knows, on the contrary, that there is absolutely no foundation for any such statements. Our farmers are, as regards their mortgage indebtedness, in a first-rate position, far superior to that of the same community in any part of the United States, with which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to desire the closest connection. My hon. friend also, with his usual exaggeration, stated that the *per capita* debt of Canada was $60 per head, whereas it is only $47.50. He stated that the American people had grown tired of protection, and this in the face of the fact that at the last elections they returned a protective Republican Government in opposition to a free trade Government. In 1878 hon. gentlemen on this side of the House undertook to solve a great problem. They did not shrink from the responsibility of grappling with the condition of the country, and they have, to-day, good reason to be satisfied with the stand they took, because every year since has shown that the policy they inaugurated was the salvation of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite saw the position into which the country was drifting and never lifted a hand to relieve it from distress. One of the speakers opposite dilated at length on what he called the exodus or the decrease of rural population. But we know very well that, though in some portions of the country the rural population has to some extent decreased, the urban population has increased, and thus, while the consumers of farm products have increased, the farmers themselves have had less competition to contend against, and have been able, consequently, to obtain better prices for their products. But, if the rural population has decreased in certain parts of Ontario, what has been the effect? It is not, as hon. gentlemen opposite have contended, that this decrease was caused by men leaving for the United States, but by men either added to the urban districts or going out to settle in our glorious North-West, where they are thriving and building for themselves and their country a great future. It is deplorable to find speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite couched in such a doleful strain as to convey the impression that there is no prosperity in Canada, and that the people are discontented. The people of Canada are not discontented; the people of Canada are happy; the people of Canada see in their country a great future. From the Atlantic to the Pacific there is a contented people. There may be differences of opinion as to the best way in which the affairs of the country should be managed, as to the best means to be adopted for the advancement of the country, but the people of Canada are in a better position to-day, financially and otherwise, than the

people of the United States. It will be necessary and proper that I should, at this stage, state before this House facts, absolute facts, facts that cannot be denied, facts that are verified and certified to by the Government of Ontario, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute them. We are told that the farm lands of Ontario have decreased in value. Of course any hon. gentleman may go into any part of Canada, may go into any township, and may find a farm, which, under peculiar circumstances—an overflow of water or something of that kind—has been sold at a low price, but this is not the way to estimate the position of affairs. The true way is to find the position of the farms from the verified returns. The average value of farm lands in Ontario, was $31.33 an acre in 1882, and $44.75 in 1888, or an increase of 42 per cent. in the value per acre during the only years in which the farmers of the United States experienced a shrinkage in the value of their farms. During the six years from 1882 to 1887, the average per acre of Ontario farm lands, was $29.67 per acre. In 1888, the value was $44.75. In 1888, the value of farm lands, farm buildings, implements and live stock, shows the large increase over 1882 of $987,000,000. During that period, the Canadian farmers exported about $60,000,000 of live stock and meats, the greater portion of which came from Ontario. Farm buildings have also gone up in value, and competent authorities agree that there has been a great deterioration in farm buildings in the United States, Central and Western, Kansas alone, for example, showing 5,000 deserted farms last year. I have to-day had the following extract placed in my hands :—

"The pamphlet just issued by the New Hampshire State Commissioner of Agriculture and Immigration, Hon. N. J. Bachelder, is an appeal to people to 'Secure a Home in New Hampshire, where Comfort, Health and Prosperity Abound.' The words we have quoted appear on the title page, and the facts adduced sustain the claims thus advanced. The State is really a pleasant and prosperous one. It is true that 1,442 of its farms have been abandoned—that is to say, are not inhabited. Still, the value of cattle in the State is increasing half a million dollars yearly, and the last few years have given birth to summer hotels and boarding houses ample to accommodate thirty thousand guests, and the setting up of sixteen creameries proves an extension of pasturage lands and a demand for their products. The farms, which are fully described by the commissioner, are distributed among the different counties, as follows: Rockingham, 113; Strafford, 52: Belknap, 54: Carroll, 124; Merrimac, 215; Hillsboro', 228; Cheshire, 211; Sullivan, 160; Grafton, 265; Coos, 20. We are among those who think that the disposition to leave the State has culminated, and that most of the deserted neighborhoods are more likely to improve than to grow worse. Of course, energetic youths will continue to seek the centres of population, but if the same energy is manifested in reviving and keeping up the energy of the churches as is displayed in secular departments, New Hampshire is bound to be in the future, as it has been in the past, a nursery of noble men and women."

The true reason probably for the depression in some of our farming districts there, and in Eastern Canada as well, is that the competition they have to meet is that of the virgin soil of the North-West and the West, but no one should run away with the idea that Canadian farmers are in a bad position in comparison with those of the United States, or accept the picture which hon. gentlemen have painted, that we are in such a bad position, and that, if we could join with the people to the south of us, we would be in a better position. When the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated, as far as Canada was concerned, it taught the people of Canada self-reliance. They sought out new channels for trade. They had stout hearts and strong arms, and they said they would fight for themselves, and so they did. The time was when the people of Canada would have been glad to do anything in order to renew that treaty in natural products, but I am prepared to take my stand and say, that we have a people here who can depend upon themselves, and can hew out their homes in this country, and that it depends upon them whether this shall be a country at all. The great future for Canada is to fight out its own destinies, and I, for one, will side with those who propose to carry out a policy of that kind. I find, that in 1882, the value per acre of farm implements was $1.83. From 1882 to 1887, the average value was $2.15. And so all along the line. Whatever you may talk about, everything was increased in value, and the mortgages on the farms were decreasing every year. Instead of hon. gentlemen trying to lead the country and the world to understand that our farmers have been getting deeper in debt, they should state the fact that the contrary is the case. In 1879, according to the loan companies' returns, the percentage of principal and interest overdue on mortgages and in default was equal to 5 per cent. of the total amount secured by mortgage, and, in 1880, it was 8 per cent. Then, as to compulsory proceedings. During the period from 1884 to 1888, there was one compulsory proceeding to each $106,000 on mortgage. In 1880-81, there was one compulsory proceeding to each $52,100, showing a reduction of one-half in the period first mentioned. Then in regard to enforced sales, an examination of the *Official Gazette* of the Province of Ontario for the years 1878 to 1888, establishes the fact that, notwithstanding the increased number of farms, sheriffs' sales in 1888 in Ontario, were but 37 per cent. of those in 1878. So much for the attack which has been made upon the farmers of Canada in regard to the position in which they are placed by mortgages and encumbrances. My hon. friend the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was in 1879 one of the prophets. I have no doubt that he believed all he said, because I have a great deal of confidence in that hon. gentleman speaking exactly what he thinks. In 1879, he made, as he always does, an admirable speech, and he quoted the position of bank stocks of Canada, and said they were depressed and that was only what was to be expected from a Government which had been only a few months in power and from the inauguration of a national policy. The evil influence, according to the hon. gentleman, was felt over land and sea, it was felt in bank stocks, in navigation stocks, and so on ; and the hon. gentleman told us how these stocks had fallen in so short a time. I am not prepared to say now what causes there were for the decline in the value of bank stocks at that time. I have no doubt there were causes, because it is all folly for hon. gentlemen to try to make the country believe that it was the fault of the National Policy, or that the Government could promise anything more than what human power could grant and human influences and human energies could bring to pass. There may have been causes for this decline in these bank stocks. My hon. friend says this was the effect, and so it would be under the influence of the National Policy. Now, let us see.

When this policy was introduced, the Bank of Montreal stock was 140. The National Policy has existed 12 years, and Bank of Montreal stock to-day is 227. He stated that Molson's Bank stock was then 77, but such has been the baneful influence of this National Policy that to-day Molson's Bank stock is 161. Bank of Toronto then was 151½, and under the baneful influence of the National Policy it has risen to 217. Merchants Bank was then 80½, to-day it is 142. The Bank of Commerce was then 103, to-day it is 125. So much for their predictions, and the same predictions they made then have been repeated year after year, and have been repeated in this House since this debate commenced, and, no doubt, will be repeated before it is closed; but if we are to judge by the predictions of the past, we will be able to show that the same evidences of prosperity which the country has shown in the past will be seen in the next 12 years. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to forget that our country is something more than the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. We have an inheritance the like of which no other nation under the sun has ever had; we have an inheritance of which every Canadian should be proud. I tell these hon. gentlemen to take a leaf out of the book of the Americans they so much admire. Where will you find a Republican or Democrat in the States who, in speaking of his country, will not stand up for the place in which he lives? If he lives in a certain township, it is the best township in the county, his county is the best county in the State, and his State is the best in the Union. As a humorous friend of mine said to me to-day here in Ottawa: "I am astonished at the way the hon. members in your House talk about your country. Why, in the States, even a resident of Florida will stick up for a crocodile hole, and say it is the best crocodile hole in the country." Let hon. gentlemen opposite take that lesson to heart, and instead of decrying their country when they speak of it, let them speak with a proper feeling of appreciation. They seem to desire to befog and becloud the minds of the farmers; they endeavor to bring out all the points that may create a difference of opinion among them. They do not rejoice, as they should rejoice, in the fact of the progress of the country in any particular industry. Why do they not tell the people that to-day we export more cheese to England than the United States? Why do they not tell the people that we have overshot the Americans in the article of cheese? To-day our cheese in England stands away above American cheese. Last year (1888) Canada exported of Canadian-made cheese 84,173,267 pounds. The United States exported 88,008,458 pounds, going ahead of Canada by about four million pounds. But the United States export was only worth $8,736,000, while the Canadian was worth $8,928,000, or nearly $200,000 more. Brought down to a per head basis, Canada exported $1.80 per cent. and the United States 63 cents. Canada exported three times the amount the United States did. In proportion to population to-day we stand at the top of the heap in the English market as the producers of foreign cheese, but it does not suit hon. gentlemen to say that, because it is a tribute to our prosperity, and so they do not say it. My hon. friend said that the United States were becoming disgusted with protection, and they realised that they had adopted a wrong principle in establishing a protective duty on iron. My hon. friend has not read the book aright; I am afraid he sometimes makes speeches without reading the book. The protective duty in the United States was what made the iron industry of that country the mammoth industry it is to-day? There was a time when every rail used in the United States was imported from abroad, and to-day if there is such a thing as an entry made of a rail into the United States from abroad, that entry can be put into a museum of curiosities. All the rails of the United States are made in that country, and it is because they adopted the protective tariff that they are able to make their own rails. We, here in Canada, have got the mineral wealth in the bowels of the earth, but we have done comparatively nothing to unearth it. I regard the tariff on iron, in Canada, as the top stone of the National Policy, and I am only sorry that it was not adopted many years ago. Hon. gentlemen will ask us to point to the blast furnaces. Sir, every thing cannot be done in a day. Yet the Londonderry works have orders booked a year ahead and have made arrangements to blow in a second furnace. The New Glasgow iron and coal works increased 314 per cent. in its business between 1884 and 1889. The iron tariff has already worked wonders in this country. I will tell you something about what the iron tariff has done in the manufacturing industries of Canada. When I speak of the city from which I come (Hamilton), I desire to say that I also speak of every large city in Canada that has established industries like those to which I refer. It is a boast of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I have no doubt of a great many on the other side of the House, and ought to be the boast of every one who has the honor of a seat in this House, that when he comes here he does not come as a representative of Ontario, he does not come as a representative of Quebec, he does not represent one Province more than another, except the special interests that require his care, but he must feel that he is a representative of the whole of this vast Dominion. Being each one a representative of this vast Dominion, we have got to give and take; we have got to devise means by which the resources of this whole country shall be brought to light, and one of the means of doing so is to bring to the surface that hidden wealth that lies in the bowels of the earth. See what our neighbors have done with their protective tariff; give us time, and we will do the same thing. Already the tariff on iron has been productive of immense benefits. The iron produced in Canada to-day, the iron rolled in Hamilton and other cities in Canada to-day, has given employment to a great number of men, and the men who are employed in these factories are strong, stalwart fellows. These factories are producing excellent iron, the best that can be got, and they are supplying the whole country. When this duty was placed upon iron, the advocates of that policy pledged themselves to the country that the policy was one that, when honestly administered, would cheapen the article to the consumer. Let me give the facts concerning the Canada Pipe Foundry in Hamilton, and there are others in Nova Scotia, others in Montreal, others in Toronto, and they have all had the same experience as the factory in Hamilton. Mr. Gartshore writes to me:

"I duly received your favor of 21st instant asking me how the late change in the tariff had affected my business? I am happy to say that the results have been most

beneficial since it has come into operation. I have about trebled the number of my workmen, and besides we have now constant employment the year round. There have also been new works started in the same line in Montreal, Londonderry and, I believe, in Three Rivers. In addition to this, the Toronto foundry has doubled its capacity. With regard to importation of pipe, this has almost ceased—excepting in a few cases where they were required so rapidly that it was impossible to make them in time."

The output of all combined is from 30,000 to 35,000 tons of pipe, and they are producing in Hamilton to-day the best pipe in the world. I can remember the time when Toronto and Hamilton could not obtain in all Canada pipe for their waterworks, because it could not be cast here. I remember in Hamilton, when the waterworks were constructed, an offer was made that any man who would cast waterworks pipe in Canada should receive 12½ per cent. additional to the price at which foreign pipe could be got, but no manufacturer could do it. The Canadian makers now understand this business, and, under the operation of the tariff, they are making water pipe for the whole country, and at this moment I understand parties are figuring to fill a contract for the growing city of Vancouver, on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. That is not the only point I have to offer. There are the Ontario Rolling Mills in Hamilton, and that establishment speaks for all the rolling mills of Canada. I desire to read some facts to show that they are prospering and doing the right thing with the trade. They said to the Government, when the tariff was proposed, that if the tariff was adopted, it would be found that iron would be made much cheaper here than it could be imported under the new duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite raised the cry, and they have rang changes on that cry all over the country, that if we imposed a tariff on those manufactures and imposed a duty, it would involve so much additional charge to the consumers. The duties have done nothing of the kind. The members of that company write to me, and state as follows:—

"The average price of English ordinary Staffordshire bars f. o. b., Liverpool, last year, as obtained by taking one quotation in the *Iron Age and American Manufactures* for each month and dividing by twelve, was £6 11s. 5½d. = $31.99; add for freight to Ontario, 25s. = $6.09. Cost per gross ton (2,240 lbs.) on board, $38.08, or $1.10 per 100 lbs.. This would cost, with duty added, $2.35 per 100 lbs. Our average selling prices here are, $1.89 f. o. b., and in Toronto, $1.98. Very little foreign iron is brought into our market; what there is, is of special quality or size."

These facts show the benefit this tariff has accomplished in assisting the establishment of rolling mills in Canada; and any man who declares that the establishment of a rolling mill in this country, employing 400 or 500 men, is not of advantage, is a man who should be leased out to Barnum. The Ontario Rolling Mills state that the amount paid in wages in 1887 was $87,850; 1889, $188,645; the output, 1886-87, 10,212 tons; the output in 1889-90, 23,887 tons. Men employed in 1887, 185; men employed in 1889, 445. In addition, this same company have nail works, the output of which in 1889-90 was 54,646 kegs, and wages paid amounted to $24,370, and their iron and nails are giving the greatest satisfaction, and wholesale dealers declare that they are more than satisfied. The Hamilton Bridge Works, another successful concern, making structures which are a credit to Canada, and I only bring these facts forward to show that all these establishments are successful. The president, Mr. William Hendrie, wrote to me on the 29th ult. as follows:—

"Below we give you some information regarding our company for the last few years. Since 1886 our annual output has increased more than 25 per cent., and we have been gradually enlarging our premises year by year; we keep fully employed an average of 150 men the year round. We have executed large contracts for iron and steel bridges for the following railway companies and corporations:—Grand Trunk Railway, main line and southern division; Canadian Pacific Railway, Detroit Extension and Ontario and Quebec Railway; Midland Railway; North and North-Western Railways; Northern and Pacific Junction Railway; Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, Nova Scotia; Niagara Central Railway; Michigan Central Railway, Canada Southern Division; St. Clair Tunnel Company, Sarnia; Crown Lands Department, Ontario Government; County of Middlesex, highway bridges; city of Ottawa, highway bridges; County of Elgin, highway bridges; County of Haldimand, highway bridges; County of Halton and Peel, highway bridges; City of London, highway bridges; County of Huron, highway bridges; Townships of Waterloo, Rainham, Wilmot, Trafalgar, highway bridges.

"Some of the principal structures turned out lately, are as follows:—Don viaduct, Toronto, for Canadian Pacific Railway, 1,200 feet long; iron bridge, Caledonia, for Northern and North-Western Railways, 750 feet long; swing bridge, Thorold, for Niagara Central Railway, 310 feet long; iron bridge, over River John, for Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, 360 feet long; steel bridge, River Thames, Chatham, Canadian Pacific Railway, 680 feet long; steel bridge, Grand River, Michigan Central Railway, 306 feet long; King street subway, city of Toronto, 900 tons steel; St. Clair Tunnel Company, shield and air locks, &c. Bridge work turned out of our shops has always given great satisfaction to the engineers of the different railways whom we have supplied, both as to design and construction."

Are hon. gentlemen to be believed when they say that they do not see in the prosperity of such companies all over the country, and in the employment of labor and the results that follow the employment of skilled labor in the country, any advantage to Canada? Now we have in this country bodies of men and women everywhere who are well remunerated for their labor and who in consequence have happy homes, and we have workingmen who go home on Saturday night with well-lined pockets after a hard week's work. Hon. gentlemen opposite are welcome to the stand they have taken, but we on this side of the House have also taken up our position. As was stated in 1878 by those who defended the First Minister and his colleagues, who introduced this policy, we nailed the colors of protection to the mast-head then, and we are not going to take them down without a fight. The people of the country are behind us and will support us in this struggle. We must have no narrow and contracted ideas of the Government of this country. I believe mutual concessions are desirable all round; that is the true policy on which this country should be governed. Hon. gentlemen opposite forget that we have a great North-West growing up. If we had followed the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by, where would our North-West Territories be to-day? Where would the development of the mineral wealth of the Rocky Mountains have been to-day? What would have been the position of Canada, which now occupies a position in the world as that of being the highway uniting different portions of the earth? Oceans no longer keep the world apart, since the Canadian Pacific Railway crosses this continent and unites Canada with all points on the other side of the world. Who can tell the possibilities of trade between this country and Australia and Britain's

Indian possessions ? We have the Grand Trunk Railway, one of the most magnificent railway systems in the world, with 3,197 miles of road in operation ; and any one travelling from Montreal to Toronto at night in one of their electric lighted cars, could fancy he was in fairyland. We have also the Canadian Pacific Railway, with 4,900 miles in active operation ; and a passenger can start from the eastern end of the line and travel to Vancouver, and at the end of his journey he will feel loath to leave the car, because of the luxury of travelling, and the company he has enjoyed day by day on the trip, to say nothing of the magnificent scenery through which he has passed. I have taken that trip, and I know of what I speak ; and I am looking at some hon. gentlemen opposite who have likewise taken the trip, and have spoken most enthusiastically of it. I have taken that trip, Sir, and I have passed through Manitoba and the North-West, and if there are persons out there who have been cursing their Maker because they went there, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, I did not see them. If there were any such, they were in hiding. I will tell you what I did see. I saw men in prosperity there ; I saw men, both in Manitoba and the Territories, who had gone there five or six years before, and who had developed into successful farmers, and had money in the bank. One of these farmers said to me that he did not know what it was to be without anxiety of mind before he left the old country, but now he was happy and contented. Hon. gentlemen talk of settlers leaving Manitoba and the North-West for the purpose of going to Dakota. I would like to give them a nut to crack just here. Here is a telegram from Winnipeg, which reads as follows :—

"Advance guard of 100 persons here from Michigan to inspect the Lake Dauphin district, and if the report is favorable all will remove here at once."

What do they say to that ? I saw a man in Brandon who arrived with his family from Dakota, and the exclamation of this good man was : "Bless the Lord, I am here at last." Do not cry down your country, gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. I tell you there is a country out in the West which has area enough to grow more than will feed the whole hungry world. Yet, we have hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who not only seek to conceal the great possibilities of this country, but actually try to make people believe that it is not a place for them to come to. There is a gentleman lecturing in this city to-night whom many members of this House know, a gentleman of the very highest respectability and reputation, the Rev. Leonard Gaetz, a man of eloquence and a man of culture, who went out to the Deer River country some years ago ; now let the House hear what that gentleman has to say about that country. He says :

"Rich bottom land—black sandy loam, yield in profusion, all grains of commerce except Indian corn. Some varieties of oats, 70 bushels to the acre, weighing 40 lbs. to the bushel, others 60 bushel, weighing 52 lbs. Great resources, adequate to a great nation. In Assiniboia and Alberta, 64,000 square miles ranch country, capable of raising 3,000 to 8,000 head of cattle, giving each 20 acres to graze upon. In 1887, in Alberta, were 110,000 cattle, 28,000 horses, 32,000 sheep. In 1888 leases were fewer, but stock largely increased. Fifteen years from now 75,000 head of cattle will be shipped from Alberta to Great Britain."

Yet this is a country that seems to be despised by hon. gentlemen opposite. The policy of the Conservative party throughout has been to build up ; that of hon. gentlemen opposite to pull down. We have sought to make the country progressive. We have sought in every way that man could devise to make the Dominion prosperous, but it must be remembered that no tariff is perfect from the beginning, and that it has to be perfected by experience. The great future of this country is assured by the fact that the foundation of its prosperity is a substantial remuneration for the labor of the people. The tariff submitted to this House shows that the farming interest of Canada has been taken care of by the Government, and the farmers would be the first to know, and to experience that fact ; besides this the great and growing industrial interests are cared for. Hon. gentlemen may decry this country as they will, but the near future will show that the mischief that these machinations and pilgrimages to Washington can effect are realised by an indignant people. Recent letters and recent correspondence in this country have shown that commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, or any other name you give to these wicked fads tend only to the political union of this country with the United States and are intended to bring that about. If you compare the utterances in this country, and the utterances in the States, and read between the lines, you will find, if these hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends have their way, that Canadians will live under the folds of another flag. But the people will never consent to that. They will be true to the British flag. In the words of a young writer of Toronto whose heart is in the right spot :

"You may say it is a small bit of bunting,
You may call it an old tattered rag,
Yet freedom has made it majestic,
And time has ennobled the flag."

Canadians will re-echo these words throughout the whole Dominion. That is the flag we will live under, and all who pretend to offer us unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, or offer to sell our nationality, will find that the people of Canada will oppose them, and will decide to continue under the grand old British flag. As Dr. Beers said : Canada is not for sale. In no country under Heaven are there greater opportunities for advancement, preferment, and progress, than in this country. We want men of the right stamp to come here to help us to develop it, men who will have the welfare of the country at heart, but we have no room here for agitators, or for those who will strive to unsettle the minds of the people. Every man in this House, as well as every man, woman and child in the country, is writing the history of Canada to-day, and it is for us to see that we do not blot the page of the history we are individually writing. We should endeavor to do credit to Canada by our lives, and by our deeds in this country, and by adhering to those principles which have made the country, from which most of us have sprung, great and glorious. Let hon. gentlemen opposite own up like men when they see the country prosperous. When they see the busy industries of the cities, when they see the rural population getting good prices for their products, when they see the farmers paying off their mortgages year after year, and only an infinitesimal amount of mortgages remain unpaid ; let them stand up like true Canadians and speak for their country as their country deserves to be spoken for. Let them feel that they are not legislating for this

one particular locality, or for that locality, but for a great country with immense possibilities. Hon. gentlemen do not like to quote anything about the savings banks deposits in Canada, but if the savings banks deposits had been on the decline they would have pointed the finger of scorn at this side of the House, and attributed the decrease to the policy of the Government. They do not say anything about the matter, however, when they find the people's savings are increasing to an enormous extent. It may help hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) smiles. I know that he has generally a good night's rest, but I would like to give him a good nightcap now. We find that the deposits in the savings banks in 1878-79 were $6,102,000 and $19,925,000 in 1888-89, an increase of $13,000,000 in ten years ; the deposits in the post office savings banks in 1878-79 were $3,000,000, and in 1888-89 $23,580,000, an increase of over $20,000,000 ; the deposits with the loan companies in 1878-79 were $9,426,000, and in 1888-89 over $17,307,000, an increase of $7,880,000 ; in the City and District Savings Bank of Montreal, &c., in 1878-79, the deposits were $5,500,000, and in 1888-89 $10,761,000, an increase of $5,000,000 ; or a total increase in the ten years of the savings of the people of Canada under the pernicious influence of the National Policy of $47,000,000. Now, when the people read these figures and put them alongside of the three blue ruin speeches that we have heard in this debate, they will know how to value them. Probably before this debate is over there may be some interesting information given to complete the literature in connection with the tea party which took place in Washington while this celebrated antagonistic American tariff was being hatched. But to bring my remarks to a close——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there anything in this tariff to prevent trap-shooting ?

Mr. BROWN. Hon. gentlemen will please keep their patience. They know very well that I never weary the House, and I have a great desire to shorten the time of this debate. I am very sure of one thing, that I will not perpetrate on the House a speech two and three-quarter hours long, true but few hon. gentlemen listened to it, and no one wanted to hear it at all. Hon. gentlemen are already beginning to count the cost of printing. the long harangue. It may be interesting, however, if I should read this letter from Mr. F. W. Glen.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He is a rebel.

Mr. BROWN. He is, I believe, a very close bosom friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think, when he comes to this country, he boards with them; at all events, he has let the cat out of the bag. Here is what he says :

"Mr. F. W. Glen, a former member of the Canadian House of Commons and a strong supporter of the Liberal party, now a resident of the United States, publishes a letter in to-day's *Empire* re-avowing his annexation sympathies, for reasons furnished by him. In regard to Mr. Hitt's resolution in Congress he says: 'A resolution was lately adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives at Washington, apparently favoring reciprocity between Canada and the United States, which cannot fairly be described, so far as it interests Canadians, by any milder term than misleading. It was passed at the personal solicitation of Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Erastus Wiman. Sir Richard Cartwright, during Mr. Blake's absence in Europe and without his knowledge and consent, adopted unrestricted reciprocity as the platform of the Liberal party. I cannot describe it otherwise than as the act of a politician who realised that he was going down for the third and last time, and therefore grasped at a straw. When Sir Richard first adopted unrestricted reciprocity Mr. Wiman was pressing his commercial union fad. About that time, in a conversation with me, he pronounced unrestricted reciprocity utterly impracticable. I replied that both propositions in that respect were exactly alike, but that of the two a commercial union treaty for a definite term of years was the less objectionable of the two. Mr. Wiman has abandoned commercial union and, like Sir Richard Cartwright, grasped at the unrestricted reciprocity straw. The resolution as passed by the Congressional Committee is, in plain English, political clap-trap. It is mortifying to be compelled to add that a committee of the American Congress has permitted itself to be used by two Canadian politicians who have blundered and misled the Canadian people, to save themselves from political annihilation. It is very humiliating to confess that a resolution adopted unanimously by the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the American Congress is a political fraud on the Canadian people, perpetrated at the request of two leading Canadian politicians professing to desire their well-being. * * *

"The tariff means practical business ; the resolutions, as I have said, political clap-trap of a very low type. As you are well aware, I aggressively opposed Sir John Macdonald from August, 1873, until I left Canada in 1886, and am in no sense an admirer of the hon. gentleman's policy ; but I am compelled to admit that he is not a fool. If I were a member of the Canadian Parliament to-day and compelled to choose between Sir John, protection and *statu quo*, and unrestricted reciprocity, I should, without any hesitation whatever, vote for Sir John, with all his faults. It is painful to write this of my late political colleagues, but I abhor all attempts to deceive or mislead the people of Canada upon the question of reciprocity, independence or annexation. Mr. Wiman has not been candid with the people of Canada in discussing the question of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, to which he has lately become converted. In his speeches in Canada he tells the Canadian people that reciprocity is the only antidote for annexation. In Washington he tells the leaders of the Republican party that reciprocity will lead to annexation, which, he assures them, is his ultimate object. In a certain sense, the hon. gentlemen who compose the Committee of Foreign Relations of the American Congress have a right to disgrace themselves personally, if they choose to take the consequences, but acting as a committee of the National Legislature, they have no right to dishonor the nation, as they have done, in passing the resolution apparently favoring reciprocity with Canada, because there is not the slightest intention on the part of the Republican leaders to grant Canada free access to our markets on any terms whatever, so long as she remains an appendage of the British Crown.

"The people of Canada may just as well understand it first as last. I have too high an opinion of the Canadian people to believe that they will ever follow a leader who asks them to make an unreasonable demand of England for the purpose of finding an excuse for a rupture of the friendly relations which now exist between England and Canada. To demand the power to make a commercial union treaty with the United States, such as was proposed in Congress through Mr. Wiman's influence, would be unreasonable and dishonorable on the part of the Canadian people while Canada remains a British province, for whose actions England is responsible to other nations. Unrestricted reciprocity is still worse. Beyond all question, when the Canadian people are ready for separation from England, and demand it as in their own best interests, the demand will be cheerfully granted, and the blessing of the glorious old mother land freely given with it. The interests of the Canadian people are far more important and sacred than the success or failure of Sir Richard Cartwright's or Mr. Wiman's political aspirations. I have none but the most friendly feelings towards Sir Richard Cartwright. From my standpoint he is the ablest Minister who has controlled the finances of Canada between 1860 and the present time. But that is no reason why the people of Canada should now be sacrificed to save him from the effects of the fatal political blunder he made in adopting unrestricted reciprocity as a party cry. Every one here appreciates, respects and admires genial and generous Mr. Wiman. He is a liberal contributor to the campaign funds of both political parties. He does not make fish of one and flesh of the other. He was an active and earnest advocate of the re-election of Grover Cleveland and revenue reform until the Sackville-West exposure, when he immediately sent a handsome cheque to the chairman of the Republican Campaign Committee, and also to the treasurer of the National Tariff League, the strongest and most intensely protectionist organisation in this country. He can adjust

himself to changes in the administration as promptly as the late lamented Vicar of Bray. These are all strong points in a way in Mr. Wiman's favor, and yet I hardly think they justify the action of the Congressional Committee in passing their resolutions in favor of reciprocity as a personal favor to Sir Richard Cartwright and himself. The New York *Sun*, in yesterday's issue, states the case to the Canadian people in candid, straightforward and unmistakable terms, as follows:—

"'That there may be no needless misunderstanding, we beg our Canadian friends to understand that they can have free trade with the United States—the only important system of real free trade in the world—on the same terms as the United States themselves enjoy it, namely, on the terms of political union. All other propositions, such as that of Mr. Hitt, in the House of Representatives the other day, can lead to nothing but vanity and vexation of spirit.'

"There are only three courses of action open to the Canadian people: 1. Sir John, protection and *statu quo*. 2. An independent republic with high protection to home industries and an attempt to maintain an independent national existence as a competitor of the United States for European emigration. As a matter of course the 5,000,000 of Canadians will have the short end of the whiffletree, while the 65,000,000 of Americans will have the long end. 3. Independence as the first step towards annexation. The maintenance of an independent republic is possible but not at all probable, and, therefore, practically, there are but two courses open to the Canadians, namely, *statu quo* or annexation. It gave me infinite pleasure to be assured that the Hon. Edward Blake does not approve of the policy proposed by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Wiman. I predict that if the Liberal party appeals to the country at the next general election with no other policy than the undefined and undefinable one of unrestricted reciprocity, the result will be overwhelming defeat, and if I were an elector in Canada I should use my best endeavors to make the majority against as overwhelming as possible."

That is the letter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would you just read what Solomon White says, now?

Mr. BROWN. I have nothing to do with him. I wish to emphasise, in conclusion, that we should do the utmost in our power to neutralise any effort to weaken our allegiance, not only to our own country, but the country from which we sprung. There may, as the years roll on, be changes of some kind or other in Canada and the other dependencies of the Empire—who knows?—but, whatever changes may come, will most assuredly be of a character to strengthen and bind closer and closer the ties which attach us to the Throne of England. We possess the grandest and most magnificent system of railways in the world; we possess the largest and best managed railway in the world; and I have no sympathy with the picayune way in which some hon. gentlemen talk about our expenditure in connection with immigration. Instead of $50,000, I would gladly see $500,000 expended in bringing emigrants to this country. What we want is to people the country. Let us, regardless of politics, stand shoulder to shoulder in seeking to bring out men to people this country. Let us make every attempt to unearth what is precious beneath the soil of our Rockies. $94,000,000 a year is taken out in gold from the United States Rockies, and an expert told me, when I had the pleasure of visiting the Pacific coast, that there is no reason why we should not develop an equal amount of wealth in our Rockies, and I, therefore, approve of the action of the Government in admitting mining machinery free for a term of years, in order to develop the mining industry of British Columbia. I have visited that Province, and I know there is a great future for that country, of which we should be proud. It has forests, grand beyond the conception of man, seas teeming with fish which have as yet scarcely been touched by the nets of the fishermen; it has vast possibilities of every description, hidden in the womb of the future, which we Canadians cannot possibly estimate. Let us, then, do what we can to develop those resources, and let us show, in every way, our devotion to those principles which will advance the interests of the country. Let us maintain those free institutions we possess, and which have made the country from which we spring honored by the whole world. I have no sympathy with a man, be he of what politics he may, who will be found silent when the progress of his country is at stake, just because that progress is promoted by the party opposed to him in politics.

Mr. MITCHELL. How about voting?

Mr. BROWN. The leader of the third party, who has not a greater admirer in this House than myself, knows well—nobody knows better—that our great object to-day should be to fill the North-West with people, and I shall hail with joy and pleasure every reasonable proposition to bring men of the right stamp to settle there. It is a land

> Where a man is a man if he's willing to toil,
> And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil.

But it is no land for the idler. It is a land where the hard-working peasant of England, though he be poor, will find material for the making of an honest living, and where he can acquire a farm for himself and achieve a position of ease and independent competence. We must not allow ourselves to be led away by the cry to prevent certain kinds of immigration. Let the man of stout heart, strong arm and determined will, come out to our North-West, and assist in every way in his power in building up that country; and let us endeavor in every way possible, to bring out such men to build up that country. The more who go in there the better for our manufacturers. The day is coming, Sir, when that great North-West will be dotted over with cities and divided into various Provinces, and become the centre of great industries. To-day, in Vancouver, they have organised a sugar refinery, and we will soon hear sugar coming down from the Pacific coast, and meeting the sugar refined in Montreal, Moncton and Halifax. The great Canadian Pacific Railway, the greatest civiliser next to the Messenger of the Cross, has done more to develop and open up that country than man could possibly conceive. Let us see that we do our duty in taking advantage of the openings there made by that railway and the branch railways which, through the wise action of the Government, are piercing that country in numerous directions; for, in the words of the Earl of Selkirk, the day is coming when that country will be the home of three millions of people. Let us rise to a sense of our duty and responsibility, and endeavor by the manner in which we administer the affairs of Canada, to promote its welfare, so that we may follow in the steps of that great country from which most of us have come—and which has bequeathed to us her spirit and her fame—and leave to our posterity a land of peace, prosperity and power.

Mr. FLYNN. I desire to offer a few observations on the resolutions which have been submitted by the Finance Minister. I am aware that nothing I can say will have the effect of altering anything contained in those resolutions, but, as I represent a constituency in a Province which will be largely affected by the proposed changes, I feel it my duty to protest against them. When the

National Pelicy was adopted in 1879, it was to be a policy of redistribution rather than of protection. The policy adopted by the Government has since been sustained by the people, but the present proposals are calculated to make the taxation fall heavily on the poorer class of the people, and it is on that ground that I feel bound to protest to-night on behalf of that class which is the most deserving of consideration. Two classes of people have sought relief from the Government this Session. The one class was the fishermen. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) introduced a resolution asking for an increased bounty to the fishermen, and he stated, as I did on the same occasion, that it would be no additional burden to the people of this country, as the fishermen were only claiming the allowance from the interest on an amount which was paid by a foreign Government on the award of arbitrators. But these fishermen had only my hon. friend from Lunenburg, myself, and a few other members to defend them. The other appeal to the Government was made by the milling industry. That industry was more powerful. They came here and asked the Government to add to the duty on flour, and they were successful, and now 25 cents a barrel is to be added to that duty, and that will be largely paid by the fishermen who were refused the boon which they asked. When the National Policy was introduced, it was understood that there was to be a duty of 50 cents a barrel on flour and 40 cents on cornmeal. It was then stated that this would largely affect the people of the Maritime Provinces, that it would be a sectional tax, but, in order to give the people of the Maritime Provinces a compensation, duty was put upon coal. That existed until two years ago, when the duty on anthracite coal was taken off, while the duties on flour and cornmeal were left as before. If justice had been done to the people of the Maritime Provinces, the moment the duty was struck off anthracite coal, the duty should have been taken off cornmeal or flour. The duty on bituminous coal would be of no use without the duty on anthracite. The millers complained to the Government that 50 cents a barrel on flour was not sufficient protection to them, as they had to pay a duty on wheat. Then the best course for the Government would have been to reduce the duty on wheat or abolish it altogether. But, while this increased duty of 25 cents on flour will be felt very severely by the people of the Maritime Provinces, the duty on pork and beef is much more serious, and will be much more burdensome to the people of those Provinces. The increased duty on pork and beef will be no protection to the farmers of this Dominion, as the quality of pork required by the lumbermen and the fishermen is not raised in Ontario, but is raised in the United States, where they have cheap corn on which to raise it. Our farmers cannot compete with the United States in raising that quality of pork, so that, whether the duty is $2, $3 or $5, the fishermen must purchase it from the United States, and it will be no protection to the farmers of Ontario. Then, taking the article of beef, on which the enormous duty of $6 a barrel is placed, we must get the beef from the United States, no matter what the duty may be, and that will be a very heavy tax on the people of the Lower Provinces. Beef, pork, lard and flour are prime necessaries of life for the lumberman and the fisherman,

and these are the articles on which the greatest increase is made in the taxation submitted to Parliament by the Finance Minister. According to the Trade Returns of last year, the quantity of beef imported for consumption was 3,806,397 lbs., value $161,392, on which a duty was paid amounting to $38,063.97. The amount of pork imported was 15,206,172 lbs., at a value of $992,438, on which a duty was paid of $152,061. The quantity of flour imported was 258,830 barrels, on which a duty was paid of $129,406. Quantity of lard imported, 8,285,266 lbs., on which a duty was paid of $165,707.65. On all these articles, prime necessaries of life for the poor man, the duty has been largely increased. Now, assuming that for the coming fiscal year we import the same amount of these articles as we imported last year the duty has been increased to this extent: On beef, from $38,063 to $114,195; on pork, from $152,061.72 to $228,092; on flour, from $129,407 to $194,110; on lard, from $165,705 to $248,058; or, in other words, a duty was paid in these four articles last year amounting to $485,240; and on the same articles this year the duty will amount to $784,358, or a total increase in duties on flour, beef, pork and lard, of $299,117, or within a fraction of $300,000. Now, it is to be remembered that these very articles, mess beef, mess pork, lard and flour, are consumed chiefly by the poor people of this country, so that the greatest portion of this increased taxation will be borne by those who are the least able to bear it. I regret that the hon. Finance Minister had not the same consideration for this class of people, the lumbermen of his native Province, and of the rest of this Dominion, as did the gentleman who preceded him in the office of Finance Minister. When Sir Leonard Tilley introduced his tariff resolutions in 1885 he felt that it would be injurious to that interest to increase the duty on pork, and he resisted all pressure to induce him to impose a higher duty. He recognised the importance of the lumber interest to this country, and realised that it would be a gross injustice to that industry to tax that article of food. On that occasion, Sir Leonard Tilley used these words:

"We have endeavored not to injure the lumber interests, because they now have a very important article used by their people at about the same rate of duty they had it before. I refer to pork."

I, therefore, regret that the present Finance Minister, who comes from the same Province, had not the same consideration for that important industry that Sir Leonard Tilley had. When I take other articles on which the duty is increased, it appears to me that the revenue will be increased by at least one million dollars. Now, Sir, I ask myself the question, and I may be permitted to ask the Finance Minister, where is the necessity for this increase of taxation? What reason does the Finance Minister give for asking to impose these further burdens on a class of people who are least able to bear them, that is, the lumbermen, the fishermen and the poorer classes? He has assigned no reason. In the same speech in which he introduced this proposition to raise the duties on these articles, the hon. gentleman announced to the House that he had a surplus for the current year of $2,700,000, and he expected a surplus for the year 1890-91, of $2,500,000. Now, I remember that in 1875, when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), occupied the

position of Finance Minister, and when bringing down his Budget he announced a small surplus of half a million, he was attacked by Sir Charles Tupper, who stated that a Finance Minister had no right to have a surplus. The contention then of Sir Charles Tupper was that it was the duty of a competent and capable Finance Minister to make an estimate of the probable expenditure during the year, and to arrange the revenue so as to meet that expenditure, and that every dollar he received beyond that sum was so much money taken from the pockets of the people. On that occasion Sir Charles Tupper used these words:

"I say the Government have no right to have a surplus; if they have, they should endeavor to get rid of it and the best way to do so is that pursued by us and by the Government of Great Britain, by lightening the taxes on the people; and when I tell you the article of sugar pays in this country 50 per cent. on its cost, while in England the Government have swept the tax away altogether, I think the House will agree with me that the time was most opportune to have used this surplus, not in adjusting the tariff for sugar, as the hon. gentleman proposed last year, but by such a decrease of duty upon the lower grades of sugar as might accomplish the object the hon. gentleman had in view when bringing the tariff before the House, and which would be received as a boon by the poorer classes of the country."

Such was the language of Sir Charles Tupper when criticising the Budget speech of my hon. friend from South Oxford. But to-day, not only is the sugar tax much greater than it was then, but every other article used by the people of this country has been subjected to a higher taxation; nevertheless, the Finance Minister announced to this House the other night that he had a surplus of $2,700,000 for the current year, and he expected to have one of $2,500,000 for the next year. More than that, he proposes resolutions for the consideration of this House, by which, I believe, if they are adopted, the people of this country would pay an additional tax of $1,000,000, if not more, and this tax would fall chiefly upon the poorer classes of this Dominion. The hon. members on this side of the House have often pointed out that it is the poorer classes of this country who feel the burden of the National Policy most severely. It seems that every turn of the screw by which that policy is extended, the poorer classes feel it still more severely. The article of flour is one of the prime necessities of life, and the Finance Minister proposes to increase the tax upon it. As an offset to this tax the hon. Minister says: But you are to have cheaper molasses and cheaper corn. He said on that occasion that the article of cornmeal was largely used in Nova Scotia; and, as an hon. member suggested, the hon. gentleman appeared to intend to feed the people on molasses and mush. Allow me, for a moment, to consider how much cheaper the people of the Maritime Provinces are going to obtain their molasses. The reduction of duty is 1½ cents per gallon. Let me presume that an average family consumes forty gallons a year, that being an outside estimate. On that calculation the amount really saved to a poor family consuming molasses would be 60 cents during the twelve months. Then, again, how does the hon. gentleman propose to treat the cornmeal question? He proposes to treat it by giving a rebate of 90 per cent., if ground in the Province. I am now supposing that we have mills in the Province. An hon. friend near me says they are all at present closed down by the operation of the tariff. I will suppose, however, that they will spring up again, and if the local millers grind this corn, they will avail themselves of the protection of 40 cents a barrel given to them. If meal is quoted at $2.50 to-day in Halifax, they may sell it at $2.48 or $2.49; but the cost to the consumer will remain the same, he paying the duty, if not to the Government, to the miller. Accordingly, there is no reduction in cornmeal. Ever since 1879, when the First Minister and his Government introduced the National Policy, they have always said they had one object in view, and that was to increase the tariff so as to secure reciprocal trade with the United States. That view has been constantly placed before the country. It has been announced again and again, and even as late as 1888 Sir Charles Tupper stated that:

"Down to the present hour we have adopted the policy on both sides of the House, and we have pledged ourselves to the people to do everything that lay in our power to obtain a free market for the natural products of our country with the United States."

With that statement, made to the House no later than two years ago, the people of the country were led to believe that, although hon. gentlemen opposite were opposed to unrestricted reciprocity, reciprocity in manufactured goods, still they were in favor of reciprocity in natural products, until the astounding statement was made the other day by the President of the Council that it would be most injurious to the farming interests of Canada if a treaty was entered into with United States' natural products. Now we have the announcement on that side of the House that those hon. gentlemen are not favorable even to partial reciprocity, to reciprocity in natural products. I think that announcement must have been heard with anxiety by the people of this country, and especially by the people of the lower Provinces, for while we on this side of the House have constantly advocated the fullest and freest trade relations, and the most unlimited and unrestricted trade with the United States, hon. gentlemen opposite have told the people they could not get unrestricted reciprocity, but they might get reciprocity in natural products, and the Government were in favor of that course. But now the President of the Council has announced a different policy, and it has not been denied by any of his colleagues, and it has even been reasserted by one of the Government supporters, that the Administration is no longer in favor of reciprocity in natural products. I say that announcement will be heard with some anxiety by the people of the lower Provinces, for they remember up to this hour the benefits they received from that treaty with the United States which was in operation from 1854 to 1866, when our country made most rapid strides in prosperity. They will regret to hear the announcement of the Government that they are no longer in favor of a reciprocity treaty in natural products. According to my view the resolutions submitted by the Finance Minister may be viewed in two important aspects. The one aspect is the enormous increase of taxation which they impose, unnecessarily impose, on our fishermen and lumbermen and laboring classes generally. But important as this aspect of the case may be, and it is a very important one, when you find it imposes onerous burdens on the poorest classes of the people, at a time when agricultural depression and depression of the lumbering business

prevail, there is another, and, to my mind, a much more important, a much graver aspect. When we consider our present relations with the United States, it seems to me that this becomes a very serious and important question. This is also the case, when we to-day consider the statement by the late Finance Minister, the present High Commissioner in London, when he said that a commercial war was an actual war, and when we were told how near we were to such war, and what he did to prevent that commercial conflict; when we see to-day the McKinley Bill before Congress, imposing higher duties on the natural products of this country entering the United States; when we see and know that the important question of the fisheries is still unsettled—when we see all these questions remaining unsettled, it is evident that this is not the time to irritate the people to the south of us. They are a people with whom we should have the most intimate social and commercial intercourse, and I am only afraid that the declarations made by the Government will tend to strain the feelings that exist and to lead to consequences that may be much regretted hereafter. At this time I deem it most unwise, I think the moment most unsuitable at this critical juncture of our history, that these resolutions should have been submitted. There was no necessity for them, the revenues did not require them; the protecting policy adopted by the Government did not require them, for every branch of industry has been protected; nothing required them, but everything demanded an opposite course. Knowing the position we occupy towards our neighbors it would have been a wise and statesmanlike view to have adopted a policy diametrically opposite to that adopted by the Finance Minister. I look upon this aspect of the case as a most serious one. In view of the announcement of the President of the Council, that the Government would refuse to enter into a treaty in natural products, the prospect of freer and fuller trade relations with the United States may look somewhat gloomy, and the prospect may not be as bright as we might hope; but there is a growing and intelligent sentiment in that country opposed to that restrictive policy, and favorable to breaking down those artificial barriers which have been set up, and desirous of entering into the fullest and freest trade relations; and while that sentiment is growing in the neighboring Republic, it is also growing in this country, and the time is not far distant when, under better auspices, and under a more enlightened policy adopted on both sides of the line, all these artificial barriers will be swept away, and the broadest and fullest trade relations will exist between this country and our neighbors to the south of us.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to congratulate the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), who has just taken his seat, on having made a very temperate speech from that side of the House. Unfortunately, we have not been accustomed to hear the moderate tone in debate from hon. gentlemen opposite which the hon. member for Richmond has displayed, especially when the question of the tariff is under consideration. I shall make a remark or two with reference to some statements which have fallen from that hon. gentleman. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there

was no duty on coal. Now, if I am not mistaken, the consumers of coal in Ontario, at all events, are paying very heavy duty on the coal that they consume most, and which is produced in the Province from which the hon. gentleman comes. There is no such thing as anthracite coal produced in the Province of Nova Scotia or in Cape Breton, so far as I can understand, and, consequently, the hon. gentleman would not be any better off if there were a duty on anthracite coal, seeing that it is not produced in that Province. As to the increase of duty on flour. If the hon. gentleman will remember what has transpired during the last few years since the duty was first imposed he will have within his recollection the declining price of flour as rather strange, in view of the fact that there was duty paid upon flour with a view of protecting it, and on the fair assumption that it would increase the value. The price of flour is lower now than it has ever been before in the history of Ontario, and the hon. gentleman will find that the duty has not been an oppressive one, so far as the consuming population of any part of Canada is concerned. With reference to the duty on pork, it has been said from the other side of the House that, from the day the National Policy was first adopted, the farmers were the class, above all others, that no provision had been made for by this Government. Now, Sir, there was some grain of truth in that, but not so much, after all, as some gentlemen would lead the country to believe. The farmers have been protected with reference to many of the products of their farms, as I intend to show before I sit down. The additional duty on pork was, I think, one of the wisest things this Government has undertaken on behalf of the agricultural industry—the greatest industry of the country. I am glad to hear that there has been very little objection taken to that particular tariff by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Surely no gentleman who represents a rural constituency, either in Ontario or Quebec, will object to the Government having found it at last proper to place an additional protection upon pork. The farmers of Canada have been passing through a very serious crisis, owing to the falling off of products for some years past. It is true that we have not been able to give them the prices that existed during the continuance of the American rebellion, or prior to the years before India and Russia became such strong competitors for the markets of the old world. But, Sir, we have been able at all events to give to our own producers, to a very large extent, the advantages and the benefits of their home markets, which was all that the National Policy ever undertook to do. To that extent, I think, we may fairly claim that the National Policy has been a success. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite on the stump, and in this House, that the followers of the Government promised they would keep up the price of wheat to a dollar a bushel, or some such large amount, notwithstanding what the value might be in any other country in the world. We never made such propositions to the people. All that we ever said to the farmers of Canada in addressing them in reference to the anticipated results that would follow from the introduction of the National Policy was, that we would give them at least their own market in Canada. I heard the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) say something with reference to the

imposition of tariffs, and its result in reference to the sale of corn in his Province. I am able to say, from information I have received from a gentleman from the Lower Provinces this afternoon, that since this new tariff has been brought down to the House 10,000 barrels of Nova Scotia cornmeal have been sold in the city of Halifax at the reduced price of 20 cents less than it had been sold at any time before this tariff had been brought down. The hon. gentleman ought to appreciate even that small favor, as he may consider it, for the benefit of the fishermen or the poorer class of the community who may use this article. I shall not further refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) and I propose now to present to the House my views on this question as they occur to me. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his reply to the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance, made what I consider one of the most damaging statements to the farmers of Canada that has ever been made on the floor of this Parliament, when he spoke in reference to the indebtedness of the people of Canada. I need not quote that hon gentleman's speech, as it must be fresh in the memory of hon. gentlemen, and I shall simply read what is necessary in order that I may answer it. The member for South Oxford says in reference to this question of the indebtedness of the farmers of Ontario :

"I have always believed that it was the duty, both of this Government and of the Local Government, who have investigated this matter, to have ascertained and put on record the increase or diminution of mortgage indebtedness, especially on farms, from year to year; and I regret much that neither one nor the other of these Governments has seen fit to do so. As the Governments would not act, and as I had cause to know that this indebtedness was increasing enormously, I took such means as were fairly open to me to ascertain what was the extent of the mortgage indebtedness of the Ontario farmers, and I am going to submit to this House a brief calculation, based on actual investigation, which may, perhaps, open the eyes of some people here and more people in the country to the condition at which the farmers of Onterio have arrived. I caused eleven ridings to be selected in various parts of the country, such as, in my honest judgment, afforded the fairest samples of its condition. Among those, I selected certain townships and certain concessions; and I have here from the reports of the registry offices of these counties a rather ample statement, to which I call the particular attention of my hon. friends from Ontario, showing the extent of the mortgage indebtedness among the farmers of this Province."

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say what were the results he obtained from eleven ridings. Then, to show how careful he is about it, the hon. gentleman goes on to say :

"In no case were any village properties included, and in no case were any farms of less than 50 acres put down"

This is no conclusion arrived at in a hasty way. The hon. gentleman had apparently spent considerable time, if not money, in getting the information which he desired and which he sought for in a very extraordinary way, when he went to the registry offices to ascertain the actual original amounts of the mortgages existing. A little further on he says :

"In the greater number, probably, of the older settled townships of the Province of Ontario, the average indebtedness of a township, according to its size, will range from $500,000 up to one million dollars; that the average indebtedness of each contituency, according to its size, will range to two or three millions; and that the total mortgage indebtedness of the Province of Ontario is probably well over 200 million, if it does not attain to 300 million dollars."

Here is a very bold statement made by an hon. gentleman who holds a very prominent position in the country and in his party, a gentleman who has had the responsibility of office, and who ought to know the danger of making statements which have really no foundation in fact, when he had it in his power to get just the information which he professed to be earnestly seeking for. I do not presume that the hon. gentleman is so ignorant, after all, as he would lead us to believe in the statement he made to this House, because I presume that a gentleman of his standing and position must be aware of the fact that not only one Government, but both Governments, have made reports with reference to the mortgage debt of the country, which would have given the hon. gentleman the information which he so earnestly sought in a small way through the side lines, probably, of those townships most likely to be encumbered. He could have found this information in a report of the loan companies and building societies in the Dominion, published by order of the Deputy Minister of Finance, made by N. S. Garland, clerk of statistics, for 1888.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that those cover all the mortgages in Canada ?

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman will get my answer in a few moments. I venture to say that they will cover all the mortgages, except, perhaps, such as the hon. gentleman himself may have against some unfortunate farmers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is so very ill-informed.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman may find out before I am through how well I am informed. Here are the reports for 1888 of seventy-eight companies in the whole of Canada, including sixty-five of the savings institutions of the Province of Ontario. They are all compiled here for the information of the hon. gentleman, and he need not have gone to the highways and byways to get the best report he could find or to draw upon his imagination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know all about it.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman could not have taken the precautions that most gentlemen in his position would have taken if anxious to give the best opinion he could of his country. Then, reports are given from ten companies in the Province of Quebec, one company in the Province of Manitoba and two companies in the Province of Nova Scotia. The capital stock of these companies is $81,816,000, and the paid-up capital $32,400,000. The deposits are $17,307,000, and probably a portion of these belonged to many of these very farmers who may have made deposits in the very year that they negotiated their mortgages. The current loans secured on real estate by mortgages made by these companies is $91,713,319. The hon. gentleman may say that there were large amounts in arrears. We would necessarily infer from the hon. gentleman's description of the condition of the country, that the farmers would be increasing their indebtedness, and the result would be that there would be large amounts of liabilities which they would be unable to pay as they matured. The amount of principal and interest overdue and in default in 1880 was $4,130,000. Now, according to the hon. gentle-

man's statement, the people are so distressed and so ground down by taxation that they are fleeing from the country as from a plague, so that we would naturally suppose that there would be a great increase in this amount; but what are the facts? The amount of principal and interest overdue and in default in 1880 was $4,130,000, but in 1888 it was only $2,516,000. That is just the condition of the country so far as the mortgages are concerned, and the hon. gentleman can take a good deal of comfort to himself in reflecting on this report. Now, I will give the hon. gentleman some further information on this matter. In 1887 the loans amounted to $17,162,000 and they paid back $18,987,000, which may be taken to represent to some extent what the borrowers paid back. In 1888 the loans were $17,049,000, and the borrowers paid back $18,839,000 of principal and interest. So that in the two last years of which we have returns no less than $3,600,000 over and above loans was paid back, representing I presume interest, besides the principal that was borrowed. I do not presume that these loans were made and paid back in the same year, but they were no doubt payments of former loans, and the figures go to show that the indebtedness was not increasing. Here you have 78 companies of the most sterling character in the country, with which I presume many members of this House are identified as stockholders or directors or presidents, and they know whereof I am speaking. I will give the hon. gentleman another statement connected with this matter. We have the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries, issued in Toronto, under the auspices of the leader of the Reform party in the Province of Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Mowat, who has I think some affection for his country and desires to speak well of it, contrary I believe to the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite. So far as the Hon. Mr. Mowat is concerned, I believe he desires that Canada should have a good reputation both at home and abroad. He feels like most Canadians, that it is honestly deserving of such a reputation, and that it ill-becomes any man who prides himself on being a Canadian, to seek in any way not fair, open or honorable, to damage the country by making statements unworthy the consideration of the House. I will give a statement of fifty-five companies which are reported in the Bureau of Industries published by the Ontario Government. I find that the total loans and investments made by these companies doing business in Ontario, the loans outstanding and secured by mortgage, amount to $81,235,305; and these figures cover not only the indebtedness of farm land in rural districts, but the indebtedness of cities, towns and villages as well. If I were to weary the House by going into the details, I could show exactly the proportion of this $81,000,000 which is due by the farmers, and I am confident I could prove that not one-fourth of the amount is on farm lands. The total indebtedness in the Province of Ontario, as shown by the companies doing business there, is $81,000,000, covering the towns and cities as well as the rural places. The loans, during 1887, by these companies were $17,162,412, and the borrowers paid back $18,987,927, and the loans during 1888, were about the same, $17,049,796, and the borrowers paid back again $18,839,040. It may be said that the counties are very grievously taxed, and that every county and municipality is heavily in-

debted. I was led to believe that myself, from having heard it so often, but I took the trouble to investigate the reports made by these county councils in Ontario, and was greatly surprised at the results. I find in Blue's Report, folio 100, table 15, that the total county indebtedness in Ontario, in 1887, was $4,065,283, and the township indebtedness was, strange to say, very much the same, $4,237,396, representing a total, township and county indebtedness, of $8,303,679, in the year 1887, the report of that year being the last report I could lay my hands upon. I need hardly mention, because it is pretty well known to hon. gentlemen, who have seats in county councils, that they have very large assets. Their assets exceed by $600,000 their liabilities, which are partly met by good securities, partly by real estate, and partly by taxation of the townships and municipalities. So much for the picture of blue ruin in which hon. gentlemen opposite delight. Let us see now, from Mr. Blue's statistics, how badly the farmers have suffered. Take the report of 1888, at page 150, and you will find that the average value of farm lands, from 1882 to 1888, was $638,772,948. In 1887 it was $636,883,755; in 1888, $640,480,801, and in this estimate buildings are not included. Here is an increase in 1888 over the average, from 1882 to 1888, of $3,700,000. Is that an evidence of ruin and of people fleeing from the country, and of farms being left vacant? I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to point out to me any farms ever worth the attention of the settler which are idle to-day. I know of none, and I have the pleasure of living in a county where we know what farming means. We find that in buildings, the increase over 1882 is $15,600,000; in implements, $3,000,000; in live stock, $3,000,000, the average from 1882 to 1888 in live stock being $99,839,261, and the value in 1888 being $102,839,235. Put these figures together and what do we find as the result? From 1882 to 1888, the average value of farms, buildings, implements and stock was $956,832,048; in 1887, the value was $975,292,214; and in 1888, $981,363,094, showing an increase of $24,481,046, in 1888 over the average from 1882 to 1888. Does that look like ruin and decay? These figures are taken from the returns made by the councils of the various counties, and I think we have a right to rely upon the calculations of men who are directly interested and who, besides, are under the apprehension that if they gave over-estimates they might in all probability be taxed on these values hereafter, and so made to pay more than they ought to pay. This is not a result we need at all be ashamed of. I would like to ask where these men, who are represented as fleeing from the country, can go to better themselves? Whither are they flying? Is it to the country which is so desirable in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite that they are going, being weary of their hard life in Canada? Are they flying from a country overtaxed to one where the people do not understand what taxation means? Surely these hon. gentlemen do not imagine the people are so credulous as to accept any such statement. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his admirable—shall I call it—essay, made one of the most remarkable speeches I have ever had the pleasure of listening to in this House. I think he excelled himself in one par-

ticular direction at all events, and that was in going beyond the mark. The hon. gentleman has always been strong in exaggeration; he generally draws upon his imagination for his facts, and will lend color to anything rather than face the actual state of affairs. Then the hon. gentleman took a little journey the other evening in the essay which he gave us in this House. He says:

"Why, we have not the inducements to draw them here, we cannot get them to come here."

This is referring to immigrants—

"Not only do we fail to get immigrants to come here, but our own people are forsaking us, and the result is that we have fear for the future, and the consequence is a great exodus of people fleeing from the wrath to come, realising that the country is going to ruin, and they are bound to get out of it, and I cannot deny that they are showing good sense in doing so."

Did you ever listen to such trash as that? Did you ever listen to such language used in a deliberative body supposed, at all events, to represent the best interests of our people? I must confess that for any one who professes to love his country, the hon. gentleman shows remarkable taste in the way in which he tries to induce people to come here or remain here. He goes on to give the case of one of his constituents—poor fellow, I have no doubt he voted for the hon. gentleman and was sorry for it afterwards. He said:

"It is said that a farmer down in my section of the country died lately, and some spirit medium professed to say what happened after his death. He had gone to market and sold his little crop of wheat for 81 cents a bushel. He had gone to his storekeeper, and finding he had only sufficient money to pay one-half his bill, he gave his note at six months for the balance. He had saved a little money for the absolute necessaries of life, and he made a few small purchases. He bought a dollar's worth of sugar, and he found between the Government and the refiner they took 50 cents of the dollar he expended. Then he wanted a felt hat for his little boy, and on it there was a duty of 25 per cent. which, with the profits of the wholesale and retailer, brought his cost to 37 per cent. more than it should be. He bought a few nails to fasten a few boards on his barn, and on them there was a duty of a cent a pound and the profit of the merchant was half a cent, making the amount one and half a cent more than they could have been purchased under free trade. He bought a razor, and that was taxed 25 cents. Then he looked at some glass goblets for his wife, but as the duty was 30 per cent. they were beyond his resources. Then as to binding twine he found that cost 25 per cent. more than should have been charged, especially as the Government were supposed to do something for the poor agriculturist. He wanted a cloak for his child who was attending Sunday school, but he found a duty on it of 7½ cents a pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and that was beyond his wealth. Two and a half cents per pound have been added to the duty, I understand. Next he bought some yarn for his mother-in-law to knit stockings, and on that there was a duty of 7½ cents per pound and 20 per cent. He looked at some kid gloves, as his daughter was about to be married, but he could not reach them as the duty was too high; then he bought a sheet of paper to write his will on, and he paid a tax of 35 per cent. on that. He went home, and he came to think over matters, and he made up his mind that this was no world for the farmer to live in, so he took that 25 per cent. razor and he went out to the barn and committed suicide. We have the rest of the transaction only through the spirit medium, and I do not know whether it was true or not, but it is represented that he went to Hades, and his Satanic Majesty met him and took him kindly and cordially in. He put him into a chamber where there were a great many Conservative politicians and Conservative editors, who died in their sins, but the farmer did not feel at home there. Then he moved him to a place where there were a couple of deacons and a number of election agents, who had met together in a Conservative caucus to devise means for carrying the County of Haldimand, but he did not like that association, and he went next into a place where there were a number of doctors and lawyers, but there he did not feel at home either. Then the Devil came round and asked him what he wanted, and said to him: 'What are you?' and the other replied: 'I am a farmer.' 'Where are you from,' said the Devil? 'I am from Canada," he replied, and 'Who did you vote for?' enquired his Satanic Majesty."

No doubt it was perfectly understood for whom he voted. However, at last the hon. gentleman says the farmer was taken into a place where he found a great number of people hung up "and the farmer said 'What does this mean?' 'Well,' said the Devil, 'these are Canadian farmers who voted for Sir John A. Macdonald and the National Policy under the impression that it would rise the price of grain, and as they are too green to burn, I have hung them up to dry.'" I think those farmers will not be too green to recognise that they should not have that man to represent them in this Parliament any longer. I have had great respect for that hon. gentleman in years gone by, but I regret that he should try to deceive the people by stating that the population is flowing from this country to another because of the National Policy. If they are going to a country where the taxation is much higher than ours, they cannot understand the principles of the hon. gentleman. Let us see some of the items of taxation in that country. At the head of the list we find sugar and molasses taxed 78 per cent. Wool and manufactures of wool taxed 58 per cent. iron and steel taxed 40 per cent. These are some of the necessaries of life, so these poor fellows who are fleeing from Canadian rule are fleeing to a country where a larger taxation exists than exists here. Then we have flax and manufactures of flax, 28 per cent.; silks, 49·71 per cent.; cotton, 40·17 per cent.; fruits, 27·90 per cent.; chemicals, drugs and medicines, 35·03 per cent.; tobacco and manufactures of tobacco, 83·32 per cent. I think that is one of those things that the poorest man might be permitted to use without being heavily taxed. Then glass and glassware is taxed 59 per cent.; earthen, stone and chinaware, 56·97 per cent.; fancy articles, 41 per cent.; animals, 20 per cent.; hops, 42·64 per cent.; fish, 21 per cent.; vegetables, 24 por cent.; rice, 64 per cent.; salt, 49·92 per cent., and so on. I think they will get pretty well salted when they get over there. I think they will realise that they have not escaped all the ills that flesh is heir to. Now, let us see what our exodus is. We have some evidence on that matter. The United States Bureau of Statistics in its report dated the 30th June, page 818, gives us the total exodus from the Dominion, including Newfoundland and Labrador. It begins with the year 1881, when the National Policy was just commencing, and comes down to 1885, when they stopped giving the statistics from Canada in consequence of the scrutiny which was made by a committee of this House into the way in which they were obtained: I think hon. gentleman who took a hand in that matter will recollect it clearly. Here we have in 1881 an exodus from Canada, including Newfoundland and Labrador, to the United States, of 125,391 · in 1882, 98,295; in 1883, 70,241; in 1884, 60,584; in 1885, 38,291. I find a note stating:

"Thus immigration from British North America is not included since 1885."

Here is a very good showing, I should say. This is the tremendous exodus that has given such trouble to the country, as we find it in the figures of the Americans themselves, published in their own reports, reports that the hon. gentleman often

refers to, but, for his own reasons, he has omitted to quote these, because they would show that the exodus was not so great as has been described. These figures show the contrary to his contention, and, therefore, he does not present them to the House. Now, the American Government, in consequence of what had transpired, in consequence of the enquiries made by the immigration department here to the immigration authorities on the American side, decided that their figures were so unreliable that they dropped making these statistics at all. The statistics they did give us, however, show a gradual diminution of the exodus from this country, and yet the National Policy has been extended from time to time, and if our people were going away at any time, according to the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite, they should be going away in greater numbers now than they did then. Now, let us see what kind of a country our Canadians are fleeing to. Senator Voorhees offered a resolution in the Senate, on 17th March, to the following effect :—

"Whereas, the deep and widespread depression and decay of the agricultural interests of the American people, the enormous and appalling amount of mortgaged indebtedness on agricultural lands; the total failure of home markets to furnish remunerative prices for farm productions, and the palpable scarcity and insufficient money in circulation in the hands of the people with which to transact the business of the country and effect exchanges of property and labor at fair rates, are circumstances of the most overwhelming importance to the safety and well-being of the Government: therefore, be it

"Resolved, that it is the highest duty of Congress, in the present crisis, to lay aside all discussion and consideration of party issues, and to give promised and immediate attention to the preparation and adoption of such measures as are required for the relief of the farmers and other over-taxed and under-paid laborers of the United States."

Now, it seems strange to us in Canada, who have been led to believe all the wonderful tales of success and the great fortunes that were being made in that country by all classes who had gone there from Canada and elsewhere—it seems strange to us to read a resolution of this kind offered in the American Senate. We find that the American people are sensible enough to realise that they are passing through the same crisis as all other western peoples, and perhaps Great Britain as well. Now, there are matters that are not under the control of legislation, which affect the prosperity of nations, although they may be ameliorated to a certain extent by legislation. We all know that Russia is now competing in the British market. She has very much cheaper labor, and is able to put the products of her farms into the British market at a much lower price than the farmers of this country are able to do, and live comfortably. Now, let us see what the Los Angelos *Times*, of 17th February, says regarding the destitution in the American North-West :

"The Chicago *Tribune* recently sent a special commissioner out to investigate, who found that the half had not been told. It was very difficult to ascertain the truth, and every difficulty was placed in the way of sending off facts, by real estate agents and others interested in hiding the truth. Here is a picture of the fearful destitution prevailing among the farmers:

"'Curtainless windows of deserted farm-houses look back vacantly. It is rarely you meet a sledge, and then it is one loaded with coal, never with grain or hay. In the houses the floors are bare, a blanket is a luxury, a suit of woollen underwear unheard of, and there is a total lack of shoes and stockings of a kind that will keep out the cold and wet. It is of no use attempting to describe a family here and there; in every farmhouse it is the same. The drouth was spread evenly over all the fields of grain. Destitution followed in its track. The clothing of those new settlers is worn out, rations are low, feed for the stock there is none, and money is absolutely unknown. Credit is a thing of the past.'"

Now, there is a picture of a country that hon. gentlemen have often held up to us as being a very desirable place for settlement and one that was a strong competitor for emigration from Canada as well as from the old country. When hon. gentlemen hear tales like that they ought to feel satisfied with their own country. I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to point out anywhere, in the agricultural districts of Canada or in the cities either, where such a tale as that can be told. Those hon. gentlemen made it a point to go round and find out the indebtedness of the farmers, in a peculiar way, and possibly they may draw upon their imaginations and misrepresent to others a state of things that does not exist; but when the facts are known, we have much to be proud of, and a great deal to congratulate ourselves upon in the present state of our country. Now, there is another point we must remember, and that is that in the United States they have to provide for an army of pensioners. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) very often gives us a dissertation upon our superannuation list, and I do not know but what we might fairly term it our pension list, although it is scarcely fair to those who have been contributors to that list. Hon. gentlemen opposite have often spoken to us about American affairs, and perhaps some of them are desirous of throwing in their lot with them, for good or for evil. Let me tell them that in the United States there is an army of no less than 489,725 pensioners now maintained at the public expense, and in the year 1889 that army was paid no less than $89,131,780. I ask: Do any of our strong, able-bodied men want to go from Canada to a country where there is so much destitution, and help to make up this fund of eighty-nine million dollars a year to pay pensioners? I flatter myself that no Canadian would like to contribute toward any portion of that sum to pay these men who are living as idlers, many of them. It is estimated that within the next four or five years this pension fund will run up to nearly one hundred million dollars. That is a state of things that we do not want in Canada. I am sorry that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is not in his place, for he might correct me, if I am wrong, in making a little reference to a communication that I find here from the Portage la Prairie *Review*, under date of 18th September. It is headed, "Disgusted Dakotans:"

"Mr. A. D. Campbell, of Glenfield, Foster County, Dakota, called at the *Review* office on Saturday, and gave us the benefit of an interview with him relative to some of his experiences during the past five years in Dakota. Mr. Campbell is an intelligent young farmer, who moved from Brant County, Ont., to Dakota five years ago. He is well known in that part of Ontario, but, perhaps, not so well as his brother, who is now treasurer of the County of Brant. Mr. Campbell's present trip to Manitoba is for the purpose of seeking homes for his own and twenty-five other families living around him in Dakota, who are disgusted with the country, and are bound to get out at any cost. He had been west as far as Calgary, and stopped off here on Friday to look over the Portage plains. He said, in relating his experiences: 'there are lots of young men in Ontario, who are, perhaps, working on rented farms, and they may be thinking of coming to Dakota, and I want to give them a word of warning not to come. We made the mistake in going there, and they can profit by our failures. I have worked away there for five years, sank what money I had, and I'll not be able to take out $600. I'd be mighty glad if I could sell for that amount when I go back. Two years ago our crops were a total failure, and the county had to

furnish us with seed. Last year the same thing happened, and the county again came to our rescue. This year we had no crops, and the county cannot help us, for it has already borrowed money to the extent of its bonding power, and what we are going to do now, if the United States Government does not come to our rescue, God only knows. The only sure thing we have about farming there is taxes. We pay fifteen mills on the dollar of county tax and twelve mills besides for school tax. Everything is taxed in the house and out of it. In good years, when the crop is not a failure, the best average is fifteen bushels an acre. We live thirty miles from market, and last year we couldn't get anything for our butter. When we took it to the store the merchants gave six cents a pound for it at first and then they quit taking it altogether. We begged them to ship it to St. Paul, and get what they could for it and give it to us, but they wouldn't touch it.' In addition to this bit of his experience, Mr. Campbell gave us a little of his opinion, too, and we give it as nearly as may be, as we got it. He said: 'You fellows are all Grits up in this country. You needn't deny it now; I know all about it, for haven't I talked with people from Winnipeg clear through to Calgary, and you are all Grits. You are kicking against the National Policy, and you are just cutting your own throats. You think if you get the duty off and get American machinery in here you would be all right, but you are mistaken. The Yankees will use you well till they get you all solid with your duty off, and then look out. Why, I saw an American plough up the line sold for $75, and they charge us down in Dakota $85 for the same machine. These Yankee land agents and railway people are nice enough till they get you located, and then you are not of much account after that. You people here had better build up a Pennsylvania and Connecticut down in Ontario and Quebec. They'll do your manufacturing, and you raise stuff to feed them. Don't send your money to build up St. Paul and other cities in the United States, Canada for the Canadians I say! A man who is a Grit ought to get and live in Dakota a while and he'll soon make a mighty good Tory.' Mr. Campbell was driven over the Portage plains, and to say that he was astonished at our yield of 30 to 40 bushels of fine wheat to the acre, would be putting it mildly. He left on Monday for Winnipeg and for his home in Dakota. He will advise those by whom he was sent up here to pull up stakes and come to Manitoba just as soon as they can."

That is the kind of literature we should distribute to the people, especially when it comes from men who have had experience. I hope that it will be the means of retaining many young men in Canada. I have some further facts here. The New York *Times* says the farmers of the United States are struggling under a burden of mortgage indebtedness approximating nine thousand millions of dollars. The *Times* further says:

"The greater portion of the money represented by the faces of these mortgages has not been expended in improving the farms, because the larger proportion of the farms were supplied with buildings before the mortgages were laid. The money has been spent to enable the farmers to live."

The Chicago *Times* says:

"Farm mortgages are swallowing up millions of acres of land in the Southern and Western States and Territories."

Professor Henry, lecturing in Richmond, Wisconsin, said:

"One of the richest prairies in the United States is that of St. Croix Valley in Wisconsin."

Of that valley he said:

"To-day the richest part of it is almost without fences; the majority of the farm buildings, especially the barns, are poor, and the people complain bitterly of hard times."

Frank Wilkeson, writing in *Bradstreet's*—an American writing in an American journal of high character—says:

"The present prosperity of Dakota is based upon the expenditure of the capital procured by mortgaging the farm lands. The farmers are spending their farms, mortgages are at 8 per cent. to 10 per cent., and the impoverished farmers have to pay an additional 10 per cent. on renewals, so that interest is really 11 or 12 per cent."

The Cleveland *Plaindealer* says:

"The mortgages on farms in Ohio amount to more than 700 million dollars, and are gradually increasing, and this, too, in an old, well developed farming country."

Mr. Cleveland, in one of his latest messages to Congress, said of the farmers in the United States:

"Their lands are declining in value while their debts increase."

A report made to the New York State Legislature in 1887 (vol. 2, No. 24, page 16, N. Y. Senate documents, 1887), says:

"It is an indisputable fact that the farming lands of this State during fifteen years have depreciated at least 20 per cent., and many agricultural localities are decreasing in population."

A despatch to the New York *Tribune* of 8th February says of the farmers in New Jersey:

"Many of the best and oldest of them say they cannot make both ends meet, and that the outlook is not encouraging. Many farmers have made assignments and others are in the hands of the sheriff."

The New York *Post* recently called attention to the fact that one of its correspondents counted in a drive on the main road from Lowell, Mass., to Windham, N. H., a distance of twelve miles:

"Six deserted sets of farm buildings, besides several which had already gone to ruin, while fields and pastures were growing up to wood."

If the ex-Finance Minister and other hon. members who have taken a prominent part in the discussion of the exodus would consider these statements, they would find there is no cause for our people being driven out of this country by the legislation of this Government. These figures I have quoted refer to the State of Ohio, which has always been regarded as one of the leading and most wealthy States of the Union. Here are pictures which hon. gentlemen opposite would do well to bear in mind when speaking of our own country, and they would do well to try to say a good word for Canada, and to assist our people to stay in this country with bright hopes for the future. These pictures are by the best American authorities, not by tourists, but by parties who are most deeply interested in the failure or success of the farming industries of the country, and pictures painted by such hands are worthy of the consideration of every intelligent citizen of Canada. It ought not to be imposed on any member of this side or the other side of the House to take up the cudgels in defence of his own country and to draw attention to the misfortunes of others, because we have a greater work to do if we are to realise the purpose for which we were sent here by our constituents. I will now come to a State very closely situated to Ontario. I refer to Michigan, which lies to the immediate west of Ontario, and which has always been considered as successful and progressive as our Province. What is the condition of Michigan to-day? An investigation was made in 1887 into the indebtedness of the farming community of Michigan. The result was that the commissioner computes "that the mortgage indebtedness of the State in 1887 was $129,229,553, on which an annual interest of $9,451,851 was paid." You will find this statement on page 2, report Bureau of Statistics, Michigan, 1888. Two facts are brought out in this statement. First, that the average rate of interest is about 8 per cent. In Ontario, according to the sworn returns of the land companies the rate of interest ranged from 5¾ to 6, 6¼ and 6½

per cent. The second fact is that the nine million acres of improved lands in Michigan had an interest burden upon them greater by $700,000 than the net interest paid by the whole people of Canada on their whole public debt, and then did not raise, by any means, as much live stock, as great a number of cereals as Ontario, nor produce as many pounds of butter and cheese. Now, Sir, there is the interest paid by the State of Michigan, which we suppose to be wealthy and prosperous, and yet we find that the interest paid upon the debt of that State is greater than the interest on our national debt. If hon. gentlemen doubt my statement they will find it corroborated at page 2 of the Report of the Michigan Bureau of Statistics for 1888. The fact is hon. gentlemen would do well to recognise it, that while the rate of interest is about 8 per cent. in Michigan, in Ontario, according to the sworn returns of the land companies, the rate of interest ranges from 5¾ per cent. to 6¼ per cent., the rate of 6½ per cent. being the highest. The nine millions acres of the improved lands of Michigan have an interest burthen upon them greater by $700,000 than the net interest paid by the people of Canada on their net public debt. These statements are, I think, interesting and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will bear them in mind when they are speaking ill of their country. Let me quote another fact with regard to the State of Michigan, which may be interesting to hon. gentlemen opposite :

"On page 84, Michigan Report Bureau Labor Statistics, 1887, there is a statement of mortgage foreclosures of farm properties in Michigan. There were in the year ended 30th June, 1887, no less than 1,667 foreclosures and 244 sales by levy of execution, or nearly four times more than in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island taken together, the total population of Michigan being 300,000 less than that of Ontario alone, and the value of farms about two hundred and thirty million dollars less than that of the farms of Ontario (according to the latest statement of both.

"In Canada we know very little about chattel mortgages on farm implements, growing crops, &c., &c. An investigation into these evidences of indebtedness in the State of Illinois showed that in 1887 farmers had given 25,442 chattel mortgages and 2,073 mortgages on growing crops. The result of the depression in agriculture in this State is that Illinois has lost in rural districts, between 1880 and 1886, 84,521 of its population.

"Checking these returns by the reports of the land companies, I find that the Erie and Huron Investment Company report for 1887 that the arrearages were only 4 per cent. of the capital invested; that they were 22 per cent. less than in 1886; that only two-thirds of 1 per cent. came back in the shape of property through foreclosure, and that the farmers in the vicinity of the company's headquarters in Canada had placed in the company's hands over a million dollars for investment. The Canadian company said, through their president, first, that the company had reduced their rate of interest by 1 per cent. in 1887; second, that the price obtained in 1887 from the sales of land were 25 per cent. higher than in 1886. The North of Scotland Canadian Mortgage Company reported that the amount of real estate which, in 1887, had reverted to the company through foreclosure was but $30,000 out of $3,000,000 invested. This same company reported in 1888 that there had been again a falling off in the rate of interest obtained; that while the company had £620,000 sterling of money lent in Canada, the amount of foreclosed property was less than $40,000. The Canada Land Company reported for 1888 that for the total lands leased and sold, the average was 33 per cent. over the estimated value of 1886."

We have heard so much about the want of vitality of the business life of Canada, and the inactivity in commercial circles, that I have been led to investigate whether there are any foundations for these statements and charges, which are given broadcast to the world. I think I may fairly illustrate the business of Canada in one respect, by giving the total of its imports and exports for a year and comparing them with the imports and exports of the United States. The imports and exports of the United States for 1889 amounted to $1,487,533,000, and counting the population at sixty millions, we get an average per head of $24.67 as representing the business activity of that great nation. Let us turn now to Canada, the country whose condition we heard so much deplored by hon. gentlemen opposite. The total imports and exports of Canada for 1889 amounted to $204,000,000, and if we divided that into a population of five millions we have $41 per head, instead of $24.67 in the United States. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, if that is not a fair indication of the business activity of this country. I am sure that business men and farmers as well, will recognise that as a fair illustration of the business enterprise and industry of the people of this Dominion. I may say, Sir, that the figures which I have quoted, and which I intend to quote, are collected by myself, and I believe they will be found correct. I have carefully endeavored to obtain them, as I always do from the most reliable sources, and I challenge their contradiction. Let me turn to some other statistics which will further prove that this country is prosperous, and that it is not in the condition alleged on the other side of the House. The deposits in the chartered banks in Canada in 1880 were $130,000,000 as compared with $66,000,000 in 1874, showing an increase of $64,000,000 during the period of our National Policy. If we look at the savings banks, building societies and loan companies, we find that in 1878 the deposits were $8,269,295, and last year the deposits were $17,712,885, or an increase of $9,443,590. I wish to draw particular attention to these figures, for it will be seen how the country fared during the five years of the Administration of the party opposite, who claimed to have achieved a great success as financiers and administrators of the affairs of the country, and who claimed that their revenue tariff was quite sufficient for the wants of the country, and better than our National Policy tariff. Let us look at the Dominion savings banks deposits. In 1874 the total deposits were $15,101,195, and in 1879 $14,222,074, or a decrease of nearly one million dollars from 1874 to 1879, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. In 1887 the deposits in the Dominion savings bank amounted to $50,944,785, or an increase over 1879 of $36,722,711. Let us add these figures together, and we will see what we will get. In 1878 the following were the deposits in Canada :

Chartered banks	$ 66,000,000
Societies, &c.	8,269,295
Government Savings Banks	14,222,074
Total	$88,491,369

Now let us compare that with the total deposits in the same institutions at present, after ten years of the benefits which the National Policy has conferred on the country. In 1888 the total deposits in Canada were as follows :—

Chartered banks	$130,000,000
Societies, &c.	17,307,033
Government Savings Banks	50,944,785
Total	$198,251,818

Deduct from this the total deposits in 1878

amounting to $88,491,369 and you have the enormous increase of $109,760,449 since the National Policy has been in operation in Canada. I think, Sir, if that does not represent the business life and business activity it would be almost impossible to give an illustration to the people of Canada. If that does not represent the very best results of the enterprise and the energy of the Canadian people, and if it is not accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, I think it would be very hard indeed to give them any reason at all, to show that we have prospered. We have another way of illustrating the business energies of the people. In 1874 the money orders issued amounted to $6,757,000, and in 1878 they amounted to $6,788,000, a very trifling increase. In 1889 we find that money orders were issued to the amount of $10,328,984. Does that represent business enterprise and energy, or do people take exchanges and buy money orders for amusement simply to show that they have some wealth? The number of letters and post cards issued, which passed through the post office in 1878, was 50,750,000, and in 1887, the last year for which I could get the figures, 90,750,000, a jump up of 40,000,000, in the post office business of the country, which, I think, is another good illustration of business life and activity. Take another illustration: In 1874 the postal revenue of the country amounted to $1,476,000; in 1879 it amounted to $1,534,000, an increase of $58,000, an average increase of $10,815 a year. In 1889 the postal revenue amounted to $2,984,000, an increase of $1,449,000 in eleven years, or an average of $131,804, against $10,815 during the period the Reform party were in power. Now, there are several ways of ascertaining the degree of prosperity in this country under the National Policy, and let me trouble the House with another statement on that point. The construction of railways in this country we have a right to take as representing whether the affairs of the country are stationary or progressive. In 1879 there were 6,225 miles of railways built, and in 1888, the last year for which I could get returns, there were 12,700 miles built, an increase of 6,445 miles since the National Policy was inaugurated. The passengers carried by these railways numbered 6,500,000 in 1879 as against 11,500,000 in 1888. Is that any evidence of energy, activity and business life? We have another way of estimating the prosperity of the business of Canada. We find that in 1879 8,348,000 tons of freight were carried by railways, while in 1888 17,172,000 tons were carried, or an increase of 8,823,000. Then, take the railway earnings. In 1879 they amounted to $19,925,000, and in 1888 they amounted to $42,159,000, an increase of $22,234,000. Not only by land, but by sea, the country has been displaying enterprise and energy, and I congratulate the House on the fact. The tonnage of sea-going and lake vessels in 1879 was 11,500,000 tons and in 1888 14,500,000 tons, an increase of 3,000,000 tons. Now, the hon. member for North Wellington stated that there was a serious number of business failures during the past year. I have not the figures for the past year, but I will give the result of my investigation of the failures as presented in two period of times. From 1874 to 1879 the failures in Canada reached the enormous sum of $133,000,000, which divided by the five years during which the Reform party were in power, gives an annual average of $26,500,000. Does that represent a satisfactory condition of things to the people of Canada, and what reason have we for supposing that it would not have continued if that party had remained in power? Contrast that showing with the showing for the nine years from 1879 to 1888 during the existence of the National Policy, when the total failures amounted to $106,000,000 or an average of $11,500,000 a year. Is that not an evidence that the country is really prosperous and is going on in a most satisfactory way, notwithstanding the assertion of hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is going to ruin and decay? I might drop the subject there with the fullest assurance that the House has heard enough to justify the statement I have made, that we have clear evidence of prosperity; but I will give some further evidence to the same effect. If there is any one thing more than another which shows the success and prosperity of a people, I believe it is the extent of their life insurance. As a rule, when men are not prospering they will not involve themselves in the expense of life insurance; they will rather carry their risk. When payments are pressing upon them, they will be careful to consider whether they can afford to take a risk of $5,000 or even $1,000 on their lives, and it is only the business men of the country who can afford to do it at any time. It is done very little by the rural population, although I believe they are beginning to find themselves in a better position to do it now than ever before. But the business men have made investments of that kind, not only for the future protection of themselves and their families, but for the sake of their credit, because a man can get better terms and treatment from a wholesale house if he has insured not only his life but his buildings, than he could under other circumstances. Now, the number of life insurance policies issued in Canada in 1879 was 53,000, and the value of the risks was $86,000,000; in 1887, the last year for which I am able to get the figures, the number of policies was 131,000, an increase of 88,000, and the value of the risks $191,500,000, an increase of $105,000,000. Now these are startling figures, and they are on the satisfactory side. They are figures on which we may congratulate ourselves. The same remarks I have made with reference to life insurances will apply to fire insurances. In 1879, the amount of fire policies was $407,000,000 and in 1887, $633,000,000, showing an increase of $226,000,000; and adding the two amounts together, we have $331,500,000 of fire and life policies in existence more than we had during the Administration of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mackenzie). I have here a statement carefully prepared from the Public Accounts, showing the products of the farm imported for home use into Canada, from 1874 to 1879 inclusive, and I include 1879, because, although the Conservative party was then in power, the National Policy had not then had time to have any effect. We imported for consumption to the extent of $55,000,000 worth, so that the products of the farmers in Canada had to meet this competition in their own market. I would ask could we hope for prosperity under such circumstances? Our farmers had to compete with American products in every market town. Every merchant could say to them: I can lay this wheat or these oats here from Chicago, at such a price, and if you do not take that price I will import the goods. The result was that $55,000,000 worth of

foreign products were brought into Canada to come into competition with our own farm products; or, on an average, $9,166,000 per year came in, and, worse still, came in without paying a dollar of taxation. Our farmers did not even have the miserable consolation of knowing that the Americans were helping to swell the receipts of our treasury, by paying a tax on these products with which they flooded our markets. Our farmers can produce all that the people require. It may be said that we do not grow enough corn, but I will be able to show that this country grows a good deal of corn, and that it was well worthy the consideration of the Government to put a tax upon corn for more reason than one, and I will quote Mr. Blue's statistics to prove this. From 1879 to 1889, we imported American grain and products of grain, amounting to $36,400,000 or at the rate of $4,100,000 a year, as compared with $9,000,000 a year during the six years of the Mackenzie Administration, and there is also this difference that, whereas in the one case, these products came in free, in the other they were subject to very heavy duties. What has been the effect of that policy? We have kept our market for our own people, as we declared the National Policy would do, to the extent of the difference between $55,000,000 in six years, and $36,000,000 in nine years. During last year, 1889, I find we collected $449,000, or nearly half a million dollars on our importation of American grain and grain products. Is not that a wise policy? Or should we admit free the products of the labor of American farmers to swamp the markets we have been endeavoring to build up for our own people, by means of bonussing railways and of establishing industries in this country? But no amount of reasoning, or figures, or facts, can convince the hon. gentlemen opposite, to whom we all know that the mention of the National Policy is like flaunting a red flag before a bull. In the great American Republic, on the contrary, both parties are united as to the necessity of protecting native industries, and there is no such party as a free trade party known there. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke of the cotton industry as one of the grievances of the country, claiming that the poor people are compelled to pay a high taxation on the cotton they purchase, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that our manufacturers are not only selling cotton cheaper than the imported article was ever sold for, but it is of a superior quality, and besides we are giving employment to our own artisans and people. In 1879, the quantity of the raw product imported was 7,250,000 lbs., whereas, in 1887, it amounted to 30,971,000 lbs., being an increase of 23,721,000 lbs. of raw cotton imported and manufactured during that period. Surely that ought to be taken into account when gentlemen are talking about the National Policy and the decay of the present condition of Canada. But that is not all. In 1878 there were imported from Great Britain and the United States 12,771,896 yards of bleached and unbleached cottons, valued at $971,685. Last year we only imported 1,634,190 yards, valued at $174,873. I think the difference in that alone illustrates what it really means, to import the raw product and manufacture it in this country. In 1879 we imported 6,230,084 lbs. of wool for manufacture. That was during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1887 we imported 12,038,693 lbs., or nearly double. Was it of no importance to the people of the country that that was imported for manufacture in this country? I cannot understand the dogheadedness of an individual who can stand up and say that it is not to the advantage of the people of this country to manufacture these goods in Canada. Hon. gentlemen may say that this wool came into competition with our own wool, but it is not so. The wool which would have competed with our wool has been shut out by a very proper duty. The long combing wools are very different from those which go into the manufacture of the fine cloths we are now using in Canada. There has been a good deal said about the increase of our national debt. No doubt that has increased very largely, but I think we have value for it, and I think I shall be able to show that we have. At the time of Confederation, there was a debt of Ontario and Quebec amounting to $62,500,000, Nova Scotia $8,000,000 and New Brunswick $7,000,000, or a total of $77,500,000. That was simply taking over the burdens of the older Provinces, and placing them, as a matter of book-keeping, upon the broader shoulders of the Federal Government. In 1869 Nova Scotia comes in, under Better Terms, with $1,186,756, and in 1873 the following amounts were added:—The old Provinces, $10,056,089; Ontario and Quebec, $4,897,503; Nova Scotia, $2,343,159, New Brunswick, $1,807,720, Manitoba, $3,725,600, British Columbia $2,029,392, Prince Edward Island $4,884,023. We have here a total of $109,430,149. Is there a single dollar of that part of the national debt that hon. gentlemen opposite would say should not have been assumed? Does that increase the burdens of the people or the taxation? I have no doubt that pressure was brought by the Provinces upon the Government to accept the responsibility of this burden, and the Federal Government, as I think properly, did accept the responsibility. Let us see how the other portion of the national debt has been created. We have built and aided railways at the request of our own people, and for their benefit. Our own people have pressed for the construction of these roads in order to open up the country and develop the land, the forests and the mines, and specially to develop the far west. We find that we have expended $103,142,393 on railways since Confederation, chiefly on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. Then we have expended on canals $32,847,148. If that is not a wise expenditure, hon. gentlemen should object to it. We are now led to anticipate some other expenditures in the same direction, and I believe large works are being carried on on the Sault Ste. Marie and the Cornwall and other canals. I believe both the east and the west are a unit in approving of that expenditure, though counties such as that I represent may not feel interested in canal enterprises. Still, as forming part of this Confederation, we are bound to accept our share of the responsibility. The canals are competitors with the railways and afford means by which we can get our products into the best markets. On public buildings, we have expended $12,539,261, and on other public works, $15,861,053. That makes a total of $164,389,854. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say which of these public works should not have been constructed? I know that objections

have been taken to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway by some people, but very few, because I think the interests of Confederation necessitated the construction of that work. I do not say that it was done in the wisest manner. I am not here to justify the expenditure of every dollar as having been made in the wisest manner, but I do justify the course which has been taken in the construction of railways, and we know that the people everywhere are pressing the Government to assist the municipalities in the construction of those railways. If you take that amount of $164,389,854, and add to it the debts which were assumed, amounting to $109,430,149, you have a total of $273,820,003. That accounts for our national debt at once. I need not go a step further in order to show that we have full value for our national debt, which amounts to $237,530.000. And this is not all. You see the total net debt is 237 millions, whereas we account for 273 millions, the difference arising from expenditures on great public works and assuming the burdens of the Provinces. Not very long ago, at a meeting of the Young Men's Liberal Club in Toronto, they discussed the question of subsidies to the Provinces. The question was long and ably debated, and I may mention that the ex-leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. Blake, was appointed president of that association. The association adopted unanimously I think a resolution that in their opinion subsidies to the Provinces should, for the future, be discontinued. I do not know that hon. gentlemen in this House will agree with that. I am sure there will be but one voice in this House that these subsidies should not be withheld or withrawn from the Provinces, yet we find the ex-leader of the great Reform party is made president of a club which has passed a resolution to that effect. Now, let us see what we have paid to the Provinces. During the twenty-two years since Confederation, we have paid $76,867,506 to the Provinces out of the revenue of this country. Now, do hon. gentlemen suppose that we can have our loaf and eat it too? Do they suppose that we can go on carrying the heavy burdens of the Provinces without increasing our liabilities? I find that we have increased our liabilities from this source on an average of 3½ million dollars a year. If we take the year 1889 there is no less a sum than $4,051,427 put down in the Estimates for subsidies to the Provinces this year. Now, if hon. gentlemen are opposed to this expenditure, let them rise and denounce it as an unwise expenditure on the part of the Government, although it is forced upon this Government in consequence of the necessities of the Provinces. I want to make one more remark about the interest of the farmers. I find in the United States Trade and Navigation Reports for 1889 a table showing the proportion of grain imported by Great Britain and the country from which wheat is imported—when I say grain I mean wheat in this case. From 1871 to 1879 Canada exported 6½ per cent. of the total imports of wheat into Great Britain; from 1879 to 1888 we exported 4⅓ per cent.; but in the last year, I am sorry to say, there has been a decline, and we are now exporting but 2½ per cent. of the whole imports of wheat into Great Britain. How stands it with our rivals, the Americans, who, I am free to admit, do grow grain cheaper than we have yet been able to do it in the older Provinces? We find that our exports of grain to England have steadily declined since 1871, whereas they ought to have been increasing. I think I explained the reason to-day to be that we had been importing too much American wheat into this country, and the farmers had found it unprofitable to grow wheat, and the result was a decline in our export of that article. From 1871 to 1879 an average of 44 per cent., almost one-half the imports into Great Britain, was made from the United States. From 1879 to 1889 they had increased their exports into Great Britain to 54 per cent. of the whole, whereas in the case of Canada, our exports declined during that period. This is a matter of very serious import to the farmers of Canada. They have got to face the fact that not only in the great prairies of the American west, but on our own prairies, they have got to face competition; they have likewise to face competition from France, Germany, Russia and British India, and I think it is known how cheaply wheat can be produced in British India. In 1871 only one-half of one per cent. of the imports of grain into Great Britain came from India; in 1879 the proportion had risen to 3 per cent., and in 1888 to 12 per cent. Here is clearly the source of the trouble—it is that with the high priced labor the Canadian farmer has to employ we are not able to compete with the cheap labor of India, and of Russia, and of Germany, and of France; consequently our farmers must turn their attention to something else. Now, let me show how the matter stands with respect to the prices of grain in Canada and in England. In England, in 1879, the price of wheat was $1.80 a bushel; in Canada, in the city of Toronto, it was $1.32, a difference of 48 cents a bushel between Toronto and the British market. In 1890 the price of wheat in England is $1.08, in the city of Toronto it is eighty-seven cents, or a difference of twenty-one cents, so that we have improved our position with regard to the English market by the difference between forty-eight and twenty-one cents per bushel, or a difference of twenty-seven cents in favor of the English market, now, if we were exporters there, as against the state of things that existed when wheat was bringing $1.80 a bushel. Now, in 1879 the price of wheat was $1.49 cents in New York, and $1.32 in Toronto, or a difference of seventeen cents in favor of the United States. The price of wheat in England, as I said, was fifty-eight shillings per quarter, or $1.08 a bushel, in 1879; while in 1890 it is thirty-five shillings per quarter, or $1.08 per bushel. Let me now give the prices in Canada: Toronto, 1879, wheat $1.32; 1890, eighty-seven cents, or a decline of forty-five cents. New York, wheat, 1879, $1.49; 1890, eighty-seven cents, or a decline of sixty-two cents. I point out that since the National Policy prices between New York and Toronto are precisely the same. If this has not been brought about by the National Policy, what has caused it? The same means of communication between New York and Toronto exist, and also between New York and Liverpool. These facts show that under the operation of the National Policy wheat is worth as much to-day in Toronto or Montreal as it is in the leading cities of the United States. No. 1 hard wheat, produced in the constituency represented by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), is quoted to-day in Canada at $1.07 a

bushel, which is a higher price than is given for any other wheat on the continent. It is encouraging also that the price of wheat has been approaching that in the English market closer than was the case in 1879, and we have also evened up with the prices in the best markets in the United States, a condition of things that did not exist in 1879. While the price of wheat to-day is 87 cents in Toronto and New York, it is only 79 cents in Chicago. We all remember ten or twelve years ago it was the rule for grain prices in Chicago to rule higher than in Toronto. Now it is equally as common to have the prices of grain higher in Toronto, and wheat from 8 to 10 cents per bushel higher than in Chicago. Oats in Chicago yesterday were 22 cents, in Toronto 30 to 33 cents. I remember the time when oats were much higher in Chicago than in Toronto, but the case is reversed to-day and the Toronto market is higher by about 8 cents per bushel than Chicago years ago. Corn is selling in Chicago at 29 cents a bushel. The question of corn is an important one for us in Canada. The Government have wisely retained the duty on it, for two reasons: first, because it comes into competition with our coarse grains; and, second, because it is a great and growing industry in this country. Its production has ran up greatly for the last few years, and it appears, according to returns of the Statistical Bureau of Toronto, that we raised in 1889 no less than 17,436,780 bushels in the ear. The year before last the crop was a partial failure, only about 8,000,000 bushels being produced, while for the preceding year the quantity was about 12,000,000 bushels. The price now quoted is 29 cents per bushel in the ear, which is the price in Chicago to-day for shelled corn. I regret it was necessary to detain the House at such length, but I have found it difficult to listen day after day to statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite without making any reply. I did not offer any remarks on the tariff last year. I represent, however, as important a constituency as there is in Canada, and one of the garden counties of Ontario, and I have a right to speak in the interests of my constituents; and, at the risk of making myself troublesome to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I have simply discharged my duty as a representative of the farmers in my county. The more I see of the National Policy the more I admire it, and although I may have had at one time perhaps some misgiving, owing to the issues raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, as to the benefits that would result from it, those doubts have been cleared away. I am confident as to the future of this country, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will follow the course adopted in all other deliberative assemblies on this continent or elsewhere, and join heart and hand with one accord to do our best to secure the success and prosperity of the people of Canada.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must confess it is a rather ungrateful task, at this late hour to address the House, not so much for myself as for my hearers, but I presume that were I not to speak, another hon. member would, so that the result should be about the same for the House. This is why, although the hon. members seem anxious and tired of hearing speeches, I think it my duty to the electors I have the honor to represent, to state my views in reference to the question now before the House. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), who addressed the House this evening, made a statement which, to my mind, gives a fair idea of the political system which the Conservative party have been carrying on these last years. He said that should one go to the United States, one should hear almost every American say that the township in which he lives is the finest in the county, the county the finest in the State, and the State in which the county is situated the richest of the whole Union. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is about what the hon. members on the other side of the House have been saying these last few years. They have taken as their political tactics, hoping thus to promote the interests of their party, to extolling the prosperity of the country and crediting their policy with it. I do not intend to follow them on that ground. I agree with them on a most important point, that this Dominion is among the finest countries in the whole world; but, on the other hand, I think it is among the worst as far as government goes, and that, perhaps, explains why it does not enjoy the prosperity one might desire. In the twelve years I have had the honor of a seat in this House, I never saw a Budget speech received with so scant applause as the one delivered, on Thursday last, by the hon. the Minister of Finance. In 1879, when Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir Charles Tupper submitted to this House the so-called National Policy, they brought forth from their friends an indescribable enthusiasm; the two speakers were at every moment interrupted by frantic applause. They had succeeded in carrying their friends in a new world, the fool's Paradise. And yet the financial situation was not then flourishing. The current year promised a large deficit; the great commercial depression was not yet over. Nowadays, although the public treasury is overflowing; it is with but a trembling voice and an evident diffidence the hon. the Minister of Finance proclaims his surpluses and his political friends receive the news, good in itself, with the most evident coldness. Why is this? Where is the explanation of such a marked difference in the hearing of this House? It is because then, Mr. Speaker, there were hopes, and now there is the painful reality. Our surpluses are but the result of exaggerated taxation; and, with the distress of the people before them, the hon. members on the other side feel they would be committing an outrageous insult were they to applaud. But the hon. the Minister of Finance is not the only one who is doubtful and almost apprehensive. These last two or three years, the Government, feeling that the delusions of their protective policy were fading away, have been constantly waivering up to these last few days, when they finally resolved to adopt retaliatory duties against the United States, and maintain till the next elections the protective policy carried on since 1879. I think it my duty to oppose this policy, as I always did so far; and while craving the indulgence of this House, I intend, Mr. Speaker, saying a few words with respect to the situation now existing in the country, to its relations with the United States and to the means of improving our position at both the commercial and agricultural standpoints as well as that of the general interests of the people of this Dominion. I do not intend criticising in its details, the general management of public affairs nor recriminating as to faults and evils which are common

to all parties under constitutional Governments. In a democratic country like this, where frequent elections are held, where contests are very close in many counties, political exigencies arise as well as obligations under which Governments are to their friends, which indeed are not possibly warrantable as to morality and the interests of the country, but which nowadays are in some measure tolerated, inasmuch as they are the inevitable result of our policy and the political morals of our people. Too harsh a censure, a censure as to details, would not be fair, for one must not exact from others what one could not do one's self. I readily agree that it was impossible for the Government, notwithstanding the promises of economy made by some of their members when in Opposition, to prevent an increase in the public expenditure. But there is nothing to warrant an increase of 60 per cent. in the public expenditure, an increase of more than 60 per cent. in the taxation of the country, and an increase, in ten years, of 75 per cent. in the public debt. Never was there a satisfactory explanation given by the hon. members on the other side as to that alarming state of our finances. There exists but one explanation, which I venture to mention: it is that system of unscrupulous corruption, organised many years ago, by the present leader of the Government, and which, in these last few years more than ever he has resorted to in order to hold to power. The favorite argument of the hon. gentleman when pressed from this side, and short of any other argument he might offer to this House in refutation, is that, notwithstanding his faults and frailties, the people still prefer him to members on this side and keep him in power. There never was a more untrue statement. It is not true that the present Government had in their favor the public opinion and that they actually had in their favor a majority of the Canadian voters. At the last general election, out of a total vote of 718,788, the Government only had a majority of 6,494, not including members belonging to both parties returned by acclamation, which would not materially affect the general result. That majority does not represent quite one per cent. of the total vote. Can any hon. member fairly contend that the victory of the ministerial party would not have been changed into a humiliating defeat, had not the Government controlled the voters' list through partisan revising officers and the vote itself through returning officers, all of whom were their political friends; had they not, moreover, annulled the vote of the free and independent voters by the vote of the Indians, who were mere tools in the hands of the Government agents, by the vote of the public officers, by the vote of the laborers controlled by the manufacturers in the country, and especially, by the vote of the venal part of the electorate, which they bought out by means of the most unscrupulous bribery ever witnessed in this our country. Had the elections been carried on without bribery, I can assure this House that the Liberal party, not the present Government, would now be in power. Few people in the country have an idea of what it cost them in the past to give the Government this narrow majority, and what it still costs them each year to keep into power the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I charge the Government with governing the country in the sole interests of the Conservative party, and wasting the money of the people in the purchase of the public favor in many counties. We are presently undergoing, Mr. Speaker, a system of bribery which is ruinous to the public treasury. There lies the explanation of such a rapid increase in our expenditure and public debt. On 30th June, 1889, our public debt amounted to 237 millions of dollars, in round numbers, representing an increase of nearly 100 millions in ten years, or nearly 10 millions of dollars annually. The public debt comes to about $50 for each man, woman and child in the Dominion, which is $500 for each family of ten members. It is an enormous amount, if we add to that all the Provincial, municipal and private debts which reach a large figure. The Honorable Minister of Finance said last Thursday that in return for our debt we have public works and institutions of a princely value. He has not named them. I am going to permit myself to name some of them in his place. First, let us look at the Intercolonial. The debt of the Intercolonial has this day reached the incredible sum of $51,000,000, and has an annual deficit varying from $100,000 to $400,000 on the cost of management. Apart from that, it is adding to its debt about $1,000,000 a year. There, Mr. Speaker, is a public enterprise which pays royally, not the public (nobody would dare to claim that), but the Conservative party, which for many years has made use of that iron road as of an electoral machine, to assure itself of the counties through which it passes and to show favor to the political friends of the Government, by reductions on the charges of transport. The Intercolonial, far from paying, costs the country about 1¼ millions a year. Why? Because it is a railway worked with a political aim in view, and with no other object. We have made another fine investment of public money in the section of the Pacific Railway of British Columbia, and that of the north of Lake Superior. I shall not recur to this oftimes discussed subject, but I believe that the Government must itself admit to-day that it then committed an error which has cost the country many millions. We may now still recall like a sort of fantastic history, the extravagance in the construction of the Grand Trunk, and the enormous sums paid by the country for that undertaking. Far from me, Mr. Speaker, be the idea of censuring the policy of the construction of railways. What I censure is the manner of execution and the enormous waste which has accompanied the accomplishment of these great works. If I did not fear to abuse the attention of this House I would cite the whole of a list of election railways, for which the country has incurred considerable responsibilities. I shall name only a few of them. Let us take ahead of all the others the famous Chignecto marine transport railway, which in 1886 obtained from the Government a grant of $170,602 a year, during 20 years, being in all about 3½ millions of dollars. The object of this road is to transport vessels not exceeding 1,000 tons burden from Baie Verte, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, to the River la Planche, in the Bay of Fundy. This grant took place in the year preceding the elections of 1887, and its only aim was to favor the election of the members for the neighboring counties. This is what may be called literally throwing millions into the water. Another line, the road from Oxford to New Glasgow, which is parallel with the road of Truro and Pictou. This line was constructed on the assertion

of Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, that it would be 45 miles shorter than the other line; but it only shortens the route by about seven miles. And now it is proved beyond all doubt that the only aim in the construction of this line was to bribe the counties through which it passes. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to find anything more condemnable from a political point of view than the outlay occasioned by the construction of the Short Line, and the continuation projected by the road of Harvey and Salisbury. I shall recall to-day the transactions and political underhand dealings which drove the Government to subsidise the railway called the Short Line. This question has already been the subject of a debate before the House. We occupied ourselves some time since with the line of Harvey and Salisbury, which will continue the Short Line of the State of Maine as far as Halifax. The road of Harvey and Salisbury will cost the country at least $5,000,000. What will be its utility? It was clearly proved before this House that it will have no utility in view of the general interests of the country, unless by shortening by some miles—20 to 25 miles—the route from Montreal to Halifax. Not only will the road cost 5 millions, but it will, besides, have the effect of causing competition on that part of the Intercolonial which runs from St. John to Moncton; of diminishing by one-half the revenues of that portion of the Intercolonial, and consequently to cause the Dominion Treasury to lose a great many thousand dollars. Not only is this road not useful, but if will be in the future an occasion of dead loss to the public treasury, and nothing can explain the conduct of the Government in this affair, unless that in thus acting it satisfies the desires of the electors of the surrounding counties, and fulfills the promises made at elections. There are quite a legion of railways subsidised in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, either before the elections of 1887, to dispose the electors to vote well, or immediately, to fulfil the promises made at elections. I cite the grants made to the Maritime Provinces, because the bribery there was more direct and more patent; but the same system has also been carried on in the other Provinces of Canada. I regret to say it, Mr. Speaker, for several years we have seen a scandalous application of the public money for the construction of small pieces of railways, which are asserted to be lines constructed for the general advantage of Canada, while more important lines are neglected. I repeat it, I am in favor of subsidising railways with a view to the interests of the country; but it is my duty to condemn such subsidies when their only aim is to give partisans to the hon. gentlemen on the right. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can take away from the public debt all the money which has been expended since 25 to 30 years the aim of bribery and political partisanship, for the construction and, in certain cases, for the working, of the Grand Trunk, of the Intercolonial, of the Pacific, of the lines which I have just named, and of a crowd of others subsidised with a political view, I believe that you would be astonished at the enormous reduction which by such means we should make in the public debt. I do not expect to make hon. gentlemen accept my opinion, or to make them pass sentence of condemnation on their past conduct; but I believe that, without doing the least harm to the well-being of Canada, it would have been easy to save at least

sixty-five millions, perhaps a hundred millions of dollars on our public debt, and from four to five millions of dollars for the annual expenses of the interest on our debt, and of management upon the lines which belong to the Government at the present time. In every case the estimates are certainly not too high, if we add to them the other public works, executed within the same lapse of time. During this session there have been numerous attacks against the extraordinary expenditure made since a good number of years in the Department of Public Works. I do not wish to cast a doubt on the present capability of the hon. Minister of Public Works in the management of his Department. It, however, appears evident to me that he has allowed himself to be carried away by the general tide of the policy of bribery of the Government, and that a host of edifices and public buildings have only been erected to fulfil promises given at elections or to please electors during electoral struggles. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to pass on to another subject nearly allied to that which I have just been treating. I wish to speak of the public expenditure. The public expenditure for the year ending June, 1888, was $36,917,779; 1878, it was $23,501,000, or an increase in eleven years of about 60 per cent. I shall go over some items of annual outlay with the view of proving that it should be possible for an economical management to keep down a host of useless expenses. Quite recently, we had a long debate in this House asking for the repeal of the Electoral Act. The administration of this law has already cost the country hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Liberal party did not succeed in causing the repeal of this law. Why? Because the Government makes use of this iniquitous law to give itself advantages over its opponents during election times. The hon. Secretary of State estimated the cost of preparing the lists at over $150,000 a year; some hon. members of this House have made a still higher estimate of the cost. However that may be, the saving effected by suppressing this law would be considerable. Mr. Speaker, another expense which is rapidly increasing is that of the Civil Service. This expense has increased about 60 per .cent. since 1878. The hon. Minister gave as a reason the considerable increase in the business of Canada. I may state, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that it is very unfortunate that business has not increased in the Department, because our commerce has remained stationary for 20 years. These expenses in 1878 amounted to $800,000, and now they are nearly $1,300,000. Formerly, when the hon. gentlemen on the right were in the Opposition, they were in the habit of reproaching the Mackenzie Government with appointing too many public officers, notwithstanding the proverbial economy of that Government. I recollect that all the Conservative papers, *La Minerve*, *Le Canadien* of Quebec, and several other papers, made it a crime of the Government to have appointed a great number of inspectors of weights and measures. The first thing that the Conservatives did on coming into power was to dismiss the inspectors of weights and measures. But what was not the surprise of the public, some time ago, to find that we now spend for the inspection of weights and measures exactly the same amount that we expended in 1878. It is true that in 1879 only a small number of inspectors were appointed, but this

expense has increased so rapidly that it is now, as I have just said, as high as when the Mackenzie Government was in power, and the inspection is done with a great deal less efficiency. I said just now that the Mackenzie Government were upbraided with filling the public offices with employés. To-day they are so filled up that there is no longer any place to put them in, and the hon. Minister of Public Works was obliged to erect an immense building, which is going to cost upwards of half a million dollars; and I may say that in three or four years these new offices will be filled, and another building may perhaps be necessary to lodge them. I allow, in every case, that there may be reasons for increasing the number of public officials to a certain extent, but up to the present time I have not heard any good reason from the hon. Minister of Finance to explain as great an increase as that which I have just mentioned. Another excessive expenditure of the public funds exists in the superannuation fund. I shall not press this point, but will merely cause it to be remarked, that the system adopted for some years has been purely and simply a means of paying a double salary for a large number of officials. The amounts granted for superannuation have more than doubled during ten years. In 1878 they were $106,588; they are now $218,993. The institution of superannuation had a twofold aim—to care for such officials as became incapable, and to increase the efficiency of the public service, by making their dismissal more easy in cases where they ceased to be useful through infirmity, age, or otherwise. Unfortunately the present Administration has abused the superannuation law to the extent of making of it a veritable tool for bribery and a burden to the public treasury. In order to make room for political friends asking for employment, able employés are put aside, with pensions which are sometimes high; and the result of this is that the country is paying double salaries. My hon. friend from Simcoe East (Mr. Cook) spoke some time ago of Mr. LeSueur, who at this very time draws over $1,000 from the superannuation fund, while receiving a salary of over $1,200 for another Government employment. This Mr. LeSueur resigned in favor of a relative a situation bringing him a salary of $2,400. What proves that he was neither incapable nor disqualified is that another situation was given to him. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) mentioned, some days ago, two or three dismissals and superannuations which took place in the city of Quebec without any reason or apparent cause. I will not enter into details, but it is not exaggeration to say that at least twenty-five or thirty cases of the arbitrary dismissal of perfectly capable persons were reported before this House, with the only aim of making room for political friends. We have at this very time in all parts of the country a host of people able to earn their living, who are living at the expense of the people of Canada, for the only reason that positions had been promised to the friends of the Government and that it was necessary to give them. It is a system which costs the country very dear, and which does not do justice to the public employés. There is a host of persons who for twenty years have drawn from the public treasury sums varying from $5,000 to $20,000. A striking case, which I was forgetting, is that of Judge Clarke, whom I heard a few days ago pleading before the Railway Committee in favor of the great Pacific Company. This eminent man, who probably receives from $15,000 to $20,000 a year, was superannuated with a judge's pension, as being incapable of filling his position. Facts of this nature speak more for it than long speeches, and require no comment. Another detail, that of double salaries. We have often argued about the salaries of public officers, which in many cases are reasonable, on the principle that in order to have good officers they must be well paid. But a blamable excuse is that of double salaries for work done after office hours. There are 618 employés who thus increase their pay by 25 and 50 per cent.—some who double their salaries. After studying this question, and having had explanations of it before the Committee on Public Accounts, I could not do otherwise than arrive at the conclusion that in a great number of cases this system of double salaries is a means of including a sinecure with a regular employment, in order to show favor to a friend of the party at the expense of the public treasury. It would be difficult to find in the whole world a Government which has more absurd Government positions with a view to bribery, or which has showed a more machiavelian aptitude in the art of multiplying positions, and of scattering the public money among its favorites. A striking example is found in the administration of the Department of the Interior, and especially in the Indian Department. I have often endeavored to account to myself for the affairs of these Departments. The Committee on Public Accounts have sometimes also sought to explain to itself the enormous expenditure of the Indian Department, of the public lands—in a word, all the expenses of the Department of the Interior. But it will be said that the Prime Minister of Canada, who, among his friends, passes for one who commands the various elements, has done all in his power to envelop this part of the administration of public affairs in mystery. There all is mystery and darkness. No one has ever been able to explain, for example, how it happens that it is necessary to pay such a large number of employés to so mismanage those distant territories. No one has ever been able to make me understand how it happens that the administration of public lands costs the country over $300,000 in salaries and expenses of management, only to bring in this year $227,000, by the sale of public lands. There is negligence and evident bad mismanagement. The cost of the journeys of inspectors of every description in the Indian Department, agents for the public lands, represent each year thousands and thousands of dollars. The North-West has become a gulf which has not only swallowed a great part of the millions which now compose our national debt, but which, each year, absorbs several million dollars of taxes which are paid by the electors of the old Provinces of Canada. This swallowing up of the public funds has certainly in a great measure injured the colonisation and material development of the old Provinces, and these millions have been so badly spent, and so badly distributed, that the North-West is only developing with a surprising backwardness, which has overthrown the hopes which had been built on that immense territory. The subsidies to the Conservative journals under the form of advertisements and various printing each year reach a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Such subsidies vary from some hundreds to some

thousands of dollars for each sheet. The *Mail* of Toronto alone absorbs over $2,700. These subsidies to newspapers have the double fault of costing the country dear, of increasing the public expenses, and of depriving the press of all independence. This explains why the proceedings of the Government are accepted and defended by the whole of a political party in Canada. These few facts will suffice to prove that a considerable economy might each year be made in the administration of public affairs. But I might multiply these examples, if I did not fear to encroach upon the attention of the House. These examples not only prove the extravagance of the Government, but that the administration of public affairs is carried on with the sole view of favoritism, of rewarding political friends, and not for the real interests of the country. It is to meet this extravagant expenditure that the people pay enormous taxes, and in no way with regard to the revenues of the electors of the country. And here again, in the manner of levying taxes, we still find that spirit of favoritism and want of principle which characterises the present Government. Not only does the Government raise considerable revenues to meet these public expenses, but it has adopted a system of assessment of taxes which makes them still heavier for the tax-payers of the country to support. This is what I am going to prove by facts. The very principle of protection is a false and dangerous principle, because it implies favoritism of a class or of certain classes at the expense of the other classes of society. What have we seen since 1879? Delegations of all kinds representing the various industries of the country repairing by turns to the Minister of Finance to obtain special favors for themselves. One may tell which are the suppliants who will be listened to, and which will be those to be refused. It will suffice for that to know their political color and the amount of influence they can dispose of at election times. The present tariff is not founded on any principle, nor upon any particular law. It depends entirely on the absolute will and on the caprice of the Minister of Finance or on the political needs of the Government. There is not a single member in this House who can deny that under the present régime any manufacturer who controls the elections, in a county may impose and in fact does impose, his will on the Government, at his desire to fix the tariff for the kind of industry in which he desires to make his fortune. The Government of the country is, at the present time, at the mercy of commercial coalitions and of the manufacturers of Canada. It is they who have given power to it, who will support it, and will dictate, from a commercial point of view. In protectionist countries, the wretched classes are those which are not protected. In Canada these classes are artisans and farmers. While the Government receives deputation after deputation on the part of manufacturers and railway companies, it does not receive any on the part of farmers. Why? Because the agricultural class feels well that its voice would not be listened to. Since 1879, at each Session, the members of the Opposition made themselves the echo of the numerous and just complaints of the agricultural class of the country. We asked for the farmers their share of protection. What did the Government do for them? Nothing; absolutely nothing. I defy the hon. members on the right to prove before this House that the Government has ever given any encouragement to agriculture, and that it has done anything to favor it in this country. The policy of protection did not succeed and could not succeed in creating a national market, and the price of all agricultural products is at the present time lower than it has been for more than 20 years. The agricultural depression is terrible, alarming. I shall permit myself to cite here the opinion of practical farmers of the Province of Ontario. I have myself translated the following resolution, passed last year by the Farmers' Institute in Toronto, to enquire into the causes of agricultural depression in the Province of Ontario, and the means of remedying it. It reads as follows:—

"That the agricultural industry of the Province is considerably depressed is a fact which will not be denied by any of those who at the present time have any interest in agriculture. Your committee is of opinion that the principal causes of the agricultural depression are, among others, the excessive taxation which has been imposed to meet the expense incurred for the establishment of the Provinces in the west of Canada, and to meet the interest on our debt, which is growing to alarming proportions; these taxes in a great number of cases being imposed in a manner contrary to the interests of this country.

"As to the proper remedy for any or all of these causes, opinion may differ to a wide extent, but your Committee believe that the following suggestions are along the line in which, at least, a measure of relief may be obtained: (1) Free entrance to the markets where our products have to be disposed of; and your Committee would strongly advise that in future all legislation in regard to import duties be in the direction of lowering those duties."

I will also read to the House the following petition to the Government, adopted by the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario:—

"Whereas we consider the present high tariff is very injurious to the agricultural interests, making what we buy proportionately dearer than the products we sell; and whereas, the present high tariff has given rise to the combine system, by which competition is, to a great extent, prevented; and whereas, the agricultural interest is suffering under a serious depression, and unable to bear the strain occasioned by the tariff and the combine system aforesaid, and as the agricultural interest represents the largest majority of the population; that, therefore, this, the Central Institute, do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the duty on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is laboring."

The agriculturists say that the tariff is too high. I shall only instance some articles. Sugar costs 4 cents in England and 8 cents in Canada. The difference in price represents the amount of the tax. Coal oil costs 8 cents in the United States and 20 cents in Canada. The tax upon liquors is so high that at present the contraband article is a veritable scourge all over the country. The tax upon flour has just been raised to 75 cents a barrel. They are unjust, and constitute a real oppression of the poorer classes. The taxes on iron, cottons, woollen goods, imported under the name of protective duties are almost prohibitive duties, and constitute an intolerable burthen to the farmers and working class of the country. The honest consumer could never be made to understand that the Parliament of Canada has the right to force him by legislation to pay, for the convenience of another citizen of his country, from 25 to 30 per cent. dearer than he would otherwise do for every manufactured article that he buys. "Exchange is as much a natural right as property,"

says Bastiat. Any law which, without making any compensation, encroaches on the rights of exchange of any particular class of the population is a law contrary to justice and legally a robbery. I represent an agricultural county, Mr. Speaker, and I undertake in this House the defence of the electors who have put confidence in me; I make it my duty to protest with all my strength against an unjust, iniquitous policy, against the policy of favoritism, which the Government maintains in this country. Let us see what is now the position of Canada, of which I complain, and of which nine-tenths of the electors have a right to complain? The public expenditure amounts to $8 per head of the population. The taxes to $6 per head, only for the Customs revenues and Excise duties, without counting $3 or $4 more per head, which are really paid upon articles manufactured in the country. We have a public debt of about $50 per head of the population, which has increased, during eleven years only, by about $20 per head of the population. The public expenditure and the taxes have increased by about 60 per cent. upon the amount to which they had risen in 1878. The amount of taxes paid by the people only for the government of the country is enormous for Canada, because the Dominion taxes are not the only ones, the cost of maintaining the Local Governments, the municipal and school taxes, must be added. This constant increase of the public debt and of the burthens which weigh upon the people are serious affairs, when it is stated that the extent of our commerce is nearly the same at present as it was fifteen or twenty years ago, notwithstanding the enlarging of our territory and the growth of our population. Our commerce, which fifteen or twenty years ago was nearly $55 a head, is now only $40 per head of the population. This increase of taxation, in the face of the decrease of the incomes of the consumers, gives a full explanation of the large emigration of our fellow-countrymen to the United States. This emigration will continue, or rather it will go on growing from one year to another, as long as the Government of the country does not find the means either to diminish the taxes and public expenditure or to adopt any measure whatever which will put our population in a position to support the heavy burthens now imposed upon it. The hon. President of the Council, in the magnificent speech which he made in answer to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, that our young people emigrated to the United States because they are carried away by their spirit of adventure, because they lose their heads by reading reviews which give a brilliant description of the North-West and West of the United States. It may be that some young people who emigrate may be carried away by a spirit of adventure; but this remark certainly does not apply to the fathers and mothers of families who emigrate with their children. The hon. President of the Council does not share in the opinion of Mr. Gladstone upon this subject, who said one day that it is as difficult for a man to emigrate as to uproot an oak. I can never be made to believe, for my part, that it is from lightness of heart that heads of families decide upon selling their cattle, their furniture, and all their old family souvenirs by public auction. Not from caprice do people part with all these things. Neither is it from caprice that these people separate themselves from their friends at an age when it is always difficult to make new ones. What causes Canadians to emigrate is debt; it is poverty; it is because they can no longer find the means of living in the country. The hon. member for South Oxford gave a reason in laying before the House the sad situation of the farmers of Ontario. I regret to say that that of the farmers of Quebec is not much better. The commerce of Montreal is worse than it has been for 30 years, and agricultural products are lower in price than I can remember, for my part, to have ever seen them. In the face of this situation, what does the Minister of Finance do? He imposes fresh taxes. He believes that this is the only remedy he can apply to the situation. He claims that it is necessary, at the expense of the class which suffers, to enrich still further the manufacturing class, who are overflowing with riches. This new imposition of taxes is infamous under the circumstances. It is vexatious, Mr. Speaker, to have raised the duty on flour. It is an insult to the Province of Quebec and to the Maritime Provinces. There was, however, something better than that to be done. Never had a Minister of Finance a better opportunity to make himself popular all over Canada. The United States offer with one hand free trade with them, and with the other a commercial war — commercial war or a prohibitive tariff on our native products, that is, 30 per cent. on horses, fowls and animals of every description; 5 cents on eggs; 25 cents a bushel on potatoes; $4 a ton on hay; heavy duties of 25 to 30 per cent. on pease and beans—in a word, on all the agricultural products which we export to the United States. It is the ruin of our Canadian farmers. On the other hand, if the Minister of Finance had adopted reciprocity in native products, that is to say, the only thing which will at this time save us from the agricultural depression from which we are suffering, our farmers could have sold their products from 20 to 25 per cent. dearer than they can sell them now, and they could easily tide over the depression which has been produced at the present time. Commercial reciprocity would, besides, have the effect of considerably developing the working of our mines. We have in the country rich mines of iron, copper, asbestos, and of coal, which only await American capitalists, only reciprocity to bring riches to the country. Having to choose between these two alternatives, the Government preferred to yield to the importunities of the manufacturers, and to sacrifice the remainder of the population. They make a great mistake, and the people will hold them responsible for it at the next general election.

Mr. McKEEN. I do not often trespass on the time of the House, and at this very late hour of the night I must ask the indulgence of hon. members, while the observations that I shall make shall be as brief as the circumstances of the case permits. My attention has been called to a statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his recent speech, which in justice to myself and the county I have the honor to represent I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. He said:

"My connection with the Mining Commission of Ontario brought forcibly under my consideration the great advantages which would result, not only to Ontario, but to all sections of the Dominion having mining resources, from free trade with the United States. For instance the only coal fields on the Atlantic coast from Florida to

Greenland are in Nova Scotia. The consumption of bituminous coal in the New England States and in the Atlantic seaboard cities of the United States amounts to from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons a year; and with free trade Nova Scotia could, in all these markets, undersell the bituminous coal brought from the interior of Pennsylvania and the paltry export trade of about 500,000 tons a year, which I think it is at present, could be increased indefinitely. Would that not confer great advantages on Nova Scotia?"

Now, Sir, while holding the highest respect for the hon. gentleman, and for the position which he occupies in church and state, I may be pardoned if I presume to venture the suggestion that the hon. gentleman has not given this important subject the attention which it deserves, and that possibly his opinions may be influenced more by political prejudices than with a view to any advancement of the mining industry. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in 1878, when speaking on this subject, stated from his place in the House as follows:—

"The Minister of Public Works read them a telegram a few minutes ago stating that the sale of Nova Scotia coal in Montreal this year was to exceed that of last year by 10,000 tons, and that with the remission of canal tolls, and other favorable circumstances, had some hopes of selling 20,000 tons more further west. For the purpose then of conferring that degree of benefit on the Nova Scotia mine owners, they were to have 266,432 tons of anthracite imported into Ontario, which could not be replaced by any other, and a great part of the 321,000 tons of bituminous coal brought into that Province taxed 50 cents a ton. This sacrifice was to be inflicted in order to sell not more than 50,000 tons more of Nova Scotia coal. Any policy more absurd could scarcely be conceived."

And again:

"The tariff was a two-edged sword which cut in every direction to the detriment of Canadian interests. He saw no reason for anticipating a rise in the price of coal in the United States, but rather a decrease. In fact there had been a heavy decrease during the last four or five months and this duty stepped in to deprive the Canadian consumer of all benefit he would otherwise have derived from that decrease. Of all the absurd features of this tariff, the imposition of the duty on coal, and especially on anthracite, was the most absurd."

Speaking again on this subject in 1889 the hon. member is reported in *Hansard* to have said:

"However, I crave permission at the outset to make a few remarks in reply to the observations of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) with respect to the coal duty. That hon. gentleman informed us that some 15,000 or 20,000 people derived their subsistence directly or indirectly from the business of mining coal in Nova Scotia. That business, I believe, is confined to three counties in that Province, and the duty designed to protect fifteen or twenty thousand people in three counties in Nova Scotia is made to bear with extreme severity upon many important manufacturing industries, and upon the interests of the general public in the Dominion at large. Our importations last year of coal amounted to 1,325,000 tons, the value of which was $3,644,000, and upon the whole of this vast amount of coal imported a duty was exacted for the benefit of a portion of the population of three counties in one of the Provinces of this Dominion. Now, Sir, the imposition of that duty upon coal has a direct tendency to render unsatisfactory any attempts at engaging in iron manufacture in this country. Coal is a raw material, and from coal is produced the coke which it is necessary to use in the reduction of iron ore into pig iron; yet the Government by imposing a duty upon coal and upon coke, a product of coal, used in the manufacture of iron, have almost if not entirely neutralised the protection it affords, by a duty upon pig iron and by bounties. I hold, Sir, that coal is a raw material, and that the imposition of a duty upon it bears unjustly upon the whole population of this Dominion who require to use coal as fuel, and with unjust and undue severity upon the iron interest and the other industries in this Dominion where coal is used either for the conversion of ores into metal or as fuel for propelling machinery. I repeat that I consider this an impolitic and an unjust tax."

Mr. McKEEN.

Now, Sir, with such evidences of hostility as these utterances indicate, it is not surprising that the miners of this country view with some suspicion any professions of interest that the hon. gentleman may make with a view of advancing our coal industries. Had his advice, and the advice of the party opposite of which he is a prominent member, been taken, the collieries which to-day are affording employment to thousands of industrious and honest miners, and which are giving an impetus to business throughout the whole of that section of our country, would to-day be practically closed, and would, I may say, have ceased to exist. Those who are most interested in the success of our mining industry believe that reciprocity in coal would be most disastrous to us. We contend that without protection we could not hold the markets of the St. Lawrence, but with protection our trade has increased from 80,000 tons in 1878, to somewhere about 680,000 tons, in 1888. In proof of this we point to the quantities of American coal which are to-day being brought into Montreal. Our shipments to that city last year fell off 50,000 tons or thereabouts, and why? Because the opening of a new railway leading by Massena Springs, and connecting with the Grand Trunk Railway, afforded the means of supplying that company, of replacing with some 50 or 60 thousand tons of American coal, the coal which they had hitherto obtained by vessel from Nova Scotia. This shrinkage in our trade is due entirely to American competition. The fact of our having for the last ten or fifteen years met with the attempted competition of the American coal owners in the markets of Montreal, proves that without this protection our markets there would be practically closed. Now, Sir, assuming that we shall to a large extent lose these valuable and to us important markets, the next question is, are we going to have compensating markets in the United States? In discussing this question in this House two years ago I took the ground that it was impossible, owing to the changed conditions of trade, and owing to the different channels in which the coal trade of the United States is now running, ever to obtain the foothold which we had during the few years subsequent to the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty. In support of that contention, I showed that for six years following the abrogation of that treaty we sent to the United States, under a duty of $1.25 per ton, 1,562,000 tons, or an annual average of 262,230 tons. I further showed that for the six years preceding 1888 our exports to that country, under a duty of only 75 cents a ton, had fallen to some 85,000 tons annually, one-half of which was culm coal, valued only at from 30 to 40 cents a ton. Last year, if my information is correct, we sent to the United States 5,465 tons of round coal and 74,000 tons of culm coal, the latter realising to the producer only 30 cents a ton. So that these markets have been almost entirely wrested from us. I do not ask the House to accept my uncorroborated opinion on this matter. It is well known that some of our largest collieries are controlled by gentlemen residing in the United States, who, having invested their capital in them, have for years watched the course of the coal trade. The colliery I am connected with is owned by myself and three American gentlemen, one living at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, another in Boston, and the third in Washington. These gentlemen, from their long

experience in the trade, ought to be able to judge what the possibilities are of our sharing in the United States trade if we had unrestricted reciprocity; and they have unhesitatingly averred that the coal trade as it now exists is infinitely better for their interests than any system of unrestricted reciprocity that could be arranged. These gentlemen speak from a non-partisan standpoint; but I will give also the evidence of a gentleman in New York, whose means are more largely invested in the coal mines of Nova Scotia than those of any other gentleman on this side of the Atlantic. This gentleman is capable, from his business experience, his standing in the community, his knowledge of the New England trade, and his interest in the collieries of Nova Scotia, to give an opinion that should merit the confidence of every hon. gentleman in this House, and with the permission of the House I will read a few extracts from a letter written by him in January last. He says:

"At the present quotations for American coals in Boston, $3.10 to $3.20 per ton of 2,240 lbs., the Pictou coals could not compete there. Acadia is now selling at $2.50, and Vale and Albion at $2.25 f. o. b. at Pictou. Out of this, the company pays the Intercolonial Railway freight from the mines to Pictou.

"We will suppose, however, the American duty removed, and that for shipment to the United States the coal is sold for $2 per ton at Pictou. To deliver it in Boston there must be added freight, which will average at least $1.60 per ton, and insurance, &c., five cents more, making a total of $3.65 against $3.10 and $3.20 for American coal, which latter, for manufacturing and locomotive uses, is worth some fifty cents per ton more than Nova Scotia coals, except, possibly, Acadia, which, as we can sell all produced during the shipping season at $2.50, would not be exported at $2.

"Unless, therefore, the prices of American coals should advance in Boston to $4 per ton, no Pictou coals of any consequence could be sold there, and the same applies to the entire New England coast, for the freights to Boston are not in excess of those to other points—in fact, rather less.

"During the Reciprocity Treaty, Cumberland coal shipped at Baltimore, sold in Boston at from $4 to $5 per ton. The Pocahontas and Kanawha coals from West Virginia, shipped from Norfolk and Newport mines, at the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay, were not then in the market. The railways now transporting them have been completed within the past ten years. Also the Clearfield Coal Field, served by the Pennsylvania Railroad, has since been developed, and is considered the equal of the old Cumberland.

"These four are not only produced by rival coal companies, but are also brought to tidewater by competing railways, so that any increase in the shipping prices f.o.b. at points of delivery, is most improbable. Moreover, many of these coals lie most favorably for cheap mining, the veins being almost flat, above water level in the mountain sides, and requiring no expensive haulage, no pumping for drainage, nor much artificial ventilation.

"The best Virginia coals are produced, I believe, at about 60 cents per ton, f.o.b. cars at the railway connections, and the Cumberland and Clearfield for about 80 cents and they thus start with a great advantage over the Nova Scotia coals, which, from their geological position, are much more expensive to mine.

"The same general condition for cheap production exist in Western Pennsylvania, where are found the coals that are brought to Montreal by the new Massena Springs connection of the Grand Trunk Railway.

"The foregoing refers to Pictou. Cumberland County is more advantageously placed with reference to freights to New England, having ports upon the Bay of Fundy, but I doubt if the difference would exceed 30 cents per ton, nor can I see, at the rates spoken of for transportation of vessels by the new ship railway, that Pictou will benefit at all by its construction. From Cape Breton to New England the freights would be about the same as from Pictou, and the Cape Breton coals can be mined and put f.o.b. much cheaper than those of Pictou, but their value in the market is not so great, except possibly, Old Sydney for domestic use (see Montreal quotations) and this would about equalise the position.

"There is no doubt that if the conditions of the bituminous coal trade were the same now as during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, the removal of the duty would greatly increase the consumption of Nova Scotia coals in New England. Even with the duty on and the other conditions unchanged, much more of the trade would have been retained. But in addition to the introduction of the new coals before mentioned, the Westmoreland, Pennsylvania coals have entirely superseded the Pictou and Cape Breton coals for gas making. They have a much higher percentage of gas, are almost entirely devoid of sulphur, and the price, combined with their superiority, together with English coals of the same quality, coming in ballast, will retain the market in future. During reciprocity, as much as 40,000 tons per annum of Albion were sent to the Boston Gas Company alone, and large quantities of Cape Breton to the New York gas companies and to small cities in New England."

The impression made by these facts remain in the public mind, but the changes which have gradually taken place in the circumstances are not known, and hence delusion exists respecting the effect that the removal of the duty here would produce. I do not mean to say that no increase of coal shipments would ensue, but the increase would not be material or at all commensurate with the loss which would result from the repeal of the Canadian duty. There is one direction in which the removal of the American duty would unqualifiedly benefit Cumberland County, and incidentally Pictou, and that would be the development of coal trade by rail through the interior towns of Maine. But for this probable development, I do not see any advantage which would accrue from the removal of the duty. He goes on to say:

You may be quite sure, however, that the repeal of United States duty by the present Administration will not be brought about by any concession that Canada may offer, but solely and simply by home agitation and changing opinions on the question of free raw materials, without reference to reciprocal interests and wholly with a view to the benefit of the United States."

With the permission of the House I will quote a few extracts from the evidence of another gentleman who is thoroughly well posted on this subject, and whose testimony, I think, should carry weight with every impartial person who takes an interest in this matter. He took the ground in giving his evidence before the commission, in Boston:

"That the removal of the duty here from Nova Scotia coals would not increase our imports over 30 to 50 thousand tons per annum, and the removal of duty on all coals would admit 100 to 200 thousand tons from England, chiefly gas coals. This upon the assumption that the American companies bringing domestic coals to tide water should continue present freight tariffs, or, in other words, removal of the duty will simply compel American coal railroad companies to reduce their rates. My testimony was not reported by the newspapers, but the *Journal and Advertiser* gave me very complimentary editorials.

"I stated that there is no coal in Nova Scotia that can be used here for iron purposes, except Acadia, and that being a superior house coal, the limited product of the mine finds ready local sales, at prices that shut it out from here, free of duty. The fact is that the Norfolk and Western Railroad, with their Pocahontas coals, and Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, with Kanawha coals, will not permit foreign steam coal to come in here. They made heavy contracts in 1888 and 1889 at $3.10 to $3.20 per gross ton delivered here into shed, and in some cases above three bridges, from March to March covering winter ocean freights.

"Their position is to sell their coal—the only point being to get the trade at any figure that will secure it. Both of the above companies have sold 400,000 tons (each) east of Cape Cod, during the past year. If the duty is removed here, the Dominion Government will doubtless remove it on American coal going into Canada, and it will seriously affect your Canadian trade."

We beg to differ with this gentleman in that respect. This is the testimony of two gentlemen who are as competent to judge of the position of our trade with the United States and other countries, and the conditions which govern it, and all the possibilities which may arise from reciprocal trade with the American people, as is any hon. gentleman in this House, who has ventured to give an expression of opinion on this subject. It is most unfortunate that hon. gentlemen, without properly informing themselves on this question, should hazard opinions that might be taken hold of and be disastrous to a prosperous and important industry. I would further state that while admitting that our own prospects with regard to our trade have largely improved within the past few years, they are not yet what we would like them to be. Owing to our very isolated position, particularly in Cape Breton, during the winter months, we have a great deal of idle time, and our mines to a certain extent are closed ; yet, if I can judge from newspaper reports, our miners, in their circumstances, can favorably compare with those of that very much favored country to the south, which has been held up to us as being the most prosperous on the face of the earth. I have no doubt that had the hon. gentleman seen accounts from the mines of Nova Scotia as gloomy as those we have had of the mines of Pennsylvania, he would have taken occasion to bring this wretched and despondent condition of affairs before the notice of this House, but this state of things which exists in Pennsylvania may have escaped his notice. At any rate he made no allusion to it. With the permission of the House I will read a few extracts from the newspaper reports, which will perhaps open the eyes of some hon. gentlemen present, as to the condition of trade in that country, which we are told is going to open up such immense avenues for our surplus mine products :

" SCRANTON, Pa., 25th.—A shadow blacker than anthracite is extending its phantasmal proportions through all the coal regions of Pennsylvania. It is the shadow of want and suffering, and its baleful influence is felt in hundreds of homes throughout the mining valleys of the Keystone State. Mr. B. G. Morgan, of Hyde Park, a prominent member of the Relief Committee, says that the destitution is beyond description. He tells of a man who went to a storekeeper and begged to be trusted for a sack of flour. The storekeeper said he could not afford to give any more 'trust.' When the man was going away he seized and carried off one of the sacks of flour which he found outside the door. The storekeeper was informed of the occurrence a few minutes later and hastened to the man's home. There he saw a sight which touched him to the heart. The sack of flour lay open on the floor and the poor man's children were sitting around it helping themselves to its contents with spoons. Stories of distress all along the mining hamlets of the region are numerous and well authenticated, and the worst feature is that there does not seem to be a silver lining to the cloud which hangs over the coal trade. The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Company ; the Delaware and Hudson Canal Company, and the Pennsylvania Coal Company, whose men are starving in the very shadows of the silent coal breakers, should come to the rescue at once and do something substantial. These coal companies, as well as others, are responsible for the overcrowding of this region with labor and the glutting of the market with anthracite. They cannot escape their moral responsibility in this trying time, even if they cannot be legally held for the misery they have helped to cause. A month's pay would be but a small portion of the wealth the coal kings have derived from these valleys, 'where wealth accumulates and men decay,' and even if corporations have no souls the men who manage them should not be soulless. It is the solemn duty of the coal companies to relieve the necessities of their starving workmen, and they should do it without delay. A meeting of the Central Relief Committee, of which Mayor-elect John F. Fellows is chairman, and of the Scranton Poor Board, was held to devise means for helping the poor. Mr. Fellows vigorously denounced the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company for its neglect of its starving miners. He said that corporation was responsible for most of the destitution in and about this city, and it had not contributed one cent for the relief of its workmen. It was notorious, he asserted, that this company had crowded its mines with laborers, and opened more collieries than were necessary for the purpose of cutting down wages by glutting the labor market. Now, when the mines are idle and the men starving, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western magnates turned a deaf ear to their cry of distress. He favored the doubling of the poor tax so that the company would be compelled to bear its share of the burden it had imposed on the community by impoverishing the great army of miners and laborers who have been reduced to starvation. Mr. Thomas, of the committee, said he had personally investigated the condition of the poor and found it absolutely appalling. The Poor Board voted $500 for immediate supplies, and will co-operate with the Relief Committee. In the meantime the great coal corporations are expected to do something for their starving workmen."

I have read these extracts in order to show that, poor as our country may be, it is not so bad as the condition of a large body of miners who are working under the same circumstances and in the same avocation as the miners in our own country. Though the condition of our miners is not what I would desire it to be, I am thankful to say that it does not at all compare with the condition of those men in the United States. Our miners are independent, and, as far as I can judge, live comfortably. In a conversation I had a short time ago with a gentleman who holds an important position in the Knights of Labor, and who is well known to many members present, I gathered from him that he had the opinion that the condition of the miners in the United States was not to be compared to anything in England or in Nova Scotia, or to anything outside of the condition of those who work as condemned convicts in the mines of Siberia. There is the country which we are asked to open our markets to, the country which we are to ask for reciprocal trade and to which we are to give up our own markets and take the risk of obtaining as a small pittance the requirements of the New England States. Although gentlemen representing the coal districts are accused of being anxious to favor the Government in carrying out its policy from personal motives, I believe the interests of the mine owners of the country are the interests of the miners, and are also the interests of the laboring classes and the farmers. Whatever the policy of the Government may be in this matter, I hope it will not be anything which will hazard the protection we now have. But while I have, since the introduction of the National Policy, been a supporter of the right hon. the leader of the Government, believing that his policy is the one most conducive to the advancement of a young and growing country like this, while I have been always steady in my allegiance to that policy, at the same time I must take this occasion to express my deep regret that the Minister of Finance did not see it possible to respond to the applications that were so earnestly made by members representing the coal counties of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, and to grant increased protection to this important article of coal. We have always thought that an increased protection was necessary in order to keep American coal out of our market. We are willing to admit that difficulties have existed which, perhaps, have made it impossible for the Government to grant our request. At the same time, we do not relin-

quish our claims, and we purpose to bring this matter up again, and we hope the Government will be in a position to grant an increased duty. If not now, we hope that, at the next Session, the Government will be able to grant us this protection which is most important for this industry.

Mr. WATSON. How much?

Mr. McKEEN. That we shall leave to the discretion of the Government, but we expect to get an increase. We are thankful for what has been done. We appreciate it. We appreciate the coal policy of the Government, in the face of the strongest opposition of gentlemen on the other side, but we feel that, under changed conditions, the protection is not enough for our present trade. As I stated before, we are subject to inconveniences in carrying on our trade which do not exist in other places. The long winters shut us out from navigation, but I am glad to see that, through the generosity of the Government, we are likely to have access to an open winter port, which will certainly give an impulse to our coal trade. At present we have no open port in the winter, but with the extension of the Louisburg railway, which we hope for from the Government, we have every reason to believe that, before another year goes by, we shall have a winter port and shall be able to ship our coal at any time of the year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE INTERPRETATION ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) to amend the Interpretation Act. He said: With the permission of the House, I will read the Bill, which is as follows:—

1. Section 7 of the Interpretation Act, chapter one of the Revised Statutes, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraphs thereto:—

"58. The repeal of any Act, or part of an Act, shall not be deemed to be or to involve a declaration that such Act, or the part thereof so repealed, was, or was considered by Parliament to have been, previously in force.

"59. The amendment of any Act shall not be deemed to be or to involve a declaration that the law under such Act was, or was considered by Parliament to have been, different from the law as it has become under such Act as so amended.

"60. The repeal or amendment of any Act shall not be deemed to be or to involve any declaration whatsoever as to the previous state of the law.

"61. Parliament shall not, by re-enacting an Act, or part of an Act, or by revising, consolidating or amending the same, be deemed to have adopted the construction which may, by judicial decision or otherwise, have been placed upon the language used in such Act, or upon similar language."

Mr. MITCHELL. As it would require a Philadelphia lawyer to understand the meaning of what the hon. gentleman has read, perhaps he will make a further statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As an explanation has been asked, I may be permitted to add that, occasionally, when the Government amends an Act in order to make it plainer, and to remove doubts on the subject, the amending Act is liable to be construed as having changed the law, and questions which have arisen under the law as it originally stood are adjudicated on under the amending Act. The courts are inclined to take the view that the law must have been changed from what it was, or else Parliament would not have passed the amendment; whereas, in point of fact, the object of Parliament may have been to make the original law more clear.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether Odilon Pelletier is keeper of a telegraphic or marine signal station built on the mainland opposite St. Roch's Traverse? Does he receive from the Marine Department any salary for making signals? And what salary?

Mr. TUPPER. A signal station has been established for some years opposite St. Roch's Traverse, and Odilon Pelletier is in charge. He receives no salary from the Marine Department for making signals, but is paid by fees for messages sent.

STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1st. Whether any report was made by the warden to the inspector, of evidence under oath, as to an offence committed by convict No. 41 in Stony Mountain Penitentiary, with a view to corporal punishment? 2nd. If so, when? 3rd. Whether any report was made by the warden to the inspector as to the infliction of corporal punishment on convict No. 41, and if so, when?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report referred to in the first branch of this question was received about the 18th of December last. I may add for the hon. gentleman's information, that the recommendation made in that report for corporal punishment, has not been approved. No report has been received but one, to the effect that corporal punishment was used.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—EXTRA CLERKS.

Mr. TURCOT asked, 1. Since when have the supernumerary clerks of the Technical Branch of the Department of the Interior worked until five p.m.? 2. What are the office hours for supernumerary clerks, under the Civil Service Act? 3. What are the names of the supernumerary clerks of that branch; at what date did they enter the service; what is their work and salary? 4. Is the accumulation of work in that branch such as to compel the said employés, for a considerable time yet to come, to work for an extra hour each day? How much has such extra work cost the Department up to date?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. The clerks in all the branches of the Department of the Interior have worked until five p.m. since the commencement of the Session of Parliament. There are many of them whose duties have made it necessary for them to work not only until five p.m., but occasionally much later. 2. The Civil Service Act prescribes no hours for clerks, either temporary or permanent. That matter is regulated by Order in Council, which gives to heads and deputy-heads of Departments power to call for the attendance of all or any of the clerks in their Departments at any hours the public service may require. 3. This information, if wanted, should be moved for in the usual way. 4. The work of the Department will require the attendance of the clerks as at present until the close of the Session, and perhaps longer; work done within the hours at present prescribed does not cost anything in addition to the salaries of the clerks.

BLISS' LETTER-BOX.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt Bliss' patent letter-box?

Mr. HAGGART. The box described by the hon. gentleman has been received by the Department, and sent to the person who manufactures these articles, to report upon it. There has been no report as yet received on the subject.

NEXT CENSUS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government intend to cause the number of persons actually present in the Dominion, at the time of taking the census, to be recorded as well as those enumerated under the *de jure* system?

Mr. CARLING. It is the intention to take the next census in accordance with the *de jure* system, and as much care will be taken as possible to obtain accuracy.

VOTERS' LISTS—RETURNS.

Mr. BARRON asked, Have the revising officers throughout the Dominion, all of them, made return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa, of duplicate copies of the voters' lists finally revised and certified, within their respective electoral districts, for the year 1889, in accordance with the statute in that behalf? If not, for what electoral districts, if any, has the duplicate copy of the voters' list been received by the said clerk subsequent to the 31st December, 1889? For what electoral district, if any, has the duplicate copy of voters' list for 1889 not yet been received?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. According to the information I have received from the Queen's Printer and from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, I have a list here of the revised lists which have been forwarded, for the year 1889, by the revising officers in all the electoral districts. They have all been forwarded in time, with the exception of twelve. These are: six in the Province of Ontario, namely: Brockville, Essex South, Essex North, Frontenac, Leeds and Grenville South, Leeds South. In the Province of Quebec, four: Iberville, Maskinongé, St. Johns and the town of Sherbrooke. In the Province of British Columbia, one: New Westminster. The list of this district was received, but minus one polling division. In the Province of Manitoba, one: Marquette, making a total of twelve.

I. C. R.—FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, What rate of freight is charged over the Intercolonial Railway on pig iron from Londonderry to Montreal?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. $2.46 per ton; that is to say, the distance from Londonderry to Chaudière is 598 miles and the $2.46 per ton yields a fraction over four-tenths of a cent per ton per mile.

QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) asked, Does the Dominion Government, or the Government of Nova Scotia control the remains of the Queen's wharf, its site and approaches, on the Garrison Ground at Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The remains of the Queen's wharf on the Garrison Ground at Annapolis Royal, N.S., are under the control of the Dominion Government.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. FOSTER moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide by law that a bounty of two dollars per ton be paid on all pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore between the first day of July, 1892, and the thirtieth day of June, 1897, inclusive.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether any, and what bounties have been paid on iron in the past? I believe a law was introduced some years ago for a bounty, and I want to know whether there has been any paid.

Mr. FOSTER. The total amount or the rate?

Mr. MITCHELL. The rate.

Mr. FOSTER. The rate at present paid is $1. Previous to this year it was $1.50.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the hon. gentleman state the total amount that has been paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the total amount here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume, from the wording of the resolution, that the present duty expires on the 1st of July, 1892.

Mr. FOSTER. It does.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And it is now proposed to fix a seven years period. I think that is very objectionable.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, my hon. friend has misapprehended the resolution. The $2 per ton is not proposed to date from this year, but from the date of the expiry of the present term.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware of that. We are paying a very considerable duty at present; and, although I shall not discuss that now, it appears to me a very objectionable prac-

tice for one Parliament to tie up the hands of its successors for seven years. The resolution ought to be so worded as not to extend the term beyond the life of one Parliament. We have done such things, but they are very objectionable.

Motion agreed to.

DUTY ON SEED CORN.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question. A gentleman some time ago purchased a car-load of corn for seed purposes, which will be delivered in a few days. He writes to me to ascertain whether under the new tariff it will be brought in free.

Mr. BOWELL. It will if it comes under the description of item 254 in schedule C, which has as full effect and force now as it will have after it is sanctioned by the House. The entries made between this time and the final passage of the tariff require to have written across their face, "Subject to amendment," so that in case the tariff, as it stands, should not become law, they would have to pay duty.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What evidence is required to show that the corn is to be used for seed purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter of departmental regulations, which will be found among the instructions issued to collectors. Item 254 is as follows:—

"Indian corn of the varieties known as 'Southern Dent corn' (Mammoth Southern Sweet) and 'Western Dent corn' (Golden Beauty), when imported to be sown for ensilage, and for no other purpose."

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, for second reading of Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This House has been in Session about two months and a-half, and I think it is a subject of regret to the members generally that such an important measure, affecting the financial policy of the country, has been left to this late hour for discussion. We were under the impression, from the information generally received, that the Government were considering some changes more important in principle than those involved in the resolutions before the House, and that in consequence they required a length of time to mature their conclusions. But when the tariff was submitted by the hon. Minister of Finance, I think the impression generally was that it might have been arranged in a very short time by that hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Customs. I listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, and I am willing to congratulate him on the very plain, business-like statement he made; but I am sorry to say that I cannot congratulate him on the manner in which his tariff was explained. I think the hon. gentleman should have given this House much more information in detail than he laid before us. The changes which have been made generally are of a much more important character than they appear at the first glance. The proposals have been so divided and cut up, one way and another, that it is almost impossible for any business man in this House to judge of the tariff as a whole and arrive at a correct conclusion as to its operation on the country. I think, from what I have been able to gain from my own observations of it, as well as from what I have learned from other hon. gentlemen who have bestowed their attention upon it, that these tariff proposals will take at least half a million dollars out of the taxpayers of this country. Of course this is merely an estimate, necessarily made in a hasty manner. I listened to the hon. Minister of Finance with great pleasure when he informed the House that the finances of the country were in a prosperous condition. The hon. gentleman may be well assured that any statement of that kind emanating from the Finance Minister will always find a hearty response from this side of the House. Every one interested in the welfare of this country, be he on the Government side or on the Opposition side, must naturally feel a great interest in maintaining our public credit, and, therefore, we must all feel, when told that the financial exhibit of last year shows a surplus of over a million and a-half, that it is a very satisfactory statement to go to the public. It is highly important that the credit of the country should be maintained. We know that the money market of the world is very sensitive, and nothing is better calculated to sustain the credit of the country there than the fact that we have been making fair progress, and that our financial balance is on the right side. But, Sir, while congratulating the hon. gentleman to that extent—and I am willing to accord to him all the credit I can—I cannot follow the hon. gentleman in his congratulation with regard to the condition of the country under the administration of the Government for the past few years. I do not think the hon. gentleman and his colleagues can find much cause for congratulation in the financial operations of the Government during the past five or six years. In 1883-84 they had a deficit of $2,240,000, in 1884-85 they had another deficit of $5,834,000, and in 1885-86 they had another of $810,000; or a total deficiency in those three years of $8,884,000. In the following year, 1886-87, there was a surplus of $97,000, in 1887-88 another surplus of $1,865,000, and in 1888-89 another surplus of $1,800,000; or a total surplus in the three years of $3,762,000, which, deducted from the deficiencies of the previous three years, would show a net deficiency of $5,122,000 for these six years. Now, if such is the case, as is proved by the returns before this House, I do not think the Government are in a position to throw across the House the statement which they are very frequently in the habit of doing, that the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was a Government of deficits all the time it was in power. The Government, finding these deficiencies accumulating from 1885 to 1886, were brought face to face with their actual condition, and it was then that the hon. Finance Minister of that day, the present High Commissioner, increased the duty on iron. We all remember the eloquence with which he introduced those resolutions to this House—how he pointed out that before many years elapsed we should have iron blasts going from one

end of the country to the other, that iron would in no way increase in value, that the native ore would be smelted by native coal and native industry, and that the policy he was then pursuing was calculated to greatly develop those great mineral resources which we know this country possesses. But, up to the present time, what have we seen? We have one or two weakly manufactories. We have one, notably, in Nova Scotia, which has been fostered by the Government with a large bounty and with cheap coal, which is hauled over the Intercolonial Railway at a rate much less than that charged to any other industry in Nova Scotia; and we know that to-day the product of that manufactory is brought to Montreal over the Intercolonial Railway at a rate far below that of other freight coming over the same railway; and yet, with all these advantages, this industry in the Province of Nova Scotia is in such a position to-day that the hon. Finance Minister has just intimated his intention of asking this House to increase the bounty which has been previously paid to that company. Now, if, after so many years, this company, which was considered to be most favorably situated, has not been able to show a successful balance sheet, but asks this Government to give a further bounty such as that proposed by the Minister of Finance to-day, the country will arrive at the conclusion that these industries are not indigenous to it, and that they are fostered at too great expense to the taxpayers. Although we would be glad, and no one more than I, to see this or any other industry of a similar character in a prosperous condition on its own merits, few would be willing to agree to the principle that they are to be sustained and fostered, as this industry is, solely by the system in existence. When this Government found themselves face to face with a deficiency, the Minister of Finance of that day asked this House to consider the whole question of the duty on iron. Those who were in the House at the time are familiar with the discussion which then took place. We know that the duty on iron was raised from 17½ to about 65 and, in some cases, 75 per cent., and that in consequence the Government have been able to take out of the consumers of that article about $1,250,000. This article coming into use in almost every branch of industry, there is, perhaps, no tax which could be imposed that would be of a more general character. I admit that if we have to raise revenue on any article, a fair revenue on iron might be more fairly raised than on many other articles, because it is used by a large portion of the people, but under that system the Government imposed more than a revenue tax. But this was not sufficient. They found, with this deficiency of $5,000,000 staring them in the face, that they had to look in other directions and see where more taxes could be levied, and, therefore, the Government changed the duty on sugar from the combined specific and *ad valorem* system to the polariscopic system. I do not wish to be understood as saying one word against the polariscopic system which is now in operation. I was one of those who recommended it, and I believe that, if properly administered, it would prevent the scandals and irregularities which were found in many of the Custom houses in this country, but I was not prepared for the application of that principle to the extent to which the Government applies it. That principle, if applied as it might have been, if the wants of the Government had not been so pressing, might have taken not more than the same duty on sugar which was received under the combined specific and *ad valorem* tariff; but the Government seized the occasion to apply a percentage much higher than we ever supposed they would apply, under the operation of which they received about $500,000 more. That was a measure which, perhaps, was not thoroughly understood by the business men of this House, because it was a principle which could only be understood by that class of people who are familiar with that class of business. Therefore, when I mentioned it, a year ago, hon. members were surprised somewhat that their attention had not been drawn at an earlier date to this increased taxation. These taxes, combined with the tariff now before the House, are, no doubt, impairing the resources of the industrial classes of this country. We have seen it established here, as a fact that has not been contradicted, that the Government have taken sixty millions of revenue out of the country more than was required for the ordinary services of the country. That has gone directly into the treasury, but we have seen that, by the operation of the protective system, that is only a small portion of what the consumers have to pay. Nearly as much more goes into the hands of the favored classes, nearly as much more is distributed among the combines and the manufacturers, in order to make a few millionaires while leaving hundreds of thousands who are living from hand to mouth, and as many more hundreds of thousands who are hardly able to pay their way. The people of this country have been industrious and honest and economical enough, but, with all these advantages in their favor, with a fine climate, with a fine soil, with a good country to live in, the fact remains that the industrial classes of this country have not made that permanent headway which they had a right to expect. The farmer will say: I work as hard as ever I did, I spend as little money as ever I did, I rise early, and go to bed late, and why, at the end of ten years, do I find myself in a worse position than I was in ten years ago? He does not realise the fact that this tariff is sapping his resources. He does not see, that in his daily occupation there is a process going on which takes from him the hard earnings of his daily toil, but this man is taught to believe—particularly if he is a friend of the Administration—that any such system with which such great promises were connected could have no such effect upon his condition. What is the fact we have to meet to-day? We have been told, and I am very sorry to hear it, by reliable and responsible men in this House and out of it, that the condition of the farmers in this country, and notably in the west, is not satisfactory. I am extremely sorry to hear that. I regret to hear complaints of that kind coming from any part of the Dominion, because, if the farming interest is not in a flourishing condition, the business ramifications of this country—whether they refer to the banking business, or the retail shop, or any other business—must be affected, directly or indirectly, by the position of the farmers. In my own Province of Nova Scotia, I am happy to be able to believe that, with that variety of resources we possess—with our coal and fishing industries, with our agriculture and our fruits, with our lumber and our shipping industries, we are able to make up

a general average which leaves us, perhaps, in a better condition than the Provinces in the West. I was rather startled the other day to hear an observation which fell from a prominent man who is connected with the financial institutions of the country and is well acquainted with the condition of the various Provinces. He said that he wished that the farmers and the business men in the West were in as sound a condition as those in the Maritime Provinces. If that is the condition of affairs, it is shown conclusively that the condition of the farmers in western Canada is not satisfactory, and that much which has been stated in regard to that position must be true. The drain of these people has been, as I have shown, continuous and increasing under the operation of the National Policy. This National Policy was established by the Conservative party with four objects. The first object was to increase our trade with Great Britain, the second object was to reduce our trade with the United States, the third object was to secure a reciprocity treaty, and the fourth was to create a home market for the products of the country and secure high prices for the farmers' products. The question naturally arises, whether the National Policy has accomplished any one of these designs. Can any hon. member on the other side of the House point to the accomplishment of any one of the designs for which the National Policy was advocated and established? I remember in 1878 being on the other side of the House, listening to the arguments of the present leader of the Government and the present High Commissioner in England, when they pointed out that under a change of Government with the introduction of a National Policy, we should have in this country all the advantages which they claimed under these four conditions. They said that they would make the condition of the farmers' interests better, because they would build up manufacturing industries which would consume the products of the land, and so the products of the farmers would be sold at higher prices. The answer to that was given by the President of the Council only a few days ago. The President of the Council told us that it was impossible for any fiscal regulations of a Government to affect the products of the country, to increase or to lower their price. He made an admission at that time which, I think, was involuntary, like another admission which he made in regard to the Reciprocity Treaty. However, the hon. gentleman admitted the contention of the Liberal party in 1878, that no action of this Government or of Parliament could affect the value of an article which was affected entirely by its value in other markets. I congratulate the hon. gentleman, as a member of the Government, on having at last arrived at such a sound conclusion. Doubtless we shall not hear any more of the previous contention, because now, when prices are lower, it does not suit the Conservative orators to propound a doctrine such as that under which they managed to gain the confidence of the farming community in 1878. I have said that the National Policy was introduced, in the first place, to increase our trade with Great Britain. What has been the result? Our exports to Great Britain in 1878 amounted to $45,941,539. Ten years after that time, in 1889, our exports to Great Britain only amounted to $38,105,126, or a falling off of $7,836,413. Then it was intended to increase our trade with Great Britain. Then the Government were moved by patriotic fervor to take our trade away from the Americans, because they said we could do without them. And from that moment we have been reaping the fruits of the position which the Conservative party took on that occasion, by the feeling towards us in the United States. Then take, for the same time, the exports to the United States. In 1878 they amounted to $25,244,898; in 1889, ten years later, they reached $43,522,404, or an increase of $18,277,505, showing that while our exports to Great Britain fell $7,836,413, they increased during the same time to the United States to $18,277,505. Therefore, the operation of this tariff, which, it was said, would have directly the opposite effect, has proved the contention which had been taken by members on this side of the House, that our natural trade being with our neighbors to the south of us, no financial or fiscal regulations, no matter how absurd or stringent they might be, would prevent that flow of intercourse across the line between two peoples requiring the exchange of each other's products. Then, again, take our aggregate trade with each country. In 1878 our aggregate trade with Great Britain was $83,372,719; in 1889 it was $80,422,513, showing a falling off of $2,950,000. Then take our trade with the United States during the same period. In 1878 our aggregate trade amounted to $73,876,437; in 1889 it was $94,059,844, showing an increase of $20,183,407, and showing here, also, that while our aggregate trade with England fell off nearly three million dollars, our aggregate trade with the United States increased over twenty million dollars. This will prove conclusively to the framers of that policy that whatever tariff regulations they may introduce to this House, they cannot prevent the natural flow of commerce from one country to another. Then, again, we were told that if we introduced the National Policy and assumed an independent attitude towards the people of the United States, they would come down on their knees to us, they would be the first to offer negotiations for a renewal of the treaty. That was the doctrine propounded from day to day by the Conservative party in this House; that was the doctrine which was inculcated through the press and on the platform of every political gathering from one end of the country to the other. There was a very strong feeling throughout this country, generally, in favor of a renewal of that treaty. We had had experience of its benefits for twelve years before, and our people, not only in the Maritime Provinces, but throughout the West as well, had found that by opening up the markets of the United States for our natural products, we were having the benefit of customers at our very doors. Under those circumstances, it was not unnatural that those people who were longing for a renewal of that treaty, should have lent a willing ear to the promises of the Conservative speakers of the day, that by adopting the National Policy, they would be taking a step in favor of securing a renewal of the treaty. In 1878, Sir Charles Tupper, in Prince Edward Island, said:

"All we have to do to-day is to support the protective national policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, in order to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States within two years."

The hon. gentleman at that time was so certain about it, that he actually fixed the date. He knew, he said, that if we once showed our independence to the people of the United States, within two years—he seemed to have thought that it would take them two years to make up their minds—we should have reciprocal commercial relations with the United States. Well, Sir, the time passed away. A majority of the people of this country, unfortunately, as I conceive, for their own interests, sustained the views which were propounded by the Opposition of that day, now the party of the Administration, and placed them in power. Time went on, and no reciprocity treaty was obtained. Year after year passed away, and there was no evidence that we were likely to obtain any larger measure of commercial intercourse with our neighbors to the south of us. The producers in the various parts of this country saw a market across the border open to them, if they could only take down the tariff barriers and regulations which impeded free intercourse. But nothing of the kind was—I will not say attempted, though much does not seem to have been attempted—at all events, nothing was accomplished. Then, in 1886, eight years afterwards, in view of another general election, the same gentleman, now High Commissioner, visited Prince Edward Island for a second time. On that occasion the hon. gentleman is reported to have said :

"Since the expiration of the latter term of twelve years of the Washington Treaty, we have shown our American neighbors that we intend to stand up for our rights and interests. By adopting that policy we shall obtain a commercial treaty with the Americans at no distant date. I think there is reason to hope that we shall have it within two years."

On this occasion the hon. gentleman was not quite so confident as he was in his first assertion, when he said we were going to have it within two years. Now he says: "I think there is reason to hope that we shall have it within two years." Well, the two years have passed away, and we are in the same position to-day that we were in 1886, and the Government have not been able to show us that there is any early probability of securing a renewal of that treaty. It is true that to-day we have two propositions before us. The one is the gloved hand of freer intercourse, under the Hitt resolution ; the other is the iron hand of tariff war, under the McKinley tariff proposal. Which shall we accept? The people of this country were in hopes that, with the history of the question before them, the Government would at once have shown a willingness, without loss of dignity, without loss of respect, without lowering their own positions, to intimate in some way, directly or indirectly, that we would be willing to meet the proposal, the magnanimous proposal, I may say, under the Hitt resolution. But instead of that the President of the Council was put forward, the other night, to express the views of the Government, that reciprocity in our natural products would be a calamity for the farmers of this country. Sir, I was amazed when I heard that statement had been made. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman delivered his speech, but, when it was reported to me afterwards, that he had committed the Government to that position, I thought that really it was capable of some explanation ; but, when I took his speech and read it in his own language, where he stated most emphatically, and gave his reasons—

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

which, of course, we assumed were the reasons of his colleagues—why reciprocity in natural products would be an injury to the farmers of this country, I saw then that the Government had at last arrived at the conclusion, had at last expressed the opinions which had always been in their own minds, that while they were preaching through the country their great desire to obtain reciprocal relations with the United States, they had an *arrière pensée* in their own minds, that they never would have a reciprocity treaty with the United States, even in our natural products, and the President of the Council was the first to give utterance to that opinion. Shall we now, I say, under these circumstances, show our willingness to treat with them ; or shall we, as under the proposal before the House, attempt to set them at defiance? The tariff proposals of the Government are nothing more or less than a defiance of the United States. We know to what state a tariff war may be brought. We had a statement made by the present High Commissioner to England, and we did not require his statement to make us aware of the fact, that a tariff war was not very far removed from a natural war ; and with all the irritating questions now existing between the two countries, the present Administration, in my judgment, has committed an act of which they have not yet seen the full fruits. We have before us another difficult question with the United States, namely, the fishery question. I do not wish to enter into the subject, or to express any opinion with respect to its present position, more than this : that, if there is anything calculated to make the Americans stand on their dignity, and insist on the fullest construction of their contentions with respect to the fishery question, which we know under the Blaine Administration they are disposed to do, this Government could not have adopted any course more calculated to irritate the American Government than that now before the House. They are not only irritating, but they are insignificant matters : 5 cents duty on a gooseberry bush, 3 cents on a bunch of strawberries ; but small as these matters are, they show the animus of the Government, and that the Government are determined to show the Americans that we will not have anything to do with them in trade relations. To the American people at large that will be taken as a declaration of war. If anything is calculated to secure the passage of the McKinley tariff now before Congress, the tariff which this Government has brought down will have the desired effect. I believe there is no factor that will exercise such an important influence with the United States Congress at the present moment as the announcement made to them, as it has been made to them, of the intention of this Government to impose these small, insignificant but obstructive duties and regulations against American intercourse. The American people have watched this matter from its very commencement. They have shown a desire, as expressed by the Hitt resolution, to meet us in a fair spirit, and it would be no loss of dignity on the part of Canada and the Canadian Government to express, so soon as they have the opportunity, their desire to meet American commissioners, I do not say, to see how far they may go, but to ascertain if there is any ground on which they can meet the American Government with a view to the solution of these great questions. It is their duty to do so, and the country will hold them respon-

sible, and there is no question which in this country will receive more attention henceforward than this question; and if these resolutions become the law of the land, I dare the Government of Canada to resist for twenty-four hours, to stand on the defensive and say: We will not meet you and discuss this subject in the interests of friendly intercourse and the advantage of commerce at large. The Government would not be sustained by their own friends. We have already heard murmurs from their supporters. Those hon. gentlemen who have spoken in defence of their policy were not able to go to the extent of sustaining the Government in the views they have adopted with respect to this great question. They will find, moreover, that behind the members of the House are the constituents, intelligent, reading and thinking men, who will ponder over these questions, and who will naturally ask this question: Here we are in Canada with surplus products, we have a market to a certain extent along our line, we send there certain articles which no other country will take, we have these certain articles which must be sent there no matter what the duty may be; and will the Government dare to resist a proposition from the American Government asking for the consideration of the question as to whether we may not meet and devise some means upon which we can trade together on fair terms? It has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the American farmers are very much worse off than our own farmers. I am sorry to hear that the farmers are not well off in any part of the world, but, if there is anything in that contention, it goes to prove, as has been observed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that the American farmers are in a worse position simply from the fact that they have lived twenty-five years under the iron heel of protection, while we on this side of the line have only had ten years' experience of it. Do we require fifteen years more to place our farmers in the same position which these American farmers are described to occupy? Our young people are going out of the country, because, despite all the advantages which this fine country possesses, they fail by honest toil, patience, and economy to make headway, and they go somewhere else, no matter where it may be. They will go out of the country and seek new fields abroad. They may go to our own North-West, and in many cases they do go, and we do not lose them. But many go to the United States and to the south and to various other parts of the world, and I know, from my own experience in my own Province, that the young men, the bone and sinew of our people, the fishermen along our coast, the farmers of the interior, the mechanics and hard-working industrious men are going to the United States in the spring, and perhaps some of them return in the autumn to spend some days at home. That is a condition of affairs, however, which is an injurious one as regards the advancement of this country. The next object of a National Policy was to create a home market for our products and to give good prices to the farmers. I have already discussed this question. We must all regret to hear that the farmers in the West are not in a flourishing condition, and it is apparent, from the best information that can be obtained, that, as a whole, the farming industry is not in a satisfactory condition. It is doubtless true, I believe, that under favorable conditions farmers are doing fairly well. But, taking the whole industry, I think it will be admitted by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the farming industry of Canada is not in as favorable a condition as we should like to see it to-day. After having humbugged the farmers for the past ten years, leading them to believe that the National Policy was going to give them a home market and higher prices, and leading them to believe that if they would trust the country into Conservative hands, the condition would be changed, we now have the admission made by the President of the Council, that no fiscal policy of the country could affect the value of the home products either one way or the other. I am glad the hon. gentleman made that admission to the House. They now propose an increase in certain articles of large consumption in the Maritime Provinces. Well, Sir, the Maritime Provinces have to pay the increase. We raise very little beef or pork there except in Prince Edward Island, where a good deal of pork is raised; and our hardy fishermen pursuing their hazardous and uncertain calling, our mechanics and laborers, and all classes which go to make up the general community will be called upon to contribute towards these half million dollars which this tax imposes. Our fishermen will pay $6 a barrel on pork and beef, and at least $1 a barrel more on flour than they would have to pay if they could get it from the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do you say on flour?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). $1 a barrel. Some say the flour will be no dearer, and the hon. the Minister of Finance, the other day, in his desire to make it pleasant to both ends of the Dominion, assured us that his increase of 25 cents would make flour no dearer in the Maritime Provinces. If it does not make it dearer in the Maritime Provinces, I fail to see what advantage is going to accrue to the millers of Ontario and the West. Their object is to keep out the American flour, and if this tax does not keep out the American flour, then, of course, they have no advantage. The hon. gentleman was afraid to admit, as he should have admitted, that while this tax might, under certain circumstances, not always cause an increase directly, still, indirectly, from the nature of our position, and from the nature of our trade with the United States, there must always naturally be a very considerable difference between the price of our flour and that of the United States. The hon. Minister asked me what difference this tax would make on flour, and I answered frankly, $1 a barrel. I will prove to him, I think, how that is. The Island of Newfoundland is a large consumer of flour, and Conservative authorities in Halifax have said to us: "Why, look at Newfoundland; they have no duty, and the American flour enters Newfoundland on precisely the same terms as the Canadian flour does." I confess that, when I began to consider it in that light, it did strike me as singular that, with both American and Canadian flour entering on the same terms, the people of Newfoundland should get so much flour from Canada as was stated to be the case. I, therefore, took the trouble to write to one of the largest flour importers of Newfoundland, and this is his reply:

"We think the whole import of Canadian flour in 1889 did not exceed 10,000 barrels out of 278,000 barrels imported. Out of about 100,000 barrels which we and the bakery in which we are interested imported, not over 6,000 barrels were Canadian."

Now, Sir, here is an answer to the hon. gentleman's statement. Here is Newfoundland with no duty on flour imported either from the United States or from the Dominion of Canada, and here are the Messrs. Harvey & Co., one of the largest and most respectable houses in St. John, Newfoundland, stating under their own signature that out of the 278,000 barrels imported, there were only 10,000 barrels of Canadian flour. Put us in the same position as they are in Newfoundland, and we would naturally go to New York for our flour. We would have the haggle of the market in New York, and it will be admitted that flour can be obtained as cheaply in New York as in the west, assuming that it is no cheaper. It costs us in the Maritime Provinces 15 cents to get it from New York, whereas it costs us 60 cents to get it from the West. There is a difference of 45 cents a barrel, and on our consumption in the Maritime Provinces of about one million and a quarter barrels that alone amounts to $562,000. It must also be remembered that there is a large quantity of flour in the United States which is not up to the standard of the best Canadian flour, and that flour was largely used in the Maritime Provinces by the fishermen who desire to save half a dollar or a dollar. That flour could be bought from half a dollar to three-quarters of a dollar cheaper than Canadian flour of the same standard. It may not be quite so white in color, I admit, but it is quite as strong and quite as sound an article. The hon. gentleman may be able to afford the best black cloth to protect himself against the weather, but he is not better protected than his less fortunate brother who wears a homespun overcoat. A lady arrayed in her silks and satins is not better protected against the weather than her less fortunate sister who has to wear a cheaper garment; and so it is with consumption of this flour. The man who desires to buy the most expensive article can buy it, but the fishermen and the farmers along our coasts will be satisfied to take a barrel of flour that is equally as wholesome as the best, if he can get it at from three-quarters of a dollar to half of a dollar cheaper. He will save the money by buying this cheaper article and apply it to his comfort in some other direction. That is the operation of the tariff in this respect. It has been the custom of Conservative speakers in my Province, and it may be in this House before the debate is over, to quote my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Mackenzie), who led the Liberal Government in 1878, to show that, under the operation of the duty, flour would not be made dearer in the Maritime Provinces. I took the trouble to refer to the utterances of my hon. friend, and I find that what he said in Halifax is as follows:—

"Now, when your leaders come down here, they declare, as Dr. Tupper did the other day, that a tax on flour would not raise the price one cent, and Dr. Tupper quotes me as an authority for that statement. Well, I do not believe it; I believe that no tax will affect the price of a commodity of which we produce a surplus.

"But it will affect the course of trade in that commodity. A very large proportion of the flour consumed in the Maritime Provinces finds its natural channel by your trade with the States, and immediately that you stop the purchase of American flour, and compel the transmission of Ontario flour by a particular way to these Provinces, you simply do an injury to those that do business in that direction. But when Sir John Macdonald goes about in the West, and he was near my county the other day where they are all farmers, he told them he wanted a duty on flour to raise the price."

Again, in the *Hansard* of 1879, at page 517, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie is reported to have said:

"He desired to correct the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, in quoting his remarks respecting the flour trade:

"He said that he (Mackenzie) proved conclusively that no duty would increase the price of flour. What he said was that no duty would be of any benefit to the producers of flour in Ontario, but that the price or duty put on the flour imported into the Maritime Provinces would be a serious hardship to their people, inasmuch as the trade was not with Ontario but with the States."

That is the opinion of the hon. gentleman, which has been quoted on many occasions in support of the view that the price of flour would not be increased. But, Sir, I have an authority here which, whatever value we may attach to it on this side of the House, should carry great weight with hon. gentlemen on the other side. Sir Charles Tupper said:

"Mr. Blake told you that I said in Pictou that $400,000 was paid in coal, and paid by the people of Ontario. Now, if he did, he is not a candid man. Do you not think that Mr. Blake would have acted the part of a candid man if he had told you that of the $360,000 revenue collected on wheat and flour, not one cent was paid by Ontario, and all was paid by the Maritime Provinces?"

That is an authority which, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to respect. But, let us see what the duty on these articles will amount to in the case of an ordinary family. An average family along the coast would consume, I suppose, one barrel of pork, one barrel of beef and five barrels of flour. The duty on five barrels of flour would be $5, on a barrel of pork $6, and on a barrel of beef $6, making, in all, $17; and against this enormous taxation, which these poor people cannot avoid paying, they get the concession of the reduction on a barrel of molasses which, at one cent and a-half a gallon, would amount to about 60 cents for the barrel. The hon. Minister of Finance must think that the people of the Maritime Provinces have very little intelligence, if he supposes that they are going to be hoodwinked by such reductions as this. The hon. gentleman must surely see that if these people are compelled to pay a largely increased price for these articles, they will realise the full extent of the injury done to them. More than that, this duty will fall on the poorest class of our people. The duty on pork will not apply to our shipping industry or to our fishermen engaged in bank-fishing. When they go away in the summer to the fishing banks, they take their beef and pork in bond, and are, consequently, not compelled to pay this increased expense; but the poor fisherman on the coast, who goes out in the morning and spends the whole day to catch a few fish and bring them home at night for his family, cannot avoid paying this tax, because he cannot get the article in any other way. He must get a barrel of beef, and a barrel of pork, and a barrel of flour, and each will be that much dearer to him. I cannot conceive for what reason or upon what principle the Minister of Finance can put a duty of $6 on the pork and beef which these poor people consume, when he only puts a duty of $3 on the pork consumed by the lumbermen scattered all over the country, who are infinitely better able to bear taxation. I hope the hon. Minister will consider this

before he completes his resolution. The Minister of Finance, the other day, in speaking of what his Government had accomplished, told us that they had poured out money like water, which was true enough. He told us they had spent large sums in opening up new channels of commerce, forgetting that he could have, without the expenditure of any money, customers alongside of him who had made him an offer to trade with us on equal terms. I was amused when he told us he had opened up communication with the West Indies. Why, the hon. gentleman must have been ignorant of the fact that a steamer has been running to Jamaica, under a subsidy from the British Government, for the past fifteen years, and that during these fifteen years no new development of trade was created by that enterprise, because only the articles which are carried by our sailing vessels were carried in that steamer. Now the hon. gentleman boasts that he is spending $15,000 to run a steamer to Jamaica, which will only carry articles that would otherwise be carried in our own vessels. I showed him, on a previous occasion, that this steamer brought nothing back from Jamaica, and did not contribute in any way to the commerce of this country. He told us that he had opened up communication with Cuba, being again probably not aware that no more articles go to Cuba, under this arrangement, than went before, and yet he is paying $20,000 a year for that steam communication. The steamer takes out some quintals of fish and barrels of potatoes, and she returns to Halifax in ballast. I will send the hon. gentleman a Halifax paper, giving the manifest of that steamer's cargo the other day, on her return trip, showing her total return cargo to have been six cases of cigars; and this is the magnificent enterprise which the Government are assisting with $20,000 of public money. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his enterprise. Then he referred to his other enterprise—the opening up of communication with Demerara. I need not further refer to that, as the subject was well discussed the other day, when it was shown that the hon. gentleman has made a contract to give a subsidy of $4,000 in order to carry $6,000 of our produce, which would go, under any circumstances, to the British West Indies. If the hon. gentleman considers that statesmanship, I do not. I was very sorry to hear what he said with reference to the English mail contract. A year ago we were told that we were going to have a fast line. My colleague the other day brought to the notice of the House how imperfectly the service was performed by some of the steamers now on the route, and since then there has been no great improvement. What do the Government propose to do? The Finance Minister says that, considering the high prices of steel at present, the Government do not propose to make any effort to secure another contract for the improvement of the service. Had the hon. gentleman accepted the advice tendered him two years ago, and reduced his pretensions down to a moderate service, suitable to the wants of our country, had he not mounted his high horse and told the country we were going to have a fast line, equal to the fast lines in the United States, he would have been in a position to ask the House to-day, to support a reasonable scheme. He is already in possession of an offer to put on a sixteen or seventeen knot service, if the Government would entertain the proposition. Two of the largest companies having relations with this country, have two large steel steamers of 6,000 tons each now building on the other side, and they have intimated to the hon. gentleman, that they are only waiting the decision of the Government to know whether they should make them seventeen knot steamers or put in less power and make them a thirteen knot service. Yet the hon. gentleman took no notice of the proposal, and the Government have apparently no intention of taking any step to improve the mail service between this and the old country. If they were in earnest they would accept within twenty-four hours this proposition, and have a mail service of seventeen knots an hour established at a moderate rate. The policy of the Government and the policy of the Opposition are very fairly contrasted in the amendment of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright). The amendment calls upon us to say:

"That it is the bounden duty of this House, instead of adding to the existing oppressive taxation, to apply itself to the reduction of the burdens now impeding the progress and prosperity of the principal producing classes of the Dominion, and for this purpose to abolish or reduce the taxes now imposed on articles of prime necessity to farmers, miners, fishermen and other producers."

That is a proposition which I am sure will find a response in this country, and be acceptable to the calm and responsible judgment of the people. The whole question of our financial policy is embodied in that amendment, and it is for hon. gentlemen on the other side to consider the responsibility they incur in voting down such a proposition. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance, if, during the multiplicity of his labors, he has had time to read an article which has lately appeared from the pen of that distinguished statesman, Mr. Gladstone. I refer to the correspondence between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Blaine, that no less celebrated protectionist authority of the United States. Here is an opinion coming from an authority which, I think, the hon. gentleman and his party, with all their prejudices, are bound to respect. It is the matured judgment of a man who to-day probably stands head and shoulders above any other living statesman—a man whose utterances command attention in every part of the world. There probably is no man living to-day, who, when he delivers himself of a public utterance, has so many readers, and whose opinions are so carefully scanned and discussed. What do we find Mr. Gladstone say? He says:

"The constant tenor of the argument is this: High wages by protection, low wages by free trade. It is even as the recurring burden of a song. And I can state with truth that I have heard this very same melody before; nay, that I am familiar with it. It comes to us now with a pleasant novelty; but once upon a time we British folk were surfeited, nay, almost bored to death, with it. It is simply the old song of our squires, which they sang with perfect assurance to defend the corn laws. Protectionists terrify the American workman by threatening him with the wages of his British comrade, precisely as the English landlord coaxed our rural laborers, when we used to get our best wheats from Dantzic, by exhibiting the starvation wages of the Polish peasant.

"These arguments were made among us, in the alleged interest of labor and of capital, just as they are now employed by you; for America may at present be said to diet on the cast-off reasonings of English protectionism."

I think Mr. Gladstone might have included Canada as well.—

"But we broke down every protective wall and 'flooded the country' (so the phrase then ran) with the corn and the commodities of the whole world; with the corn of America first and foremost. But did our rate of wages

thereupon sink to the level of the continent? No; it rose steadily and rapidly to a point higher than it had been ever known before.

"Mr. Giffen, of the Board of Trade, whose careful disquisitions are known to command the public confidence, supplies us with tables which compare the wages of 1833 with those of 1883 in such a way as to speak for the principal branches of industry. The wages of miners, we learn, have increased in Staffordshire (which almost certainly is the mining district of lowest increment) by 50 per cent. In the great exportable manufactures of Bradford and Huddersfield the lowest augmentations are 20 and 30 per cent., and in other branches they rise to 50, 83, 100 and even to 150 and 160 per cent. The quasi-domestic trades of carpenters, bricklayers and masons, in the great marts of Glasgow and Manchester, show a mean increase of 63 per cent for the first, 65 per cent. for the second, and 47 per cent. for the third. The lowest weekly wage named for an adult is twenty-two shillings (as against seventeen shillings in 1833), and the highest thirty-six shillings."

Then he goes on to say:

"The argument of the free trader is that the legislator ought never to interfere, or only to interfere so far as imperative fiscal necessity may require it, with this natural law of distribution."

The hon. the Minister of Finance has not been able to show that there was an imperative necessity for imposing the further taxation which he proposes now. Mr. Gladstone further says:

"All interference with it by a Government in order to encourage some dearer method of production at home, in preference to a cheaper method of production abroad, may fairly be termed artificial. And every such interference means simply a diminution of the national wealth."

Then Mr. Gladstone goes on to show that Americans are prosperous on account of their great resources. He says:

"Let me now mention some at least among those elements of the unrivalled national strength of America, which explain to us why she is not ruined by the huge waste of the protective system. And first of these I place the immense extent and vastness of her territory. She carries on the business of domestic exchanges on a scale such as mankind has never seen. Of all the staple products of human industry and care, how few are there, which, in one or another of her countless regions, the soil of America would refuse to yield. Apart from this wide variety, I suppose there is no other country of the whole earth in which, if we combine together the surface and that which is below the surface, nature has been so bountiful to man. Now, this vast aggregate superiority of purely natural wealth is simply equivalent to the gift, say, of a queen in a game of chess, with this difference—that America could hold her own against all comers without the queen. By protection she makes a bad move, which helps us to make fight, and ties a heavy clog upon her feet, so that the most timid among us need not now to greatly dread her competition in the international trade of the world."

That is to say, that America, with all her advantages, with all her great natural advantages, does not compete with England under free trade in any part of the world. He further says, and this is a peculiar sequence of the whole, which hon. gentlemen should well consider:

"America makes no scruples, then, to cheapen everything in which labor is concerned, because this is the road to national wealth. Therefore, she has no mercy upon labor, but displaces it right and left. Yet when we come to the case where capital is most in question, she enables her shipbuilders, her ironmasters and her millowners to charge double or semi-double prices; which, if her practice as to labor saving be right, must be the road to national poverty. *E converso*, if she be right in shutting out foreign ships and goods to raise the receipts of the American capitalist, why does she not tax the reaping machine to raise the receipts of the American laborer?

And he concludes, in regard to the moral aspect of the subject, in these few words:

"I urge, also, that all protection is morally, as well as economically bad. This is a very different thing from saying that all protectionists are bad. I have seen and known, and had the opportunity of comparing the temper and frame of mind engendered, first by our protectionism, which we now look back upon as servitude, and then by the commercial freedom and equality which we have enjoyed for the last thirty or forty years. The one tended to harden into positive selfishness; the other has done much to foster a more liberal tone of mind."

Therefore, independent of all the advantages from a national standpoint, independent of all the advantages which free trade has conferred on that great country, independent of all these lower considerations, if they may be so termed, Mr. Gladstone, that distinguished man, points out the fact that it has had the effect of removing national animosities, of bringing the inhabitants of one country into closer contact with those of other countries, and, generally, of bringing about a better feeling among the nations of the world. I believe that nothing is so much calculated to bring about a better feeling between us and the people of the United States, which is so desirable, than to show to this great people on the south of us, that we are willing to consider any reasonable proposition tending to this end. I believe that, notwithstanding all the expressions of public opinion, gathered from general elections, and notwithstanding all the assertions which have been made to the contrary, there is an underlying feeling deep down in the heart of every reasonable, sensible man in this country, who is not directly interested or benefited by the present policy, that a policy of free trade, putting in the possession of the great masses of the people those articles which are necessary for the benefit of themselves and their families, would be of the greatest possible importance. That feeling is growing. I believe we are standing to-day almost on the brink of a precipice. I believe the Government have now exhausted every means of taxation. They have divided and cut up, and sub-divided and re-divided every possible branch of taxation by which they could take anything out of the people; but I believe they have at last reached the end of their tether. If this Government go on at the rate they have been going on, and pour out their money like water without reference to the necessities of the case, I believe the time is not far distant when the Minister of Finance will be brought face to face with an alarming condition in the finances of this country. I think the hon. gentleman hardly knows how near we are in this country now to a financial crisis, if all accounts are true. I think he hardly realises the fact that there is a great feeling of uneasiness pervading the commercial people from one end of the country to the other, and that, if once the public confidence is destroyed, if once a financial disaster occurs at one end of the country, it will find an echo from one end of Canada to the other, and no one can tell to what it may reach. I warn the hon. gentleman that not long hence he may find the country in a different condition from that in which it stands to-day. I should regret it very much as a business man, and as one interested in the development of this country, but I should not be amazed if the vast folly of the Government, and the course which they have pursued in sending such enormous amounts out of the country and putting them in unproductive enterprises, should not bring about its natural result. There is no exception likely to be made for the present Government, or in behalf of the very able Finance Minister. The immutable laws and the great principles which control the financial operations of the world are

based on authorities and on principles higher than his, and they may come back on him at a time when he cannot withstand the recoil. I warn the Government as to the effect of the policy they are adopting, and I believe that when the people realise the position in which they are placed, especially by this last attempt to tax them another half million of dollars, to be taken from their hard earnings, they will come to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite should make way for better men. I believe that will be the feeling of this country when the people come to realise the true position in which they stand. I am not usually of a desponding character. I am not a man who is despondent by nature or by disposition. I always like to look upon things in the most favorable light, and with a sanguine temper; but, as a prudent business man, as an observer of what is passing around, I feel that I should not be discharging my duty here, if I did not appeal to the Finance Minister to stay his hand. I should not be doing my duty here, if I did not call to his attention those great operations which are going on over this country, partly as the result of the policy which he is directing to-day. I ask him and the Government to reflect, whether it may not be even to their own interest carefully to consider what steps they are going to take with reference to the financial policy of this country in the future. Sir, I cannot resume my seat without again saying to the Minister of Finance, that I hope he will reconsider many of those propositions which he has brought down in his tariff resolutions, because he will find that they are going to impose a very heavy burden upon a class of people who are the least able to bear these taxes. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not had this matter brought home to him as clearly as I have endeavored to do so, and I humbly submit to him to-day, that the people along the coast of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will be seriously affected by the operations of this tariff, if it passes. I hope, therefore, that the hon. gentleman, before these resolutions take their final stage, will consider whether he may not be able to lessen the taxes on those articles which I have particularly referred to.

General LAURIE. Some years after Confederation it was the practice in the House of Assemby of Nova Scotia, when they had nothing else particularly to talk about, to resolve themselves into a committee to discuss the general state of the Province. Now, it does seem to me, although we have something else to talk about, that my hon. friend has followed the practice of those with whom he was for a long time politically associated with in Nova Scotia, and has resolved himself into a committee to discuss the general state of the Dominion. I must say, that the larger portion of his speech that he has addressed to the House, had nothing whatever to do with the subject before us. It seemed to me that he went over every matter except the one that we are considering. We are considering, I take it, the tariff—there was hardly an allusion to the tariff in his speech.

An hon. MEMBER. The Budget speech.

General LAURIE. I think the Budget speech was made in introducing the tariff. It is true that, in making the Budget speech, the Minister of Finance did allude to the state of the country, and in that sense, perhaps, my hon. friend's speech was pertinent. But I cannot help thinking that the old proverb applied largely to his speech: that what was true was not new, and what was new—well, I will simply say, was fallacious; it was a little deceptive in the argument and the way it was placed before the House. I propose to consider some of these points which my hon. friend has alluded to, and I must say it is a little difficult to follow him, because he was rather interjectory in many portions of his speech. Well, first of all, he talked about Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone's opinions are very valuable. He has tried every policy, he has been a Protectionist, he has been a Free Trader, and, I think, he has been three times Prime Minister of England, and as the result of his last Premiership, we have the report of a Royal Commission, appointed to enquire into the depression of trade and industry of England. I think that report is a very fair result of the policy that Mr. Gladstone has advocated and carried out, and afterwards he had to call the leading minds of England together to advise him as to what was the trouble with the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In what year was that report?

General LAURIE. In 1886. Now, I will give you some of the results formulated by this Royal Commission. As we have had Mr. Gladstone, we may as well have the Royal Commission against Mr. Gladstone, and hear what they have got to say. If England is a free trade country, it is due to Sir Robert Peel, and not to his follower, Mr. Gladstone, who left the protectionist party and came over to free trade. The Royal Commission stated in their report that one of the causes of the depression was:

"The effect of foreign tariffs and bounties, and the restrictive commercial policy of foreign countries in limiting our markets."

This shows that, after all, protection is not an injurious policy in those countries that have kept English goods out of them. We find that another cause of depression is stated to be:

"Foreign competition, which we are beginning to feel both in our own and in neutral markets."

Those are some of the principal causes of depression of trade in England, as stated by that Royal Commission. There are various other causes, to which I may allude later on. The hon. gentleman also alluded to what he called a danger and a serious objection, according to himself and the party with whom he is in accord, in that the Conservative party and Government have been building up millionaire manufacturers who are taking the cream and employing operatives at starvation wages, so to speak. Now, Sir, the result of the examination into the trade of England, a large manufacturing country, is reported by this Royal Commission to be:

"There can be no doubt that, of the wealth annually created in the country, a smaller proportion falls to the share of the employers of labor than formerly."

So that, so far from a number of millionaire manufacturers taking the cream, they are the people who are suffering, while labor takes a larger proportion of the profits of manufacturing than it formerly did. My hon. friend went on to allude to the subsidy given to a steamer, fifteen years ago, to ply between Canada and Jamaica, and he said that it had not built up trade. I think my hon.

friend is in error. If my memory serves me, that steamer used to go to St. Thomas, and it is only within the last three or four years that the British Government urged that the steamer should lengthen its trip to Jamaica; and if our Halifax merchants are to be believed, they were building up a very profitable trade with Jamaica during that time. But my hon. friend objected to the steamer; he was one of those who circulated a petition to the British Government requesting that the subsidy to that steamer going to Jamaica might be withdrawn, and the result has been that, as it was found necessary to have communication with Jamaica, this Government now has to subsidise a steamer to that port, and we have to thank my hon. friend and his colleagues for that subsidy having been withdrawn by the Imperial Government and placed upon our own Government. The hon. gentleman made an extraordinary calculation as the effect of the tariff upon our people in Nova Scotia. I was surprised to hear him state that the addition of 25 cents a barrel to the duty on flour, made flour $1 a barrel dearer. I do not know how he arrived at that calculation, but it must have been by some extraordinary process which I have not been able to follow. Then he stated that the lumberers were only to pay $1.50 a hundred weight on pork and beef, that is to say, $3 on a barrel, whilst the fishermen had to pay $6. I am not aware there is any discrimination in favor of the lumbermen as against the fishermen. Both stand on the same footing, they can go to the same market, they can buy the same article, and they are called upon to pay the same duty. And under these circumstances I say the statement made was doubly fallacious. There are some other points to which my hon. friend alluded, but I do not know that I should occupy the time of the House in dealing with them, yet I am loath to pass them by. Many of these subjects have been dealt with so frequently, and the assertions have been answered over and over again, that I almost expected to hear the word "chestnut," and I almost expected to hear that word when I reply to those assertions by arguments which so often have been presented. We know that if the export trade of the country has not increased to the extent we might wish, the internal trade, the trade between Province and Province, has increased enormously. We know, for example, according to the Trade Returns, that more raw material comes in now and takes the place of manufactured goods, and under that head there is a larger quantity of raw material coming from the United States, and our trade with the United States has thereby apparently increased. And so it has increased; but it has increased in a way which benefits our working people, because it enables us to manufacture the raw material, instead of bringing manufactured goods from England. England is in no sense a country for raw materials. England exports manufactured products; and, if our imports from England decline, it is because we do not import so many manufactured goods as in the past, and because we obtain more raw material from new and less developed countries, and manufacture that raw material ourselves, and employ our own labor thereby. When we hear that the Hitt resolution and the McKinley tariff are to us, on the one hand, an invitation and, on the other hand, a threat of open war; and when we are told that if our Ministry dares not to move in the matter, or dares to refuse an invitation from the American Government, they will not stand twenty-four hours, and that the Government are simply standing on their dignity on this question—I say I trust the Ministry will recognise the dignity of Canada, that they will recognise we have a dignity, and that our dignity will be considered by those who have been appointed to administer the Government of the country, and that our dignity will be duly considered by the Government, and I deem it is in the best possible hands. The hon. gentleman said that when the National Policy was introduced in 1876, he, sitting on the other side of the House and on the Government benches, listened to it but was not convinced. That is true, no doubt, and that is the reason why he is on this side of the House at the present time. But when the advocates of that policy went to the country, they secured a reasonable majority in support of the National Policy. Hence, he is on this side of the House, and I am afraid, until he is convinced, he is likely to remain on the Opposition benches. With the permission of the House, I will quote some remarks made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), giving reasons why we should stimulate manufactures in the interests of the consumers. The hon. gentleman said:

"There are many classes of manufactured commodities capable of being produced in this country, which require, for their economical production, a large market. There is nothing clearer as to numerous classes of commodities, that, within certain limits, which far transcend our population, the larger the market the cheaper the goods can be produced; and long ago, in some particular cases, we had supplied to the full the home market, created to some extent a foreign trade, and were dependent for the further extension and growth of our manufacturing interests upon the facilities that one might obtain by cheap production and reasonable arrangement with foreign nations, in sending forward our goods into their countries. That development of manufacturing to which I have alluded is one not interesting to the manufacturer alone, but of interest and importance to the whole community, to the consumer as well as to the producer, because it is based upon the theory that economy of production will ensue from the largeness of the production, and from that economised production, the consumer will obtain a portion of the benefit, so that it may be argued that while there are in other respects apparent or real divergencies of interests between the manufacturer and consumer, it cannot be said in this respect that there is even an apparent, still less a real, divergence of interest."

I only quote these remarks made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), a strong advocate of the party policy that is enunciated from the Opposition side of the House, and a strong co-worker with his party, because I think his opinions are to be received with respect, at all events by the Opposition; and certainly, when he argues in that direction, I take it that we should accept his statements as a recognition of the fact that in pushing production we are benefiting the consumer. I do not think it is necessary to enter at great length into many of the questions that have been brought forward and to go over ground that has been already travelled, but I have one or two points that I desire to bring to the attention of the House. I regret that, owing to the imperfect acoustic properties of the Chamber, I was unable to hear a large portion of what was said by hon. gentlemen who addressed the House, but I did hear one or two remarks from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I should like to join issue with him. I heard him state yesterday, to my great surprise, because I know

how faithful a financial student he is, and how closely he analyses financial questions, that the income tax in England, which he advocated, is a preferable tax to an import duty, that it is a just tax, that it is a tax according to a man's capacity to pay taxes. If he were to study the opinions of leading men in England, he would learn that, so far from that being the case, it is one of the most unjust and unfair taxes known. In considering this question, it is always important to consider that the people are opposed to direct taxation, and, of course, they prefer no taxes at all; but, if their contributions must be obtained to the revenue, the people certainly prefer to make them by indirect taxation. What is the income tax, and how is it raised? A large number of young men educate themselves and acquire a profession or a calling, and, during their earlier years, train themselves so that in after life they are able to go into the world and follow their profession as a doctor, lawyer or engineer. Now, these young men are taxed to the full extent of their earnings, and the capital which they have invested in their education in their early life is practically taxed in full. It is expected to be within the power of any man who has invested his capital in acquiring a profession, to accumulate sums to replace the capital sum invested, and these sums he will, no doubt, obtain from his profession. All his earnings, which should go to replace his capital, are heavily taxed, and, as a result, the income tax is most unpopular with every one except the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by him alone it is approved, because it is very easily raised or lowered, according to the financial necessities of the country. We, fortunately, do not have to so change the amount we raise year after year. We have no foreign disputes, no large army and navy to maintain, no wars to carry on, and, therefore, there is no necessity for any change being made in the income we raise. Accordingly, the only arguments that justify the imposition of the income tax in England are quite foreign to us here, and an income tax is a most undesirable tax in itself, and it certainly would be most unpopular here, and would be a most unwarrantable tax. I desire to refer to a point made by the mover of the amendment. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) seldom speaks in this House without in some way suggesting that the Government have debauched constituencies and whole Provinces, and by inference, if not by actual statement, he has made that charge against the Province of Nova Scotia, the Province from which I come. I take it as a gross insult to our Province that such remarks should be made, especially when they have been controverted again and again. Such an assertion is most unfair, most unwarranted, and most unjustifiable, and I say, that nothing of the sort has occurred. In every part of the Province where railways have been built, the counties, as a matter of fact, were already Conservative, and so far, therefore, from their being influenced by railway subsidies, I may say, that as regards the counties which I and my friends have won from the Opposition, no railway subsidies were granted to such counties, in any shape or form. I feel bound to say, that the statement of the hon. gentleman is an unfair and gross slander on our Province, and I, as a member from that Province, resent it; and I regret that other hon. members from that Province, sitting around the hon. gentleman, and otherwise supporting him, do not repudiate a charge made against the Province. I do not propose to continue the discussion to any length, and I did not intend to speak. But when I found, as I did find, that no hon. members from the Maritime Provinces had taken part in the debate, and when there were some points in the tariff that I had most strongly urged upon the Government, I felt I would be false to my position, if I did not say a few words on these points. I wish to say something as to the tariff *per se*. We have heard it stated that it is a tariff hostile to the Maritime Provinces, and my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) spoke of $1 a barrel being added to the price of flour by an increased duty of 25 cents. I fail to follow his arithmetic there, and I fail to follow the argument by which he endeavored to back it up, except the statement he made that a Newfoundland merchant said so. I do not know whether that gentleman has prospered in Newfoundland, or whether he has failed, like so many others have; but I do not understand his calculations. Let us take the tariff as it affects the three lower Provinces, and on the three important points on which the duty is altered. I will give the House the statistics as to the importations of wheat, flour, cornmeal and molasses last year, with the duty that was paid under the old tariff and the duty which will be paid under the proposed changes. Last year the importation of wheat flour into the Maritime Provinces was as follows:—

	Quantity.	Duty.
Nova Scotia	13,923	$ 6,961 00
New Brunswick	3,470	1,735 00
Prince Edward Island	1,389	694 56
		$ 9,390 56
Add 25 cents a barrel		4,695 28
And the total increased duty will be		$14,085 84

The importation of cornmeal was as follows:—

	Quantity.	Duty.
Nova Scotia	111,055	$44,422 00
New Brunswick	22,005	8,792 00
Prince Edward Island	3,927	1,570 00
Total	136,977	$54,784 00
Deduct 90 per cent. rebate		49,305 60
Total duty under new arrangement		$ 5,478 40

We imported into the Maritime Provinces last year 2,240,557 gallons of molasses, on which a duty of $70,923.15 was paid, and if we import the same quantity next year, the reduction of duty will amount to $35,462. Therefore, on these three items, the balance sheet shows that we only pay an increased duty on wheat flour, if we choose to import United States flour. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) says that we like to buy inferior stuff, and that we do not want the good Canadian flour. However, I may say that, far from that, our fishermen in buying flour insist on having the very best quality. They will not buy the inferior American flour, and it is quite a delusion of the hon. gentleman to suppose they will. We, therefore, find from the tables I have quoted, if the same quantity is consumed, that the increase on duty on flour will be $4,695.28, while the reduction of the duty of molasses would be

$35,462 and the reduction on cornmeal $49,305.60. We have, therefore, reduced the duty to the extent of $80,072.32 on these three articles joined together, and given that to the benefit of the farmers and fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. We have, as I said, lessened the duties to the extent of $84,767 on molasses and cornmeal from the fishermen, as against an increase only of $4,085 on flour, and which increase it is at their own option to incur or not. The fisherman cannot buy his cornmeal elsewhere, except in the States, he cannot buy molasses anywhere without paying a duty, but he can get his wheat flour free of duty if he chooses to use Canadian flour. I may state that you can buy American or Canadian flour in bond, from the merchants in Boston, at the same price, but Canadian flour can be obtained here without duty, whereas American flour has to pay duty. If a man prefers, under these circumstances, to buy inferior American flour and to take it to Nova Scotia and pay 25 cents a barrel duty on it, I do not see how we can prevent his folly. He can buy from De Long & Seaman, or any other large merchants in Boston, as much Canadian flour as he wishes; and as the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones) says that Canadian flour is better than American, we are helping the people in advising them to buy good flour instead of bad. I like to look at both sides of this question. I do not want to look at one side and present it to the House, without looking at the other side also. It is true that there is a large increase of duty in the Lower Provinces on the beef and pork imported. I am, perhaps, new to parliamentary life, and I may not be most capable of ascertaining facts from blue-books, but I find that if we buy the class of pork which pays $6 a barrel duty, the price will be increased to the amount of $64,397. I may as well say, at once, however, that we shall not continue to import that pork. On the contrary, our farmers are well able to provide the supply for our home markets, but the surplus from the Chicago markets has been forced into the country to crowd out the product of our own farmers. It is quite a mistake; it is one of those fallacies to which I have referred, to say that our Maritime Provinces do not raise sufficient meat for their own consumption. They raise plenty of beef and pork, but the difficulty with our farmers has been that they were not able to dispose of it in face of the competition from the Chicago product, sent in to compete with them at slaughter prices. I believe that the placing of this duty is a judicious step, but whether it might be judicious to modify the tariff in favor of the salt meat as against the fresh is another matter for consideration. We have no right to assume that these figures, by any means, refer to the salt meat alone. They refer to the salt and fresh meat together, and the fresh meat we can supply in any quantity. I shall be very much surprised if Prince Edward Island does not lift up its head and do a little better in pork production in the future than it has done in the past. We know the people of Prince Edward Island are fastidious—we know the hon. gentlemen who represent the Island in this House—yet I find that even they imported a very small quantity of pork last year. They did not import inferior American pork, as we are recommended to import inferior American flour, but they imported 200 pounds of good English pork, and paid $2 duty on it. If they continue to import that pork they will have to pay $6 duty on it; but they will, no doubt, buy their own pork instead.

Mr. WELSH. Have they said anything about that duty during this discussion?

General LAURIE. I have not heard them.

Mr. WELSH. Well, don't pitch into the representatives of Prince Edward Island.

General LAURIE. I am not pitching into the representatives of Prince Edward Island at all, Sir; on the contrary, I am praising their good taste. With reference to the question of the agricultural depression, which my hon. friend, as well as previous speakers, touched upon, their argument is met by the statement that the farming industry of the United States is also depressed, which shows the absurdity of the proposition to improve the position of our farmers by placing them in competition with the farmers of the United States, who are worse off than themselves. The cry is at once raised from the Opposition: "The United States farmers have suffered from protection for twenty-five years, while our farmers have only suffered from protection for half the time, and are consequently better off." I will now cite what is said, not by a protectionist, but by a free trader, Mr. Albert Spicer, who was a Gladstonian candidate for Essex in the last election in England. Addressing the Union of Congregational Ministers in England on the question why the country congregations were falling off in England, he said:

"If we look first at our rural districts, we find that the purely agricultural portions of England are gradually becoming comparatively depopulated. Our ministers in country churches know this, and have suffered from the effect of it for some time. And Dr. Ogle's paper, recently read before the Statistical Society, has shown that the alleged depopulation is no mere assertion; for he has conclusively proved that counties like Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Huntingdon and Rutland, have lost during the last thirty years 6, 8, 10, and nearly 12 per cent. of their inhabitants, to say nothing of the loss of their natural increase. He also shows that this loss of population consists of about 13·2 per cent. of men and 10 per cent. of women, and that it includes those between five and forty-five years old, thus clearly demonstrating that the best life-blood of the rural districts is gradually drifting into our great towns and cities."

Yet, Sir, when the progress of our towns is mentioned in this House, hon. gentlemen say that they are growing to the injury of the country, and that this is the result of the false system of protection; but in free trade England we find the same thing going on:

"This same decrease was also apparent in Suffolk, but in Essex it was still more striking. East and West Essex lost 12,000, whilst urban Essex, including the population of West Ham, had increased by 100,000, indicating how direct is the drift from the rural districts to the great centres of population. * * * Professor Alfred Russell Wallace, in his 'Bad Times,' has worked out the figures from the census returns of 1871 and 1881. In 1861 three agricultural counties showed a slight decrease; in 1871 eight, and in 1881 fourteen counties showed a diminished population; whilst in several other counties the increase was very small. Comparing the two census returns in the light of the returns of births and deaths during the intermediate period, Professor Wallace finds that a total of nearly two millions of people have, in the short space of ten years, been forced by the struggle for existence to leave the country for the towns."

They were not driven out by the National Policy or because protection ruined them; on the contrary, although this man is a free trader of free traders, he tells the truth, even though it argues against him. New South Wales is the only other large

community of Anglo-Saxon people which has attempted to carry out free trade principles; and this gentleman says, with reference to that country:

"In a recent lecture, the Rev. Dr. Jeffreys, our esteemed minister of Pitt Street Congregational Church, Sydney, has been dealing with 'pauperism,' and after thirty years of colonial experience, he has a strange story to tell. 'New South Wales,' he says, 'is rightly described as one of the richest countries on the face of the earth, and yet even here, with the great wealth already made and the vast resources for the creation of future wealth, there are between 30,000 and 40,000 persons who are recipient of state charity, and a very large number who are assisted by private charity. In Sydney there are evidences of poverty, squalor, and infamy.'"

Now, here are two free trade countries, and I produce these statements as an answer to those who say that our agricultural population suffer in a minor degree, because of the system of protection under which they live; and I think it is a pretty good answer. My hon. friend, shortly before he wound up, told us he viewed the prospects of the country in the gloomiest colors. He says he is not a desponding man. Well, I do not think he is, because one of his last utterances was that he expected soon to be back on the Treasury benches. Well, Sir, if he can see the slightest indications in this House or in the country to justify that expectation, I must say that, like Mark Tapley, he is jolly under difficult circumstances.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A great many extraneous subjects have been brought into this debate; hon. members have travelled over a great many different roads; and one hon. member, to obtain weapons for his attacks, found it necessary to extend his researches into the infernal regions. For an hon. gentleman, whose aspirations, from his past course, we should expect to be of a celestial rather than a terrestrial character, to go to such a place for weapons, argues a great paucity of material on the part of the hon. gentleman. From what the hon. gentleman said, it is quite evident that in the realms of Pluto none but Tories are to be found, because there were no Grits there. Hon. gentlemen have, perhaps, heard the story of the old Norseman who, when almost persuaded to be baptised, bethought himself to ask the missionary where his progenitors were. The missionary, actuated, no doubt, by the most sincere conviction that he was telling the truth, said: "They are all burning in hell." "Well," said the Norseman, "if that is the case, I would very much prefer taking the risk of being with my ancestors, to being your convert." I think it is a hard thing if we who are honestly in favor of the National Policy are not only to meet the wrath of hon. gentlemen opposite in this life, but must expect to meet the wrath to come; but on the question of adhering to the principles of the fiscal policy in force in this country, I, for one, like the Norseman, would prefer to hang up to dry in the realms of Pluto, than to reign in glory with the Grits.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are carrying it very far.

Mr. O'BRIEN. To lay aside all such arguments as these, I would like to say a word or two with regard to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford. The hon. gentleman has based his whole argument on two assertions, from which he has drawn certain conclusions. Those assertions relate to the depression of the agricultural interest, of which he has given certain object lessons as proof. He has talked about the large amount of mortgages on agricultural lands, and has referred to the depression in the value of farm property. With regard to the mortgages, I take most decided issue with him. I contend that the money invested in mortgages on agricultural property in this country is not a debt in the ordinary sense of the term. It represents capital which has been invested by the farmers in the legitimate carrying out of their calling. That is what the mortgage debt of this country truly and properly represents. Any one who traces the career of a farmer from the beginning, will find that most of our farmers have begun with almost no capital at all, beyond an axe, a few tools, and about six months' provisions. Having taken up a farm in the woods, and after spending a few months in chopping and putting up a house, the farmer brings his family and then goes off to work. He spends the remainder of the season working for somebody else; he comes back with his earnings, and buys another six months' provisions. That is so much capital invested in the farm; that goes on from year to year until he has forty or fifty acres cleared, and he finds it worth while to obtain more capital. His property, during this period, has, by his exertions, been brought to such an improved condition that it is good security for the investment of capital. He borrows $500, which he invests in putting up buildings, buying stock, agricultural implements, and in improving his farm generally. That capital so invested is not a debt in the ordinary sense of the term, but is properly and legitimately invested in the increase of capital stock. The next argument against the National Policy is based on the assertion that farm property has largely decreased in value. But we must not forget that at the close of the Crimean war, and at subsequent periods prior to the opening of the North-West, agricultural lands in the Province of Ontario had risen to a value far beyond their legitimate value, and far beyond that which could yield any return for the money invested. Anybody who knows anything of farming, knows that a farm valued at $100 an acre, as many of our farms were, is given a fictitious value, which must necessarily fall. When the two causes I have mentioned operated, namely, the fall from the extraordinary prices of grain which formerly prevailed, and the opening of free lands in the North-West, as a matter of course the value of land fell, and I maintain that it simply fell from a fictitious to an ordinary value, because, no man can expect to make money out of farming lands at more than their present value, $40 to $50 an acre. So much for the alleged depreciation in the value of farm property. That disposes of the two principal grounds upon which the hon. gentleman based his assertion, that the National Policy had been injurious to the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman talked about object lessons. Let any man travel through this country, and what are the object lessons which meet him at every hand? Unless my vision has been singularly contracted, the object lessons which have met my view, have been better houses, better farms, better agricultural implements, better stock, more expenditure in drainage, and in every way that can possibly promote agricultural prosperity. That is evidence of anything but despondency on the part of agricultural population. A further object lesson may be found in this: Let any one

attend where farmers congregate—at markets, fairs, churches, or anywhere else—and, I think, he will see, in the horses they drive, in the harness, in their carriages, and their dress, and every indication, that the agricultural population is not suffering, any further than he is undoubtedly suffering from the temporary depression which is being caused by a year of bad crops and low prices —causes which are entirely beyond the operation of any fiscal policy whatever. Now, there is one other point to which I wish to refer, and that is the question of reciprocity. I agree with the President of the Council in saying that we do not want reciprocity in natural products—speaking from an agricultural point of view. I think reciprocity is not the basis upon which our fiscal policy ought to be founded. It seems to me the proper course for us is to admit free what we want, and tax what we do not want, and what enters into competition with our own resources. I lay down this proposition, that between two countries producing the same articles and rivals in the same markets, there cannot be reciprocity. Take the trade in the main article of our agricultural productions, the cattle trade, upon which the future prosperity of our farmers must mainly depend. I happen to know, from personal observation, that at present the cattle trade in the United States stands, as regards prices, in a very inferior position compared with ours. Here are two countries side by side producing the same commodity. The country which has the largest production and the lowest prices, must inevitably rule the market in the country which has less production and higher prices. Therefore, if we had reciprocity in cattle with the United States, our market must necessarily fall to the level of theirs. Any one who knows anything of the Chicago market knows that it rules the whole Western States, and knows also that Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, to say nothing of the ranches in the west, are mainly given to the production of cattle, and that 60,000 head per week is a very moderate estimate of the number of cattle sold in the Chicago market. Not only does the Chicago market rule, but two or three individuals rule that market, and the result of the reciprocity in cattle would be that within a month Armour and two or three other dealers in Chicago would rule our market. The only exception would be with reference to the better class of cattle which we export to England, but as regards our second and third class, and inferior cattle, our markets would be entirely ruled by the Chicago market, which is under the control of two or three capitalists. If that be the case, I am unable to find out in what way reciprocity would be advantageous to us. By it we would lose, in addition, the advantage we now have in the English market, of having our own cattle admitted free under the most favorable circumstances. As regards unrestricted reciprocity, I should like to say this: The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has shown a good deal of assurance upon several occasions. He has shown that he is able to exhibit the silver as well as the brazen side of the shield, according to whichever might happen to suit his purpose, but I can hardly imagine even that hon. gentleman, were he, to the misfortune of his country, to take the position of Finance Minister, would have the assurance to go to the foot of the Throne and say to Her Majesty or the Colonial Secretary: We, in Canada, find that we might gain some advantage by unrestricted reciprocity, which means absolute free trade with the United States, and in order to attain that we propose not only to tax English goods, as we tax them now, but also to impose such increased taxation as will enable us to carry on the revenues of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would do it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am very sorry to hear the hon. gentleman say so. I think myself he would not do it. I think that if he found himself seated on the Treasury benches, he would not do anything of the kind. He would hardly venture to take a step which would bring this country, and everything connected with it, into most immeasurable ruin. There is one other subject I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to, and that is the imposing of a duty of 75 cents per barrel on flour. How is he going to ascertain that the effect of the duty will not be entirely done away with by the discriminating rate which railways give to the millers of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and other points in the United States? It has been thoroughly well established that the duty of 50 cents per barrel, which we had hitherto, was almost entirely destroyed, so far as the millers of the country are concerned, by the discriminating rates imposed by the railway companies in carrying this particular article. Before voting for that increase of duty, I should like to have some assurance from the Finance Minister that any benefit which we may be expected to derive from that duty, is not done away with by the selfishness, or whatever other name you may apply to it, of the railway companies. Of course I do not speak of flour carried in bond, but it has been ascertained that flour has been brought from various points in the United States and landed at St. John and Halifax, at rates which render competition by the Canadians impossible. If that should be the case, the duty on flour would be of no value whatever. As I am anxious that the debate should come to a conclusion at the earliest possible moment, I will confine myself to the points I have stated, and not trespass further on the time of the House.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If I consulted my present health, I would be silent in this debate, but, feeling that I have a duty to perform to my constituents, I am constrained to discuss this question to the best of my ability, and I, therefore, crave the indulgence which I have always received from members on both sides of the House. I do not rise to make what the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) last night called a "blue-ruin" speech. No person in this country has a higher estimation of the country than I have. No one on this side of the House, as far as I have heard the discussions this year, and in past years, ever sought to depreciate this great country. No person knowing the great sources of wealth it possesses, could decry the merits of the country; but what we have done on this side has been to impress upon the Government that they should adopt a better policy in governing this great country than

the one which is now in existence. We have pointed out, and we shall continue to point out the deleterious results of the policy adopted in 1878 and which has since been continued in this country. That policy has not brought the promised prosperity to the farmers of this country. It has not increased the price of farm produce, as was promised in 1878, but it has increased the burdens of the farmers by increasing the price of every article they purchase. Therefore, we hold as a party, and I hold as an individual, that the policy that was inaugurated in 1878, though it may have been beneficial to a portion of the manufacturers of this country, has been deleterious to those classes who are outside the manufacturing interests. Before proceeding to discuss the main question upon which I intend to touch, I desire briefly to refer to some of the remarks made the other evening by the hon. President of the Council. That gentleman came here in 1868 as a brilliant young statesman, possessed of brilliant talents and great eloquence. In the first speech he delivered, in 1868 on the Budget, when he was fresh from the Eastern Townships and possessed a knowledge of the wants of the agricultural classes, of which he had said he had made a special study, having a full knowledge of the relations between the farmers of Canada and the farmers of the United States, he was strongly in favor of reciprocity in natural products. After an experience of ten years, he appeared on the floor of this House, in 1878, and spoke on the celebrated amendment which was moved by the present leader of the Government. He made a speech on that occasion which was considered by his friends the ablest made in the debate. So able and so thorough was it that it was printed at the expense of the Government, and circulated throughout the length and breadth of this country, in order to bring before the people the information therein contained, and influence the electors of Canada in favor of the proposed National Policy. I admired the ability of the man, though I had not seen him at that time, who was capable of making such a good speech on the question then before him. But, after speaking in favor of a restrictive policy for the manufacturers of this country, he came back to his first thoughts as to the farmers of this country. He referred to the statement he had made in 1868, and impressed upon the Government the necessity of doing something of that kind for the farmers of Canada. Allow me to read an extract from that speech which he delivered on the 12th of March, 1878. He said :

"I should not be doing justice to my own convictions of what my duty is in addressing the House upon this question, if I did not make reference to the following proposition contained in the amendment :—'And moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interest of Canada may demand, will tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocal trade.'

"If every other member of this House should go back on the proposal contained in this amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston, I certainly could not do so without very glaring inconsistency. On the first occasion that it was my privilege to address this Parliament as a new member, as early as 1868, the doctrine which is there announced was urged by me upon the attention of the Government."

The hon. gentleman stated, the other night, that he was a close student of all questions affecting the agricultural industries of the country. He came here in 1868 with a full knowledge of what was for their benefit, and he laid down the proposition that reciprocity in natural products was absolutely necessary for the people he represented. If it was absolutely necessary in 1878, why is it not absolutely necessary in 1890, when he has taken altogether a different position? His influence in 1878 went so far as to secure a clause in the Customs Act of that year, providing that if the United States would allow the natural products of this country to go into their market free, the Canadian Government would permit similar articles to come into this country free. I will read section 6 of the Customs Act of 1879 :

"Any or all of the following articles, that is to say : Animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, pease and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oat meal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

Now, I would ask this House, and I would ask the country in all seriousness, whether the Government did not believe in 1878 that it would be to the interest of the farmers of this country to have free trade in natural products? In 1888 they repeated almost identically the same section in the amended Customs Act of that year, section 9 of which reads as follows :—

"Any or all of the following things, that is to say : Animals of all kinds, hay, straw, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), salt, pease, beans, barley, malt, rye, oats, buckwheat, flour of rye, oatmeal, buckwheat flour, butter, cheese, fish of all kinds, fish oil, products of fish and of all other creatures living in the water, fresh meats, poultry——"

And so on to the end. Now, that shows that the Government in 1888 believed that reciprocity in natural products between the United States and Canada would be beneficial to those engaged in those particular industries. Now, in the face of that standing statutory offer to the United States, of reciprocity in those articles, the President of the Council stated the other night, that if that offer were accepted by the United States, it would be detrimental to the interests of the farmers of this country. Is it consistent to state that reciprocity would be injurious to the farmers of this country, that it would bring down the price of barley to the corn standard, and still maintain upon the Statute-book the standing offer that I have read? Is the Government consistent in offering to the United States a reciprocity which, if accepted by them, would destroy our markets? In 1883 the United States did accept a portion of that offer, and in 1888 our Government placed those articles upon the free list ; and if the United States to-morrow accepted that offer in its entirety, I ask, would this Government pass an Act to grant reciprocity in all these particular articles? If they would not, then they are inconsistent in holding out the offer ; and if they did according, to their present contention, the interests of the farmers would be injured. The Government must take

one horn or the other of the dilemma, and whichever horn they take, the position is anomalous. The President of the Council told us a doleful story about Vermont. I will read some of the hon. gentleman's statements that he made during his address. This is what the hon. gentleman said with regard to the State of Vermont :

"I say, with a full knowledge of the State of Vermont —for I know it from one end to the other—that it compares favorably with the farming districts of the Dominion throughout, and I think I might almost say, with the favored districts of Ontario."

Further on he says :

"When a person tells you, Sir, that that beautiful valley, which is one of the most beautiful on the continent, comparing almost with that of the Shenandoah, one of the richest alluvial valleys, is not a fine agricultural section, he tells you what he knows nothing about. If he tells you of these beautiful pastures, those hillside pastures in Vermont, which are unsurpassed in any part of this continent for dairy purposes, for pure water, for luxuriant feed, if he says we have better pastures in Canada than those for dairy purposes, I tell him he does not know Vermont as well as I do."

Immediately afterwards he quotes a circular which was issued by the Commissioner of Agriculture and Manufactures of the State of Vermont, which says :

"Good farms, with fair buildings and maple sugar orchards, can be purchased at from $3 to $5 per acre; others, with better buildings and near railway or village, can be bought for from $5 to $10 per acre. None of these lands are far from a ready market, and all are adapted to dairy purposes. Payment is made easy. Farm labor is in great demand at good wages. In many sections those desiring can procure work through the winter on wood and lumber jobs."

Then he concludes by saying :

"Now, where are those lands? In what part of the State? I ask hon. members opposite to look at the proportion of that map which is marked red, and there you see the proportion, in the Connecticut Valley, in the best counties and towns in Vermont, of lands that are to be sold from $3 to $5 an acre, and many of them unoccupied."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, no doubt, meant what he said. He said that the lands were good, that the grass was luxuriant, that the plains were as fertile as the valley of the Shenandoah, he said that they were equal to those of Ontario, and then he reads a circular stating that such beautiful land, containing such pastures, such alluvial virgin soil, upon which were erected good farm buildings, could be purchased for from $3 to $5 an acre. Is there any person in this House who believes that story ? Is there any one who reads the whole account and who believes that lands of that quality, with fair farm buildings erected thereon, can be bought for that money ? Why, the buildings alone would cost more than $300 to $500. The farms we are told are adapted for raising cattle and for dairy purposes. We know that the markets in New York take a great deal of dairy products, we know that Boston and other cities consume immense quantities of dairy produce, we send our own produce there ; and do you suppose that the farmers of Vermont, having access to the same markets, without having to pay any duty, can be in such a condition that they would sell their lands for from $3 to $5 an acre ? $500 would not build a house and barn, so the land itself must be given away. Then he says that good wages are paid to farm hands, with ready employment. How could a farmer whose land was only worth $300 to $500 per one hundred acres, pay high wages for labor ? These lands were near a good market for farm

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

products, and yet the hon. gentleman had the hardihood to try and palm off on intelligent members of this House such a story as he told. There is another point to which I desire to reply, and I think I can present an answer which will satisfy the hon. gentleman. If my own argument will not suffice, I shall call in the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) to assist me. The President of the Council said :

"As to the exodus which is so much talked about, there was never a greater humbug attempted to be palmed off on any intelligent body than this great exodus which has been exploded in this House from time to time. No evidence is ever given of it."

I made a calculation some time ago, which I thought would be acceptable to the House, and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) made a statement which endorses almost exactly the estimate I made in regard to the exodus of this country. Let me point out how the hon. gentleman kindly came to my assistance in the hour of extremity. We, of the Opposition, do not decry this country when we say that many thousands are leaving it annually ; we only regret that the exodus is so large as it is. This country has expended within the last ten years nearly $3,000,000 for immigration purposes, especially to place immigrants in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and we are anxious to see the magnificent resources of the North-West developed. We are willing to admit that our North-West is far superior to anything on the other side of the line, and we are anxious to send people there ; but surely, if the Government have expended $3,000,000 during ten years and have brought 763,119 immigrants to this country, it is deeply to be regretted that so many of them have filtered through to the United States, to add to the strength, dignity and power of another and a foreign nation. In 1881, the population of this country, according to the census, was 4,345,292. The natural increase over the death rate should be at least one and a-half per cent. per annum ; it is generally placed in books at 2 per cent. Making a calculation on that basis would give an additional population of 521,435. According to the report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1889, it appears that during the last eight years 763,119 immigrants arrived who stated their intention to remain in Canada. Adding those figures together we should have a population of 5,629,846. Assuming that we have a present population of 5,000,000, we have lost 629,846 during the last eight years. I challenge any hon. gentleman to make a calculation upon a more sound basis than this. I now call upon the hon. gentleman for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) to come to my assistance with his evidence. He has great faith in American blue-books.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). At all events, when a Canadian blue-book will not suit his purpose he selects American blue-books, and obtains the figures to prove his contention.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am willing to accept the authority he adduced last night. He stated that, according to the United States blue-books, 393,000 Canadians entered the United States during the years 1881-82-83-84-85 ; and he said that since 1885 there was no basis for information. But if it had occurred to the hon. gentleman to make a simple question of

rule of three he could have obtained the result. The question, would be: if, during five years the United States obtained 393,000 Canadians, what number would they have obtained during the eight years and he would have obtained the fourth number of the equation. It would be 628,800 who went to the United States during those years.

Mr. HESSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain, as he asked me to come to his assistance. What I said last night was that the American returns gave 129,000 Canadians as going to the United States in 1881. That number gradually declined year after year, until the last year of the statement showed only 38,000. The figures showed a gradual decline, so that the number would have entirely run out in the course of three years more; and yet the hon. gentleman was so unfair as to make his calculation on the average of the first year, while there was a sliding scale. And the hon. gentleman knows I am correct.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman gave the numbers for each year. He is correct in stating that there was a reduction for the first year, but the other years stood nearly equal.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Every person who is conversant with the history of the country well knows that during the last two or three years there were more people leaving this country than for years previous. Hon. members will remember that the period of prosperity under the National Policy, if such a period ever occurred, was during the years 1881-82-83, and during those years of prosperity, fewer people left this country. During the last three years, owing to the failure of the crops, low prices, heavy taxation, extravagance on the part of the Government, and increase of debt, the number of those who have left the country has largely increased. I have taken the minimum, and the hon. gentleman, according to his statement, makes out that nearly as many people have left the country as I stated.

Mr. HESSON. We do not accept the figures as correct.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I cannot usually compliment the hon. gentleman as to his accuracy; but I agree with him in the figures he presented the other evening. I will now pass from the consideration of the remarks made by hon. gentlemen and come to another part of the subject under discussion. I do not understand hon. members when they say that the imposition of duties on the necessities of life does not increase the price. The action of the Government ever day proves the contrary. Why did they, the other day, impose an additional duty of 25 cents per barrel on flour? Will not the millers receive an additional price for that flour? Do you think, Sir, the millers from every section of the Dominion who have filled the lobbies of this House so long and so continuously during the last few years, do not intend to obtain an additional profit? Do you think the millers attended the farmers' institutes throughout the country, and told the farmers that, if they received an additional duty on flour, they would be able to pay an additional price for their wheat, without expecting some profits? How do you expect they will be able to pay an additional price for wheat, if there is to be no addition to the price of flour? Do you think that the imposition of duties is not going to give an advantage? It will benefit one class at the expense of another. There is the removal of the duty on molasses. Was this not proposed for the purpose of compensating the Maritime Provinces' people for the increased duty on flour? Why was the tariff revised in regard to the duty on cornmeal, if it was not for the purpose of giving compensation to the people of the Lower Provinces for the increased duty on flour and pork? In this way, on the one hand the Government says: We will improve your position by enhancing the price which you can obtain on the market, but we will give to another class a compensation in an opposite way; thus admitting every day that the imposition of duties increase the price of the articles upon which they are put. Not only that, but the imposition of duties upon these articles will increase the price of every other article of a similar nature that is manufactured or produced in the country. This is the fundamental principle of political economy. There may be a few exceptions, but they are caused by pecular conditions. It is not a duty in the true sense of the word. The money does not go to increase the revenue, but, Sir, the extra price paid upon these articles by the hardworking people of this country, goes as an additional profit into the pockets of the manufacturer and into the pockets of the parties who supply the people of this country with these articles. No person who has studied political economy will deny that this is the effect of the imposition of duty. Well, Sir, the ablest Finance Minister we ever had in this House—one of the ablest, I should say, for of course we always have the ablest on our side—the ablest Finance Minister we have ever had on the Conservative side, acknowledges the principle that wherever duty is imposed on any particular article, every article of a similar nature, whether manufactured in the country or not, is increased in price, and when the duties are reduced upon articles the effect is to reduce the price on every other similar article. Let me first quote what the present Finance Minister stated last Session in his Budget speech, and then I will quote what Sir A. T. Galt, the able Finance Minister to whom I have referred, said on this subject:

"Now, Sir, we will take the case of the farmer of this country, whom we all love, and for whom we all desire to do the best we can. The farmer of this country lives upon his farm in the rich Province of Ontario, we shall say. Nearly all the foods that are used by the farmer are raised upon his own farm and pay no duty; the wheat he raises he has ground at the neighboring mill, it is brought into his home and he pays no duty upon it. The home itself, the outhouses, the barns, all that is necessary in the way of housing for the work of the farm is built out of woods which grow in this country, of which we have a surplus and upon which he pays no duty. The clothing for himself and his family is in many cases made from the wool which is raised by the farmer himself, or, if not raised by the farmer himself, he clothes himself and his family with the products of our mills, the raw material of which is admitted free. His lumber of all kinds, his furniture of all staple and solid kinds, his farming machinery is made, and made to the best advantage, out of the woods of his own country. His fuel grows in the forests which are all about him, or is found in the mines in inexhaustible quantities in this country. So that, taking it in the gross, in the rough, the staple articles of consumption, and of housing, and of fuel for the farmer are those of which this country produces a surplus, which are free within the borders of this country and upon which not one cent of tax is paid."

Speaking of the artisan, the Finance Minister says:

"He does not live on a farm on which he is able to raise what he consumes, but he lives in a village or a town; but the articles of food which he buys, the clothing which he wears, the lumber he requires for house purposes, the furniture which he puts into his home, the tools which he uses to a large extent and the fuel he burns, which are

the larger items in the expenditure of the artisan, as well as in the expenditure of the farm, are obtained in this country, which produces a surplus of them, and no duty is paid upon them."

I do not know whether or not the Finance Minister was trying to humbug the people of this country by using the word "duty," or whether he meant that the farmer in using these particular articles, which were not imported from foreign countries, paid no tax into the Treasury. I contend that on all these articles mentioned by the Finance Minister, the farmer and artisan pay an extra price to the manufacturer or to the party who produces them, and, therefore, it matters not to the farmer and artisan if a dollar is taken out of their pocket, whether it goes to the Minister of Customs or to enrich the manufacturer. The dollar is gone, and the imposition remains the same. Now, Sir, let me read the testimony of the Hon. Sir Alexander Tilloch Galt in opposition to that theory of the present Finance Minister. Sir A. T. Galt, in his Budget speech of the 16th April, 1862, page 37 of the *Hansard*, says:

"Now, if upon one hand we get increased trade by a low tariff of Customs, it is equally clear on the other that every article made in the country will be decreased in value to the consumer by the reduced amount of duty upon that particular article at the Custom house.

"It is not merely upon the quantity of imports and articles taxed that the price is raised, but every similar article consumed in the country is increased in price tantamount to the duty imposed."

That is the testimony of the wisest financier that ever appeared in the Conservative party in the history of Canada. I might strengthen Sir A. T. Galt's evidence by quoting the opinion of Sir Leonard Tilley, in regard to him. Speaking of Sir A. T. Galt's appointment as delegate to Spain and the British West Indies a few years ago, Sir Leonard Tilley says:

"Sir A. T. Galt, one of the ablest statesmen of the Dominion—a gentleman whose experience in connection with the finances of this country and whose knowledge of its trade and commerce cannot be surpassed by any."

Now, Sir, I have looked through the records in the library to see if any one has said so much of our present Finance Minister, but I can find no note of commendation for him. I have placed before this House the opinion of our present Finance Minister with regard to the taxation. I have contrasted his opinion with the opinion of Sir A. T. Galt, and taking Sir A. T. Galt's opinion in preference to that of the present Finance Minister, we find that the farmers and the artisans of this country pay duty on the following articles of prime necessity:—Sugar, spices, raisins, currants, early fruits and flour, from 30 to 60 per cent.; locks, nails, hinges, paints, varnishes, glass and putty, 35 to 50 per cent.; carpets, blinds, pictures, chairs, tables, sideboards, bedsteads, bedclothes, &c., 35 to 60 per cent.; crockery, stoves, tinware, knives and forks, spoons, &c., 35 to 60 per cent.; cottons, prints, denims, dress stuffs, hosiery, mantles, tweeds, trimmings, beavers, gloves, mitts, hats, shoes, rubbers, &c., &c., 30 to 70 per cent.; hoes, rakes, ploughs, harrows, cultivators, scufflers, seed drills, forks, spades, reapers, mowers, threshing machines, waggons, carriages, cutters, harness, &c., &c., 35 to 60 per cent. Now, if these things bear an extra price in these hard times, when the fertility of the soil has failed the farmers, when prices in the home and foreign market have been largely reduced, can you wonder that the Reform party feel deeply in earnest and plead with the Government to adopt a policy more in consonance with the needs of the great consuming classes of Canada? When we point out the effects of this policy on the various consuming classes, we are told by the supporters of the Government that we are not patriots, but are decrying the great country to which we belong. No, Sir; we are standing by the helm of the ship of state while she is buffetted by storms and implore the pilot to guide this ship of state, with a steadier hand; that is what we are doing. Sir, I want to give the opinion of the agriculturists themselves. We have professional politicians in this country and in this House, who tell us that the farmers of this country are fairly prosperous. I think the hon. Finance Minister, the other day, used that expression. Well, I do not think that hon. gentleman has posted himself on the actual condition of the farmers in my section. He did, I believe, come to Huron on one occasion electioneering, with the leader of the Government, in the car "Jamaica." They came to ask the people there to support the Government. They made able speeches, which resulted in defeating a Conservative candidate in a Conservative constituency and sending to this House a supporter of the Opposition. The question whether there is a depression in this country among the farmers or not should be left to the decision of the farmers themselves. They met the other day in the Central Farmers' Institute in Toronto. There were seventy-four present at the meeting, where a resolution was passed which I will read. They were all skilled agriculturists and intelligent men. There were Conservatives and Reformers there. After full deliberation they passed the following resolution by a vote of seventy to four:—

"That this Central Institute do memorialise the Dominion Government that—

"Whereas, we consider the present high tariff is very injurious to the agricultural interest, making what we buy proportionately dearer than the products we sell; and

"Whereas, the said high tariff has given rise to the combine system by which competition is to a great extent prevented; and

"Whereas, the agricultural interest is suffering under serious depression, unable to bear the strain occasioned by the tariff and combines systems as aforesaid, and as the agricultural interest represents a large majority of the population;

"Therefore, the Central Institute do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the tariff on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn, and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is now laboring."

Now, Sir, it is not likely that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) or the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) understand the interests of the agriculturists of this country as well as those seventy-four men; yet the hon. member for Hamilton, who understands no more about the interests of the agriculturists than he does about pigeons, comes to this House and tells us that there is no depression among the farmers of this country, and the hon. member for North Perth comes with a smiling face and genial countenance and tells us that he knows from his experience that there is no depression among the agriculturists of Ontario. On the one scale we place the opinion of seventy practical farmers, and on the other scale we place the opinion of the hon. member for North Perth, and I ask the House and the country if they would not prefer to accept the

testimony of those men who speak from their own experience.

Mr. HESSON. I am afraid they are all Grits.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the hon. member for North Perth would not be so boisterous, he would bestow a favor on me and a little more dignity on this House. I wish also to read a resolution that was passed in a farmers' institute in the riding which I have the honor to represent. The president of that institute is a good, honest and conscientious Liberal-Conservative. I met this gentleman on the public platform in 1887. I found him a very *liberal* Conservative, so liberal that he wished to conserve the farmer's interest by the policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. At that institute there was present Mr. Plewis, a man capable of representing the interests of the millers of this country, who asked that institute to pass a resolution favoring a duty of $1 a barrel on flour. After a speech of an hour before the farmers at that institute the son of my eminent friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) moved this resolution :

"That, whereas, the present tariff upon wheat, flour and other coarse grains is highly injurious to the agricultural interests of Canada ; be it resolved that we, the farmers of East Huron, hereby demand that these duties be entirely removed, thereby removing those unjust restrictions on the farmers."

There, was a body of farmers, consisting of both parties in politics, and that resolution I am told was passed with only two dissentients. That expresses the judgment of the farmers. Yet the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), who probably never was in a farm house for three days in his life, and the hon. gentleman from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), will set up their authority in opposition to the judgment of these men, and say that the National Policy is not bearing so heavily against the interests of the farmers. I will give you the reasons the farmers in my section are opposed to increased duty on flour. During the last few years, the system of milling has entirely changed. The system of grinding by the stone has largely passed away. The farmers do not receive the product of their own wheat, but they sell their wheat to the millers at export prices, and then they buy the flour from the millers they require for home consumption, or, which is the same thing, the farmers exchange wheat for flour. They sell their wheat at prices governed by the Liverpool market, and buy their flour at prices governed by the increased duty, and as there is comparatively no export trade in flour of the grade sent to the Maritime Provinces and the eastern markets, the price of flour is governed by different conditions than that of wheat. The increase of duty imposed upon flour is borne by all consumers, whether they be farmers, artisans or laborers. Let me give a miller's opinion of the duty. I will give you the opinion of a man well up in his business, whom I have known for twenty years. He writes to me as follows :—

"I observe that the millers are down there strongly represented, and leaving no stone unturned to get the $1 a barrel duty put on flour. Our firm is not in sympathy with the movement. It is a relic of the age of barbarism. From the time of the inauguration of the accursed National Policy it has been a continual and severe struggle for a bare existence. Before that period the writer paid a rent of $1,800 per annum for his mill. Kept everything in repair, and made money. * * * * The Divine curse has and will rest on the whole scheme. It is dishonest as between man and man. It lacks every virtue of good business principles. It is ruin to both the milling industry, and the farming community.

"What do we need ? To kick down the fences, send the Tory army of Custom officers to the d——l if they will not reform.

"Then let every mill or miller who cannot successfully compete with Uncle Sam, without $1 a barrel protection, if placed upon equal terms in competition, get out. It is only a question of a little time, when, owing to disagreement among themselves and the pinching and ruined condition of the milling and farming industries, the Tory party will get hurled from power and the name of Sir John Macdonald, with many of his colleagues, will become, in Canadian history, as odious as that of Warren Hastings or Cardinal Wolsey, the son of the butcher."

Mr. HESSON. Is that from the president of the Millers' Association ? Because I know the gentleman very well, and I know he was here as a delegate asking the imposition of the duty on flour —Mr. John Hayes, of Listowel, a good Reformer.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have no objection at all, when a proper question is put, to answer it. I know Mr. Hayes. I know that he owns a mill, and that he has been seeking an increase of duty, and has obtained it, and no doubt it will put money in his pocket. That is his business. He is a shrewd commercial business man, who looks to his own interest, and lets politics take care of themselves. I want to turn to another question, and that is the results accomplished by the National Policy. It is a policy which is continually changing. The United States constitute a large market for our export. The Committee on Ways and Means, the other day, of which Mr. McKinley is chairman, reported to Congress a resolution recommending an increase of duties upon importations from Canada. The committee propose to add duties on articles imported from Canada, which will be disastrous to our trade if the proposition receives sanction by Congress. The committee proposes to increase the duty to $30 a head on all horses up to the value of $150, and 30 per cent. afterwards ; on cattle, it proposes to charge a duty of $10 on any beast of over two years of age. Again, it is threatened to impose 25 per cent. on all other live animals exported to the United States. Barley, one of the principal products of the farm in this country, and a crop which pays better than any other cereal produced in this country, is threatened with a duty of 30 cents a bushel, which will be prohibitive, and will consequently have the effect of confining the barley production of this country to the wants of the Canadian market. Butter it proposes to tax 6 cents a pound ; cheese, 6 cents ; eggs, 5 cents. We sent last year to the United States, 14,000,000 dozen eggs, to the value of over $2,000,000 ; or, in other words, about one-half the value of all the exports from every manufacturing industry in this country. If a duty of 5 cents per dozen is placed on the export trade of eggs from this country, the result will be injurious to the Canadian farmers. Hay, $4 a ton. Apples, 25 cents a bushel, or 75 cents a barrel. When we consider that we sent last year to the United States 144,000 barrels of apples. Then there are 2 cents a pound on lard, 3 cents on live poultry, 5 cents on dressed poultry, 5 cents on bacon, and so on through the list. On the other hand, a resolution has been reported to Congress by the Committee of Ways and Means, of which Mr. Hitt is chairman. It reads :

"Resolved, that whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to enter into such commercial arrangements with the United States

as would result in the complete removal of all duties upon trade between Canada and the United States, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be designated to represent the Government of Canada, to consider the best method of extending the trade relations between Canada and the United States, and to ascertain on what terms greater freedom of intercourse between the two countries can best be secured, and the said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

On a casual consideration of these reports we would almost suppose that the two were inconsistent, but they are perfectly consistent. The United States say to us, on the one hand: If you want to have a policy of retaliation, we are prepared for you; we have sixty-five million people and you have only five million, we can afford to dispense with your trade altogether, but you cannot afford to dispense with our markets without disaster to your interests. If, upon the other hand, you want greater freedom of trade, appoint your commissioners and we will name ours, and then let them meet and reason together. Let them consider the whole commercial relations of the two countries, and devise means by which freer and broader trade relations may be established between the two countries, equitable and beneficial to both. If anything were proposed against the interests of Canada, surely our commissioners could refuse to accept anything derogatory to our dignity or to the best interests of our people. I cannot understand why the Government of this country are determined to keep up their National Policy, irrespective of the interests of the people, unless it be on the ground stated by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) the other evening, that he would rather follow the Tories with protection into the place which burns with fire and brimstone than he would go into Paradise with the Reformers and free trade. I would remind that hon. gentleman that he is an Equal Righter as well as myself, and we all expect to go to Paradise, and I hope he will not leave us until we bring him into that happy land.

An hon. MEMBER. The noble thirteen.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). We can only count twelve, if the hon. gentleman has decided to leave us and we will have to report that:

There were a dozen and one who left the party fold,
But one went out on the hills for party policy or gold,
He's away on Tory mountains bleak and bare,
Away from the dozen's to his old chieftain's care.

Allow me to pass to another subject. I was speaking as to the burdens that have been placed upon the people of this country in the form of taxation, but that is only one kind of burden. We can appraise the financial burdens placed upon the people in the way of taxation, but the money of the people may be extravagantly expended, and the debt may be increased, and burdens may be imposed upon them in that way. It would behoove the Government, when the farmers and laborers are suffering, instead of adding duties, to reduce them, and to give up this policy of vacillation in the tariff. The National Policy is not a permanent policy. It is changed from year to year. Our lobbies are filled by deputations asking for changes on this and that article. The position of the Government in this matter reminds me of a little story. An Irishman was taking a bull to market. He was leading him by a rope, one end of which was tied round the bull's horns and the other around the wrist of the Irishman. They went on all right until they got to the market town, when all at once the bull tossed his head in the air and rushed down the street. He sharply turned one corner and then around another, and dragged the Irishman after him. A countryman who was standing near said: "Hilloa, Pat, where are you going?" "By my sowl," said Pat, "I don't know; ask the bull." So it is with the Government of the present day. The Government are every year changing the tariff to suit interested parties. They are driven from pillar to post by outside influence, and when they are asked where this tinkering is to stop, they are as ignorant as the Irishman was of his destination. We are told that they do not know the power that controls them—the manufacturers, monopolists and combinesters. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) last night made a reference to the debt of the country and to the assets we had against that debt. He admitted that there was a very large debt, but he said there was the Canadian Pacific Railway from one ocean to the other, and there was the Intercolonial Railway, and there were our canals, which were aiding the commerce of the country, and all these were assets. I ask the hon. gentleman if the Canadian Pacific Railway is an asset of this country? Who is receiving the profits from the running of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Into whose pockets are the large profits of that road going? Where is the income arising from the Intercolonial Railway? Where is the income arising from the canals; there is no income from these public works? Sir, there is no colony of the British Empire to-day that is so heavily burdened with debt as Canada, and which has less to show for it.

Mr. HESSON. Australia.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will show very soon that the hon. gentleman knows very little about Australia. We have a net debt of 237 millions; we have the Intercolonial Railway, which has cost us 52 millions; we have canals, which have cost us about 37 millions; and we have not one solitary asset in Canada to-day that is yielding a revenue. Last year the Intercolonial Railway represented a net loss of $454,000, which would represent a debt, instead of an asset, of over 15 millions, and we might justly add this sum to our present debt. Now, in regard to Australia. The seven provinces of that country have a debt of 830 million dollars, or $230 for each man, woman and child. That is a larger debt than ours, but the hon. gentleman must remember that of that 830 million dollars of debt of Australia, 480 millions were borrowed for the purpose of building national railways, of which they have no less than 12,000 miles, owned by the Government, not by private companies, and the proceeds coming into the national exchequer, and not going into private pockets. The railways of Australia are not in the position of our Intercolonial Railway, for they gave a net return last year of nearly 3½ per cent. upon the capital invested in them or a total net earning of $13,500,000. I would ask the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) to compare that showing with the showing of our Canadian railways. In addition to that, all the telegraph lines of Australasia are national in their character, they are owned by the Government, and have cost that country many millions; many of these lines are now bringing in a revenue to the Government. Sir, I hope the hon. gentleman will listen and learn. In addition to the railways and telegraph lines, the Government own all the water-works that

have been built for the purposes of irrigation, and which are let out to parties using them, and in that way a large revenue is brought into the public exchequer. In addition to that, the Government own the sewerage system, which also brings in a revenue. Moreover, all the educational institutions of that country are supported by the several Colonial Governments. Last year four of the seven colonies paid no less than 11 million dollars for educational purposes, and during the last 20 years 150 million dollars have been paid for educational purposes, for which there is no corresponding expenditure by the Federal Government of Canada. When we consider all these things, it will be seen that the debt of Australasia does not bear as heavily upon the people as has been represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is another point which I wish to present to the House. Canada, with a population of 5 millions, has a foreign trade of only 200 million dollars, whereas Australasia, with a population of 3½ millions, has a foreign trade of $510,390,000; showing the extraordinary volume of trade which the people of that country carry on with foreign nations, and the wealth which pours into that country and enables them to pay the interest on their debt without feeling it. The Finance Minister, last year had the hardihood to compare the debt of Canada with that of Australasia; whereas, according to these facts, no comparison can hold between them. Deduct the cost of the railways, canals, water-works, sewers and educational institutions from the 830,000,000, and Australasia has a less debt to-day than Canada, and much greater wealth to meet it. Let me give a few more items of information to the hon. gentleman, which will, perhaps, prevent him from interrupting future speakers on this question. We cannot suppose that the debt weighs heavily upon the Australasians, when a small colony like Victoria, with only one million of people, spent $132,128,530 on railways; on water-works, $26,725,750; on state schools and buildings, for which we have no corresponding expenditure in Canada—because education in this country is borne by the various Local Legislatures—$8,754,845, or a total for public works of $147,609,125. Now, when we consider the immense wealth of Australia, and the condition of Canada to-day, I think I am justified in saying that there is no colony in the British Empire upon which its debt rests so heavily as it does on Canada. The value of the assessable property in Victoria is $689,428,505, and the average per capita is $680. Do you suppose the average wealth of the people of this country, notwithstanding its boasted prosperity, averages $680 per head? The average for each family in Victoria is $3,400. Now, let me give you another fact to prove my point that the burden upon this country is heavier than it is upon Australia. I heard an hon. gentleman to-night speak about New South Wales as being a free trade country, and he compared it with other countries that had a restrictive policy. New South Wales is situated alongside of Victoria, and possesses about the same population, and has gained equally in commerce, in population and in manufacturing industries. I might go on and describe it, but it is unnecessary, as its history is nearly the same as that of Victoria. I think, therefore, that I have proved my point. Have I not shown that the debt of Australia, large as it is, does not bear so heavily upon the people as our debt does on Canadians? Now, while I am speaking of debts, it may be interesting to see how our debt compares with that of the United States. The following table shows the debt of the United States at several periods in their history:—

Year.	Population.	Debt.	Per Capita.
1830.....	12,820,868	$ 48,565,406	$ 3.55
1840.....	17,019,641	3,308,124	0.20
1850.....	23,067,262	63,452,773	2.75
1860.....	31,183,714	64,842,287	2.10
1870.....	38,115,641	2,480,672,427	65.00
1880.....	49,371,340	2,120,415,370	43.00
1889.....	60,000,000	1,134,062,246	18.90

In 1889, notwithstanding the expenditure connected with the last civil war, when money was poured out as water, the debt of the United States was only $18.90 per capita, while that of Canada, which had not gone through a single fight, except that of Batoche, when half a dozen were engaged on each side, reaches no less than $47.80 per capita. It is time the Government called a halt, and ask themselves if the public moneys are not being expended too extravagantly. In 1868, when we had a population of 3,500,000, our total expenditure was $13,460,000. When the Reform party came into power, Sir Leonard Tilley said that the whole business of the country could be managed on an expenditure of $22,000,000, and if the Conservatives were in power they would succeed in doing so. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), during the five years his Government were in power, only increased the expenditure $187,000, or an annual increase of $37,500. When the Tory party came into power in 1878 the expenditure increased by leaps and bounds, until to-day it is very nearly $38,000,000, or $16,000,000 more than Sir Leonard Tilley stated, in 1873, the country could be thoroughly and efficiently governed in all Departments. Yet we find the Finance Minister to-day stating that the expenditure cannot be cut down one dollar. He stated the other day—I hope in the interests of the country his prophecy will prove true—that the increases had now reached a close and that the annual expenditure would be reduced. He said the present expenditures would not continue to increase after 1892. Sir Charles Tupper made the same prophecy when he was going out, but he went out, and the expenditure has increased, as the Finance Minister told us the other day. It is time we should call a halt, and look carefully at the expenditure side of the financial question. Why should we, during the depressed times, make such large expenditures in the Department of Public Works? Why should we give so many subsidies to build small railways in different sections of the country, which roads are wholly for local purposes? Why should we build Customs houses and post offices in various towns for the purpose of securing votes at the elections, when the people are already groaning beneath their burden? Why should we expend $200,000 a year in pensioning civil servants while the people are groaning under taxation imposed upon them in order to meet those expenditures?

Why should so many contingencies appear in the Auditor General's Report? Why should we expend over a million dollars on the militia, when one-half would suffice to defend Canada? We are in no danger of being attacked, and the raw material from the farm and the counter would be sufficient to put down any rebellion or quarrel among ourselves, instead of spending a million and a quarter on militia. I might go through other Departments and point out where large expenditures might be saved and reductions effected. I know the Minister of Militia is thinking that I am talking nonsense in regard to militia; I see it in his face. But if the militia were wiped out, the hon. gentleman would not be Minister of war, and he would not be so bold, so valorous, or so loyal, probably, as he is to-day, because these qualities are forced upon him from the position he occupies in connection with the militia of Canada, and, therefore, I can quite understand why he does not agree with my view of this particular question. I desire briefly to allude to the foreign trade of the country, which has not been dwelt upon by any speaker in the course of this debate. The Finance Minister last year touched upon it very daintily, and I wish to bring to the attention of the House what the hon. gentleman stated last year, and I am sorry the First Minister is not in his place, because I intend to show what he stated in regard to foreign trade a few years ago. I have shown that the foreign trade of Australia is $510,390,000, or a per capita trade of $142, while the Canadian foreign trade is only $200,000,000, or a per capita trade of $40. But hon. gentlemen, in 1878, stated that, even if they failed to secure reciprocity with the United States, they were determined to open up foreign markets—those of British Guiana, the Argentine Republic, the West Indies, France, Germany, and other countries, which were ready to take the products of our people. If the United States refused, by their high tariff, to admit Canadian products into their markets, Canada would have other markets independent of the United States. Speaking on this question on 21st April, 1882, Sir John A. Macdonald is reported in *Hansard*, page 1085, as follows:—

"I am not aware—my memory may be at fault—that those gentlemen opposite ever made a single advance to any foreign nation, or sought to develop the trade of Canada in any port of the civilised or uncivilised world. I believe it was in our time that the development and extension of our trade was commenced, and I am proud to say that our mother country is truly a mother country in the best sense of the word, always assisting us, especially of late, in any attempt or any expressed desire of Canada for the development of her trade with any and every country in the world."

Further he said:

"We commenced at once to extend our trade. In the first place we went to a nation on this side of the Atlantic, and we have now got the official, the not ostentatious, but, to a great extent, the expressed assistance of Her Majesty's representative at the Court of Brazil, and we have now a line running monthly between Canada and Brazil, and although that trade is in its infancy, I think the indications are clear that one of our best markets in the future will be Brazil. The commodities of the two countries are of such diverse nature that we can profitably send our productions to Brazil and receive hers in exchange."

Now, Mr. Speaker, just notice here the evidences of success that were set forth by the right hon. the First Minister. He said that we would have the experienced assistance of Her Majesty's official officer at Brazil, that the products of that country were diverse from the products of this country, and, therefore, that Brazil would become a profitable market for the products of Canada. Let us see what the hon. Finance Minister said with respect to trade with these countries. I call his particular attention to the remarks he made last year, and I was astonished this year that in his Budget speech he did not make any reference to that trade which he promised us. Last year the Finance Minister said:

"There are, lying to the south of us, countries that are willing to trade with us and in which an advantageous trade to Canada could be established. The vast country of South America, with its different governments, with its vast natural resources, with its demand for certain articles which we can supply of the best kind, is ready for trade with us on equal conditions with all other countries of the world. The West Indies, rich in elements of trade which complement ours and needing a great many of the products and manufactures which we can supply, afford a field for what we believe to be a permanent and profitable trade."

Now, Sir, these were the prophetic visions of two members of the Government a year ago, and I would call the attention of the Finance Minister now to what has been accomplished. After he and the First Minister made that boast, and after portraying such a beautiful picture as the Finance Minister did, it will be interesting to know how much of our products we send to these countries. Brazil has a population of 14,000,000 and our exports to that country for the years mentioned are as follows:—

1882	$493,549
1885	310,912
1888	333,000
1889	334,779

In 1882 we had a subsidised line of steamers, and the representative of Great Britain in our favor, as the First Minister said, and yet our exports decreased. Instead of extending our trade to these southern countries, during these eight years we have a decrease of 32 per cent., after all the efforts that have been made by the Government of this country. This may arise from either one of two causes. First, because Brazil may not be a natural market for us, or that we fail on account of Canada not having the power of making our own treaties. The failure of the Government may be owing to the operation of both these causes as well as to their own negligence, but whatever the cause or causes may have been the failure is quite appparent. At all events, it proves conclusively to this House and to this country, that we have not established that trade with Brazil which was promised by the Government. Now, Sir, I will give the hon. members of the Government a little more information with regard to our trade with the south, and I hope they will look after it. In British Guiana, one of the countries of South America, with a population of 1,250,000, the following are the statistics for 1887, the last year for which I could obtain them:—

TRADE WITH BRITISH GUIANA.

Total imports	$ 8,016,000
Imports from United States	1,585,000
Imports from Canada	220,915

	From United States.	From Canada.
Bread and biscuits	709,730 lbs.	11,200 lbs.
Butter	182,671 "	6 "
Tallow candles	32,745 "	None.
Cheese	193,720 "	"
Corn and oatmeal	1,791,124 "	"
Flour	138,941 brls.	"
Grain	28,064 bush.	100 bush.
Hams	205,831 lbs.	1,223 lbs.
Oil	393,233 gals.	None.
Soap	494,890 lbs.	150 lbs.

These articles which I have mentioned can all be supplied by Canada just as well as by the United States. It will be seen from these returns that we did not export one single pound of cheese to British Guiana from Canada, the greatest cheese producing country in the world, which exported cheese to Great Britain and to other markets last year of over 88 million pounds. Is this the result of the efforts of the Government in establishing a trade towards the south? Is this the only result they can show, after having a line of steamers running for several years and three lines of steamers during the last year, subsidised by the money of the people of Canada? I believe that we, on this side of the House, are entitled to receive some information as to the reason why no better success has attended the efforts of the Government? If no market can be established there, why should thousands and thousands of dollars be spent in seeking to establish one where there is not a natural market for Canadian products. We were told by the Finance Minister last year that he was bound to establish a large trade with the West Indies. What has he accomplished in this direction? Let me give you the figures of the export trade of Canada to the West Indies. They are as follows:—

1878	$3,414,000
1882	1,688,962
1885	1,583,800
1888	1,491,824
1889	1,658,844

In 1878, the Reform Government was in power, but every year since that the export trade with the West Indies has been a declining trade, notwithstanding the boast and the efforts made to extend it in that direction, and last year we found it decreased 51½ per cent. as compared with the trade in 1878. While at the same time they were shutting out the United States markets, which are our natural markets, the Government did not succeed in establishing markets in other lands which would purchase our products. Now, Sir, let me refer to France. France is a country with which I have always thought Canada should trade to a very great extent. We are bound to France by ties of consanguinity. Nearly 1,500,000 of our people belong to the same nationality, speak the same language, worship in the same church, and have the same habits and customs. The people of France require a large quantity of the articles produced in this country, and we require a large quantity of the articles produced by France; and what could be more reasonable on the part of the Canadian Government than to establish a lucrative trade with that country? But what has been the case? Sir Alexander Galt went, a few years ago, to France to negotiate a trade treaty between that country and Canada; but he had to stand behind the Ambassador of England, and, according to his own statement, he was not able to reach the proper executive power in France; but everything he had to say had to be filtered through the English Ambassador, and he failed to secure a treaty. Afterwards Sir Charles Tupper, another able man, went to France with the same object, but he also failed to secure enlarged trade with France. Now, Sir, let us look at the meagre export trade of Canada to that great country. In 1878 our exports to France amounted to only $369,391; in 1882 they rose to $825,573; in 1885 they fell to $303,309, and in 1889 they were $334,210, $35,181 less than twelve years ago. At the same time the Argentine Republic, a country 2,000 or 3,000 miles farther away from France, and producing almost the same products as Canada, with only 3,800,000 people, sent to France in 1887 $24,871,354 worth, or 72 times as much as Canada sent in the same year. Now, I ask the hon. Finance Minister why we cannot establish a similar trade; and if we cannot, we should seek to establish better commercial relations with the country to the south of us. Let us look at our trade with Spain. It was said a few years ago by the party in power that there would probably be a large trade establish between this country and Spain. Has that prediction been fulfilled? Canada's exports to Spain in 1878 were $47,816, in 1882 $108,082, in 1885 $132,695, in 1888 $52,417, and in 1889 only $13,526; whereas the Argentine Republic, which is 2,000 miles farther away, sends to Spain $1,321,203 worth of products, or 95 times as much as Canada. Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell us the reason of the failure of our trade with foreign counties, and especially the failure of their efforts to open up the markets of Spain to the products of this country? Now, we have a country almost adjoining ours with which our trade is declining; I refer to the colony of Newfoundland. Our exports to Newfoundland have been as follows:—

1878	$2,094,682
1882	1,974,923
1885	1,670,968
1888	1,523,827
1889	1,302,335

This shows a decrease of 37½ per cent. since 1878. Now, if our trade is decreasing all around us, what are the Government doing to enlarge our markets and bring capital into Canada? Our exports to Britain in the same years have been as follows:—

1878	$45,846,062
1882	45,273,930
1885	41,871,991
1888	40,084,984
1889	38,105,126

Or a reduction since 1878 of 17 per cent. Now, where has our trade gone? I have shown that it has not gone to Brazil, to British Guiana, to the West Indies, to France, to Spain or to Great Britain. Where has it gone to? It has gone into the natural market of this country in spite of the restrictive policy of this Government. Our trade has been forced over those high barriers, a fact which abundantly proves that the United States is the natural market of Canada. Our exports to that country in the same years have been as follows:—

1878	$25,244,898
1882	43,475,203
1885	34,783,251
1888	42,572,065
1889	43,522,404

Or an increase of 42 per cent. during the last ten years, notwithstanding the persistent efforts to shut us out of that natural market for Canadian products. Under these circumstances, I ask, is it right, in the interest of the great producing classes of this country, that fresh barriers should be erected between Canada and the markets of the United States? Now, I want to state the Canadian exports to all countries other than the United States and Great Britain, and hon. gentle-

men will notice from the figures I give how our trade with foreign countries outside of those two is declining. The following is a statement of the Canadian export of home produce to all countries other than the United States and Great Britain, expressed in percentages of the whole export trade :—

Name.	1878.	1889.	Increase.	Decrease.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Canada	12	10	.....	2
Nova Scotia	61	46	.....	15
New Brunswick	10	5	.....	5
Prince Edward Island	7	25	18	.....
British Columbia	14	15	1	.....
Manitoba	None	1	1	.....
Ontario	2	1½	.....	½
Quebec	8	6½	.....	1½

You will notice from these figures how the trade of our country, both as a whole and as Provinces, is decreasing in exports to other foreign countries outside of Great Britain and the United States. Now, I propose to give you, Sir, the Canadian export to Great Britain. It is as follows :—

Name.	1878.	1889.	Increase.	Decrease.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Canada	54	43	.....	11
Nova Scotia	16	23½	7½	.....
New Brunswick	70	56¼	.....	14
Prince Edward Island	69	5	.....	64
British Columbia	10	20	10	.....
Manitoba	92½	48	.....	44½
Ontario	29	13½	.....	15½
Quebec	83	78	.....	5

It will be noticed from that statement, which has been carefully prepared, that our trade with Great Britain—both taking Canada as a whole, and taking it in different Provinces—is equally declining. Now, I come to our export trade with the United States, and the following statement will show that, notwithstanding the restrictions and barriers placed between the two countries, to prevent their having commercial relations with each other, our trade is overleaping these barriers to seek its natural market. The following is a comparative statement of Canadian exports to United States :—

Name.	1878.	1889.	ncrease.	Decrease.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Canada	34	47	13	.....
Nova Scotia	23	30	7½	.....
New Brunswick	20	39	19	.....
Prince Edward Island	24	70	46	.....
British Columbia	76	65	.....	11
Manitoba	7½	51	43½	.....
Ontario	69	85	16	.....
Quebec	9	15½	6½	.....

I ask this House if these figures do not prove conclusively that the United States are our natural market ? And that, notwithstanding the efforts of the Government, and the large subsidies paid for the purpose of extending our trade in other directions, our trade with the United States is enlarging? What, therefore, is best to be done under the circumstances ? It is to open that market as speedily as possible to our goods, if that can be accomplished upon just and honorable terms and conditions. Let us send our manufactured goods into the various centres of the United States, and let the United States send their goods into Canada. We should not be afraid to compete with the Americans ; we are their equals in ability, skill and physique, and why should we put up a high tariff wall when we can have free access to their markets by allowing them the same privilege. It is, therefore, the duty of the Government to seek an interview with the representatives of the United States, and I am convinced that, in such an event, they will come to the conclusion that the freest commercial intercourse between the two countries is the only panacea for the depressed condition of our farmers as well as in the interests of the country as a whole. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but I felt it my duty to give my views on these questions to which I refer. I have no doubt differed very widely from the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I thank them for their courtesy and the attention they have given my remarks.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). I do not intend to detain the House more than a few minutes, although the questions now under discussion are, perhaps, more important than any that have engaged our attention during this Parliament. Although I am new to parliamentary practice and to the matters which engage our attention, I would like before the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) leaves the House, to ask him if the amendment to the motion which he has made were carried, would it do away with the duty on flour, beef and several other articles in which the farmers of the country are interested ? I take it that the hon. member knows that would be the result. The senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) made a remark in reference to a letter which he read, purporting to have been written by my predecessor in the representation of South Ontario. I dare say you have seen the discussion that has taken place between him and Mr. Wiman, because the *Ontario Reformer* has been distributed broadcast through this House. I know that my predecessor when he left Canada left it for Canada's good. He has suggested testing South Ontario as to the annexation feeling which he says prevails in this country. I say that South Ontario is loyal to the core. I was born and brought up there, I have mixed with the people, and I do not believe a dozen electors could be found in the South Riding of Ontario, which is one of the finest counties in the Dominion, who would support the statement which was made. I admit that the farmers have felt a depression during the past year. I must admit that, being one of them myself. I contend that we would have been in a far worse condition but for the National Policy, and those duties which the Government in 1879 placed upon many of the articles in which we are interested. In regard to the duties levied upon flour, I take this ground, which I believe cannot be disputed. Large quantities of flour have come into Canada during the past ten years, and, if that flour came in paying a duty of fifty cents, although the price may be ruled to a great extent by the

price in Liverpool, the market in Canada must be better than the foreign market. Though the duty has now been increased by twenty-five cents per barrel, still wheat in Canada has been higher in price by from eight to twelve cents than it was in the United States. That, unquestionably, must be beneficial to the farmer. The increased duty upon flour will have the effect of helping the millers of this country, and also the laborers, the coopers, and the forwarding interest, who are all directly interested in the flour trade. I would also refer to the increased duty upon hogs. As I said last year, I believe that the farmers have benefited by the duty on pork more than a million dollars a year, and I believe that now, with the increased duty, they will benefit to the extent of about two millions a year. I am very much mistaken in the temper of the farmers of Canada if they do not recognise these facts at the polls on the first opportunity. As to the beef industry, that may not have been much affected until within the last eighteen months or two years, but since that time the Americans have been coming in to our market with their beef, and I believe that in two years more they would have controlled our beef market. The present Administration have adopted a wise policy which I believe will give that market to ourselves. Allow me to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that strong efforts are being made to bring American cattle in here in bond to be killed. I hope the Government will never allow anything of that kind, but will realise the great advantage we have in our cattle being allowed to enter the ports of Great Britain, which privilege I believe is worth at least one cent a pound to us. As I believe the Government have the interest of the farmers at heart, I am confident they will never allow American cattle to come into Canada for such a purpose. If time permitted, I might discuss several other items, but will content myself by saying that the market of Great Britain is almost illimitable for every article of farm produce. In Great Britain they require even more than Canada and the United States can give them. In 1888, they imported 377,000 head of cattle, of which Canada only sent 60,000; and they imported 966,000 sheep, of which Canada sent only about 45,000. I might refer to cheese and butter, hams and bacon, and show that the proportion is similar. We have entered upon a new period. Farming will probably undergo many changes, and we will probably become greater competitors in the old country market. Instead of sending cattle to the United States at $30 a head, we will probably send cattle to the old country at $90 a head. Instead of sending sheep and lambs to the United States, we will probably feed them here on our coarse grains and sell them to the old country at $8 and $9 a head. In the cheese and butter market there is a great future before us, and, if we are wise, we will not allow these things to slip out of our grasp. With the fostering care of the Government, with the great judgment which they show in these matters, with the eye which they have on the great agricultural interests of the country, we need have no fear for the future. The sky is already clearing, and I look forward without any apprehension to the future, so far as the agricultural interests are concerned. With these great markets of Britain open to us, ready for us to take possession of, the farmers need have no fear, and, notwithstanding the dark pictures of blue ruin that hon. gentlemen opposite have been drawing, I venture to say that within twelve months from to-day they will have to tell a different story. They may repeat these dark statements, because they have become so accustomed to the pessimistic pleasantries of the member for South Oxford that they desire to imitate him in every particular; but, if they are true to their country and to the great agricultural interests of Canada, they will be true to the facts and not draw these dark pictures. The farmers do not thank them for it. They are able and willing to help themselves, and with the assistance the Government has given them by the changes in the tariff, I venture to say that the bright day is not very far off when we will be able to take advantage of those changes.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Huron). I believe the great question under discussion between members on the two sides of the House is the National Policy. We contend on this side that the National Policy, as it has existed for ten years past, has not been in the interests of the Dominion of Canada generally, and especially that it has not been in the interest of the agricultural community. The First Minister and his colleagues, when they introduced the National Policy, promised us:

> "That it will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed; will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market; will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving—as it ought to do—in the direction of reciprocity of tariff with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

These were some of the blessings which were to be showered upon this country under the benign influence of this National Policy. I was very much astonished the other day, when the hon. Finance Minister told us that the farmers and fishermen of Canada had been fairly prosperous, and he showed how taxation had steadily increased. I quite agree with him that taxation has steadily increased. It has not only increased steadily, but it has borne more heavily upon the workingmen and upon the farmers of Canada; it has steadily borne more heavily upon the classes who produce the wealth of this country, and I hold that those who are the producers in a country, ought to receive the first consideration in legislation. Now, let me show how taxation has increased, and how the Government are extracting the money from the pockets of the people. I am going to show how the rate of taxation has increased faster than population has increased. I find that in 1880 there were $560,994 collected more than the increase of population would warrant; in 1885 the sum was $8,023,834; and in 1886, $11,401,611; or in all, from 1880 to 1889, the sum of $53,267,885 was taken out of the pockets of the people of this country in taxation, more than the increase of population would warrant. That is what has enabled hon. gentlemen opposite to boast of having surplusses, whereas the Government that preceded them had deficits. I ask whether a Government that continues to impose heavier taxes upon the people each year is to be commended more than a Government that refused to increase the taxes. I ask you whether the present Government, with a surplus during the last year of $1,800,000 extracted from the pockets of the farmers and the workingmen of this country, is to be commended, and

they are doing this at a time when the struggling masses are hardly able to make both ends meet. Then we are told that manufacturing industries were springing up. Let us see how much increase has taken place in some of the manufactures of this country. The only article in our manufactures, the product of which has increased very much, is that of cotton. I will give the following table to show how the case stands with respect to the value of some of the chief articles of import :—

GOODS IMPORTED INTO CANADA IN THE YEARS 1881 AND 1889.

	1881.	1889.
Cotton goods.....	$ 10,204,465	$ 4,245,868
Woollens.....	8,742,024	10,414,963
Wood manufactures	909,139	1,486,331
Iron and steel.....	8,598,250	9,680,967
Carriages.....	123,687	398,293
Earthen chinaware..	439,029	697,947
Leather manufact's	1,473,754	1,521,868
Musical instruments	375,138	487,519

So that according to these figures, taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, the statement of the Finance Minister in his Budget speech is not borne out by the facts. Last year he made a statement concerning the incidence of taxation paid by the rich men, and he told us that when a wealthy man wanted to get a fine musical instrument he went over to New York and bought a piano for which he paid $1,000. But I have examined the Trade and Navigation Returns very carefully, both for the years 1888 and 1889, and not one single rich man of Canada went over to the United States and bought this fine piano worth $1,000—not one came into the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman told us, also, that when a rich man wanted to buy a fine carriage he would go over to the other side and get one worth $500. I have also examined the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1888 and 1889, and I find not a single carriage imported from the United States valued at $500. Four carriages valued at $535 each came from England, and this is one of the incidents of taxation. The hon. gentleman went on to speak of the duties on flour and wheat, and to these I will now refer. The duty on flour will bear heavily on the farmers of the country. I will give the House an opinion from a grange on this subject :

"At a regular meeting of the Hullett Grange No. 393 it was moved by John Cuming, sr., seconded by John Brigham, and carried unanimously, that this Grange in session, condemns the action of the Millers' Association in asking a higher tariff on flour, as we think it is an injustice to the farmers. Also, that this Grange thinks that the present tariff in exchanging flour for wheat is too high, and we are of opinion that the Government should pass a law regulating, in some way, the quantity of flour and offal that the miller should give in exchange for our wheat, as we are of opinion that they do not give us a fair exchange."

I believe the millers came to the conclusion that it was not in their interests that the duties on wheat and flour should continue in the future as in the past. At a meeting of the Millers' Association held on 6th August at Peterborough, a decision was arrived at to ask a reduction of duty on wheat and flour. At a meeting on 10th July, they wanted flour to be protected $1 per barrel in order to place it on an equal footing with other protected industries. Mr. J. Waxcup said that other property had doubled and trebled in value, while mill property was stationary. I deny most emphatically that farm property has doubled or trebled, while mill property has remained stationary. Another miller stated that they were dying from consumption caused by too much opposition; that they could produce 18,000,000 barrels a year, when the country could only consume 5,000,000 barrels. I ask the people of this country if it is justice to our workingmen and to our farmers to impose an extra duty upon a commodity, when one of the principal grounds for the duty is that too many have engaged in the industry? We have so many mills in Canada that they can run only four months in the year and remain idle during eight months. Have the farmers and the workingmen, whose burdens are already too grievous to be borne, to be taxed to support a class, simply because there is too much competition in that particular industry? Of course, I do not blame the millers for securing relief, for, no doubt, they have been suffering for a number of years. Mr. James Stark, of Paisley, said, with respect to free trade with the United States, that he believed we could hold our own. I see in the *Globe* to-day, that at a meeting of the Millers' Association, it was stated that the present position of the flour business could not continue, that they must purchase wheat from the farmer and sell to the farmer his flour. I hold that the flour which the farmer gets from the miller from his own wheat will pay duty as well as the flour obtained by any other class in the community. I hold that the increase in the duty will have the effect of raising the price of flour. Why should the millers come to the Government and ask them to place an additional duty on flour, if it is not to give them an advantage? And I hold that that advantage is to be obtained at the expense of the farmers and working people of the Dominion. The oatmeal mills are in a similar condition to the flour mills. We have 60 oatmeal mills in the Dominion, according to a statement made to the Combines Committee two years ago, and four mills will abundantly supply the consumption in the country. The same evil exists in regard to the flour mills; there are far too many engaged in that branch of industry, but that has been induced by the National Policy and the imposition of a duty of $1 per barrel on oats. These are not, however, the only industries that have been injured in Canada, and I hold this Government has a duty to perform, that is, as those best acquainted both with the oatmeal and flour milling interests have suggested, to remove the duty altogether, and allow wheat to come in free, and flour also. The greatest political economists have always stated this, that wherever there is a retaliatory tariff imposed by the Government, it has always acted to the injury of the people under that Government. We have been told time and time again, that the National Policy has increased the price of grain to our farmers, and that it would be great injury to them if we allowed grain to come in free. We were told last night, that the price of wheat is to-day as high in Canada as in any part of the United States; but I want to tell hon. gentlemen, that at the time when the National Policy came into force wheat was higher in Canada than in the United States. Let me quote from a Government return placed in my hands, showing the prices of wheat in Canada and in the United States in 1881, at about the time the National Policy came into existence. That return states :

"That this difference is not exceptional between the two years taken, but is due to a steady and persistent

decline in prices during the intervening period, is shown by the table of prices of some of the same articles at Montreal in the years 1881 and 1886:—

Average Price in Montreal.

	Per Barrel of Flour.
1881	$5 64
1886	3 56

Average Export Price in the United States.

	Per Barrel of Flour.
1881	$5 66
1886	4 69

This is a reduction of only 97 cents a barrel in the United States while it had been reduced $2.08 in Montreal. Now let us take wheat. He shows that in 1881 wheat in Montreal was worth $1.33 per bushel and in 1886 85 cents, or a reduction during the five years of 48 cents per bushel. Wheat in the United States in 1881 was worth $1.11 a bushel, or 22 cents lower than it was in Canada during that year, and in 1886 wheat was 87 cents in the United States, or only 24 cents per bushel of a shrinkage, just half the shrinkage of the price in Canada during these five years. Will that satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite, when I prove it from a return that they cannot dispute, that it has not been in the interests of the farmers of this Dominion to have this National Policy. Just to show how men's minds will be warped when they have an object to accomplish and when they want to show the better side of a bad case, let me read another remark with respect to the fall in the price of wheat in Canada during that period :

"The very marked effect which the adoption of the National Policy, in 1879, had upon the imports of wheat and flour, will be immediately apparent upon looking at the above table. It will be seen that while the average importation of wheat in each year from 1868 to 1879 was $5,480,735, in the period 1880 to 1886 it only averaged $168,097 per annum, increasing the home market for wheat to the extent of $5,312,638 annually."

Now, Sir, we might say that this shows that a great benefit had been conferred upon the farmers of Canada by giving them a market for the extra 5 million bushels of wheat. But let me read the next paragraph, which will explain itself :

"The decline in the price of wheat during the last five years has been very marked. In 1881 in Montreal it was $1.33 per bushel, and in 1886 only 85 cents per bushel, being a reduction of 48 cents. According to United States official reports, the export price of wheat in 1881 was $1.11 and in 1886 87 cents, a difference of 24 cents a bushel."

That is the great blessing that the National Policy conferred on the farmers of Canada. It reduced the price of their wheat 48 cents a bushel, while wheat only reduced 24 cents per bushel in the United States during the same years. That bears out the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who preceded me. Now, Sir, when we come to examine closely we find that Indian corn, an article which we do not raise very much in this country, was, in 1881, 60 cents per bushel in Canada, and, in 1886, 49 cents, a reduction of 17 cents per bushel in Canada, while in the United States, in 1881, it was 55 cents per bushel and in 1886 49 cents, or a reduction of only 6 cents in the United States. This shows that the National Policy has not had the effect of giving us a market for our own coarse grains, for it shows that corn has fallen off more in price in Canada since the duty was imposed than it has in the United States. I state positively, with respect to Indian corn, that it would be a great benefit and a great blessing to the farming community of this country if we could import that commodity free of duty. The Finance Minister has also proposed to us an extra duty on beef. Well, Sir, with respect to that duty there is not the least doubt on my mind that some parts of the country will be benefited by cutting off the 3,800,000 pounds of beef which come into the country. But so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, the extra duty will have very little effect in that Province, for the reason that there are only 432,000 pounds of beef imported there. In the Province of Ontario the most of the beef we raise is for the English market, and it is that market which regulates the price of our beef cattle. There is no doubt, however, but that in the localities where a great amount of slaughtered beef comes in the farmers will derive a certain amount of benefit from this duty. There is also no doubt that the duty of half a cent per pound put upon pork will put a little into the pockets of the farmers, but I am in perfect agreement with a letter which appeared in the *Globe* yesterday, written by the principal pork-packer in the Province of Ontario, from Liverpool, when the news reached there of the intention of the Government with regard to the duty on pork. He said that the pork-packers will not be benefited by the extra duty ; that Ontario, or Canada, is not a pork-packing country, and that the farmers would be more benefited if the duty were allowed to remain as it was, and if they were allowed to import free corn, in order that they might be able to raise cheap pork in this country. I am in perfect accord with that statement, and I believe that a greater benefit would be conferred on the farmers if such a course had been pursued. If the tariff, which is outlined in the United States Congress, is put in force, of which there is very little doubt in my mind, the action of this Government in increasing the tariff on certain articles will be the cause of the United States Government imposing a prohibitory tariff on the trade of Canada, and it will be passed as a retaliatory measure, because of the action of the Government here. If the tariff proposed in the United States is carried into effect it will inflict a greater injury upon Canada than it is possible for any person to calculate at the present moment. I have figured up that on the 17,277 horses, valued at $2,113,000, we will have to pay, under the new tariff law of the United States, if it goes into force, a duty of $518,310. Last year we shipped 37,000 head of cattle to the United States, a class of cattle which it is not worth sending to the English market. I was rather astonished to hear the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Smith) say that these cattle would go to the English market and that we could get between $80 and $90 for them. These are cattle which will not pay to take across the ocean, and it would be ruinous to a number of farmers if they cannot ship them to the United States. Those cattle were sold in the United States at $13.07 per head, out of which, if the farmers paid $10 per head of duty, it would leave them the handsome price of $3.07 per head. Then, Sir, we were told that the duties are to be increased on woollen goods. We have already been paying a very high duty on woollen goods, and the manner in which the duty is imposed places the heaviest duty on the class who are the least able to bear it. The increase of 2½ cents per pound will, perhaps, increase the price

to that extent to the wealthy man who can buy his fine broadcloth, while at the same time it will increase the price 5 or 6 cents a pound to the poor man, who can only afford to buy woollen goods of the value of 50 or 60 cents per yard. Then, the hon. President of the Council gave us a very bright picture of how Canada had been prospering, saying that the value of land in Ontario has been steadily increasing from 1883 to 1888. Well, Sir, it is very strange that I must apply to the very same report from which he took his statement in order to show a very different result. I find that in 1883 land alone in Ontario was valued at $654,793,025; in 1888 it was valued at $640,480,801; but the advance report for 1889, which I have in my possession, shows that the value of land in that year was only $632,329,433, a reduction of $22,463,592. But this does not take into consideration much more than half the reduction that has actually taken place, because from the reports in the Library I find that from 1883 to 1887, 300,000 acres of land in the older townships had been placed on the assessment rolls, and 400,000 acres had been cleared. The 300,000 additional acres at $29 an acre will give $8,700,000, and the 400,000 acres, which were cleared at $20 an acre, will give $8,000,000, which adds $16,700,000 to the amount to be deducted from the value of the land, which brings the reduction of the value of the land since 1884 to $39,100,000; and yet the hon. President of the Council congratulates the Province of Ontario upon the steady increase in the value of property in that Province. I wonder, Sir, how long the country will continue prosperous if the same rate of decrease should continue for a number of years? Why, Sir, these figures do not tell half the tale. Does that hon. gentleman know anything about the Province of Ontario? During the last few years the municipalities have been spending large sums of money in digging ditches and reclaiming a great deal of waste land. That is not taken account of in this calculation. A very large amount of underdraining has also been going on, improving the quality of the land in reality; and yet the price has been steadily reduced. With regard to buildings, although we find that they have increased, there is a good reason for that. The farmers find that they can no longer farm or keep stock successfully in the buildings which they were formerly accustomed to have, and they have been building new and improved barns for the care of their stock, either for beef or dairy purposes; and many of the mortgages that have been placed on farms have been to enable the farmers to get proper buildings. That is not the only reason, however, why we have so many farms mortgaged in Ontario. Another reason is that many farmers have been sending their sons away from home to settle in the North-West or in the United States, and in other cases they have purchased farms for their sons, and in order to do so have mortgaged their own. For these and other reasons the farms of Ontario are very heavily mortgaged indeed. Then, Sir, we were told by the hon. member for North Renfrew that the present Government have been doing a great work for the farmers of the Dominion, and he asks what the Mackenzie Government did to encourage the farmers to follow scientific farming or to encorage them otherwise? Just let me read a little statement to show how the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie encouraged the farmers of this country during the time they held office. During that time we could get all our agricultural implements into the country free; now we have to pay 35 per cent.; waggons were free, they now pay 50 per cent.; buggies were free, they now pay 41 per cent.; a hay-knife was free, it now has to pay 79½ per cent.; hoes were free, they now have to pay from the United States 45½ per cent. and from Great Britain 53 per cent.; a clothes wringer was free of duty, now it has to pay 73½ per cent.; scythes were free, now they have to pay 79½ per cent.; picks, spades and shovels were free, now they have to pay 40¾ per cent.; tiles were free, now they have to pay 20 per cent.; fertilisers were free, now they have to pay 20 per cent.; timothy, clover and other seeds were free, and we have had timothy and clover free only during the last two years, but now a duty of 15 per cent. is imposed on them; turnips, mangolds and beets were free, and we have been paying a duty of 15 per cent. on them up to the present time, but now they have again been placed on the free list. What is the reason that Mr. Massey, the manufacturer of agricultural implements of Toronto, stated that the duty of 35 per cent. did not benefit the agricultural implement manufacturers of the Dominion? Mr. Massey said that the increase in the duties which took place last year, would take $10,000 in taxes out of their pockets in one year. During the time of Mr. Mackenzie pig iron came in free, while to-day it is charged 31 per cent. duty. Let me read a statement with respect to what that industry has cost the country at present. I have here a statement which shows that in Canada, during the year 1888, 21,799 tons of pig iron were manufactured, on which a bounty of $43,790 was collected. That was not all. There was a duty on 68,333 tons of $273,332, amounting in all to $316,930, which it cost the Dominion to manufacture 21,799 tons of pig iron. Under the Mackenzie Government it was different. He allowed the manufacturers to have free iron from which to manufacture agricultural implements, and he allowed agricultural implements to come in free to the agricultural societies. Bar iron, rolled or hammered, was taxed only 5 per cent. under Mr. Mackenzie, but we find, according to the Government return of the quantity of iron manufactured and the quantity imported, and the duty paid, that malleable iron pays a duty of 53 per cent., and yet hon. gentlemen opposite have the audacity to point to benefits which the present Government has conferred upon the agriculturists. We do not deny that the Government have established an experimental farm, and that $400,000 have been voted to establish this farm, but that any great benefit has been derived by the farmers to the present time from this expenditure, I deny. However, I will discuss this question when the estimate is before us. The President of the Council went on to make a comparison between the value of the crops in Ontario and in the several States of the Union. This is a question that demands considerable attention. It is not at all times the country which raises the greatest amount of crops, or the farmer who raises the greatest amount per acre, that receives the greatest amount of profits from the crops. I will take a statement from the Bureau of Industries, with respect to the year 1887. In

the Bureau of Industries for 1888, giving an account of the same year, there is a statement of the amount required to raise an acre of fall wheat, an acre of spring wheat, an acre of barley, an acre of oats and an acre of pease; and that this report has been compiled from 190 of the most correct reports sent in by the farmers all over Ontario. To raise an acre of fall wheat, it costs $19.43, according to this statement. In 1877 we only raised sixteen bushels and one tenth per acre, and the value was $12.61, showing a loss to the farmers, of $6.82 per acre, or causing a total loss in fall wheat alone, of $6,422,607, that is on 897,743 acres of fall wheat. I will not take up my time in reading over all the table, but just state that I found that of fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats and pease, there are 4,559,129 acres. The whole value of the crop was $49,465,196, showing a loss to the farmers, during that year, of $23,272,030, and those are the principal crops raised in Ontario. Is it possible that with such a loss as this in the products of the farm, the farmers of Canada can be in a healthy condition? I say it is utterly impossible for such to be the case. Let me compare that with another which I have, showing the amounts which the farmers realised. During the year 1882, the total value of the crops of fall wheat and spring wheat, barley, oats and pease, amounted to over $93,000,000 in Ontario, and the crop was pretty nearly the same. During that year, the farmers of Ontario, through the increased yield and the very high prices they got, made a profit of over twenty-three millions of dollars from crops of that description. I have another return which shows that, for the years 1882 to 1887 inclusive, the average loss to the farmers on crops of that description was over seven millions annually. Allowing for the cost of production, the cost of labor and the price per bushel, the total loss was $43,000,000. This proves more conclusively than any other argument that can be produced that the farmers in Ontario cannot be in a prosperous condition, because a farm is only worth the amount you can realise on the products after the labor is paid for. I may be asked why the farmers of Ontario have not, under these circumstances, become entirely bankrupt? The only way in which I can account for it is that they have been working their own farms with the assistance of their families, and I know that within the last four or five years many of them have not been able to make both ends meet, throwing in their own labor and that of their families to boot. There is no doubt that the statement which has been made in regard to the mortgages on farms is correct. If any one will go to the president of any insurance company and examine the policies that come in and the mortgages upon the lands generally, he will find that the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will be fully borne out. Before I left home, I was visiting a certain concession where I was well acquainted with the people, and in conversation I found that there were seven hundred acres mortgaged to the tune of $22 per acre. If the truth were made known, I have no doubt that it would be shown that the amount of mortgage is very heavy. It seems strange to me that gentlemen on the Government benches can give such correct statements and can give such credence to their own statements as to the amount of mortgages and to the indebtedness in other countries, while they question every statement which is made as to the indebtedness and mortgages in Ontario. In Ontario we have just as reliable information as can be obtained in any part of the United States. The statement was made that our young men would not remain on farms at the present time, but that they went off in all directions, some to the United States, some to the towns and cities, and all over the country. Is it to be wondered at when we find that all classes of the community are, as it were, preying upon the farmers? Young men are now receiving a superior education to that which their fathers received. They are able to analyse the affairs of the country correctly, and to examine the fiscal policy of the Government, and they find that, although the income of the farmers is not great, one-third of that income goes either into the treasury or into the pockets of the manufacturers. In this connection let me say something in regard to binding twine. I said something about that last year, and an hon. gentleman on the other side tried to hold me up to ridicule for saying that such large amounts of money were paid for twine, because he showed that only $15,000 had been paid on binding twine. But that only included 432,000 pounds of binding twine imported into this country. Mr. Massey was examined before the Labor Commission, and he is well acqnainted with the whole of that trade. He stated that we required 3,000 tons of binding twine during the summer of 1888. Taking 2,000 pounds to the ton, we have 6,000,000 pounds of binding twine on which there must have been a duty paid of $210,000. Mr. Massey stated that the reason why he objected to the large duty on binding twine was that the raw material came into the country free, and the manufacturers got the whole benefit of the duty. In this case there was one dollar going into the treasury and eleven dollars going into the pockets of the manufacturers, and that was taken from the farmers of this country. During the last two years, it has become a very grave question with the farmers of Ontario whether they should purchase binding twine or should return to the reaper and bind the grain by hand. Binding twine is one of the articles which certainly ought to be placed on the free list. When the Government of the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie was in power we had no binders, or there is no doubt we would have had free binding twine. We have been told by the President of the Council that the older Provinces did not use improved implements. I am not very well acquainted with the Province of Quebec, but I know that in the Province of Ontario we do use improved implements. I want any intelligent farmer on the other side of the House to correct me if I refer to any implement which is not used on any well conducted farm in Ontario, and I know many farms on which a number of implements are used which I have not counted. I desire to show some of the blessings and benefits which the present Government has conferred on the farmers compared with the Mackenzie Government. The following list will show the average number of implements used on farms in our Province, the value, and the amount of duty paid on each:—

Implements.	Value.	Duty.
Harvester	$110 71	$38 15
Mower	30 00	10 50
Seed drill	27 40	8 53
Ploughs, 2	36 82	12 88
Harrows, 2	22 80	8 00
Gang plough	15 00	3 89
Cultivator	36 00	9 34
Horse-rake	22 00	5 17
Scuffler	16 00	4 15
Turnip drill	15 00	3 89
Roller	16 00	4 15
Fanning mill	28 50	9 97
Waggons, 2	129 34	53 06
Sleigh	14 23	4 39
Buggy	70 52	29 00
Cutter	14 23	4 39
Horse-power	88 00	22 82
Straw cutter	40 00	10 36
Horse fork pulleys	26 00	6 00
Double harness	60 00	15 56
Single harness	22 00	5 71
Kit of tools	20 00	3 50
Hay knife	3 15	2 51
Forks, 5 / Hoes, 3	2 20	1 00
Churn	7 00	1 40
Clothes washer	16 20	3 70
Clothes wringer	2 28	1 67
Sewing machine	33 90	9 77
Stoves, 2	38 00	8 77
Scythes, 3	4 70	2 30
Picks, spades, shovel	3 00	1 00
Wheelbarrows	2 36	0 70

Here we have a statement of the duties which a farmer, occupying 100 acres of land, has to pay on his farm implements in the course of ten years, because I estimate that, on an average, these implements will last ten years, and we may add to that sum $3 a year for binding twine. Now, I hold that this list is a fair and honest list. Last year the member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn) criticised this list in a very unjust manner. The statement made by the President of the Council was that these improved implements are not used in the Province of Quebec, but we know there is a large amount of land in Ontario upon which they can be used. Now, we come to examine the census of 1881, by which I find that there are some 200,000 farmers who occupy between 50 and 200 acres of land; there were over 90,000 who occupied less than 10 acres; some 150,000 who occupied less than 50 acres. According to the Bureau of Industries of the Province of Ontario, the average size of farms is 121 acres, which, allowing 82 acres for cleared land would give something less than 200,000 farmers in the Province of Ontario who are able to use these implements. I would like to know where the member for Toronto Centre last year found his 650,000 farmers who used these implements in Canada. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman drew upon his imagination for his facts. I say that a large amount of the tax paid for agricultural implements does not go into the treasury, but it goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. It is no difference to the farmer whether the money goes into the treasury or into the pockets of the manufacturers, except that if it goes into the treasury, it is spent, or ought to be spent, in the interest of the country, but the amount that we pay to the manufacturer is money legislated out of our pockets for which we do not receive a corresponding return; it is money taken out of the pockets of the farmers, and the laborers, and the workmen of this country, and put into the pockets of the manufacturers, for which these latter give no corresponding value. You may call it what you like, but I hold that it is a

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

dishonest system of legislation that takes money out of the pockets of the producers and puts it into the pockets of any class of the community, when the latter do not give any adequate return to the individual from which the money is taken; if it was parliamentary, I would say that it is legalised robbery. Now, we were told that under the Mackenzie Government there was a deficit, while under the present Government there is a surplus. Is if to be wondered at that there is a surplus under the present Administration? The hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Paterson) showed the other day that fifty-three million dollars had been taken out of the pockets of the people in taxes, more than the increase of population would warrant; is it to be wondered at, therefore, that the Government have a surplus at the present time? It is not creditable to this Government to boast that they have a surplus, when depression is overspreading the land, and they are legislating in such a manner as to increase that surplus. I hold that the changes in the tariff are not going to benefit the farmer to any extent. Last year we had clover seed and timothy seed free, but now we have to pay 15 per cent. We have got to pay extra for flour, because I contend that the flour will be increased in value. The millers of Canada are alive to their own interest, and they know that if you put 25 cents a barrel upon flour, the farmers of Canada have got to pay that money, and they will get no corresponding benefit. The millers have made the statement that they are not going to pay the extra price for wheat, that they cannot be benefited as a class. Much has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to Canada being a more desirable country than any State of the Union, so far as agricultural products are concerned. Let me state this, and I press it upon hon. gentlemen opposite, that I know hundreds of farmers who left Ontario and settled in the United States, and to-day I can count on the fingers of my right hand all those who have returned. If the farmers in the United States were in the deplorable condition alleged, why do not these men return to Canada and purchase farms which can now be obtained at reduced prices. A gentleman before the Immigration Committee the other day pictured the condition of farmers in the North-West, and the condition of farmers in Dakota. He told us that he had been through Dakota, and he had ascertained the condition of the farmers there, and also the condition of the farmers in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and he endeavored to show the great advantage that would accrue to farmers by removing from Dakota into Canadian territory. When the question was put to him, as to how many he knew had moved; he knew of two who were going to move, or were moving; and that was all the result of the large sum given to that gentleman during the past twelve month. Many statements have been made with respect to the condition of farmers in Canada and the immigration from Canada, and its causes. Let me read a statement from Mr. Grahame, Government agent in Winnipeg, as it appears in his report. He says:

"Many will be surprised that the number of actual settlers in our Province and Territories has not been as large as expected, neither has the amount of wealth brought in by those who have come been as considerable as that of former years. This may appear strange, when we consider the many efforts that were put forth by the

many different organisations, to induce immigration to the Province and neighboring Territories, but it is nevertheless a fact, that out of the many thousands who left the mother country, ostensibly for the North-West, a large number of them found occupation and homes on the Pacific coast, and I regret to say, a large majority of these are on the American side."

He continues:

"I took a keen interest in this matter and interviewed the pursers of the local steamboats from whom I gathered information that would lead me to believe that the steamboats plying between Vancouver, Victoria, San Francisco and the American ports at the head of Puget Sound carried very little less than 10,000 immigrants, most of whom left Europe with the intention of remaining in British possessions."

Here are immigrants who have been led astray by representations made to them, that they would be able to obtain employment in British Columbia and the North-West Territories. But let me say here, that when an honest immigration agent gives a fair and honest statement with respect to immigration, the Government consider it to be their duty to notify him that if he does not send in his resignation they will be compelled to dismiss him. The Government do not want a correct statement with respect to the condition of this country; but any individual who will not state the correct condition of affairs, whether prosperous or the reverse, is not doing his duty to himself or to his country, or to the people who think of coming here from other countries. Much has been said in regard to taxation. I have a short statement which I desire to submit, and it shows the amount of duty collected and the amount of that duty which has passed into the pockets of manufacturers. Of binding twine we imported 454,278 lbs., on which a duty was paid of $15,904. Of this sum $15,904 went to the treasury and to the manufacturers $194,096, being in the proportion of one dollar to eleven dollars. Thus for every one dollar that goes into the treasury eleven dollars go to the manufacturer. Take coal oil. We imported 4,523,056 gallons, on which a duty was paid of $325,655. There was refined in Canada 9,833,228 gallons, on which a duty was paid of $707,992. So that for every dollar that went into the treasury $2.20 went to the refiner. Next as regards sugar. We imported 201,839,821 pounds, on which a duty was paid to the Government of $3,433,334. On this article, $2,566,666 went to the refiners and $3,433,334 to the Government. Take cotton goods. We imported these goods to the value of $4,200,072, and in 1881, $10,204,465, and $2,345,627 was paid to the Government. It is only fair to say in regard to cotton goods that while the imports were reduced from $10,000,000 in 1881 to $4,000,000 in 1888, a corresponding increase took place in the goods manufactured in Canada, because we find that of raw cotton there were 16,000,000 lbs. imported in 1881, there were 39,000,000 lbs. imported in 1889. So that while we pay $1,191,509, which goes into the treasury, we pay $2,383,000, which goes into the pockets of the cotton manufacturers of the Dominion. In 1881 we imported woollen goods to the value of $8,742,024, and in 1889, to the value of $9,842,319. We imported raw wool, for the manufacture of cotton goods, in 1881, amounting to 8,040,287 lbs. and in 1889, 10,266,440 lbs. We find there were manufactured in 1881 in Canada $8,113,055 worth of woollen goods, while according to the amount of raw material imported we should have manufactured $9,842,000 worth. Taking into consideration the reduction of the price of goods, it is a low estimate to say that for every dollar that goes into the treasury another dollar goes into the pockets of the manufacturer. In this connection I would like to state, that it is a favorite argument with the Conservatives of the present day that we never had goods so cheap as they are to-day in Canada, and that a dollar will purchase more to-day than it ever did before. We admit that a dollar will purchase more goods to-day than it ever did before, but take this in connection with the statement made by the Minister of Finance last year, that there is a shrinkage of goods in the British market of 31 per cent., and will any gentleman tell me, and tell me honestly, that goods have been reduced as much in Canada as they have been in the United States or in Great Britain? When the National Policy was proposed we had only a tariff of 17½ per cent., and to-day we have a tariff of something like 29 or 30 per cent., so that goods cannot have shrunk in value as much by 11 or 12 per cent., as they have done in the markets of the old country. Another favorite argument with hon. gentlemen opposite is that times are so bad in the United States that the farms are mortgaged to a large extent. Is it to be wondered at that the farmers of the United States are in a depressed condition? Since 1865, they have suffered from a system of protection that has drained the very heart's blood out of the farmers of that country, and when we have suffered for so long a period from the same cause, I do not know what this country will be reduced to. We have endeavored from this side of the House time and again to impress upon the Government and their followers the reduction in the price of land in the Province of Ontario. Last year and this year some hon. gentlemen opposite admitted that the prices of land had been reduced in Great Britain and in the United States, but they denied it was reduced in Canada, and said that the farmers of Canada were prosperous. As a farmer in Ontario for the last 47 years I have never before gone among the farmers and found them in so bad a condition as they are to-day. We have been told that it was not in the interest of the farmer to allow the tariff walls to be beaten down between the United States and Canada, and that it would ruin our markets for coarse grains. Let us make a comparison between the coarse grain markets of the United States and Canada. No. 2 wheat in Toronto is selling at from 83 to 86 cents, and No. 2 spring from 86 to 87 cents, and in Buffalo it is near the same price as it is in Toronto. We find barley in Toronto selling at from 50 to 52 cents, and Canadian barley in Buffalo selling from 63 to 65 cents, a difference of 13 cents a bushel in favor of the Buffalo market, which shows conclusively that if we had a free interchange of our agricultural products with the United States, we could sell our barley in the United States at something like 50 cents and buy our corn at 40 cents. If we could have 10 cents a bushel more for our barley, and at the same time 8 lbs. more feed per bushel for our cattle, it would be of great benefit to us. Oats in the Toronto market are selling at 29 to 31 cents per bushel, and in Detroit from 28½ to 29 cents. It must be borne in mind that while the Canadian measure is 34 pounds to the bushel, in the United States it is 32 pounds to the bushel, so that

relatively oats are just as high in the United States market as they are in the Canadian market, when you calculate the difference in weight, and yet we are told that if corn were allowed free, it would be a great injury to this country. We imported something like 15,000,000 lbs. of pork from the United States and if we go back to 1877 we find we exported $800,000 worth more of all kinds of meat than we imported into the country at that time. At the same time we imported over 8,000,000 bushels of Indian corn. At the present time we import over $1,000,000 worth of meat more than we export, but we only import at present a little over 2,000,000 bushels of Indian corn. At the time we imported 8,000,000 bushels of Indian corn, our oats stood higher in the market, compared with oats in the United States, than they do to-day; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us reciprocity would ruin the farmers. Why, Sir, the Government has told us steadily from 1878 down to the present time, that it was their policy to bring about reciprocity with the United States. The hon. the First Minister told us that the only way to bring about reciprocity was to have a retaliatory tariff to bring the United States to their senses. Now, we are placed in this position, that if the Government want to obtain reciprocity, which we on this side of the House have always argued for, I believe they have now an opportunity, and if they do not embrace it, and obtain for us that which I believe will relieve the farmers of this country more than anything else that could be done for them, they are not true to their own policy as declared since 1878; they are not true to the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1888 when he came down to this House and stated that it was the policy of the Government, as it had been the policy of the Reform Government when in power, to get reciprocity with the United States at as early a day as possible. I hold that there is nothing we could get that would confer such benefit on the farmers of the Dominion of Canada as free and unrestricted trade. Now, before I close, I am going to give a few statements that I heard in a well delivered sermon last Sunday evening. The preacher said it would be ridiculous to admit that the Government cannot control the avarice of corporations. Why, Sir, at the very time the preacher made that statement, it occurred to me that it was true that the Government cannot control the avarice of corporations. Why did the Government call the members of this House together on the 16th of January when they were not ready? They knew that the corporations would not bring pressure upon them until the House had met. We were here for a month, and the corporations were here. The corporations may be called the tail and the Government the dog, and the tail wagged the dog, and it has continued to wag. The corporations control the Government of this country. Then, the preacher said that we should insist upon the economic value of all honest labor, and no individual should be allowed to take out of an industry more than he had put in. If the Premier was in the church, I hope he benefited from that sermon, and will take the advice of the preacher and give every man the just reward of his labor, and not compel me and every other farmer in the Dominion of Canada, when we go to buy an agricultural implement, for every $100 to the manufacturer to pay $35 to the treasury, or to some manufacturer in the shape of taxes. Then, the preacher said that the golden rule of political economy that ought to prevail was to allow every individual to sell the fruits of his labors in the dearest market in the world and to buy in the cheapest. No sounder political economy was ever preached, and the gentleman who announced that doctrine I have been told is a strong Conservative; but being a minister of the gospel, he no doubt feels the injustice that is done to a large number of the people of this country, and wishes that justice and righteousness should prevail on the face of the earth, and that the Government of this country should do justice to all classes. He further stated that society is in a barbarous condition so long as every man does not reach the honest rewards of his labor.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the preacher?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The Rev. Mr. Herridge. He went on to say that it was the duty of the Government to find out what was the proper policy for a nation to pursue, and to teach the people to follow it. I only hope the gentleman may preach that sermon wherever he goes, and I hope that when members of the Government go on their knees to-night, they will think upon their actions for the last ten years and the injustice they have perpetrated on the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. Let them pray earnestly that they may get forgiveness for the great evil they have perpetrated, and resolve to do better in time to come.

Mr. FISHER. I do not propose to make any lengthened address, but there are a few things which I think it is absolutely necessary should be said before this vote is taken. First, I must express my surprise that the hon. Minister of Finance, when he introduced his resolutions, showed an incomprehensible disregard of the actual state of affairs in this country, when he said that our farmers and fishermen were fairly prosperous. I will not quote those resolutions which have been so frequently put before this House to show the absurdity and inaccuracy of this statement. I quoted them on a former occasion; but there are one or two which have come from the Province of Quebec since that date which I think proper to put before my hearers. I will first, however, refer to the resolution which was passed in that great parliament of farmers in the Province of Ontario, the Central Farmers' Institute, at the meeting at which they discussed the question of the agricultural depression. A report was presented to the meeting by a committee which had been directed to consider that question, and this is how they wound up that report:

"As to the proper remedy for any or all of these causes, opinion may differ to a wide extent, but your committee believe that the following suggestions are along the line in which at least a measure of relief might be obtained: (1) Free entrance to the markets where our products have to be disposed of; and your committee would strongly advise that in future all legislation in regard to import duties be in the direction of lowering those duties."

Then they agreed to this resolution:

"Whereas, we consider the present high tariff is very injurious to the agricultural interests, making what we buy proportionately dearer than the products we sell; and

"Whereas, the present high tariff has given rise to the combine system by which competition is to a great extent prevented; and

"Whereas, the agricultural interest is suffering under a serious depression and unable to bear the strain occa-

sioned by the tariff and the combine system aforesaid, and as the agricultural interests represent the larger majority of the population; that, therefore,—

"This, the Central Institute do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the duty on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is now laboring."

It does not look as if the agriculturists asking these things were fairly prosperous or satisfied with their present condition. I have here a resolution passed in the little village of Danville, in the Eastern Townships, where the dairymen of that district were gathered at their annual meeting. Their resolution was as follows:—

"Moved by Capt. Mairs, seconded by Mr. R. Allen, and resolved: 'That it is in the interest of agriculture, that corn, cotton seed meal and flax seed meal should be placed on the free list, and the importation of adulterated lard should be prohibited, and that the Federal Government be petitioned so to do.'"

As an evidence that the farmers in that section are not satisfied with their present condition, and are not prosperous as they think they ought to be, and as they would be if the Government would yield to their desires, and consider their interests, I have here a petition which was largely circulated among the agricultural societies in Quebec, and which a large number of them instructed their officers to sign and forward to this Parliament. In that petition they say, alluding to the state of agriculture:

"That in consequence we look forward with anxiety to the future and the competition confronting us by the United States, and the other countries which have in the past, and will in the future, receive of the fertility of our soil.

"We would most respectfully request:

"That the following articles be placed upon the free import list, namely: Corn, cotton seed, flax seed, and all cattle food, ground and unground. Also all manures, chemicals, minerals, and all materials whatsoever for the manufacture of manure."

It was partly in consequence of this, and other demands such as this, that a little while ago I took upon myself to ask the Government to put corn upon the free list. I know that cotton seed and flax seed were upon the free list, of which fact these gentlemen did not seem to be aware, and they remain on the free list still; but, unfortunately, the Government did not see fit to take the advice I offered. What has the Government done to aid the farmer in this new tariff? The Minister of Finance said that the agricultural industry of this country was fairly prosperous, but in almost the same breadth he expressed his intention to aid the farmers and help them out of their difficulties. What is his remedy? Protection and further protection. I am not going into this question at great length, but I wish to bring the attention of the House, as an antithesis to the Finance Minister's proposition, the demand of the farmers, which, briefly stated, is reduction of the duties and free raw material. It is the duty of the Finance Minister to meet these demands which have been clearly and distinctly put before him and his colleagues from the different bodies of farmers throughout the country and by several gentlemen on the floor of this House. But instead of doing so, he increases the tax on woollens, and puts a tax on their grass and other seeds which were formerly free. By his re-adjustment of the tariff, he practically forces the traders to charge higher prices on their goods so as to ensure against loss. Those who have gone into a calculation of the result of the increases of duty in this tariff and the re-adjustment of the duties say that they amount to an imposition of $500,000 a year of increased taxation, and I have every reason to believe this calculation is exact. Unfortunately, the farmer will have to bear the greater part of this increased burden. I need only allude, as a specimen brick in the new tariff, to the fact that the increased duty on woollen goods is imposed on the heavier and coarser fabrics, as the specific duty is increased, but the *ad valorem* duty remains as it was. This is an instance of the way in which the farmers' interests are legislated against. The Finance Minister has gone still further by adding to the price of flour to the eastern farmer who cannot raise wheat cheaply and profitably, and can use his land for other purposes to better advantage. But the Finance Minister in his speech, placed in close juxtaposition to this increased duty on flour his proposition to compensate the farmer by allowing seed for ensilage corn in free, but he takes care to prevent the farmer having free choice as to what kind of seed he must use; for, although he has not had any experience himself in farming, the Finance Minister takes upon himself to dictate to the farmers the exact kind of corn seed he must use, whether his experience has proved it to be the best or not. He proposes also that the farmer shall get his molasses and his cornmeal at a lower rate. Provided he can fulfil the conditions, which the Minister of Customs is sure to make as complicated as possible, necessary to obtain a rebate on corn, which may be kiln-dried and used as human food, the Finance Minister, in the kindness of his heart, will allow him to use his molasses and cornmeal together; so that when the farmer is obliged, by his depleted purse and the increased price of flour, to substitute Johnny cake for the wheat bread he was in the habit of using, he may sweeten them by an unlimited application of molasses instead of the butter he might be reasonably expected to use. I wish now to state what, in my opinion, the Government might have done. We want free raw material, free corn, free artificial fertilisers, &c., and the farmer wants a chance to buy where he can cheapest, or at any rate not to pay an outrageous tax on articles of necessity. He has asked that when changes are made in the tariff they should be in the direction of lowering the duty. But what has the Finance Minister given him? He proposes a reduction of duty on dry plates for photographs, and also gives him the great and inestimable blessing of being able to buy wall-paper a little cheaper than before. The Finance Minister and his friends propose to protect the farmer. This is their great panacea—protection, nothing but protection. They seem to think that protection has been so successful that they can apply it on every occasion. I would call their attention to the fact that in former days, when they tried to protect the farmer in his wheat and wool growing and by putting a duty on corn, what has been the result? That kind of protection, instead of aiding the farmer, actually hurts him, and to-day these farmers, who for the past eleven years have been enjoying that protection, are calling on the Government to put wheat and flour on the free list; but the Government insist on taking the opposite course. In this connection, I would like to read an extract from a newspaper which hon. gentlemen opposite cannot consider as totally opposed to them, although on certain occasions it

attacks their policy. I refer to an editorial in the *Mail* newspaper of 7th February, written after the meeting of the Farmers' Institute in Toronto, and in which the writer puts clearly the position from the farmers' standpoint:

"Looking at the tariff as it stands, it is difficult to find in what particular it assists agriculture. It does not improve prices at home when there is any sort of a crop to sell and it certainly acts as a check rather than as an assistance to exportation. The British and foreign markets to which we wish to send our surplus and to which we must send our products in order to pay our interest on our debts, do not respond to the upward movement of our tariff.

"The heavier burden is being felt at this moment. We see this in the reduced agricultural exports, in the loud demand for higher import duties on fresh and salt meat and in the interest that is everywhere apparent with regard to the future of our foreign trade, some seeking closer trade relations with our neighbors, others asking that Great Britain shall discriminate in favor of the colonies with a duty of five or ten per cent. It is not at all desirable that the Government should come to the rescue of the farmer with bounties or rebates. What it should do is to reduce the tariff as to place him in a better position to compete with his rivals."

Here is a very clear and able exposition of the gist of the whole matter, but, instead of this, the Government has proposed to assist the farmers by granting higher protection. In other words, it is proposed to raise the wall, and, therefore, they have increased the duty on beef, pork, bacon and ham. The intention may be very good, but I do not think experience will show good results. The Finance Minister, in speaking of this matter, said:

"Now, there is no reason in the wide world, to my mind, why Canada should not only raise all the meat necessary for the consumption of her own people, but should become one of the largest exporters of these different kinds of meat to foreign countries. It is with a view of fostering these meat producing industries with a fairly protective duty, that the Government have come to the conclusion to protect the farmers by raising the duty on these meats in this way."

He expects that to be brought about by increasing the duties on these commodities at home. How could that foster our export trade? The Minister knows very well that the price of these articles in the countries to which we would export them is not regulated by what we export, which has an inappreciable effect on those markets. While we might get a little better price out of the home market, we cannot affect the prices of these articles in the foreign market. The Finance Minister ought to know that, whenever we have a surplus and export to the foreign country, the price in the home market is invariably regulated by the price for export purposes. He cannot expect, and he knows that our farmers will not be able to obtain an appreciably larger price in the home market than they will obtain for what they will export. I do not believe that our farmers can get any great benefit from these extra duties. The farmers will not be able to get any greater price from the pork packers, the bacon curers or the lard triers. I think the duty on live hogs will prove to be a little less than the duty on mess pork, and the pork packers will not give any better price than before. I find by past experience, that where a business of this kind is started it is the middlemen and not the producers who make the benefit out of the increased duties. I suppose there will be increased prices to the consumer, but I am afraid the farmer, who is the producer, will not get the benefit of them. The home market has been held up to us as the great compensation for all the evils from which the farmer has suffered under the protective policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been told, over and over again, that the farmers ought to have a great home market. I read with great attention the speech of the President of the Council. I was sorry I was not present, because he is always an eloquent and able speaker, and I listen to him with pleasure. But I was surprised at some of the statements made by him. I was astounded at the deductions which were drawn from the facts he stated, and one of the most extraordinary was that, as has been stated over and over again by the hon. gentleman and his friends, the home market in the United States has enabled the farmers there to obtain increased prices, but he kicked over his own argument by the statement that in the New England States the farmers are in a condition of despair, and, in fact, are much worse off than our farmers are. What is the comparison between the home market which the farmers of the New England States have and the home market which our farmers have? In the New England States there are a number of large towns. In Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and down to Pennsylvania and even down to Washington and Baltimore, you find that large cities are so close together that, when you are on the railway, you can scarcely get out of one before you arrive at another. Yet, even there, the hon. gentleman says that the farmers are in despair, that they are leaving their farms and seeking other pursuits. Is this an example of what is to happen to our own farmers in eastern Canada? I do not believe that the home market has done much for the farmers in the Eastern States, and I do not believe it will do much for our own farmers. I agree to a certain extent with what the President of the Council has said in regard to the New England States, but I must differ with some of his statements. I know something of the New England States. I live close to them. It is true that I have not lived there so long as the President of the Council, and no doubt I have not travelled so much through those States as he has, but I know something about them, and, while I confess that it is easy for the hon. gentleman to point to certain farms in certain districts which the people have left, districts which are depleted and farms which are no longer profitably cultivated, yet I know that contiguous to these farms he will find farmers who are amongst the most prosperous on the continent of America, men who have taken advantage of the home market to which he refers, and who, by taking care to suit their wares to their market, have made money and are prosperous. Those who know the New England States know well that there is a great deal of waste land in that country. There are immense ranges of mountains and rocky places which it would be folly for any farmer who understood his business to attempt to till. On the other hand, the river bottoms are fertile, and where the washings of the hills have accumulated there is good land, and there are farmers there who are very prosperous and who are producing the articles which are suitable for their home market. But, in the same municipality with them, you will find hill-sides which it would be folly to attempt to till. If an investigation were made, I believe it would be found that the farms which are vacant are such as I have described, that those which are worth $2 or $3 or $4 an acre are those which it would be

folly for any man who understood agricultural pursuits to try to make a living out of. I will read a short extract from the State Board of Agriculture of Vermont, the last which I was able to obtain in the Library. A gentleman writing about what crops the Vermont farmers should raise, says this :

"From where I now write I can see a range of mountains and note the difference in the value of the clearings. One part is a pasture noted for its productiveness, has good living springs upon it, was all or nearly all cropped to wheat or rye, and produced large crops. Joining this is a large tract cleared the same way, cropped the same, but instead of stopping near the top of the mountain it was cleared to the very summit. Now, what is the difference of the two? The first with a heavy growth of forest above it so protects it from the winds that snow stays upon it with little drifting. The natural decay of leaves and other forest matter is washed down by the melted snow and rains, all of which and many more cause to enrich, protect and water such lands on the side of our mountains, but where cleared to the top and over, it matters but little how rich and productive the natural soil is, and a great many years will not pass without its showing signs of deterioration."

There is another point to which I wish to allude in connection with the statement of the President of the Council. These farms in the New England States have been tilled far longer than our farms in the Eastern Provinces. It is true that all over the eastern part of this continent we have, to a large extent, exhausted the native fertility of the soil. but those New England farms have been tilled for a hundred years longer than the farms in the Eastern Provinces of Canada, and it is not to be wondered at if at length their fertility has become exhausted, and the farmers are feeling the effects of it. But, although this state of affairs exists in the New England States, I know that during the last season the prices of some farm products have been lower in the United States than they are in Eastern Canada, but it is only within the last year that such has been the case. Although our farms have not been tilled nearly so long, and our farmers have not been under the baneful influences of protection nearly so long, our farmers are rapidly reaching a condition which will very soon be absolutely worse than that on the other side of the line. We know that our farmers have only suffered from protection for 11 years, while the farmers of New England have been suffering for 25 years, and it is no wonder that the latter have at last reached that stage which was depicted by the President of the Council. But there is another point which the hon. gentleman overlooked, and which I think partially explains why these farms have been able to stand the drain upon them longer than ours have. In the American Union, while they have a high protective wall round the whole Union, they have free trade over a large territory, and with a great population ; while we, unfortunately, have free trade amongst a very small population, although over a large extent of territory. There is another comparison which the hon. the President of the Council made, and which I must allude to. He quoted statistics to show that the farms of the Province of Ontario are much more productive than the farms in the United States. I do not, for a moment, suppose that the hon. Minister had any intention of misleading the House, but he could not have chosen figures which would more easily mislead his hearers, had they not been fully aware of the facts. On the one hand he took the crop reports of the Province of Ontario, and on the other hand he took the average crop reports of the whole of the United States. Now, anybody who knows anything about Ontario knows that that Province is the garden of the American continent, and that its lands are tilled by the very best farmers to be found in America. The figures he quoted included not only such favored States as Ohio, Illinois and New York, but the crop returns also included the prairies of the west, which are tilled in a very crude manner, although profitably enough, no doubt ; they also included returns from the Southern States, which have generally a poor soil, tilled by ignorant black laborers, who know nothing about farming, and in a climate unsuitable to the production of crops which the hon. gentleman chose for his comparison. He took these figures and compared them with the figures from Ontario, comprising, as I said, the best farming lands in America, which land is cultivated by the best farmers on this continent, and then he takes a great deal of satisfaction in showing that Ontario presents a great superiority over the United States. So I say that his comparison is not fair, and the Minister could not have appreciated the way in which he was misleading and deceiving his hearers, and the way in which his words, if they went to the country without explanation, would be likely to deceive and mislead the people. Now, we do not pretend to deny that the farmers of the United States are suffering ; the farmers of England are suffering. The world is coming under new conditions, owing to the opening up of channels of communication between different countries, and new fields are being brought into the markets of the world, and farmers are being handicapped as they never were before. But the fact that the farmers of the United States are suffering does not disprove the fact that the policy of the hon. gentleman is to blame for the suffering amongst the farmers of Canada. We see that the farmers of the United States, in their various organisations, are protesting vigorously against the protective tariff, and are asking to be relieved from the burden of taxation under which they are laboring, and the farmers of Canada are asking the same thing. If the Government wish to continue the parallel a little further they can take an example from the Government of the United States, and look at the McKinley Bill and the present resolutions before Congress, and see the example which they are inclined to follow. But I do not think that is the true policy. On the contrary, a much better policy is proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the amendment he has moved to the resolutions of the Finance Minister. I have said that the Finance Minister proposed to give us, in return for additional burdens imposed on the farming community, an export trade in pork and beef. A little while ago the Minister of Finance was urged to give us free corn. Before that again the Minister was asked to give us a rebate on corn fed to animals for export, just as he gives a rebate on corn made into whiskey for export. At that time the Minister of Customs said it would be exceedingly difficult to arrange a rebate and to arrange for the farmers to get the benefit of it, and we supposed the Minister was therefore afraid to give us the rebate, and certainly he was not going to have anything to do with a rebate on corn. We asked for free corn.

The Minister of Finance has refused us free corn; but, contrary to the tenor of the remarks of the Minister of Customs, he has undertaken to give us a rebate on certain corn. He has arranged to give a rebate on corn, not fed to animals for export, but when prepared and eaten ourselves. In other words, we are not allowed to take the corn and feed it to our cattle and get the advantage of a rebate, but the hon. Minister insists that in order to get the advantage of this tariff we must feed the corn to ourselves. I prefer to feed my corn to my cattle rather than to myself, and I think it is more suitable food for them than for me. We, in this country, do not raise any quantity of corn. We raise coarse grains for various purposes, and in Ontario notably they raise barley, which they can sell at a higher price than corn. It is natural, that we in this country should import, and we will continue to import, notwithstanding the increased duty of the hon. gentleman, a very large quantity of pork products, bacon, ham and so on. If the hon. Minister had enabled us to have free corn to feed to our animals, we would have been much better able to supply the home market with those products than we are under the present conditions and with the increased duties. The seven cents per bushel duty on corn is a much greater hardship to the farmer in feeding pork than is the advantage of the extra duty placed on pork, even as regards controlling the home market, while the latter is of no use in enabling him to secure an export trade. It is well known among farmers to-day that the only solution of the agricultural question is to reduce the cost of production. Competition is so keen that, unless our farmers are able to place the products on the market at the very lowest prices, they have no chance to secure business, and an import duty on those products does not aid us to decrease the cost of production, it simply enables us to fleece our neighbors who are obliged to buy our products. But if the Government had given us free raw material in the shape of corn, also free artificial fertilisers and free seeds, our farmers would be able to reduce the cost of production and have been able to go to work at once and compete with a much better chance of securing profit and increasing their trade. There is one particular item in regard to the export trade to which I desire to allude, and it is extraordinary. From the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we exported last year live cattle to the value of $62,000, which, according to a calculation of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), would be worth about $13 per head. They were the unfinished products which were exported to the United States, to be fed with the cheap corn which the New England farmers are able to obtain from the west without paying duty, and after feeding them they sent the animals back to the Maritime Provinces to be eaten by the people there. What is the actual loss in that trade last year? While we exported live cattle from those Provinces, as I have said, to the United States, of the value of $62,000, we imported from the United States beef to the value of $167,000. Can anything be a more suicidal commercial transaction? I do not know of any. We send over lean cattle, and the farmers of the United States, having the cheap corn, are able to fatten them and return them to this country in the shape of beef. Duty has to be paid on those cattle when they go to the United States, and on the beef when it comes into this country; and the result is that the people who eat the beef have to pay higher prices for it, and the farmers of the United States reap the larger profits. A more complete exposé of the fallacy and extraordinary character of the present policy cannot be placed before the House. What do the Government propose? They propose to raise the tariff higher than before, they are throwing down a challenge to our neighbors to enter on a war of tariffs. I did not expect it of the Government, I did not even expect the Finance Minister to be so reckless; I thought that, although the gentleman who was the greatest statesman of the party is now High Commissioner in London, his shadow and spirit would have controlled them even up to the present time, and they would not have dared to take this step. But after reading the speech of the President of the Council and the announcement he made, I suppose with the approval of his colleagues, that he is not in favor of any kind of reciprocity any longer, the murder is out. We know now with what we have to deal. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) endorsed that petition, but the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) said he did not go so far, that he was not prepared to go that extent, and I rather thought he would go very far against reciprocity and conciliation with the United States. But I was glad to find that that hon. gentleman, showing his usual independence, was prepared to come out, and at all events utter a word of caution to the President of the Council and his colleagues in the Administration. I am rather surprised that the President of the Council was chosen to place before the House a statement of that kind. He has not generally spoken in that sense. Some hon. members can look back to the day when he made a very important speech in this House, in the course of which he pinned his faith to reciprocity, and in which, although he asked for a higher tariff to be passed, he said he did not want to force a war of tariffs, but he said he was in favor of reciprocity of tariffs because he wished to enforce reciprocity of trade. I need not, however, go so far back as that speech. The hon. gentleman has had abundant opportunities since that time to make this announcement. The question of reciprocity has been brought up on various occasions, and hon. members on this side of the House have stated themselves in favor of it. Never, until the other night, has the hon. gentleman spoken in that direction. Nay, more. Last summer I met the hon. gentleman on the hustings in the Eastern Townships, and he made a long address dealing with reciprocity, but he did not go so far as he did the other night. On the contrary, he said he was in favor of reciprocity in agricultural products. He pointed to the statutory offer which hon. gentlemen opposite always point to when they deal with this question, and said he and his friends were in favor of agricultural reciprocity, although not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. I was surprised that that hon. gentleman, coming from the Eastern Townships as I do, should have made that statement, but he is not alone in his party in his former sentiments with regard to reciprocity. We know what the leader of the Government has said on various occasions, and I happened to come across some remarks of the First Minister, made not later than 1884, when my hon. friend from Queen's,

P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), moved in favor of unrestricted reciprocity and which remarks will bear quotation to the House :

"I do not know any reason why the hon. member who moved this or the seconder, laid before the House these elaborate statements to show the value of reciprocal trade or trade of any kind with the United States. That is admitted. That goes without saying. We all admit that it would be well that we had a large trade with the United States, rather than a small one ; and I think Canada as compared in her action with the action of the United States, has done everything that she could well do in order to secure that desirable object."

Here was the leader of the Government in 1884 asserting most positively that he was in favor of limited reciprocity, but still reciprocity, and boasting of the fact that he and his Government had done all they could to accomplish that fact. But now we hear the President of the Council declaring himself practically against all kinds of reciprocity, and what occasion is this on which he does so? It is at a time when in the United States there are two parties fighting on this very question ; it is at a time when we know there are two propositions before the Congress of the United States, just as there are two propositions before this House and before the people of Canada. We have on the one hand in the United States the Hitt resolution which comes very close to the proposition made from this side of the House, and on the other hand we have the McKinley resolution which imposes a prohibitory tariff on Canadian products. I can only conclude from the remarks of the Finance Minister, and from the remarks of the President of the Council, that the McKinley Bill is the one which they desire to see brought into force. They cannot expect anything else from the Congress of the United States, for at the very time Congress is asked to pass judgment on these resolutions the Minister of Finance says: "We will no longer keep our standing offer on our Statute-books ; we do not want even the limited reciprocity we have had, we will not have reciprocity even in natural products." What answer can we expect from the people to this? The only answer we can expect, and I fear it is the only one we will get, is, that the United States will put in force these severe tariff restrictions which have been proposed in the McKinley resolution. Let us see what will be the result of this. For some weeks we have had these tariff resolutions before us and during that time I have met many farmers from my own district, and I have had correspondence with many others. I have heard what was going on, and I have seen what was written in the newspapers, but I have not met with any farmer or with any one who takes any interest in the agriculture of this country, but who is fully aware of the fact that if these resolutions become the law of the United States, we, the Canadian farmers, will suffer materially and severely. If there were any dishonor in any way whatever to Canada, in the proposition which we make, I would be the last to advocate it, but when we find that there is a large section, if not an absolute majority, of the people of the United States who are prepared to meet us half way in arranging our trade relations, it seems to me the height of folly that our people should refuse to meet them and refuse to try and bring about a reasonable and proper understanding on this question of reciprocity. Although I believe this question of reciprocity affects every industry in this country, although I believe that our manufacturing industries, and our trade and commerce will be benefited enormously by the most unlimited measure of reciprocity we can bring about, still I believe that the interests of the farmers more than that of any other class are involved, and that it is more to their advantage than to any others, that reciprocity should be obtained. I will give you an instance of what will be the result of the two policies now before the people of Canada and the people of the United States. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) proposes an amendment, of which I will quote the last paragraph as it is a concise statement of its purport. It says :

"That the additional taxation which is now sought to impose will still further increase the burthens of the people, and is likely still further to aggravate the distress unhappily existing among a large portion of the farming population of this Dominion, and that under such circumstances it is the bounden duty of this House, instead of adding to the existing oppressive taxation, to apply itself to the reduction of the burdens now impeding the progress and prosperity of the principal producing classes of the Dominion, and for this purpose to abolish or reduce the taxes now imposed on articles of prime necessity to farmers, miners, fishermen and other producers."

While he proposes that we shall have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States the hon. gentlemen opposite propose just the reverse, viz., the raising and the increasing of the tariff wall between us and that country. I have applied the two policies to one article which is largely exported from my own Province. Hay is largely exported from the Province of Quebec to the United States, and there is a duty of $2 per ton upon hay going into that country. Under that duty our people can with a moderate degree of profit export that hay, and it is a business which is largely carried on, as may be seen by a reference to the Trade and Navigation Returns. Last year Canada exported $822,000 of hay to the United States. We propose to make hay free going into the United States by means of obtaining unrestricted reciprocity, and thereby giving the farmer $2 per ton more on all his hay. The policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite proposes to make the United States duty on hay $4, a practically prohibitory duty, which will absolutely shut out that nearly a million of dollars worth of hay going to the United States. Such a policy will prevent our people reaping the profit of that export trade, and will throw on the people, especially of the Province of Quebec, a large amount of land which to-day is not very suitable for other agricultural operations. In this way the market of this country will be glutted to such an extent that the prices will be largely reduced, and there will be no consumption for that hay which we now export. Any one who knows farming knows that that land cannot be changed in one or two years so as to make it suitable for other crops. This is a fair specimen of the way in which the two policies now before the people of this country will affect the farmers of Canada, and I think it is a very fair example indeed. I would not venture to characterise that policy in the way I heard it characterised a little while ago by one of their own friends, but I cannot help thinking that the epithet applied to it was a pretty correct one. An hon. member opposite during this debate, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) said :

"Whoever heard before of people trying to make a bargain, as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be trying to make a bargain with the United States decrying what they have to sell? If they are striving to have reciprocity on fair terms with the United States, why do not hon. gentlemen do as any man would do if he was selling a horse or any other commodity—let the other people find out the bad qualities?"

Now, I confess that I do not want to see our statecraft in this country carried on in the way in which horse jockeys do their trading; I do not want to see in this country what I might call horse-trading politicians. I would not have characterised the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in this way if their own follower had not thus characterised it. I think it bad enough for men with no great reputation to trade horses in that way, and try to take advantage of and cheat their neighbor as much as they can; but when an hon. member gets up in this House and asks the people of Canada to endorse such a policy, I do not think it is a very dignified procedure, and I regret to think that the hon. gentleman should suppose that his own friends would be guilty of a horse-jockying statecraft like this; but I think it is a sufficient condemnation of their policy. It is not undignified, but it is only self-respecting and dignified on our part to hold out the olive branch to the people of the United States. I do not think that in doing that we should be lowering our dignity so much as we would by following the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford has announced an alternative; he has moved an amendment of which I have just quoted the last paragraph; and I feel convinced that it is my duty to vote for that amendment in preference to the resolutions the hon. Finance Minister has proposed. If that is not carried in this House, I have confidence that when the people of the country come to judge between the two policies, the farmers at all events, who are the largest class of voters in the country, will feel that the hon. member for South Oxford has understood their needs and interests and has sympathised with them, and that they will support and endorse that policy. At any rate, I know full well that the vote I am going to give will be endorsed, not only by the people I represent, but by the other people in the Eastern Townships, whom I feel I have a better right to represent than the hon. President of the Council in the utterances he has given in this debate.

Mr. TURCOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this advanced hour of the evening, I shall not long occupy the attention of the House with the discussion of the subject which has been brought before our consideration during three or four days. Since the beginning of this discussion I have heard speeches from both sides of the House. But notwithstanding the eloquent speeches made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), as well as by the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) I cannot be persuaded that there is, at the present time, as much prosperity in the Dominion of Canada as they wish to make us believe. The question which is now occupying us is a question of general interest, and having the honor to represent an agricultural county, I believe that it is my duty to say a few words to explain the vote which I shall have to give on the amendment of the hon. member for Oxford South (Sir Richard Cartwright). A great deal has been said about prosperity on the other side of the House; but, Mr. Speaker, no argument has been advanced to convince me that there is any great prosperity in the country. According to my idea, the signs of prosperity in a country should be manifested by an increase in commerce, an increase in exportations, an excess of exportations over importations, and, in short, I believe that the best sign of prosperity of a country is a rapid increase in the population. In examining the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that there has been no increase in navigation since 1874. In 1874, the sum total of our commerce was $217,565,510, and in 1889, the sum total was only $204,414,098; that is to say, a decrease of $13,000,000 between the two periods. Now, if we take the years 1883 and 1889, we find a difference of nearly $26,000,000. In 1883 the sum total of our commerce was $230,339,826, whilst last year it was only $204,414,098. It is impossible to see in these figures any signs of prosperity, since our commerce instead of increasing has decreased. I said that another sign of prosperity was in the increase of exportation. If we again examine the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that our exports, in 1883, amounted to $98,085,304; and in 1889 they were $89,189,167; that is to say, a difference of over $9,000,000. Thus, then, notwithstanding the speeches of the hon. members on the right, we cannot, in these figures, see any sign of prosperity. The third sign of prosperity of which I have spoken, is an excess of exportations over importations. In examining into the amount of our importations, I find that in 1883 we exported to the amount of $98,085,804, and that we imported to the amount of $132,254,022; that is to say, that there was an excess of importations over exportations of more than $34,000,000. In 1889, the last year for which we have the returns, we had an excess of $26,000,000 of importations over our exportations. And, if we take the total amount since Confederation, we find that our exportations amounted to $1,834,344,456, and that our importations amounted to $2,285,361,310, or a surplus of importations over exportations of $451,016,854; making an average per year of $20,500,000. It is, therefore, impossible to see in these figures any signs of prosperity in our country. Mr. Speaker, in reading the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, I perceive that he tells us that we are in an era of prosperity, because the Customs and Excise revenues are increasing. He tells us that in 1881 the Government revenues, arising from all sources, were $29,635,297, and that in 1889, the last fiscal year, these revenues amounted to $38,762,870, making an increase of $9,147,573. These figures are perfectly correct; but, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a surplus in the taxes, especially when the population is not increasing, denotes rather a sign of decay than of prosperity. The fourth sign of prosperity that I have mentioned is a rapid increase in the population. Now, Mr. Speaker, taking the two years mentioned by the hon. Minister of Finance, 1881 and 1889, I see that in 1881 the population of Canada was 4,324,000, and in 1889 it was 5,075,000, that is to say, an increase of 751,000, or 17½ per cent. Now, if we take into account the immigrants who come here at our expense from foreign countries, and who, according to statistics, reach the number of 750,000, we find that our population has remained stationary since 1881, and that there has been no increase. I said,

a moment ago, that the hon. Minister of Finance announced, in his Budget speech, that we were in an era of prosperity, seeing there was an increase over the revenues of the consolidated funds of $9,147,573, from 1881 to 1889. That is to say, that in 1881 the revenues were $29,635,297, and in 1889 they were $38,762,870. The reason of this increase is easily understood. It is due to an increase of taxes upon importations. Thus, in 1874, we imported to the value of $128,213,582. The duties collected upon this sum amounted to $14,421,882.67, or 11½ per cent. In 1878 the figure for importations was $93,081,787, and the taxes levied amounted to $12,795,697.17, or 13½ per cent. I now take the figures for 1880, the period of the inauguration of the National Policy; the importations amounted to $86,489,747, the taxes amounted to $14,138,849.42, or 16½ per cent. Whilst in 1874 our importations amounted to $128,000,000 in round numbers, the duties levied amounted merely to $14,000,000; that is to say, that there was a difference of $42,000,000 upon the importations, and that the amount from taxes was the same. This result is very easy to understand. It is that in 1878, after the inauguration of the National Policy, a tariff of 35 per cent. was imposed upon manufactured articles, instead of 17½ per cent. as it was in 1874. There is the kind of prosperity such as understood by the hon. Minister of Finance, according to his argument. Now, let us take the amount of importations in 1881. They amounted to $105,330,840; the duties levied to $18,500,785.97, or 17½ per cent. on the total amount of our importations. In 1883, importations $132,254,022; duty collected, $23,172,308.97, or 17½ per cent., making an average of six per cent. higher than in 1874. In 1887, during the first session that I had the honor of sitting here, there was an amendment to the tariff. In 1887 the importations amounted to $115,224,931; the taxes collected amounted to $23,784,523.23; that is to say, that with a deficit in the importations of $17,000,000 as compared with 1883, the taxes were the same as in 1883. Now, if we compare these figures with the population, we shall see that in 1868 the tax per head was $2.62; these taxes have risen year by year to about $6 per head. Well, if we seek for signs of decay in a country, I believe the rapid increase in its debt, the rapid increase of its expense and taxes, are exactly what we should look upon as indications of such decay. Let us look at the state of our debt. In 1881 it amounted to $155,395,740.40; in 1889 it amounts to $237,530,041.65, or an increase, in that space of time, of $82,134,261.25, equal to 53 per cent. more. In 1881 the debt of Canada was $35.76 per head; in 1889 it is $46.50. The expenditure has increased very nearly in the same proportion. In 1881 it was $25,502,554.42, and in 1889 it was $36,917,834.76, making an amount per head of the population of $5.90 for 1881, and of $7.27 for 1889. If we now calculate the amount of such expenditure per day, counting 365 days in the year, we find that in 1881 this expenditure was $69,870.01, and in 1889 it was $101,144.78 per day. The increase in taxation has also increased at the same ratio. The taxes in 1871 were about $4 per head; in 1881 they were $5.53 a head, and in 1889 $6.03. Thus, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the prosperity about which they hold forth to us from the other side of the House, we see that our taxes and our debt are rapidly increasing, whilst our commerce is diminishing, whilst our populatien remains stationary, and whilst our imports exceed our exports. All the speakers whom I have heard have said that on our side we do our best to cry down the credit of our country. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are some truths which are sad to tell, but they must be told. I represent an essentially agricultural county, and I believe that it is difficult at this time, for those who know the farmers, and who keep themselves informed of their condition every day, to say that they are in a prosperous state. It cannot be said that they are not courageous, for they always strive to prosper from year to year; but I am certain that the hon. Minister of Finance, when he tells us that the farmers' incomes are no less than in ordinary years, and that on the whole they are in a prosperous state, does not know much about their condition. It is true that we cannot expect anything from the Government in favor of the farmer, because, according to the speeches which we have heard from the hon. Minister of Finance and from his supporters, these gentlemen assert that the farmers are rich. We cannot, then, believe that they will do anything for the farmers because they think that they want nothing. Does not the hon. Minister of Finance know that the greater part of the farmers work and pay discount upon their future? Does he not know that farmers, in years such as those through which we are now passing, begin by getting into debt, paying discount upon the future, and finally, when they find themselves in a position when it is impossible for them to pay their debts, they sell their farms, and whatever remains to them to go to the United States? If the Government knows the condition of the farmer, I have no doubt that it will apply a remedy to it. But for all answer the Government tells the farmers, particularly those of the Province of Quebec, that it will give them protection by imposing an increased duty of 25 cents upon flour, when we know that there are not 10 per cent. of the farmers who do not buy flour during six months of the year. Truly these gentlemen make me think of the physician who was attending a sick person to whom it was necessary to give violent poisons. He begins by administering a small dose and he increases the dose gradually, and his patient finishes by being able to take a quantity of poison that would kill any one who had not been accustomed to it. Just so is it with protection. They began in 1878 by imposing a tax of 50 cents a barrel on flour, and now that the farmers have continued to keep these gentlemen in power, that tax has this year been increased by 25 cents, and if the farmers do not grumble too much, it is certain that in a few years, they will finish the dollar, the tax being gradually administered like the poison. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the farmers of the Province of Quebec, understand that tax. It is true that the Minister of Finance said that to make amends he would take the tax off molasses, but I must here remark that people use much more flour than molasses or black strap, as it is commonly called. If the Government labors to protect the farmer, I believe that it is not on molasses that they would levy taxes because in the Province of Quebec the farmers possess fine groves of maples and make a great quantity of sugar and syrup. If the hon. Minister of

Finance doubts this, as I intend spending some days in the country during the Easter holidays, I will bring him some *latire* and sugar, to show him that a great deal of sugar and syrup is manufactured in the Province of Quebec, and he will see that he should take some other means to protect them than by providing molasses at a low price. Mr. Speaker, several speakers who have spoken about the duty on flour have told us that such a tax has not increased the price of flour. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us that the revenue for the last year was increased $106,015 by the tax upon flour. Then, who pays this sum? For if the tax on flour does not increase anything, how does he hope to make up the loss of $60,000 caused by diminishing the tax upon molasses? He tells us that the removal of the tax on molasses is to compensate farmers for a diminution of the tax on flour. He, therefore, hopes to make up on flour the diminution of the revenues on syrup. I heard a certain merchant who loved competition, and who thought to make his fortune, say, that he decided to sell molasses and syrup at cost price to attract custom. Customers came in abundance, but only bought molasses and syrup, and at the end of two or three years the merchant was obliged to assign. I hope the Government may not become bankrupt, but I also hope that at the next elections the electors will thank him for his molasses and his syrup and that they will be inclined to support men who are opposed to taxes upon flour, which is an article of the first necessity. The hon. Minister of Finance has besides announced great prosperity to us, for he tells us that this year there is a surplus of one million and more. This is about the best argument he has given us; but, if I consult the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that in 1888 the taxes were $28,177,413, and in 1889 they were $30,613,522; that is to say, that there is an excess of taxes in 1889 of one million and a half over 1888. That is where the signs of prosperity of the hon. Minister of Finance are to be found. This year the hon. Minister of Finance thought he ought to reconstruct the tariff anew in order to increase the taxes still more. He finds his present surplus in taxes imposed upon the people, and he does not consider himself prosperous enough I suppose, for he is amending the tariff to make next year prosperous also. And he tells us that the present Government has inaugurated a system of protection under which the country has prospered, and that he intends to continue in. I believe that he is mistaken. I believe that the National Policy has brought prosperity to the Conservative party but has not made the country prosperous, that is to say the party of consumers. I have no doubt that he is satisfied, but the people are not so well satisfied. The hon. President of the Council (Mr. Colby) in his speech of the 27th March, admitted that our people were emigrating to the United States by hundreds of thousands; but he said also later on in his speech,—the translation is my own: "I can affirm that if our farmers were more prosperous than those of Vermont or New York it is because we have protected them upon our markets, in a manner so that they can sell off their products at reasonable prices at our local markets." Does not the hon. President of the Council know what the price of agricultural products are on our markets? Thus, butter upon the Montreal market, which is the largest market that we have, is only worth 9 or 10 cents a pound.

Mr. DESJARDINS. How much? When did you learn that?

Mr. TURCOT. I did not learn that from the statistics. I am a dealer in that article and have seen for myself. I have at this present time several tubs of butter on the market, and if I could find one of the hon. Ministers to give me 13 cents for it I should be quite satisfied with a profit of two cents a pound. It often happens that there is no reason in depending upon statistics, but the man who is in the trade, and who has articles of this description upon the market, has no need of statistics. Let any one believe me who wishes, but I can say upon the authority of the best houses in Montreal, who sell butter on commission, that good butter is now sold at from 9 to 11 cents, and I have seen creamery butter sold lately at 15. The hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Ste. Marie) who is a dealer in hay, informs me that pressed hay sells for $7 a ton. Oats bring in 30 cents for 32 pounds. And that is called good prices for agricultural products. Well, the only protection possible, to my mind, is to open foreign markets, since we produce more than we consume. Because there is no doubt that if the population of Canada consumed less than it produced prices would be higher; but as we produce more than we consume we must find a market to dispose of our surplus products. This end might be attained by establishing commercial relations with the United States. For, in spite of the high duties that we pay, as set forth in the Trade and Navigation Returns, the United States buy the greater part of our products. In 1888 our exports to England amounted to $40,084,-984; to the United States they amounted to $42,-72,065; or a difference in favor of the United States of two millions and a half; in 1889 the exports to England amounted to $38,105,126; to the or a difference of five millions and a half in favor of the United States. I say, therefore, that the United States is the most natural market that we can have. I spoke a moment ago of the trade in hay. I believe that the only market that we can have for hay is that of the United States. Thus, in 1889 we exported 82,308 tons of hay to the United States, or a value of $822,381. Moreover, this hay is taxed to the amount of $2 per ton, and the poor farmer is obliged to work hard to harvest this hay; he pays besides 35 per cent. duty on agricultural implements. Is this what we understand by protection to farmers? Let us see now about horses. 164 horses were exported to England, representing a value of $26,975; 17,277 horses were exported to the United States, representing a value of $2,113,782. What should we do with our lambs if we had not the United States markets? I have no statistics of lambs, nevertheless, I have bought them for several years, as many as I can buy, in my own parish, as well as in the surrounding parishes; and in spite of a duty of 20 per cent., which makes a tax of nearly 50 cents a head, we sell lambs to the United States 50 cents, 60 cents, and sometimes 80 cents, dearer than on the Montreal market.

Mr. CIMON. And calves?

Mr. TURCOT. I will speak about them soon. I see that last year we exported to England 43,417

sheep, amounting in value to $303,009, and we exported 307,779 to the United States, amounting to $918,334. The American market is again, therefore, the natural market for this product. As to eggs, Mr. Speaker, we exported 98 dozens to England, amounting to $18, whilst during the same period we exported 14,011,017 dozens to the United States, making an amount of $2,156,725. As a great deal has been said about barley by our friends from the Province of Ontario, I shall excuse myself from speaking about it. Let us now pass on to potatoes. Two years ago I, myself, bought and despatched, from the station at Ste. Julie, about 10,000 bushels of potatoes, and was compelled to pay 15 cents duty to the United States. Not a year passes without a large quantity of potatoes being exported to the United States. If it were not for this duty of 15 cents per bushel upon potatoes, that would be a great source of income to our farmers, particularly in counties such as that which I represent. Last year we exported 444 bushels of potatoes to England and 717,668 to the United States. We lost on horses, on account of the duties which we had to pay, more than $400,000, on sheep over $180,000, on hay $164,616, and on potatoes $107,650.20. The only means then of protecting the farmers would be to obtain free trade between the United States and Canada. Our farmers produce more than they need for their consumption, and we necessarily require a market to dispose of our surplus products. But we are told that free trade between the United States and Canada would destroy the trade of our manufactures. I do not believe that there are many men who are inclined to maintain that trade in the country is in a prosperous condition. I find in the *Journal of Commerce*, page 124, a speech made by Mr. Bosquet, of La Banque du Peuple, in which he tells us :

"The considerable increase in the number of failures during the last year forms the dark side of the picture. The reports of commercial agencies point out in the Province of Quebec, in 1889, 651 failures, as against 482 of the preceding year, an increase of 169. The total amount of liabilities in 1889 reaches $6,856,105 as against $4,466,824 in 1888, an increase of $2,389,281."

In 1878, when we inaugurated the system of protection, I began to occupy myself with elections, and I saw influential Conservatives come to our country parts and say to the farmers : if you wish to sell your butter for 50 cents a pound vote for the Conservatives ; if you wish to sell your pork for 20 cents a pound vote for the Conservatives. The people allowed themselves to be deceived by these fine promises. We have tried protection, and after twelve years' trial we are now in a worse state than that in which we were in 1878. If this protection which was to do so much good to the country has done nothing ; if this protection which ought at least to have been favorable to the interests of manufacturers and merchants has not succeeded in bring prosperity to either merchants, or manufacturers, or farmers, I believe that it should be time to try some other means. I know that the hon. members on the other side of the House have said that they have always voted in favor of protection, and that for this reason they ought to maintain it. But I do not believe in that theory. The country has its needs and ought not to work always in the same direction ; it sometimes happens that a work is done after one manner, and it is successful, but that the following year the system ought to be changed. If we have tried the protective system for twelve years without any result, and I am in a position to believe it, because being in trade myself, having business with farmers, having business, so to speak, with all merchants, I am in a position to say that the country is not prosperous ; if the protective system, I say, has not given any good results, why continue it ? One thing is certain, it is that in protecting some one, we are protecting him at the expense of others. If we believe the papers which informed us that for a long time the Government has been receiving deputation upon deputation to change the tariff, each coming to make his complaint and finding that the tariff is in the way to make his fortune, we may judge from that that everything was not rose colored. But I do not believe that the last changes in the tariff can be any more satisfactory, and the hon. Minister of Finance will again receive a number of deputations and appeals against that tariff. I know that he has already received appeals against that tariff. I received this morning from the firm of Hudon, Hebert & Co., which I know personally, and which is one of the best groceries in Montreal, the following letter :—

"SIR,—We enclose you a copy of the petition presented to the Minister of Finance, on the subject of the proposed changes in the duties on liquors. By supporting the contents of this petition you will certainly meet the views of the trade of the Dominion.

"Yours respectfully,
"HUDON, HEBERT & CO."

Here is now a copy of the petition which has been presented to the hon. Minister of Finance :

"*To the Hon. George Foster,*
"*Minister of Finance, Ottawa.*

"SIR,—We, the undersigned, being a committee duly nominated to represent the wine and spirit interest of the City of Montreal, would respectfully bring to your notice the fact that the proposed changes in the Customs tariff relating to the duties on spirits are unsatisfactory.

"A case of imported whiskey, rum, brandy, &c., of one dozen bottles, reputed quarts, contains not more than two gallons. By the proposed tariff, a case is made to pay duty upon three gallons, an excess of, at least, one gallon over the actual contents.

"It is the universal custom to import spirits in bottles at various strengths under-proof, and we would respectfully submit that the levying of duty on bottled spirits, without allowing for such under-proof, is not equitable, as when imported over-proof we have to pay extra, because it will lead to the bottling of liquors by the purchaser here. Thus the safeguard of the shippers' branded cork and registered label will be lost and the consumer will, in very many instances, pay a high price for inferior and very often injurious liquor.

"We, therefore, pray that proof strength be taken as a standard, and that over-proof be charged extra and under-proof be allowed for in proportion. As to the contents of cases, we ask that the duty be levied on actual measurement.

"We also pray, that ginger wine, now proposed to be classed as a cordial, be classed as a wine as heretofore.

"We would request that immediate action be taken in this matter.

(Signed) "GILLESPIE & CO.,
"J. HOPE & CO.,
"D. MASSON & CO.,
"HUDON, HEBERT & CO.,
"H. CHAPMAN & CO.,
"WM. FARREL,
"L. CHAPUT, FILS & CIE.,
"L. A. WILSON & CO.,
"MATHIEU FRERES,
"MEAGHER BROS. & CO.'

Thus, Mr. Speaker, you see that even before the tariff has been put into force the Minister begins to receive petitions asking for a change, and as soon as it is voted deputations will continue to ar-

rive from all parts. I believe that particularly in the interests of the farming class, in the interests of the county which I have the honor of representing, we should abandon this protective system and endeavor to have free trade with the United States. For these reasons, I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the Government will certainly not be surprised to see me give a vote of want of confidence.

Mr. MITCHELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. leader of the Opposition whether he finds that there is no possibility of finishing the debate to-night?

Mr. LAURIER. I think it is absolutely impossible to finish the debate this morning. Several hon. gentlemen yet want to speak on this question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In that case, I hope the hon. gentleman and his friends will do their best to finish the debate at the next sitting of the House, otherwise we may be sure that it will be continued all next week.

Mr. LAURIER. It is certainly desirable that it should be finished as early as possible, but, at the same time, I cannot say that it will be finished at the next sitting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will do his best to have it finished then.

Mr. LAURIER. I certainly will do my best.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ALIEN LABOR BILL.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That 500 copies of Bill (No. 8) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in Canada, be printed and placed at the disposal of the Select Committee to whom the Bill has been referred, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might just say that there are a great many enquiries for copies of this Bill, and the supply is exhausted. There was a resolution passed in committee yesterday asking that this number should be printed.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that in accord with the resolution of the committee?

Mr. TURCOT. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot see why we should depart fron the usual rule in this matter. It is customary to bring any question of this kind before the Printing Committee, and I cannot see why that is not done now. Is this intended to be a kind of advertisement for the hon. gentleman who brought in the motion. There must be something to induce the hon. gentleman to bring the matter before the House, and to try and smuggle it through just at a time when a number of members are not here. We require a full explanation of this.

Mr. GILLMOR. The explanation is, that the members of the committee understood there was a large demand for the Bill, and that it was important that it should be circulated. The committee desires that the Bill should be printed, if the House is willing to grant it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me, that the Bill, if printed, should not be confined to the Committee; it should be distributed to members of the House, so that they may deal with it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This Bill met with very general disappointment when it was first introduced. It contains, to my mind, very objectionable principles, and very objectionable legislation, which I cannot approve of in any sense or way. The House disapproved of it, the leader of the Government pronounced against it in very strong language, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), one of the most experienced men on this side of the House, pronounced against it, many hon. gentlemen denounced it as containing possibly injurious consequences of a very grave nature, and the result was, that a select committee was appointed to report on the Bill generally. That committee may make a report for a modified Bill, or for a new Bill if necessary, but when that Bill comes before the House, it will be time enough to consider it. The present Bill will meet with greater disapproval outside of the House than it met with in the House, and in view of what is transpiring in the House of Representatives at Washington, I know of nothing which could be more injurious to Canadian interests than the publication of this Bill in the country, or the leading of the workingmen of the country to believe that we are going to adopt such a measure. I, for one, will not give my assent to this proposal. I did hope that when the Bill was referred to a committee, the matter would be calmly and quietly considered, and that we should have a report containing the result of the mature deliberations of the more sober-minded men of that committee, which would in some degree reflect the opinion of the House. I can see nothing but evil from the circulation of this Bill among the general public, as it would lead them to believe that it had a second reading in this House. It received a second reading on the understanding that it was only read *pro formâ*, and the House was in no way or sense committed to it. If this Bill is printed, it will be understood outside that the Bill has received the assent of the House, and the declaration made on both sides that it only received a second reading in a technical tense, and not any endorsement of its princi-

ple, will not be understood. I hope this resolution will not be agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman is late in the day in discussing the merits of the Bill. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asks why was not the usual rule followed and the committee allowed to recommend this printing? The committee did recommend it. I can say, for one, that I have had many applications for copies of this Bill, and was unable to supply them. If they are wanted by people in the country, I think there is no reason why we should not supply them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), that this is no time to set the heather on fire; and if there is anything likely to do it, it is this spirit of retaliation which has grown up in this Parliament towards the people of the United States. In place of that, we ought to try to conciliate and subdue that feeling of antagonism. I entirely disagree with the proposition to publish additional copies of this Bill for circulation throughout the country. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island has correctly stated that, in giving this Bill a second reading, the House was not assenting to the principle of the Bill; that was distinctly stated by the hon. First Minister. The Bill was merely allowed to pass its second reading *pro formâ*, in order that it might be sent to a committee to examine witnesses and obtain information to be placed before the House; and nothing can be gained by circulating additional copies throughout the country, except to excite antagonism towards the United States. What will be the result? The result will be to intensify the feeling against Canada at Washington, as represented by the McKinley Bill, which, if carried, will have the effect of destroying the markets of the United States for the farmers and other producers of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know if a resolution of this kind is in order without notice?

Mr. GILLMOR. I think the merits of the Bill ought not to be discussed when it is not before the House. The committee which has been appointed to consider this matter has been taking evidence at several meetings. This may be a small matter to our friends who are not living along the frontier. You talk about creating excitement. The excitement has already been created; the difficulties exist; and, therefore, it is a matter of serious consideration all along the frontier of 3,000 miles. Nor is it due to any legislation of this Parliament or any act on this side of the line. Nothing has been done in Canada to call forth this Bill. The trouble is all in consequence of legislation which took place at Washington. This Bill is a copy of the Act passed at Washington, which is being enforced all along the line, to the serious interference of Canadians. No matter how anxious we may be for conciliation—and no one is more anxious for it than I am—there is a point at which a man of self-respect must resist, and if we, as a people, want to maintain our self-respect, we must at least let the United States understand that we do not approve of their measure, and if they are determined to enforce it and drive Canadians out of their country when they go there for employment, they ought to be shown that we have power to return that compliment. This measure is well understood in the United States. We are told that the United States Government do not wish to enforce their Act. Why, there is a clause in that Act providing that those who give information shall be remunerated out of the fines imposed on Canadians; their officers are acting upon that provision, and our people are being harassed beyond endurance.

Mr. LAURIER. The point of order has been taken, and perhaps the House may think it better to have this matter postponed to another day.

Mr. SPEAKER. As a matter of course the question cannot be put.

TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) to amend the Territories Real Property Act. He said: This Bill consists of a multitude of details in connection with the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. LÉPINE (for Mr. CURRAN) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint the Commission to report upon plans for Montreal Harbor improvements, early enough to enable the Commission to inspect the present condition of the River St. Lawrence, before the ice shoves and is carrried away?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government to appoint such a Commission. I suppose it will be appointed early next week.

EASTER RECESS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, at 3 p.m.

Mr. TROW. I wish to say that a number of the members have already left, a number of others are going at half-past four or five o'clock, and others desire to go west at ten o'clock to-night, and it is utterly out of the question to think that a vote can be taken on the question before the House to-night, for I am aware that from ten to twelve desire yet to speak on this side of the House. Therefore, is it not advisable that the House should adjourn to-night at six o'clock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If there are so many members to speak that it will be impossible to close the debate to-night, surely that should not prevent the House sitting and going on with the debate; but I should hope that the speeches will not be so numerous or so long that we cannot take a vote to-night.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is right that the House should sit, and that members should go on and deliver their speeches; but the importance of the division on the resolution now before the House cannot be ignored, and I do not see how we are going to take a division in the absence of three-fourths of the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought the understanding was that we should, if at all possible, take a vote last night. The leader of the Opposition informed us that was not possible, and so we adjourned at two o'clock in the morning, thinking we might possibly be able to take a vote to-night. If we could do so, that would certainly hasten

very much the close of the Session, but if we do not, we will probably reach Thursday before taking a vote. If the leader of the Opposition thinks it is not possible to come to a vote to-night, I would suggest that both sides should agree to close the debate at eight o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think that arrangement could be made. A large number of the members will have visited their constituents during this so short recess, and may desire to submit their views to the House ; and it would not be fair to make an arrangement which would prevent their doing so.

Mr. KENNY. I understood the arrangement was made two days ago that the debate would be closed last night if possible. These delays, instead of being a convenience to private members, are a great inconvenience.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). It will be impossible to take a division to-night, as the House cannot sit after midnight ; and if we sit until then many members, who object to travelling to-morrow, will have to delay their departure until Saturday. I have no objection myself to travelling to-morrow, but the objections of others should be respected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand from the whips that the absent members have paired, so that their absence will make no difference. They have paired for their convenience, and that should not prevent our going on with the business of the country. If we do not take a vote to-night and do not sit to-night, we cannot take it on Tuesday, and another week will be taken, which will certainly delay prorogation until late in May. It is not our fault if the debate does not close to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. Let the debate go on to-day as long as it can, and we will take a vote on Tuesday.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If members cannot be here on Tuesday in time for the vote, that will be their own fault. They ought to be here. Gentlemen from the distance Provinces are anxious to get through the business of the Session, but every now and then arrangements are made by which members who live near Ottawa can go home and get back in time for work. This is not fair towards gentlemen who live at a distance, and, therefore, cannot possibly attend to any business during a short adjournment, as for practical business purposes it is useless for them to take advantage of these adjournments.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would suggest that the vote be taken on Tuesday next without naming the hour, and when hon. gentlemen know that is the understanding they will not want to sit up until three or four o'clock.

Mr. MARA. My impression, and that of the majority on this side of the House, and of a great many members opposite, was that the division would be taken to-night. If that arrangement is to fall through, why not adjourn until Saturday, and let the House sit Saturday. In that case a division might be reached on Saturday night. If one arrangement is to be broken, there is no reason why we should hold to the other.

Mr. MULOCK. Were this an ordinary question, it would be reasonable to endeavor to come to such a conclusion as has been suggested. But the question we are debating is one of such vast importance, so far reaching in its effects, involving, in fact, the national life of this country, that Parliament would not be doing its duty if it adopted any measure calculated to restrict the expression of public opinion. There is a question before this House involving more or less our relations with a foreign country, and the expression of public opinion here should not be stifled. The adjournment, which is to take place for a few days, may be of great benefit to the country. Hon. gentlemen, when removed from the excitement of this Chamber, may form opinions and gather information which would add to that already possessed by the House. I do not think we are doing our duty to the country to enter into any arrangement by which the humblest member of the House should be prevented from expressing his views. Though I have no desire to add anything to this debate, I will reserve the right to speak at any time, no matter what arrangement may be come to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the suggestion which has been made, to have the vote taken during the sitting on Tuesday, should be adopted. We may have to sit to two or three or four o'clock in the morning, though I cannot expect that any one will make us sit up to that hour. I understand the proposition to take the vote on Tuesday is acceptable to the members of the Government, and I think it should be to members on this side of the House.

Motion agreed to.

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to refer to a very important matter in regard to which I think this House ought to receive some information. We have recently had a Minister of the Crown at Washington—the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Fisheries Department. He has been back for some days, and the country is interested in the proceedings which have been taken, or likely to be taken in regard to the fisheries. The *modus vivendi* being practically at an end, I think it is the duty of the Government, if they can do so without interfering with considerations of public policy, to inform us as to the present position of affairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here at this moment. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will renew his question when he is here.

Mr. MITCHELL. I saw the Minister here a few minutes ago, but, if the Government are not prepared to give us information now in regard to the present status, they ought to be prepared to do so when the House resumes its sittings on Tuesday next.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will ask the question when the First Minister is here.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster for the second reading of Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it due to myself, to the constituents whom I have the honor to represent, and to the country, that I should give my views in relation to this tariff. There never was a time during my public life when I felt it was more important to call attention to the course which the Government is pursuing, and the direction in which we are drifting. I desire to give a little bit of past history as to what has led us to our present position, and that will take me back to the time when the First Minister and his colleagues at that time interjected themselves into the gathering of delegates from the Maritime Provinces which took place in Charlottetown, P. E. I., in 1864. Some hon. members may consider this ancient history, but I consider that it is necessary, to understand the attitude which was taken at that time, and the manner in which we have drifted since into a very different position in regard to the trade policy of this country. At that time we in the Maritime Provinces, representing a very small minority of the people of British North America, were induced to forego the scheme for the adoption of which we had met at Charlottetown, by the present leader of the Government, whom we were glad to welcome, and whose presence there we were all glad to see. He asked us, and we decided, to postpone the important measure we had met to consider, and to meet again in Quebec in order to make a larger union of the colonies of British America. The project captured my youthful mind at that time, and the plausible manner of my hon. friend and the way in which he addressed the gathering of delegates there, induced me to believe that it was in the interests of the country to unite the scattered Provinces and to come under one Government, and so to cement British rule on this continent. We were told what advantages this would give us in dealing with the United States. We were told that we were excluded by the protective tariff of the United States, which was not as high then as it was after the war necessities came to be understood. We listened to the voice of the charmer and agreed to his views, and we met in the following October in Quebec, for the purpose of creating one grand British nationality on this continent. I am pleased to say—although I have some regrets in regard to it—that the national object which the right hon. gentleman presented to us, has since been carried out. But, while I am willing to give the right hon. gentleman every credit for his sincerity of intention at that time, in stating that the smaller Provinces would have their rights carefully guarded, I regret that we did not take the necessary safeguards which would have completely insured to the smaller Provinces that protection which we then thought they would require. A picture was presented to us on that occasion of the great advantages that would flow from the connection of those isolated Provinces by railway with the greater Provinces of Canada, and ultimately, by the extension of the system, with the West. That scheme was so grand, so magnificent, that it captured the imagination of every person at that meeting. We consented to go to Quebec, in order to see what could be done by way of an arrangement which would unite under one Confederation all the colonies of British America. I am not going to take up much time of the House with too much ancient history, but I feel that something must be said of the origin of Confederation, in order that we may ascertain where we may stand to-day. What was the policy of Canada on that occasion? My right hon. friend knows that the policy of the statesmen of that day, including himself, was one of free trade. What was the policy of the Maritime Provinces that were led into that union? It was a policy, from one end to the other, of free trade, with the least possible amount of taxation upon the people, and with Customs duties comparatively small. Sir, I recollect well some of the conversations I had, and I recollect my admiration for one particular despatch that was read to us at that Quebec Conference, a despatch written by the then Finance Minister, Sir Alexander T. Galt, in which he took stand, in relation to what the tariff of Canada should be, and that we should regulate it ourselves. I could not help but admire the manly position which was taken, because I may say now that the smaller Provinces then had not that amount of freedom, and did not exercise, in their government, that amount of independence which the older and more independent Provinces did. I felt that the union of those Maritime Provinces with the greater Provinces of Canada ought to result, under almost any reasonable circumstances, in advantage to the whole. Sir, we became united. I am not going through the process by which it was done, the time that it took, and that we public men sacrificed to build up this nationality, the time spent in England before the British Parliament, in securing the British North America Act under which we exist to-day. Sir, that Act was passed, and I am pleased to say that the knowledge, and judgment, and acumen, and shrewdness of the right hon. gentleman did a great deal to bring about the creation of that Act under which we exist as a Confederation. Sir, in 1867, when we first met as a Dominion, what was the policy of the country then? Why, there was not one public man in the Parliament of Canada that would venture to proclaim what we have heard proclaimed since this debate commenced. The whole theory of the fiscal policy of this country was one of friendship to the United States, and an endeavor to meet our friends on the other side of the border in an effort to bring about reciprocal trade arrangements, and a continuation of the reciprocity treaty that went into effect in 1854, the reciprocity treaty of Lord Elgin. Sir, the existence of that treaty was shown to be of such benefit to the people of Canada that there was but one sentiment among all the delegates, both at Quebec and in Prince Edward Island, and subsequently in London—there was but one feeling amongst the delegates, namely, that the policy of this country should be a policy of friendship towards the United States, and an endeavor to perpetuate that reciprocal trade arrangement which existed when Confederation was accomplished. Sir, I need not recapitulate the reasons why that arrangement came to an end. The American war, which had broken out some time before, led to the imposition of enormously high duties in the United States. They were imposed from the necessities of that country, from the enormous demands made by the civil war which raged in the United States; the people were compelled to put on what were then called war

duties, and which were understood throughout the United States to be put on merely for war purposes. Sir, we know what it means when any Government gets a duty placed upon the statutes of the country, and we know how difficult it is to get it removed. Then there was the feeling of antagonism which grew up in the United States, arising from either a real or an imaginary cause, that we had been hostile to the North, and this led them to give notice of the termination of the treaty. We know what happened in this country after that treaty was terminated; we know that a great feeling of distrust prevailed throughout the whole of Canada. Our lumber interests were affected by it, our farmers on all hands felt that they wanted the market which the Lord Elgin treat had given them, and every industry which we possessed was in a measure paralysed by the cessation of that treaty, and by the refusal of the American Government to continue it, because they believed that would have been hostile to the interests of the North, during their internecine war. In 1867, when we first met together in Parliament, it will be recollected what the feeling was then. I am sorry my right hon. friend is not now in his place; I am sorry he cannot find a little time to listen to a few truths which I hope to tell him; I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not here to hear me, because I do not like to speak of him in his absence. I have already conceded, I am willing to concede, the great ability which he showed in framing the constitution under which we are now governed, and I say that he has done much since that time, to promote and encourage the development of this country. There is no doubt about it, and I recognise it. I am proud to say, that I was one of those who assisted him from the time of the Quebec Conference, in 1864, up to 1878, to carry out the policy which it was understood should be carried out by the Dominion of Canada, in relation to its fiscal arrangements. Sir, I supported him up to 1878, when I was unfortunately led, by his persuasive powers, to adopt the system called the National Policy. But when I attempted to understand what that National Policy meant, and when the right hon. gentleman, in answer to my question whether it involved a duty upon the food of the people of Canada, told me that it did not, I said: Well, I am willing to go into the National Policy thus far, I am willing to put a reasonable duty upon imported manufactured goods, the maximum not to exceed 25 per cent. I did not assume the attitude which many of my hon. friends here have assumed in this House. I was not opposed to all duties, but I was willing to accept those that were necessary for fiscal purposes; I was in favor of so adjusting the amount of duty as that it should be sufficient to carry on the business of the country, and at the same time to protect those industries which could be profitably pursued in the country. That was the National Policy that I believed in, and that I understood my right hon. friend advocated at that time; and I state here that I accepted that policy on the distinct understanding that there was to be no duty upon the food of the people. But, in the midst of a general election, in 1878, when I found myself committed to his National Policy, I discovered that speeches were being made throughout the west in the farming districts, promising a duty upon flour, upon cornmeal, upon pork and beef, and upon all the articles which entered into the consumption of the masses of the country, and which were absolutely necessary for the preservation of the chief industries of the Province from which I came. Sir, what are we doing to-day? I find, for the first time in this Parliament, that the Government has thrown off the cloak, they have come out boldly, and the President of the Council has made a declaration which I will refer to later on. During the whole campaign of 1878, the right hon. gentlemen never delivered a speech, never gave a public utterance, in which he did not proclaim to those who were listening to him, that the object of the National Policy was simply to compel, or coerce, or whatever you like to call it—to induce, I would rather say—the Americans to take off their restrictive duties, and return to reciprocity. That was the object of the campaign of 1878. It was the means by which hon. members who sit behind the First Minister were induced to come in and support the new departure from the past policy of Canada. How do we stand to-day? True it was that some were slaughtered by the course pursued. Owing to the flour duty and the food duty, I was left at home for four years. Up to that time I was a supporter of the right hon. gentleman; but when I found that the duty on the food of the people was to be heavily taxed, I doubted the correctness of the National Policy, and especially when, instead of a maximum duty of 25 per cent., the rate was gradually increased until to-day we have duties imposed on articles imported equal to 150 per cent. and even higher. When we find that staple articles like iron, which enters into the consumption of every man, farmer, lumberman, mechanic, is taxed an average of 50 to 55 per cent., it is enough to unsettle any one who has a desire to see reciprocal relations between this country and the United States. But it remained for the House this Session to see the cloak thrown aside. Is there any desire on that side of the House to have reciprocal trade relations, as was announced during the campaign of 1878? No; we find the President of the Council rising in his place and announcing, in the course of his speech, in which he enunciated the policy of the Government, that he would deprecate the idea of reciprocal arrangements with the United States, even in natural products. What are we to understand from that statement? I can understand the Government refusing reciprocity in manufactured articles, because they have built around themselves a set of boodlers, if I may call them so, of companies and corporations, who, for anything I know, may have furnished them with money to carry on the elections, and I believe they have done so.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). You got yours from Wiman.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot hear what you say; you had better close up if you cannot speak out. Corporations have been built up under this tariff, so that they have become a power in regard to the Government of the day. We find that, year after year, the Government are increasing the taxation of the people without just cause. We could understand, if there had been a deficiency in the revenue, the hon. Minister of Finance coming down to the House and asking for the imposition of additional

duties for the purpose of making up that deficiency in the revenue. But he tells us the Government had a surplus last year, and that there will be a surplus this year of $2,500,000, and yet he comes down and asks us to impose additional duties such as are described in the resolutions, which, for anything we know, may impose two and a-half million dollars more taxation on the people. The hon. Finance Minister tells us in his glib way that there can be only so much revenue derived from these changes. I have been making some calculations, and my hon. friends around me have been making calculations, as to what the imposition of these duties will result in, and, in my opinion, there will be an increased revenue of $1,750,000 or $2,000,000 by the imposition of these duties. How is this being done? I ask this House, if there is any wonder that I should have refused longer to follow the right hon. gentleman, when this state of things exists, and when, taking my own Province, and particularly my own county, there is not one industry that is benefited by the National Policy. Yet, the Government go on, year after year, imposing additional duties on the people of my Province and my county, without giving them any direct benefit from their policy. It was not enough that the Government should place a tax of 50 cents a barrel on the flour of the people in 1878 and 40 cents on cornmeal, an article grown only in a couple of counties in Ontario, and then not in greater quantities than sufficient to feed the people there; but they have now added 25 cents per barrel on flour, an increase of 50 per cent. on the food of the people. I believe, about 1,250,000 barrels of flour are used in the Maritime Provinces, and we know that in many of the localities, the people have to pay about 60 cents a barrel freight on the railways to get the flour from the place of production in Canada, to the place of consumption in those Provinces; whereas, if the duty did not exist, they could get flour from New York for 15 cents and from Boston for 10 cents per barrel by schooners along the coast of Nova Scotia and a portion of New Brunswick. Is it right that our people should be sacrificed—for what? There is an election coming—we might as well speak plainly—and the change would never have been made except to conciliate Ontario. I dare say it is very well for the First Minister and his friends from that section of the country to look out for themselves, but they should show some sense of right and justice in dealing with the people. They should consider the position of the people of the smaller Provinces, and in dealing with the tariff should not impose duties for the sake of one portion of the people, when those duties are unfair, unjust and outrageous. Let me consider for a few moments the interests of the Province. I do not know what the members of the Government know of the condition of New Brunswick, but I may say the principal industries in that Province are lumber and fish. The agriculturists do not raise farm products for exportation. If they raise what will maintain themselves it is enough, and it is all they expect to do, and all they generally accomplish. The chief markets for their hay and oats is the lumberman's camp. The lumbermen have, however, had a most difficult and trying time in carrying on their business. While the umber of the Ottawa valley and western Ontario is mainly composed of the superior kinds, pine, oak, and the more expensive and valuable woods, our timber is almost entirely composed of spruce, for which there is only one market, namely, the English market, and there it comes into competition with the cheap spruce from the Baltic. Under these circumstances, lumbering has been a struggling business for many years in the Maritime Provinces; and, in making that statement, every one from that portion of the country will say I am telling the truth. There are five articles forming the staple food of the men in the lumber camp, and also their families: flour, pork, lard (which is the butter of the camp), beans and beef. What has the Government done in regard to all these articles? They thought it was not sufficient when a duty of $2 a barrel was placed on pork going into the camps, and a pork that cannot be raised in Canada, for there is no such thing as mess pork, such as is used in lumbering camps, raised in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say "no," and I know all about it. I leave it to any lumberman whether, if they had their choice of taking the local pork of the country as against $4 per barrel tax on mess pork from Chicago, it would not be more economical and better to buy the foreign pork than to obtain the pork of the country. For several reasons: First, because the men in the camp will not have the local pork; and, next, because Chicago mess pork will go a great deal further than the local pork raised in this country. Now, Sir, every one acquainted with the nature and condition of the lumber business, knows that they are unable to stand the strains put upon them; and I hold in my hand a remonstrance from almost every leading lumberman in the part of the country which I represent. I will read to the House the telegram:—

"CHATHAM, N.B., 1st April, 1890.

"To Hon. P. MITCHELL.

"Strong feeling here against increased duties on provisions. We, on behalf of the lumber interest of the North Shore, urge you to use your utmost influence against proposed increased duty on flour, beef, pork and lard, which commodities are largely used in our business.

(Signed) "E. HUTCHINSON,
GEO. BURCHELL & SONS,
D. & J. RITCHIE,
C. C. TURNER,
SCOTT FAIRLEY,
J. B. SNOWBALL,
WM. MURRAY,
NEW BRUNSWICK TRADING CO.,
B. N. T. UNDERHILL,
A. & D. LOGIE,
J. W. & J. ANDERSON,
JNO. SADLER."

Now, with the exception, perhaps, of a couple of gentlemen, one of whom I know is out of the locality at present, every leading merchant connected with the lumber business in that district, has signed that remonstrance. I think it is a most unfair thing, when a business is depressed as the lumbering industry of this country is, that this Government should submit to this House, through their Minister of Finance, a scheme for putting additional taxation upon the staple articles which are the foundations of carrying on this great staple industry of the Province from which I come. I will make a few references to the incongruities of

this proposed additional tax on pork. The Government have put $3 a barrel, which is an additional dollar, upon mess pork, and they have put upon all other pork and beef and flesh food $6 a barrel of 200 pounds, making 3 cents a pound on mess pork.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am quite right. They have put 3 cents a pound upon mess pork by the increase of $1 a barrel, and they have put 6 cents a pound upon every other kind of meat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I speak subject to correction. It is 1½ cents a pound, but it means $6 a barrel.

An hon. MEMBER. No; $3 a barrel.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may not understand the multiplication table, but if you will listen I will endeavor to convey my ideas as I understand them. I will read the item:

"Meats, fresh or salted, 3 cents per pound."

Well, 3 cents per pound upon 200 pounds in a barrel means $6, if I know a little about it.

An hon. MEMBER. That is right.

Mr. MITCHELL. If that is right, that is all I am contending for. The lumbermen are charged $6 a barrel upon every barrel of pork that goes into their camp, except it is mess pork. I will now refer to some of the incongruities of this particular tariff. Mess pork is selling to-day in Chicago for 50 cents a barrel higher than clear pork. Clear pork is considered, under ordinary circumstances, worth 50 cents a barrel more than mess pork, but owing to the peculiar circumstances of the market at Chicago, mess pork is selling for 50 cents a barrel more than the clear pork. This clear pork is subject to $6 a barrel duty, whereas mess pork is only subject to $3 duty. It is the clear pork that is most valuable for transportation to the lumber camps, because where there are long portages and difficulties of transit the uneatable portions of the port, such as bone, are taken out, and so the clear pork is more valuable to the lumbermen than the mess pork. Under this tariff the mess pork is only charged 1½ cents a pound, but the clear pork is charged 3 cents a pound. It is manifest to any one that the person who made that tariff did not understand the nature of the trade, and I merely mention this thing now to show one of the inconsistencies of this tariff, and to ask the Minister of Finance, when the House goes into committee on this resolution, that he will rectify that matter, and in the meantime endeavor to get information from some of his friends on that side of the House who are engaged in the trade and knowing something about it. I will mention another circumstance connected with this trade. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has said to us, that in order to compensate the people of the Maritime Provinces, and more especially the Province from which he comes himself, for the imposition of this pork and flour duty, he agreed to take off one-half the existing duty on molasses. I will read to the hon. gentleman what some of his friends in the city of St. John say about that. I may say the firm that wrote this letter, which I am about to read, are strong supporters in the city of St. John of the administration of my hon. friend.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Very strong?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; perhaps the strongest supporters he has in the Province.,

Mr. FOSTER. Hall & Fairweather.

Mr. MITCHELL. You know. The following is the letter:—

"*Molasses:*—A good deal of inconvenience and friction will be experienced if the tariff goes through as proposed, *i.e.*, polariscope test not over 55 degrees, 1½ cents a gallon duty; over that test, 6 cents duty. Two things will combine to make this very disadvantageous to the trade, namely, the uncertainty of what the duty will be, and the delay in ascertaining it. First, molasses which tests, say, 56, may not be of more value than if it tested 55—yet the duty would be quadrupled. The uncertainty of the test would add to the risk of the importer. A cargo arriving and being rated even on degrees above 55, while of scarcely perceptible commercial value to about 55 test, yet the duty being 6 cents, would exclude the goods for this market, and necessitate its re-importation to some other country. Secondly, delay in ascertaining the quality for duty would be a great inconvenience. A cargo must be landed, samples sent for examination, result waited for—all delaying sale and business. Heretofore a purchase could be made in the West Indies, cabled, and the merchant could commence selling to arrive, being able, approximately, to ascertain cost. As the tariff is proposed this could not be done, but the tedious process above outlined would have to be gone through. If a standard could be fixed that would, without doubt, admit the customary kinds of molasses, without risk of exceeding the test fixed on, so that the danger of incurring the high duty would be avoided, it would be very much in the interest of the trade. With 55 degrees test it is to be feared a good deal of risk and uncertainty may prevail."

That is what is said about molasses.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not bad.

Mr. MITCHELL. It certainly is not good, coming from your friend. He is much dissatisfied with you and points out the very serious difficulty of carrying on trade under this tariff. Now let us hear what is said about pork:

"*Pork:*—Some difficulty is likely to arise from the provision of the tariff making one description. Mess pork, as defined by the general 'Inspection Act" dutiable at 1½ cents a pound and other salted meats 3 cents. Clear pork is, in New Brunswick and by the lumbering and fishing industries, quite as largely used, perhaps even more largely used than mess. Clear pork is intrinsically of the value of 50 cents to $1 per barrel more than mess; this difference should not make it liable to double duty. But there is another consideration. It happens often, and is the case now and for some months past, that mess pork is the subject of speculation in the cheap market, and this circumstance causes it to be held higher than clear pork. Our people, therefore, buy clear almost exclusively, getting better value therein. The difference in the tariff or double rate for clear would enforce the purchase of the inferior article at the higher cost. There is apparently no reason for clear pork being dutiable at double the rate of the other—mess pork. Mess pork and clear are used for the same purposes; some buyers use the one kind, some the other, though of late much the larger proportion of clear has been imported. It will prevent much embarrassment if the definition in the tariff is made to cover clear pork at 1½ cents per pound duty. At latest advices the sort of clear which is most largely imported, was 50 cents a barrel lower than mess."

These are a couple of instances of the inconsistencies of the tariff. Now I will give my hon. friend something which I received yesterday from the manager of that important paper which hon. gentlemen opposite love so much, the *Herald*. The hon. gentleman proposes to alter the tariff on stereotype plates. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) also has a statement which is far stronger than mine, which I suppose he is prepared to put forward himself. I asked the manager of the *Herald* to send me a statement of what the additional tax on these plates would amount to, and, very much to my surprise, he sent me this:

"The new tariff sections 150, 151, have made a very large advance in the cost of stereotypes for newspapers. 150, re-

lating to newspaper advertisements, has been changed from 20 per cent. to 2 cents per square inch; and 151, from 5 cents per pound to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent per square inch; the latter includes all plate matter for newspapers, and is an advance of 150 per cent. as $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent is equal to 12 cents. The former is a prohibitory measure as regarding importations of plates for pamphlets, almanacs, &c., but as regards newspapers it will be serious. Now, our advertisers in the States and England send us stereotype and electrotype cuts of their advertisements, they charge us nothing for them, and it saves setting up type, but if we have to pay such a duty as 2 cents per square inch, it will fall somewhat heavy, as it will be impossible for a newspaper to collect any duty from an advertiser. I enclose a circular from Toronto, which looks very plainly that the tariff has been amended in this particular, for these parties."

Included in that letter was a circular from an institution in Toronto, which favors the Administration of the day, and the managers of which, I have no doubt, got the ear of the Minister, and induced him to make this alteration for their benefit, affecting almost every newspaper in the country. I ask the hon. Minister if he thinks it is right to increase the tariff from 20 to 150 per cent. on such an article, which gives information to the people? I do not think the people of this country will approve of that. I might go on to show how this tariff affects the fishing and lumbering industries, in which my county is largely interested. The farmers of that county grow but very little for export; what they grow they dispose of in the domestic market, for the lumber camps and the fishermen; so that they receive no benefit from the National Policy, while they find the duties increased on every barrel of pork and every barrel of flour they buy. Four-fifths of the flour used in that county is imported, as our farmers find it more profitable to grow oats and other products for the lumber camps, and import their flour. Then, this tariff taxes woollens $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. We all know that the woollens the laboring classes wear are the cheapest kinds: there is no feature in which the National Policy benefits that section of the community; and I ask if it is judicious, right, honest or fair to impose additional taxes on the food and clothing of people who cannot afford to pay them. I might go through this tariff and refer to the duties imposed on fruits, seeds, and other things, to show that this Government have really abandoned the policy of reciprocity even in natural products. What are they doing by their policy? They are creating antagonism in the United States. We know that there are two parties in the United States, as there are in Canada, one party favoring protection, and the other party favoring closer trade relations between the two countries. The party in power will, I presume, support the McKinley Bill, which is an exclusive Bill, which proposes to put a duty of 5 cents a dozen on eggs, 20 cents a bushel on barley, 10 cents a bushel on oats, $4 a ton on hay, 30 per cent. on horses and 20 per cent. on cattle; and I ask if the policy now proposed by this Government will strengthen the hands of the men who want reciprocity in trade with us, or those of the men who want to impose prohibitory duties? If any additional evidence were wanted to prove the truth of the statement of the hon. Paesident of the Council and some other hon. gentlemen, that the Government do not want reciprocity with the United States, the evidence is before us in this tariff, which will do more to strengthen the hands of those who are supporting the McKinley Bill than anything else we could do. Sir, there is a growing feeling in the United States for closer trade relations with Canada among men like Mr. Hitt, who has moved for the appointment of a commission to see how those trade relations can be promoted. How will they be aided by a tariff like this, which will take the wind out of their sails, and give Congress an excuse for passing the McKinley Bill? Instead of doing anything to promote reciprocal trade relations with the United States, hon. gentlemen opposite are doing everything they can to kill our trade with that country. I regret to have heard the statement of the hon. President of the Council. I had hoped, notwithstanding the policy hon. gentlemen opposite have been pursuing, that they still believed in reciprocal trade relations in natural products; but the Government have now thrown off all disguise, and to-day they stand in the position of establishing a policy of prohibition towards the United States, and desiring to put up a Chinese wall between the two countries. It is well the country should know their policy and not be deceived by any pretensions they may make. I may state what my opinion is regarding the true course to be pursued by us in the interests of Canada. I believe that the prohibitory tariff proposed in the United States will paralyse Canada.

Mr. HICKEY. Nonsense.

Mr. MITCHELL. I tell my hon. friend, and I warn the Government that if there are any annexationists in this country, they are the men who are creating them; they are the men who are doing more to drive this country into annexation by their policy than by any other policy we could adopt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. No? Where will you go with your barley? Where will you find a market for the $2,000,000 worth of eggs which we export to the United States, yearly?

An hon. MEMBER. England.

An hon. MEMBER. We will use them ourselves.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why did you not send them to England before? Where will the French Canadians, all along the border, find a market for their horses? I am sorry the President of the Council is not here, for he comes from the border.

Mr. HICKEY. He knows them better than you do, and his opinion is worth more.

Mr. MITCHELL. He does not; I have forgotten more than ever he knew about them. But I am not so interested in misrepresenting things and in keeping silent; I am not in the receipt of the revenues of a Government office.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). That is the trouble.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have placed in my hands here what the President of the Council used to think. This paper says:

"After watching events for a couple of years, the member for Stanstead came out in the House on a fiscal question by moving the imposition of a duty of 5 cents a pound on hops, to meet a similar duty in the United States. Mr. Colby said: 'They preferred reciprocal free trade, but if there must be a United States tariff, let there be reciprocity of tariffs.' As this question of reciprocity has now become a serious one for the Cabinet of which Mr. Colby is a member, it is interesting to quote Mr. Colby's platform in the election of 1872. In his nomination speech he said: 'What had commended the Government to his support was the desire that he knew they had to accom-

plish reciprocity. It was contended that the country could do very well without reciprocity. It was true, that since the repeal of the treaty our exports had largely increased to the United States, while imports had diminished; but to the Eastern Townships he considered reciprocity paramount, and he would go against the Government which did not endeavor to obtain it.'"

Mr. COLBY. We have not been able to obtain it since, have we?

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you expect to obtain it by flaunting the red rag of defiance in the face of the people of the United States?

Mr. CAMERON. They showed it first.

Mr. MITCHELL. If you wanted to obtain it, you would endeavor to strengthen the hands of the reciprocal tradesmen in the United States; and nobody knows better than the President of the Council that at this moment there is an important element, both in the Congress and the Senate of the United States, anxious for reciprocal trade arrangements with Canada; and yet the Government, of which the hon. gentleman is a member, put the hon. gentleman forward to announce that they do not want reciprocal trade even in natural products. The Government of this country have obtained their position by fraud. They professed to be advocates of free trade arrangements with the people on our southern borders, the only people with whom profitable trade can be obtained by us for the general exports of our country. They got into office on the strength of that policy. They alleged in the campaign of 1878 that their National Policy was only established for the purpose of enabling them to use it as an argument to obtain reciprocal trade with the United States; but after increasing the duties from time to time, they have at last thrown off the cloak, and they now denounce the policy on which they rode into power and through which they are holding their positions of emoluments and office. This country has been sadly misgoverned. If there ever was a time when the attention of the public should be called to the condition of things as they are, it is now. What is the condition of the people of the North-West? Why, the members of the North-West here are in rebellion. There are the mutterings of rebellion among them, but they dare not speak out what is in their minds, because the votes and grants, the aid they require, the representations they make the Government, would be disregarded if they did. But let a convulsion come, let anything happen, such as happened in 1873, and you will find that phalanx behind the Government melt away like April snow, and leave not a corporal's guard behind. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke words of truth and soberness the other night. I never heard more graphic and epigrammatic truths told than what he said about the Government, and I could not help but admire him. He spoke of the magnetism that exists in the head, but that leader, he said, is no statesman. He is a man of education and ability, but no statesman.

Mr. MULOCK. A manager of men.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is just what he is—a first-rate manager of men. He is a gentleman who has no great foresight, no great ability for scheming, and planning, and plotting, but he has the capacity of grasping and sucking the brains of those who do scheme, and plan, and plot; and he has succeeded pretty well in obtaining power and holding it by false representations. What is the condition of the North-West to-day? Why, the promises the First Minister held out to us—of the teeming population which was to flow in there, and which would repay the millions we have expended—these magnificent promises of the present High Commissioner in London, which we have had repeated over and over again, in all our outlays, not only of revenue but of capital—what has been the result of all these? It has been that the immigration into that country, one of the most fertile in the world, offering a home to hundreds of millions of people, has hardly been at the rate of four or five thousand a year. What has been the cause? Ask the representatives of the North-West. I am speaking in the presence of one of the most independent of them, who gave an independent utterance the other night, and I say if you will poll their candid sentiments, they will tell you the Government have been a failure, so far as regards the settlement of the North-West, and that, if that country is to be developed, a very different policy will have to be pursued. The prosperity of Canada turns largely upon that of the North-West Territories. Without that territory as a backbone to Canada, in the face of this China-wall policy of the Government, that country will be driven into annexation, just as sure as we sit on these benches.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a thing to be deprecated. Every one who knows my public career, knows that I have been true to the flag. I have been true, as a matter of sentiment; after my adherence to it, as a matter of interest. But I tell you, Sir, that if this thing goes on, if we continue that policy of driving out the Americans and causing them to retaliate, and if we do not settle that North-West country of ours——

Mr. SPROULE. We should lie down and let them trample on us.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; I would assert our rights, but I would pursue such a policy which would combine conciliation with a firm, manly, self-assertion of our rights. What I blame this Government for is for not having taken a practical way to bring about reciprocal trade arrangements with these people. They have not taken one single step in that direction; they have been questioned time and again as to what they are doing towards obtaining reciprocity, and they have not given a single utterance to show that they are alive to a sense of the duty imposed upon them by their position. No, Sir. They have neglected their duty. There is no public documents before this country showing that they have made any strenuous effort to bring about reciprocal trade relations with the only country with which we can properly trade in regard to the products of our forests, our farms, our mines and our minerals. We have valuable mines all along the line of the Pacific Railway. What has been done by the Government to assist in their development? We see now, that nickel has been taken off the free list in the United States and that our iron ores are to be prevented from entering that country. Take every natural product of Canada, the timber and the lumber of this country, and you find that, when we put an export

duty on logs, the United States retaliate by putting a clause into their Tariff Bill providing that a corresponding duty shall be put on the imports. I will come now to something which interests my people a little more than that which I have been referring to. A large portion of the population in my county are fishermen, and they are generally of the poorest class of people. They are industrious, they risk their lives in going out in fishing boats in all weathers, they toil hard for everything they get, and they have to pay these duties on the pork and the cornmeal that they use. Speaking of cornmeal, there is another fraud. The hon. gentleman says he has given, as a compensation for the duty on flour and cornmeal to the Province of New Brunswick, the reduction of half the duty on molasses. He also spoke of the advantage which they will obtain by allowing corn to be imported free of duty for human food. That is a delusion and a snare. Does the hon. gentleman know whether there is a single mill in the Province of New Brunswick for grinding corn?

Mr. FOSTER. I know several of them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Name them. Where are they?

Mr. FOSTER. There are two in St. John.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where are the rest?

Mr. FOSTER. You might ask your friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor).

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I will take your word for it, but I should like to know if there is one such mill in actual operation?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Even if they are, does that help the people of the north shore? The freight will cost more to take the cornmeal to the north shore that the freight on a barrel of flour from Boston along the coast of Nova Scotia, and the people of our country would have to go to these little millers to get their meal. Why do you not allow cornmeal to come in free, if you have an honest intention to benefit your people? They cannot use the corn to feed their hogs or to feed themselves. There is not a mill for this purpose from Restigouche to Westmoreland; and the hon. gentleman knows it. Yet he says he is giving this as a compensation for the duty on cornmeal and on flour. I have already taken up more time than I had intended. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has handed me a memorandum showing that the duty on flour is 75 cents and the freight for carrying it to the north shore is 70 cents, making a total of $1.45. Now, there is a kind of flour, darker in color, it is true, but sound flour, which has largely taken the position which cornmeal formerly occupied in our Province. If the people can get that flour for 20 cents a barrel as against 70 cents for the other with 75 cents duty, it would enable them to save the cost of the long haul and the extra cost of the flour.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better not take Jones' calculations.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would rather take his calculations than yours. Mr. Jones has no interest in making false statements. He is not interested in using the *suppressio veri*, and that is putting it moderately. I would rather take his statement as to the subject which he understands, than yours in regard to a question which you do not understand. I have spoken longer than I intended to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MITCHELL. I generally sit down when I have done, and I have pretty nearly done now. Perhaps I have spoken a little warmly, but I have said nothing which I did not consider it my duty to say. I found a great excitement existing in the county which I represent, and in that section of country, in regard to this tariff. I find that it is going to be very oppressive to a class of people who get no benefit from the National Policy. I have been made responsible for some of the misrepresentations which have been made as to the benefits which the National Policy, which to a certain extent I once supported, was going to bring about. I would not regret my action if the original propositions of the Government had been carried out; but this policy has grown to such proportions that no one can see the end. We find that there is an increase of 50 per cent. on food, and a large percentage on other articles. What this will reach to afterwards if these hon. gentlemen remain in power, as I hope they will not, no men can foretell. They have declared themselves in favor of reciprocal trade arrangements being made, but, under the pretence of readjusting the tariff, they are taxing the people for the purpose of revenue and in order to build up local manufactures in certain parts of the country. This is unfair and unjust to the people of the country, and it is a condition of affairs which I do not believe the people will endorse when they next get the opportunity to express their views at the polls.

Mr. KENNY. I always listen with particular pleasure and interest to the speeches of my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I look upon the hon. gentleman as one of my political sponsors. I cannot forget that the first time I came to the city of Ottawa, and that is many years ago, the hon. gentleman was a very energetic member of the Cabinet which was led by the right hon. the present Prime Minister. It is, therefore, with pleasing recollections of those early days that I listen to his utterances. The hon. gentleman has told us that in the early days of Confederation what attracted him more particularly was that, under the new arrangement, the confederated Provinces would have the power of making their own tariff. That is the one thing that the Parliament and the people of Canada are as anxious about to-day as they were in the early days of Confederation. They desire, above all things, and they are determined, that they shall retain the power to make their own tariff. I congratulate my hon. friend from Northumberland in being able to make a speech from that side of the House without saying one word disparaging or derogatory to Canada, or to the people of Canada. In that respect, the speech of that hon. gentleman is a bright exception to the harangues with which we have been favored since this debate commenced. From the start of this debate until this moment, nearly every hon. gentleman who has addressed the House from that side, has spoken of Canada in the most depreciatory and disparaging manner.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. KENNY. From the first day, led by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who moved the amendment that is now under consideration, I say nearly every member who spoke from that side of the House has spoken disparagingly of Canada. Not only in this debate, but during all the time I have had the honor of a seat in this Parliament, not a year has passed that we have not been obliged to listen to the same baneful utterances; every year we hear the same doleful sounds and cries of decay, and every year we have these pessimistic stories about distress, and ruin, and decay in Canada. These dismal statements, so regular, so frequent and so persistent, that at first I was disposed to attach some importance to them, but having since become more familiar with the state of Canada, and the position of its people, I have come to realise that these utterances are simply the distorted and perverted utterances of a diseased political imagination. These hon. gentlemen are never so animated, and apparently are never so happy, as when they are belittling and besmirching their own country. I have seen them almost applaud the recital of a calamity which I should suppose, as it was national, as it was Canadian, would appeal to their sympathies and excite their commiseration. Every indication of commercial depression, every sign of manufacturing stagnation, every form of financial or mercantile difficulty which is brought to our notice here, instead of these hon. gentlemen endeavoring to mitigate or palliate, they invariably magnify, exaggerate and intensify. If the crops are poor, and if there is distress in the agricultural and rural districts of the country, the hon. gentlemen have not a word of sympathy for those who are suffering, but they invariably turn round and blame the Government and say that the National Policy of Canada is responsible if the crops will not grow. The farmer of Ontario seems to be the pet aversion of these hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know what the farmer of Ontario has ever done that these gentlemen should be so hostile to him; I am not sufficiently familiar with the domestic history of that Province to be able to solve that question. I always supposed that the Province of Ontario was in a prosperous condition. I was wont to point with pride to the condition of that, our greatest Province, and I am still hopeful that the stories that I have heard of the ruin, the depression and decay which exist there have been greatly exaggerated. But the attempt to injure the Province of Ontario must react upon the whole Dominion. In order to establish their contention that Ontario is in a depressed condition, I find these hon. gentlemen have been obliged to ignore the ordinary sources of information which are available to every person who desires to seek them honestly and impartially, and instead of having recourse to the books that are published by the Liberal Government of Ontario, they have been obliged to resort to the expedient of manufacturing their own statistics. Sir, as regards the Province of Ontario, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion which has taken place, and I have come to the conclusion that the stories of distress which are told about it, are very much exaggerated. But it is not the Province of Ontario alone that suffers from the remarks of these hon. gentlemen; the whole Dominion has also been disparaged. Well, Sir, I believe that the country is all right, that the Dominion is fairly prosperous, and that, after all, it is only the Grit party in this Dominion that is wrong. I believe that all this pessimism may be traced to political disappointment. The political position of the party opposite is so hopeless and so helpless that they actually have to resort to the wretched policy of disparaging their own country. It has been stated that this depression is very general, and in order to emphasise it, and in order that their policy may have some weight, I suppose, in the country, some influence on the minds of the people, they endeavor to convince us that the country is going to ruin. I do not find that to be the case. The hon. member for South Oxford has stated that during the year 1876—and I assume he means all the years during which his party was in power—the condition of this country was comparatively prosperous. In order to inform myself in this respect, I went back to the blue-books, and looking over the trade of the country, and comparing the figures for the two periods under the Mackenzie Administration and that of the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), I find the following results:—

TOTAL IMPORTS OF CANADA.

1875....	$ 123,070,282	1886....	$ 104,424,561
1876....	93,210,346	1887....	112,892,236
1877....	99,327,962	1888....	110,894,630
1878....	93,081,787	1889....	115,224,931
	$ 408,690,378		$ 443,436,358

Showing an increase for Liberal-Conservative period of $34,745,980.

TOTAL EXPORTS OF CANADA.

1875....	$ 77,886,979	1886....	$ 85,251,314
1876....	80,966,435	1887....	89,515,811
1877....	75,875,393	1888....	90,203,000
1878....	79,323,667	1889....	89,189,167
	$ 314,052,474		$ 354,159,292

Showing an increase for Liberal-Conservative period of $40,106,818. Then I have compared the total trade of those periods, and I find that during the four years to which the hon. gentleman has referred, when the country was, as he says, in a prosperous condition, the total trade, imports and exports, from 1875 to 1878, reached $722,742,856, and that the total trade for the last four years amounted to $797,595,650, which gives an increase of trade for the last four years of $74,852,798. So if the condition of affairs was so very satisfactory to the hon. gentleman during the years from 1875 to 1878—if he is simply judging of the condition of the country and not referring to the political position he then occupied—it is evident that the present condition is eminently more prosperous. But hon. gentlemen are disposed to judge of the prosperity of the country by the excess of imports over exports. I have examined into that question too, and I find that from 1875 to 1878 the excess of imports over exports was $94,637,904, and that during the last four years, from 1886 to 1889, the excess was $89,277,066. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has laid great stress on the indebtedness of this country for its imports, and this statement shows conclusively that, during the years when he administered the finances of the country, the excess of imports over exports exceeded the excess during the past four years by $5,360,838. I have also, in order to inform myself accurately and cor-

rectly on this matter, and in order to ascertain if we are really retrograding at the rate hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavoring to make it appear, entered into an examination of the exports, the products of Canada, for the first ten years of Confederation, and I find they amounted to $617,489,132, and for the last ten years they amounted to $787,100,665, or an increase, during the last ten years over the first ten years of Confederation, of $169,611,533. I think these figures will show conclusively that the general trade of the country is in a satisfactory condition, and that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he drew a comparison between the general prosperity which reigned in 1876 and the present time, was more influenced by his recollection of the position he then occupied than by the actual facts. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) also referred, in order to show how rapidly this country was going to ruin, to the fact that during the last five months the deposits in the savings banks had declined $1,800,000. The hon. gentleman is perfectly accurate in those figures; but if he had taken the trouble to look at the deposits in the chartered banks, which bear interest as the deposits in the savings banks do, he would have found that the deposits in those chartered banks had increased during the same period, and I will give the figures in order that there may be no mistake. At the end of August, 1889, the deposits in the chartered banks were $69,500,000; on 28th February, 1890, they were $72,400,000, or an increase of $2,900,000. If, therefore, we deduct $1,800,000 withdrawn from the savings banks from this sum of $2,900,000, there will appear an increase in these items, showing an increased amount of the earnings of the people to the extent of $1,100,000. I also find that the amount on deposit in Dominion savings banks at the end of 1879, before we began to feel the full effect of the National Policy, was $14,700,000, while the amount on deposit at the end of 1889 had reached $53,700,000, or an increase during these ten years of $39,000,000. Let me also look at the condition of the deposits in the chartered banks. In 1879 they amounted to $63,000,000, in 1889 to $123,000,000, showing an increase of $60,000,000; and thus, during these ten years from 1879 to 1889, the savings of the people of Canada have increased, because that is really what these figures mean, namely, that after the people have supplied themselves with all the necessaries of life and many of the luxuries and comforts, they were able to invest in this form, during those ten years, $99,000,000. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) spoke of the condition of the Province of Ontario, and I suppose it is a reflection of the condition of the whole country; and he said the condition was worse than he had remembered it for 35 years. At all events it is gratifying to us—who, perhaps, have not the same sources of information as the hon. gentleman, for he seems to have very original sources of information—to know that while the country is retrograding so rapidly the savings of the people in interest bearing bank deposits alone during the ten years have increased by $99,000,000. I remember a remark made by an hon. gentleman opposite on one occasion, that whenever he had a suggestion to address to the Government he always made it in open House. That is not the custom followed by supporters of the Government, but even a supporter of the Government sometimes finds it advantageous to make a suggestion on the floor of the House; and, before leaving this question of the savings banks of Canada, I desire to call the attention of the Finance Minister and of the members of the Government to the regulations which prevail, today at least, in Halifax. These should be amended, and the amounts which these regulations allow to be deposited annually, and also the total sum to be deposited, should be increased. The present regulations provide that no one shall deposit more than $300 in one year or a total sum of $1,000. The object of the bank and the use to which the bank is applied is essentially that of a savings bank, and it does not at present fulfil as it should do that mission. For this reason: that if a man is anxious to save money to purchase a home for his family, he cannot acquire a suitable property for $1,000. I respectfully suggest to the Finance Minister that he should look into the matter and allow the amount of deposit to be increased. An hon. gentleman opposite referred, the other evening, to the statistics of the population of Canada, which is a favorite topic with hon. gentlemen opposite when it becomes necessary for party purposes to endeavor to create the impression that the country is not prosperous. Sir, I find that the Province of Ontario—this Province which is said by hon. gentlemen opposite to be so depressed, to be going to ruin, and to be a country only fit to get out of—I find that, when I compare the increase of population in that Province with the great State of New York, we have the following result:—

Population of State of New York, 1870... 4,382,750
Population of State of New York, 1880... 5,082,871

Or an increase of 15·97 per cent.

Population of Province of Ontario, 1871.. 1,620,857
Population of Province of Ontario, 1881.. 1,923,228

Or an increase of 18·6 per cent. Therefore, the ratio of increase of the Province of Ontario, which is going so rapidly to ruin, if we are to believe hon. gentlemen opposite, was much greater than in the rich and thriving State of New York. If we go back to the days of our grandfathers—I do not know how many of them were on this side of the Atlantic—we will find that, ninety years before the last census, the population of the United States had increased from 4,000,000 to 60,000,000, just twelve and a half times, while Canada in the same time increased from 156,000 to 4,324,000, or nearly twenty-eight times. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment made no reference specially to the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion, when relating his story of depression, but as I reside in the Eastern Provinces I have taken the trouble to compare the statistics of population of the four New England States, and the four Eastern Provinces of this Dominion. The four States I refer to are Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Maine, including, of course, the great city of Boston. I find that their increase of population between 1860 and 1880 was 24·4 per cent., while in the four Eastern Provinces of the Dominion, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec, between 1861 and 1881, the increase was 25·6 per cent. New Hampshire and Vermont increased only 6 per cent. while the Province of Quebec increased 9 per cent. Prince Edward Island, which for five months in the year is separated from Canadian commerce, had

increased its population from 1860 to 1880 by 28,000, whereas from 1861 to 1881 Vermont, which was in uninterrupted contact with the traffic of the sixty millions of people of the United States, and had free access to its markets at all times of the year, only increased 17,000. Therefore, these New England States, having free access to the trade of the sixty millions of people of the United States, and being nearer that market than we are, had not such an increase of population as the Provinces of this country which lie close to them. The statistics of farm lands are still more remarkable. The increase in the number of acres under cultivation in the four New England States from 1860 to 1880 was 11 per cent., and in the four Canadian Provinces I have referred to, the increase was 43 per cent. In the four New England States the increase in the number of acres under cultivation was 1,200,000, whereas in the four Eastern Provinces of Canada it was over three millions. Although these statistics are no doubt exceedingly tiresome, it will be necessary to enquire a little further into them. Let us take the live stock in these four States, and compare it with the live stock of the Eastern Provinces of Canada. In 1880, as compared with 1860, these four States, having the enormous markets of sixty millions of people, had a decrease of 400,000 head of live stock, whereas in the four Eastern Provinces of Canada, from 1860 to 1880, there was an increase of 465,000 head. That is the result of twenty years of stock-raising, and it shows, after all, that the trade of these sixty millions of people has not done much for the stock-raising of these four north-eastern States. Let us look for one moment at the several principal items of farm produce, namely, wheat, barley, buckwheat, Indian corn, oats, rye, potatoes. In these four New England States the produce was 35,813,451 bushels, and in the Eastern Provinces of Canada 75,000,000. There was a positive decrease in the four New England States of 3,500,000 bushels, while the increase in the Eastern Provinces of Canada was 16,250,000 bushels. These figures will show that in agricultural development and in stock raising our Eastern Provinces will compare favorably with the adjoining States of the Union. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) referred to the changes in the tariff, on beef, pork, flour and lard, and he intimated that this would be a very serious charge upon the people of the Maritime Provinces. Now, in order to arrive at the condition of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and to be able to appreciate the effect that this increased taxation will have upon them, I shall, with the permission of the House, give an authority which, I think, will be unquestioned by the Opposition in this House. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), in the course of his address yesterday, referred to Mr. Gladstone's views of the political economy of the United States of America, and to the controversy which is going on between that distinguished statesman and Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State of the United States. Whilst I have the greatest confidence in Mr. Gladstone, and the greatest admiration, and the greatest respect for him, I do say that as regards the United States of America, and as to what best suits the people of that country, I would sooner take Mr. Blaine as an authority than Mr. Gladstone. But when it comes to a question of the condition of the laboring classes of the Provinces of Nova Scotia, I think I can give my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) an authority which he may consider undoubted. I find that on 8th May, 1884, the Hon. A. G. Jones, addressing the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax, stated:

"Before 1878 the laborers were paid only 80 cents a day, but this was gradually increased to the present rate. He was of opinion that Halifax laborers had no good reason to be dissatisfied. If more money had to be paid for labor, the merchants of Halifax were going to be seriously handicapped. He believed a laboring man who was sober and industrious could get along in Halifax as well as anywhere in the world. He had an idea that we were educating a great many people now out of their sphere of action, and the burden came heavier on us because we had to bear the cost of their education. We were educating too many for emigration. He was glad to know that laborers were living much more comfortably now than they did in the past. He could recollect when wages were 75 cents per day, and flour was $12 to $14 per barrel. Now it was $6.25 per barrel, with tea, potatoes, cottons, and most all the other necessaries of life were just as cheap as ever they were, with wages $1.25 per day."

That shows the condition of the laboring classes in the Province of Nova Scotia in 1884, as described by an authority which I am sure my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) will not question. Now, Sir, let us examine into the increased taxation since that date, when those people were living in comfort and were better off than they had ever been before, when tea, potatoes, cottons, and most of the other necessaries of life were just as cheap as they ever were. What has been the augmentation of taxation on the necessaries of life? It is all contained in the present tariff, and I examine it from the standpoint of my own Province. I find that there has been a very appreciable increase in the duties on beef, pork, flour and lard, which, to a population of 500,000 people, as we may assume the population of Nova Scotia to be, will amount to an increase of about 10 cents per head. My hon. friend from Richmond told us that the reduction of the duty on molasses amounted to about 60 cents per family, or, allowing five persons to a family, 12 cents per head. If he is accurate in that estimate, and as a rebate of 90 per cent. of the duty is to be allowed on the cornmeal ground in Canada, there will positively be no increase in the taxation. My hon. friend spoke of the increased amount which the fishermen would have to pay. My hon. friend must surely be familiar with the fact that the fishermen—those, at least, who are engaged in the bank fisheries—get all their supplies duty free, so that the duties on beef, pork, lard and other provisions do not affect them. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs tells me that it is contemplated to extend the same privilege to the coast fishermen.

Mr. BOWELL. It has been done, not contemplated.

Mr. KENNY. I was not aware of that. Now, Sir, while we are considering these increased duties, I must certainly say that I agree with the remarks that fell from my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that the duty on the kind of pork called clear pork should not be higher than the duty on mess pork. I also desire to point out to the Government that the proposed duty of $6 a barrel on beef actually amounts to 100 per cent. Now, Sir, as I am a protectionist, and I am not ashamed to proclaim myself one here or elsewhere, I am in favor of doing everything possible to de-

velop the great beef and pork interests of this country ; but I think that might be accomplished without such a very large increase of the Customs duties on these items. I hope, therefore, that the hon. Finance Minister, before we go into committee, will carefully revise these two items. My hon. friend from Richmond referred to the increase in the flour duty. The hon. gentleman must remember that the hon. Finance Minister explained to us the reason for that increase—that it was simply to adjust the disparity that existed between the duty on wheat and the duty on flour. He explained to us, that at the rate of 4¾ bushels of wheat to a barrel of flour, the duty on sufficient wheat to make a barrel of flour, would be in the neighborhood of 71 or 72 cents, and the increase of 25 cents a barrel on flour will equalise it with wheat. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), during the course of his remarks, forgot entirely the remission of the duty on cornmeal ; and when that is considered, I think he will recognise that there will be absolutely no increase in the *per capita* taxation on the people of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Richmond said that we should not have a surplus ; he seemed to contend that a surplus was not very desirable ; but I would say to my hon. friend that if we had not a surplus, we must increase the funded debt of the country, and he knows very well that we in the Maritime Provinces are clamoring for subsidies to railways, and that these railways must be assisted by the Dominion. My hon. friend referred to the deficits which had taken place from 1884 to 1889, and my hon. colleague, the senior member for Halifax, pointed out that they aggregated $5,122,000 ; but the hon. gentleman must remember that we paid something like $5,000,000 for rebellion losses, and if we deducted that item, there would be absolutely no deficit during that period. The hon. member for South Oxford gave his opinion that the conditions of Canada do not fit it to become a manufacturing country. I regret that the hon. gentleman did not refer to my hon. colleague, who would have been able to tell him that since the National Policy was inaugurated we have started in the Province of Nova Scotia, sugar refineries, cotton mills, woollen mills, and many other industries, which, if they have not been very remunerative to their shareholders, have employed a very large amount of labor.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And lost their entire capital.

Mr. KENNY. That may be ; I, unfortunately, cannot contradict that as far as the sugar refinery is concerned. It was an infant industry, and the hon. gentleman seems to have taken a particular dislike to all infant industries. The other day when an hon. friend mentioned one, he assailed it on the single ground that it was an infant industry and ought to be strangled. But let me point out to the hon. gentleman that, in the course of his address, he referred to the duty on iron, which, he said, was imposed in consequence of deficits in the revenue. I was in the House when the iron tariff was introduced by the then Finance Minister, the present High Commissioner in London, in 1888, and he made it clear to the House that his object was to encourage the development of our iron industries. That was undoubtedly an eminently protective duty. Any one who has looked into the question must know that there is no industry in the country of greater consequence than the iron industry and that in no country has it been successfully developed except by means of protection. We know that in England for many years iron industries were protected, and that England owes her manufacturing supremacy to those industries, to which all the other industries are very largely contributory and upon which they are largely dependent. In the United States we know that by the imposition of a protective tariff the iron industry has been amply developed. In Canada, as my hon. colleague (Hon. A. G. Jones) has said, it is an infant industry. It has only been two years since the protective tariff was adopted ; yet a great deal has already been accomplished, and I believe much more will be accomplished in the early future. This is a question in which Nova Scotia is particularly concerned ; yet, he said, it is not indigenous to that Province. He seems to be of the same opinion as regards the iron industries, as the hon. member for South Oxford is with regard to our manufacturing industries generally, namely, that none of them have a future in this country. I dissent entirely from that view. I think that the iron industry is eminently indigenous to our Province because we have the iron ores and the coal in close proximity, and, under proper management and protection, they will in a few years be largely developed. Our iron ores of Pictou will be developed, and I find, on looking at the *Official Gazette* of Nova Scotia, that the Lieutenant Governor of that Province was made to say, in a speech which was placed in his hands by the Grit Repeal Government of Nova Scotia :

"Arrangements have been made by my Government for subsidising a line of railway connecting the Intercolonial Railway with the iron mines of the East River, in Pictou County, under conditions which give assurance that the work will be prosecuted immediately, and that at an early date these valuable deposits of iron will be opened and smelting opetations on a large scale carried on."

It is evident, from this quotation, that the members of the Nova Scotia Local Government consider that the iron industry is indigenous to our Province, because they proclaim that they have done all they can to assist it, and express their belief that these deposits of iron ore would be opened and smelting operations on a large scale carried on. That is a very satisfactory answer to the statement of my hon. celleague. But as regards the protection to our iron industries, hon. gentlemen connected with shipping know that, twenty or twenty-five years ago, our sailing ships were regularly engaged in carrying pig iron from England to the United States. The owners of Nova Scotia shipping will also remember that when the protective policy was inaugurated by the United States, the transportation of that article ceased ; and I was very much surprised this morning at receiving from an hon. gentleman who takes an interest in the iron industry, a statement regarding the development of that industry in the United States, which statement will be a surprise to hon. gentlemen who study that question. By protection in the United States, as we are aware, an immense development has taken place in that industry. They are now producing steel rails in the United States almost as cheaply as in any part of the world. The quotation I am about to read is

one which will prove conclusively that under the protective system, the iron industry in the United States has been marvellously developed, and we may expect that the application of the same system to the Dominion will lead to the same results. I read in the Philadelphia press, as follows:—

"There is a good deal of significance in a contract which the Thomas Iron Company have made for the delivery of 1,000 tons of pig iron in Liverpool. Owing to the beneficial efforts of protection, very little pig iron has been imported into the United States of late years, while the price has been steadily declining. While under the protection system the competition within the United States has steadily reduced prices, we have now reached a point when we can export pig iron to England. That is the result of the application of the protection policy to the United States. The prices have so declined that to-day the United States manufacturers are able to export pig iron to England."

Let us see under what tariff this was brought about. The first protective tariff imposed on iron in the United States was, I think at the rate of $8 or $9 a ton. It was then reduced to $7 a ton, and is now reduced to $6 a ton. Our tariff to-day, even with the bounty, amounts only to $6 a ton, but we allow scrap iron in at $2 a ton. In the United States there has been a wonderful development of the iron industry under their protective system, and I believe in Canada the same results will follow the policy this Government have adopted. The advantage of this iron industry to the whole population of a country must be so self-evident that it would be hardly worth while dealing with the question in an assembly like this, were it not that some hon. gentlemen have stated that the farmers of the United States have been crushed under the iron heel of protection. I appeal to hon. gentlemen if they do not think that the condition of the farmers of the United States, bad as it is to-day, would be infinitely worse if they had not a large home market for their products, and whether, if the men employed in the factories and mines were idle, the condition of the farmers would not be absolutely worse?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What about reciprocity?

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman will hear all about that in due course. I might ask my hon. colleague some questions in regard to his arithmetic. He stated that the difference in the price of a barrel of flour would be $1 under this increased duty. He is one of the most successful business men in our community, and, if he can make 25 cents do the work of a dollar, we may be able to understand the secret of his success. The increase is not a dollar.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not say that was the increase. I said that, under this system of putting 75 cents duty on a barrel of flour, we would actually find our flour $1 dearer a barrel in our market than in the American market.

Mr. KENNY. The facilities of transportation are the same now as they were before the duty was increased, and the hon. gentleman knows, that Canadian flour in bond can be carried very easily from any point in the New England States to our seaboard. Therefore, the position is just the same as it was before the change was made. My hon. colleague also referred to the fact that, in the colony of Newfoundland, a larger amount of American flour is imported than of Canadian flour, and he gave us the statistics of last year to prove his statement. I regret that he did not give us the statistics of several years, because, if my memory serves me aright, a much larger amount of Canadian flour went into Newfoundland before last year than during the period to which the hon. gentleman refers. We know that, in the colony of Newfoundland, during the last year or two, the population has been in anything but a prosperous condition. They have been in a worse condition than that which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) makes out the farmers of Ontario to be. They have been so badly off, that the Government of the colony had to send food to the fishermen there, and it is reasonable to suppose that they are not able to buy such a quality of flour as the miners, the lumbermen and the fishermen of Nova Scotia are able to buy. In Sydney, one of the most distant points in the Dominion, a barrel of good, sound Canadian flour can be bought for $5, and, while good flour can be bought at such a price, those people will not likely buy an inferior article. As a matter of fact, the price of flour to-day is no higher than it was since the duty was imposed, and I am told by a friend of mine who is engaged in the business, that the price of home manufactured cornmeal has been sensibly reduced. My hon. colleague could not get through a speech in this House without having a slap at the Jamaica steamers, and he told us that they had been running for fifteen years. I hold in my hand a letter which I received the other day from Halifax, from a gentleman who is well able to give accurate information on this point. It reads as follows:—

"I have your letter of the 18th instant. The change from St. Thomas to Jamaica was made in January, 1880, and the steamers stopped running in June, 1886. For the first few years after the change was made, we could get little or no freight for Jamaica. Before the steamers stopped running, a different class of shippers got into the business, and a regular order of business was established, dealers in Jamaica sending up their orders which they could count upon receiving regularly to the day or almost hour, and, as I take it, a much more wholesome kind of trade between the two places was established."

Therefore, instead of these steamers having run to Jamaica for fifteen years, they have only run from 1880 to 1886.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who is your authority?

Mr. KENNY. I have no objection to show the hon. gentleman personally the signature to this letter, but, as it is a private letter, I do not desire to mention the name across the floor of the House. But does my hon. friend deny the statement? He stated that we have had steamers running to Jamaica for fifteen years. I state that they were only running between 1880 and 1886, and during the two years from 1888 to 1890. That is a very different thing from fifteen years, as the hon. gentleman stated. The hon. gentleman referred to the small cargoes which we received in return from the islands of the West Indies. The very reason why we ask for a subsidy for these steamers is that the return cargoes are small.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to correct an error into which I was inadvertently led before recess, by a remark which fell from the Minister of Customs. I stated that the bank fishermen were privileged

to take their necessary supplies in bond, and consequently paid no duty on pork or other provisions and supplies which they require. I understood the Minister of Customs to say that that privilege is not restricted to the bank fishermen; I understood him to imply that it was also extended to the boat fishermen. In that respect I find I made an error. I was surprised at the time the hon. Minister made the statement, because I could not see, knowing the manner in which the boat fishing is conducted, that it was possible to apply such a system to the boat fishing; I desire, therefore, immediately to correct that mistake. Referring again to the West India trade, and the advantages of having a subsidised line of steamers to the West Indies, our object, mainly, was to advance and develop our export trade. Whilst this trade, in the return cargoes, is yet very much smaller than we desire it to be, it is satisfactory to know that in the item of exports, the trade is increasing. I heard, very recently, of one contract alone for the supply of 1,400 tons of hay for Cuba, and the delivery of it extends over a period from this date until September. That item in itself shows that there is a trade there for the agricultural productions of Canada. Reference was made by the senior member for Halifax to the polariscopic test as applied to our sugars, and the hon. gentleman paid a just tribute to the Minister of Customs for having adopted that improved method of testing our sugars. But the hon. gentleman should also have told us that the Government of which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is a member, has done much more than that for the West India trade. When the senior member for Halifax was a member of the Parliament of Canada, sitting on the Government side of the House, he vainly endeavored to induce the Government of which he was a supporter to take some steps to improve the condition of the West India trade. He told them repeatedly in 1876, and in 1877, that they were depriving the Maritime Provinces annually of from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000 of trade; and in 1878 he also told them that he had been a true prophet, and that Boston and New York had become the capitals of the West India trade. If, now that trade has been brought back to our own country, we have to thank the present Government for it. I desire to say a few words in reference to the condition of our farmers, and the proposal which is made by hon. gentlemen opposite to place the farmers of Ontario on the same plane as the farmers of the United States. I find that the New York *Times*, referring to the condition of the farmers of that country, states :

"The farmers of the United States are staggering under a burden of mortgage indebtedness approximating $9,000,000,000."

I find also that, with reference to the State of Wisconsin, Professor Henry, lecturing in Richmond, Wisconsin, states :

"One of the richest prairies in the United States is that of the St. Croix Valley in Wisconsin."

Of that valley he says :

"To-day the richest part of it is almost without fences; the majority of the farm buildings, especially the barns, are poor, and the people complain bitterly of hard times."

We are told that in Kansas :

"The farmers of this vicinity are burning corn for fuel, finding it cheaper than coal. Corn is sold on the farm at 20 cents per bushel, while the average price of coal delivered at the farm ranges from 21 to 23 cents per bushel. The Farmers' Alliance brought the attention of the farmers to the relative prices of the two commodities, and advised that half the corn crop be used as fuel, thus advancing the price of the other half and saving money in fuel bills. The farmers have begun to act on this advice."

These are States that are tributary to the market of sixty millions of people, yet this is the condition of the farming population of the States of Kansas and Wisconsin. In Ohio we find, from an official statement prepared by the Secretary of State, that :

"The mortgage indebtedness of that State at the present time is no less than $515,511,000. This bears an average interest of six per cent. So that the people of Ohio have to pay $31,000,000 a year in interest, or about $10 a head of the total population. They have also to pay $12 a head for state and municipal taxation, and $5.76 a head for federal taxation. This is how matters stand in Ohio."

Now, Sir, these gentlemen who would try to convince us that the condition of the farmer in the United States is better than that of the farmer in Canada, must know that when the federal, municipal and state debts are added together, the farmer of the United States has a much heavier taxation than the farmer of the Dominion of Canada. Residing in the eastern portion of the Dominion, I naturally take more interest in the condition of the people in those States that are nearest to my own Province, and I find that so great was the decline in the value of farm property in the New England States, that an effort was made by a Mr. Nott, who was a contributor to the York newspapers, to find out the cause, and in the course of his enquiries, he writes as follows to the New York journals :—

"'A Good Farm for Nothing.' The farm which suggests the title is the Foster farm, on the Cold Spring Road, a mile distant from the most beautiful village in New England, Williamstown, Berkshire County, Massachusetts, and within two miles of the station at which twenty passenger trains a day stop. The farm has twice taken a premium as the best managed farm in the district. The price of agricultural products, except hay, mutton and butter, is the same in the neighboring villages of Williamstown and North Adams as in Troy and Albany. There are a farm house and ten farm buildings, which it would take $10,000 to replace, and which are fully worth $6,500 now. Yet the whole farm is offered at the latter price, and, therefore, it is said that the 105 acres of land are really offered for nothing."

Now, I do not think that even the hon. member for South Oxford could show such a condition of things as that in the Province of Ontario. I read again in the Boston *Globe* of this month :

"What a pity to see people rushing like madmen into the wild Sioux reservation country, without food or shelter, while farms in New England can be bought for five dollars an acre, with houses and barns on them which alone cost six times the purchase money. And all to raise corn, at 10 cents a bushel, with no market at that, and reap a yearly crop of cyclones."

Mr. Speaker, I expressed the opinion, that we may attribute all these disparaging remarks which we have heard in this House applied to the people of Canada, to the political disappointment of our friends opposite. These gentleman have told us that in the year 1876 the country was in a prosperous condition. I have read to you tonight statements which were taken from the blue-books, showing the aggregate trade of the country in 1876, and at the present day. And when you consider further the great development of the

banking capital of the country, the great expansion of our manufacturing enterprises, the increased savings of the people, as illustrated in the savings bank returns and in deposits in the chartered banks, I think we must come to the conclusion that the people of Canada to-day are in a condition eminently better than they were in 1876. I am not so optimistic in my views as not to fully recognise that caution ought to mark the guarded way I recognise fully, that nationally, commercially and financially, we have been going—I do not want to say, too fast, but, at all events, at a pretty rapid pace. We have been going under very full sail, and I think it would be wise for us to shorten sail. In my individual capacity as a business man, associated with financial institutions in this country, that is the advice I would consider it my duty to give to those in whom I am interested. And as it affects the individual so it affects the nation, and I do not hesitate to say that I think we should be exceedingly careful in our public expenditure. Not that I see anything that immediately necessitates alarm; but we have been fairly prosperous, we have been spending large sums of money collectively and individually, and therefore we must expect that there may be some reaction. In the course of this debate much has been said regarding our relations with the people of the republic to the south of us. I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that we should endeavor to cultivate the most friendly feelings with the people of the United States. I think that is the desire of the people of Canada, that always has been the desire of the people of Canada, and I believe that the Government of Canada have entertained and do earnestly entertain that desire. Our public men are much better informed of the condition of the United States than the public men of the United States are informed of the condition of Canada, or of the sentiments of our people. With the American people we have much in common. They are of very much the same offspring as ourselves, and they are a bright, intelligent, hospitable people, and those who visit them, I am sure, always hope to go again. I say, then, that we have nothing to blame ourselves as regards our treatment of the American people, or the disposition which our people and the Government of Canada have always shown towards that great nation. Reference was made, also, by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), to the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866. But that hon. gentleman knew well, as we all know, that the treaty was abrogated by the action of the United States Congress, that its abrogation was not the act of the Canadian Parliament; and we all know that every subsequent trade arrangement we have made with that people was abrogated and nullified by the action of the people of the United States, and not by the people of Canada. Only this afternoon the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), when a reference was made to the Alien Bill which was before this House, called attention to the fact that legislation on that question originated at Washington and not at Ottawa, and that, therefore, if there has been any friction between people living on the boundaries of the two nations, the Government of the United States and not the Government of Canada is to be blamed, and must be held responsible for it. As regards our relations with the

United States, hon. gentlemen opposite, in their party difficulty and dilemma, have discovered that the panacea for all their troubles is the fad of unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, or continental free trade, or whatever they choose to call it. There is not one of those hon. gentlemen, who has ever undertaken to tell us what he means by unrestricted reciprocity; we have never had a definition of it from those hon. gentlemen. We see by the public press, that a very prominent Canadian politician has recently visited New York, and it is incidentally stated that he also visited Washington. To-day, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) asked the Government what news the Minister of Marine had brought back from ington. I think, when we ask the Minister of Marine to tell us what news he brings back from Washington, we might also ask the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), if he has any information to give us from Washington? I repeat, that no hon. gentleman opposite has given us a definition of unrestricted reciprocity; but now that one of their number has visited their friends in the United States, we may hope to get a more accurate interpretation of it. Some of us have the good fortune to visit Washington. We go in our individual capacity, and it sometimes falls to our lot to meet gentlemen, not of the exalted position which an envoy would meet, but gentlemen connected with the politics of the United States. I happened to be in Washington a year or two ago. I was not accompanied by the New York leader of the Grit party on that occasion. I was there in my individual capacity. I had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of some gentlemen in fairly prominent positions there, and ever since those gentlemen have been good enough to send me all the public papers printed and circulated at Washington which bear upon the trade relations of the United States of America with Canada. Amongst the documents which have been forwarded to me and which interest us, as every discussion at Washington must interest us which in any way pertains to the relations of that country with Canada are certain speeches made in Congress. I have read them for the purpose of ascertaining what is the animus of the public men of the United States towards Canada. I hold in my hand an official copy of a speech made by Hon. John Sherman of Ohio in the Senate of the United States, on 18th September, 1888. On that occasion this distinguished senator, who, it will be remembered, before the last presidential election was quite a possibility for the position of President, moved on that occasion the following resolution:—

"Resolved, that the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to enquire into and report at the next Session of Congress the state of the relations of the United States with Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada, with such measures as are expedient to promote friendly commercial and political intercourse between those countries and the United States, and for that purpose to have leave to sit during the recess of Congress."

Those hon. gentlemen opposite who tell us that we cannot live without this commercial union with the people of the United States have never pointed out to us that nearly every public man in the United States, either in Congress or out of Congress, that nearly every newspaper that has ever referred to the question in any way, that nearly every magazine article that has appeared, has distinctly said that commercial union, means political union. In

glancing over this speech made by the Hon. John Sherman there are some statements in it which, with the permission of the House, I will read. The first extract is one that is not political, but it refers to the Canadian canals, and it, therefore, may interest hon. gentlemen. Senator Sherman said :

"We have no right to complain that Canada levies tolls on vessels passing through her canals, though we levy none on American canals, for that right is expressly recognised by the Washington Treaty. All that we can ask is that no higher or other tolls are levied on American vessels than on Canadian vessels, that no discriminations are made under cover of drawbacks or bounties in favor of Canadian ports and against American ports. If we object to tolls we should do what we ought to have done forty years ago, and for which I voted for thirty years ago—build a canal around the falls of Niagara on American soil."

The senator, in the course of his speech, further said :

"Our whole history, since the conquest of Canada by Great Britain, in 1763, has been a continuous warning that we cannot be at peace with each other, except by political as well as commercial union."

Now, Sir, there is the emphatic opinion of one of the most prominent and distinguished senators of the United States, and yet I remember the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us the other day that we should always hold out the olive branch to the people of the United States, and that we should be exceedingly careful that we should not refer to them in a contemptuous or impertinent manner. I have never heard any reference in this Legislature to the people of the United States that was at all contemptuous or impertinent. I have heard the assertion of our own rights, but I have never heard anything that savored of impertinence. I suppose, however, that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would be quite satisfied with this olive branch, which is tendered us from the Senate at Washington, and which tells us distinctly that there can be no peace except by a commercial and political union. In the sentence which I shall next read to you, delivered by Senator Sherman, of Ohio, he speaks more kindly and more confidently of Canada than the hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of doing in the Legislature of their own country. Hon. Mr. Sherman says :

"Canada is now stronger, more populous and wealthier than the United States was when the Constitution was formed. In one hundred years, our country has been increased fifteen-fold in population, five-fold in extent and twenty-fold in wealth, productions and resources. We may anticipate for Canada, the same proportionate growth in population and wealth."

Hon. gentlemen opposite are not as hopeful of the future of Canada as the distinguished Senator from Ohio evidently is. He goes on to say :

"But neither can grow in extent, for the continent is shared between us."

I will quote the concluding part of this remarkable speech :

"True statesmanship consists in an earnest effort by honest means, to promote the public good. No greater good can be accomplished than by a wise and peaceful policy to unite Canada and the United States, under one common government, but carefully preserving to each state its local authority and autonomy. This controlling principle of blending local and national authority—many in one—was the discovery of our fathers, and has guided the American people thus far in safety and honor, and I believe can be and ought to be extended to the people of Canada. With a firm conviction that this consummation, most devoutly to be wished, is within the womb of destiny, and believing that it is our duty to hasten its coming, I am not willing, for one, to vote for any measure, not demanded by national honor, that will tend to postpone the good time coming, when the American flag will be the signal and sign of the Union of all the English speaking people of the continent, from the Rio Grande to the Arctic Ocean."

Now, Sir, I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that that is what their agitation for commercial union leads to. I tell them that it is not fair to the people of Canada to attempt to mislead us by telling us we can have commercial union without political union, when the other parties to the bargain tell us, honestly and candidly, that it can only be obtained by political union. This document which I have read from, as I told you, is an official document issued by the Printing Bureau at Washington, and it is headed : "Relations with Canada —Annexation." Now, that is one olive branch offered to us, and let me give you another one. I will quote the views of the Hon. Benjamin Butterworth, whose name has been very frequently before the Canadian people in this controversy. The article reads as follows :—

"Before the United States Congressional Committee on Friday last, Congressman Ben. Butterworth appeared and addressed the committee in support of his Bill for reciprocity with Canada. He said : 'As between Canada and the United States, there is not a gentleman who does not know that from every standpoint the United States has the coign of vantage. The trouble with the question of reciprocity is that politics enters into it and not statesmanship. I do not appeal to politics, but to that statesmanship which would give to our people an opportunity to have the benefit of the broad domain north of the St. Lawrence. Canada would be assimilated. (I do not use the word annexed, as it might be unpleasant to some people). It was so written in the book of destiny. The people of Canada are our kith and kin, and a very good assortment too. The highway to assimilation is closer commercial relations, because where a man's treasure is, there will be his heart also.' Such is the Butterworth scheme."

So speaks one of the greatest authorities on the commercial union fad. Now, Mr. Speaker, the name of Mr. Wiman, of New York, formerly of Canada, has been long identified with the project of commercial union. As far as I know, it has either originated with him, or in the fertile brain of some discontented Grit politician in Canada. Be that as it may, in quoting the name of Mr. Wiman in this Legislature, I desire to do so in all personal respect to that gentleman. I have never met him, but, some years ago, he extended great kindness to members of my family whom he met abroad, and for that I have always felt grateful to that gentleman. But, Sir, as a public man in Canada, dealing with a great question, dealing with the future of this country, dealing with the question which we are forced to deal with by the resolution now before us, I have to refer to that gentleman. Mr. Wiman appeared before the Committee of the United States Senate which was collecting evidence on the trade relations with Canada ; and I hope I will not weary the House if I give you a few extracts from his evidence, as reported in the Toronto *Mail :*

"Mr. Erastus Wiman was the next witness. He spoke at length about the general desire of the Canadians for closer relations with this country. Mr. Wiman believed there would be a very strong British protest against the political union of Canada with the United States."

That is evidently what Mr. Wiman contemplated ; he contemplated a political union of the two nations and he goes on to say :

"Canada will be better a hundredfold by annexation (he does not say commercial union). The question of political annexation was not growing as rapidly as it ought. A

forced annexation could not be thought of. He believed that annexation at present in practical politics was an absolute impossibility. There were those who conceived that the best way to get a political union between the two countries was to open up an intimate trade alliance."

Therefore, Mr. Wiman tells these hon. gentlemen who have been associated with him, who, I understand, have been in constant correspondence with him, that the only way in which we can have a commercial union is by political union; and we must, at all events, admire that gentleman's candor. In the course of his evidence—and I desire to call the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition to this statement—Mr. Wiman says:

"One objection to the annexation of Canada was the immense increase of late years of the French Roman Catholic population."

It seems that the great objection to political union is the fact that we have a large number of French Roman Catholics in Canada. I do not know how the number can be reduced. I believe, across the border, it is not customary to have large families; but while the French Canadians increase as fast as they do, I think it will be a long time before Mr. Wiman or any one else gets them out of Canada. Mr. Wiman went on to say:

"The fact that Canadian railways were not under the interstate commerce law gave them an advantage. If a proper commercial arrangement were made between the two countries, this would not be so."

In other words, he thought the Canadian railways should also be assimilated or annexed. He was asked by Senator Hoar as to what raw material Canada could furnish the United States with; and the answer interests us, because it shows us that the great champion of commercial union is obliged to tell the Senate Committee what raw material the United States will take from Canada. He replied:

"Canada can furnish us with lumber, coal on the Pacific coast, nickel, asbestos and iron ore."

That is the best authority we can get as to the trade in raw material which commercial union will open to us, if we surrender our political existence and our right to make our own tariff—if we surrender all that Englishmen and free men in every country prize most highly. That is very encouraging. Not a pound of coal from Cape Breton or Pictou—only the coal on the Pacific coast. What is the reason these gentlemen do not want our Nova Scotia coal? I find the reason in the report of the same Committee of the Senate, but not at the same meeting. That committee held a meeting in the city of Boston, where the president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, in the course of his evidence, said:

"Our country produces all the coal, iron ore, and pig iron that is necessary for our home consumption."

He tells us distinctly that they do not want our coal, iron ore or pig iron, as they have plenty of those materials of their own. At the same meeting evidence was given by Congressman Morse, who said—and this is one of the olive branches they are extending to us:

"If the Dominion of Canada would conform its protective tariff to ours, so that we would have uniformity of tariff and protection to American industries, and if Canada would also consent to a just and fair adjustment of the fishery dispute in the two oceans, I would favor a reciprocity treaty between the two countries."

It is very unfortunate that we should be obliged to cross the border to get information on a subject which concerns us so much, when hon. gentlemen opposite possess all the information, if they would only divulge it and tell us what they do mean. But I will submit to the House another olive branch. Hon. gentlemen, I dare say, are acquainted with General Wilson, who gave his evidence before the same Senatorial Committee, and who contended that, *nolens volens*, Canada should be annexed to the United States. Mr. Wiman and his friends were rather shocked at that proposal, and a meeting was held where this question was fully discussed by Mr. Wiman and General Wilson. I will make this short extract from Mr. Wiman's speech:

"He expatiated on the value of Canada's trade, which he said was now equal to $10 a head of Canada's population, and added: With the barriers between the United States and Canada obliterated, English goods discriminated against, and an open and a free market for the development of natural resources within Canada, every Canadian would be worth $100 instead of $10 as a customer of the United States."

That is what commercial union is to give us, and I think it would be very difficult for hon. gentlemen opposite to show that we would get anything like compensation for such a surrender. Mr. Wiman here lays down his scheme of commercial union, to which I invite the consideration of this House. He says:

"The tariff of Canada should never be lower than that of the United States. In fact, the tariff of the continent should be regulated at Washington. As to its height, it should be administered by a joint commission, in which, of course, the United States should have a preponderance. The total receipts should be pooled in one purse, and the amount divided according to population."

Now, I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite, as Mr. Wiman has told us what he means by commercial union, if that is also what they mean? Now, Sir, accepting Mr. Wiman's interpretation of commercial union, let us apply it to our condition. The members of this House will see that it is contemplated that our Customs tariff should be raised to that of the United States. The practical effect of that would be that we should have to pay some $3,000,000 a year more in Customs duties than we pay now, inasmuch as the tariff of the United States is so much higher than ours. What would we get back? We would pay into the common fund $3,000,000. Our population is 5,000,000, and that of the United States, 65,000,000, so that we would get back one-thirteenth of that sum, or $240,000. We would, therefore, be $2,760,000 worse off on that item alone. Besides, by this arrangement, our treasury would lose the revenue which is now derived from the duty on imports from the United States, and which amounts to $7,300,000. How is that amount to be made up? It will have to be made up, I suppose, according to a suggestion which fell from an hon. gentleman opposite during the course of this debate—by an income tax. It would have to be made up by direct taxation. If our revenue is to be depleted to that extent, there is nothing else for it but direct taxation. I suppose, when I make this statement, I shall be called captious or, perhaps, impertinent; but that is the only outcome I can see to such a condition of things. Now, this meeting to which I have referred, between these two gentlemen, who take such a very great interest in our affairs, was closed by the following remarks by General Wilson:—

"At the close of the debate, General Wilson stepped forward and said that he would not attempt to gainsay a

single word that Mr. Wiman had said, for both were in favor of annexation, but sought it by different methods."

It is not fair or just, with this knowledge before us and these impressions on our mind, that we, having a public duty to discharge, should conceal them either from our fellow-members in this House or from the people of Canada. During the course of this debate, I find that one hon. gentleman opposite complained of the National Policy, because wheat had declined, from 1879 to 1890, 45 cents, and he blamed the National Policy for this decline. Well, that hon. gentleman must have known that the price of wheat in Canada is regulated by the price in the great markets of the world, and that while, in 1879, wheat in England was $1.80 a bushel, in 1890, in the same market, it was $1.08. There was, therefore, a decline of 72 cents in England, as compared with 45 cents in Canada. But, of course, not one hon. gentleman opposite would be happy if he did not take advantage in this debate of the opportunity to assail the National Policy; in fact, everything which tends to create a national sentiment in this country, seems to displease hon. gentlemen opposite. What has the National Policy done for this country?

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman does not know. We would never have heard of commercial union but for the National Policy; even their own fad would never have blossomed into existence but for it. Who ever heard of Mr. Wiman or of the emissaries of the American manufacturers coming amongst us until we had the National Policy? Who ever heard before of pilgrimages from the United States by leading American politicians to this country, and the more of these gentlemen come the better, for God forbid they should judge of Canada by what they hear from the Opposition. I am delighted when I see gentlemen holding responsible positions in the United States visiting our country, as they did last year, and I am always glad when hon. gentlemen on either side of politics extend them welcome. I hope when return visits are made to Washington, that the same hospitality will be extended to our representatives. The National Policy has not only made us more prosperous at home, but it has made us better known abroad.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has sent a million of Canadians across the line.

Mr. KENNY. If the hon. gentleman had remained in power from 1878 to 1890, I hardly think there would have been a Canadian left in the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You quadrupled the emigration once you got into power, and you drove away immigrants also.

Mr. KENNY. The National Policy has developed our manufacturing industries enormously, no matter what hon. gentlemen opposite may say. I believe these industries have not been very remunerative to individual shareholders, and I can speak feelingly on that point. We have not become millionaires, but we have found employment for our people, we have developed the resources of our country, and have kept our population at home. I say, therefore, that we never would have received this amount of attention which we have received from the Legislature and the press and the people of the United States, but for the National Policy and the construction of our great transcontinental railway. I believe that our transcontinental railway system succeeded in attracting the attention of Congress and the people of the United States towards us a great deal more than our National Policy did. I readily admit that, so long as the American manufacturers could use Canada, as they did when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Finance Minister, as a slaughter market for their surplus productions, that was all they wanted, and in those happy days we never had visits from Mr. Wiman and the other missionaries of the fad. We would not be doing our duty to ourselves or to our constituents if we did not endeavor to ascertain what these hon. gentlemen mean by unrestricted reciprocity. Not one of them has ever explained it, and I have, therefore, been driven across the border to ascertain exactly what the other parties to the bargain mean by commercial union. No matter how hon. gentlemen may attempt to disguise it, no matter how they may be misled, no matter how willing they may be deceived, the fact remains that commercial union means political union. If I were an American, I would be very glad indeed to see this country attached to the United States. We are worth a great deal more than we were in 1876.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Particularly our farm lands. They are not worth by $200,000,000 what they were worth twelve years ago.

Mr. KENNY. I say, unhesitatingly, that we are worth a great deal more to the people of the United States than we were in 1876. I believe they desire the acquisition of this country, and I am not surprised at it. A country which has shown the recent growth which Canada has shown, a country of our manufacturing development, a country with a population like ours, would be a great acquisition to any nation, and I do not wonder that the people of the United States desire the acquisition of Canada. In our intercourse with them, they do not disguise this desire. There is scarcely an American who knows anything about this country who does not believe that it is their manifest destiny to rule it. There is one trait of the American character which we should admire, and that is their love of their country. No matter how much an American may differ from his fellow-countrymen, he always has a kind word to say for his country. That is a lesson which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite, when they go to New York and to Washington, will learn; and I hope that when they come back their patriotism will be developed, and they will think and speak more kindly of Canada than they have in the past. I have wondered what the legislators and the public men of the United States must think of certain of our public men when they read the annals of our Parliament, and the remarks made by certain hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to their own country. Whatever may be our opinion as to the Government of the country for the time being, whatever may be our party differences, let us take care that we utter no uncertain sound when our political status is assailed. Let us show that we desire above all to retain the right of self-government, and to arrange our own fiscal policy in conformity with the varying in-

terests of our own country. Self-government is our inheritance, and it should be the ambition of every Canadian to hand it intact to his children.

Mr. WATSON. It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat through the long speech which he has made. As a representative from a Western Province, I intend to deal more particularly with the interests of the Province from which I come. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kenny) has stated that if the American statesmen were to read the speeches delivered in this House they would be astonished. I think that when the people from his Province read his speech they will be astonished.

Mr. KENNY. They have heard it before.

Mr. WATSON. We have all heard it before. The hon. gentleman did state that, as a business man, he would advise the Government to draw in the sail. In other words, he admitted that the Dominion of Canada was becoming extravagant.

Mr. KENNY. I did not say that.

Mr. WATSON. In fact, he has given advice to his friends in business, and also to the Government, to go a little slower. We can, at all events, agree with him in those sentiments. He has quoted statements from many individual members of the United States Congress in reference to freer trade relations with Canada, but he has not referred to the resolution introduced by Mr. Hitt, who represented a Committee which passed resolutions tending to freer trade relations with us. If he had referred to that as an olive branch held out by the United States to Canada, he would have touched the question more directly. We have before us the Hitt resolution and the McKinley resolution. One is held out to us as inviting freer trade relations, while the McKinley resolution is entirely opposite to that, and will probably be put in force, especially after the speech made by the President of the Council. Representing, as I do, an agricultural district, I believe that, if that resolution is put in force, it will be a bad thing for Canada. We are not in a position to attempt to enforce a retaliatory policy against the United States. The Legislature of the Province which I represent passed, on the 20th March, a resolution which I will read. I believe that the policy advocated by that House would be supported by 90 per cent. of the people of Manitoba. This resolution was passed unanimously, and was based on a similar resolution which was passed on the report of a special committee, formally appointed for the purpose of seeing how the tariff affected the Province of Manitoba. The resolution reads as follows:—

"Whereas, in the year 1884, a special committee of this House was appointed to enquire into the operation of the tariff on agricultural implements, lumber, canned fruits, &c., and submitted a report to this House, signed by the Hon. Mr. LaRivière, then a member of the Government, stating, among other things that the tariff on articles absolutely necessary for settlers bears very heavily upon our people:

"That the said report was approved of by the Legislative Assembly and presented to the Dominion Privy Council by the delegates sent by this Province in said year 1884, to obtain certain rights:

"And the tariff has continued, since the year 1884, and still continues, to press very heavily upon the people of the Province of Manitoba;

"And whereas, on account of our geographical position, it would be a very great benefit to the people of this Province to have closer trade relations with the States of the American Union lying to the south of us;

"And whereas, this Legislature considers the question of closer trade relations with the American States, as aforesaid, so important to the interests of the people of this Province that, although the subject is one beyond our jurisdiction, still, it is advisable to make representations to the authorities that have jurisdiction in the matter, with a view of obtaining an amelioration of our condition;

"And whereas, the late Honorable John Norquay, and Honorable C. E. Hamilton, representing this Province at the Quebec Interprovincial Conference in 1887, agreed to a resolution in favor of unrestricted reciprocity:

"Therefore, be it resolved, that a humble petition be presented by this House to the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, praying that steps be taken by the said Dominion Parliament to negotiate with the Government of the United States of America, with the view of arriving at some arrangement by which there should be unrestricted reciprocity in trade between the two countries; and also, that a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, praying that he will take the state of the Province into consideration, and take such steps as may be necessary in order to facilitate the bringing about unrestricted reciprocity in trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America."

That resolution was carried unanimously in the Local Legislature in Manitoba on the 20th of March last, and I feel satisfied, knowing the people there as I do, that that resolution is endorsed by at least 90 per cent. of the people of Manitoba, and the other 10 per cent., if they oppose it, do so for reasons not in the interests of the Province of Manitoba. The people of that Province are becoming satisfied that the existing protective tariff bears more heavily upon that Province than it does on any other Province of the Dominion. That has been contended in this House for years. They have no large manufactures in that Province to benefit by a protective tariff, and we feel that it is a heavy burden upon our people to pay such heavy taxes for the purpose of maintaining the manufacturers in the Eastern Provinces. I may say that, so far as I am personally concerned, I do not believe that the manufacturers of eastern Canada are making such large profits as some people imagine. In 1883, when the increased duty was placed on agricultural implements, the manufacturers in eastern Canada asked the Government to admit the raw material free of duty. The Government said: No; we will not admit raw material free of duty, but we will give you 10 per cent. increase protection on the manufactured article. The result is that the eastern manufacturers to-day are paying a high duty on the raw material which enters into the manufacture of the goods consumed by the farmers of Canada. A week ago I was up west, and in speaking to one of the largest firms, manufacturing and shipping implements to Manitoba, they told me that at that time they were importing several car-loads of bar iron from Pittsburg, upon which they were paying a duty of $13 per ton. Now, when these gentlemen pay such heavy duties on raw material, it cannot be expected that we are going to get implements as cheap as we would if there was no duty on raw materials. They have got to pay the price of the raw material, they have got to pay the duty in cash, and pay the freight, all, probably, twelve months before that material is manufactured into the article and sold to the consumer; besides, they have got to pay interest on the investment. Now, it has been contended by hon. gentlemen in this House that the duties do not bear heavily on the people of Manitoba, inasmuch as implements are cheaper there now than

they were ten years ago. I think that is no argument, because implements are cheaper everywhere. I am satisfied that, if we did not have this high duty on implements, they would cost just about the amount of the duty less in Manitoba than they cost to-day. I am satisfied that, not only do we pay duty on the goods which come into our Province, and that are imported directly, but we have to pay almost as high for all the goods that come from the east as we pay on the imported goods which we import and pay duty upon. Manitoba is purely an agricultural country. No doubt we have natural mineral wealth in that Province which will be developed in the future; but at the present rate of immigration we cannot expect that the natural wealth of the country in minerals will be developed, because it would not pay to erect large factories for the purpose of manufacturing the raw material. Now, I find, in looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, that we still import from the United States a large quantity of agricultural implements which are necessary for the farmers of Manitoba for tilling the soil. I wish to show the quantities that we have imported and their value, and the amount of duty we have had to pay. I say that that Province, with 125,000 of a population, is paying more duty on agricultural implements than all the rest of the Dominion put together, and I think that should be sufficient evidence that, so far as we are concerned, we cannot be satisfied so long as this high rate of duty is maintained on agricultural implements. I find that last year, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, we imported the following agricultural implements from the United States, with the values and duties as given below:

—	No.	Value.	Duty.	Duty Paid by Manitoba
		$	$ cts.	$ cts.
Seed Drills—				
Total	166	4,594	1,607 90	
Manitoba	148	4,364	1,527 40	1,527 40
	18	230	80 50	
Harrows—				
Total	122	1,396	486 85	
Manitoba	85	656	222 60	222 60
	37	755	264 25	
Harvesters and Binders—				
Total	35	3,815	1,335 25	
Manitoba	21	2,745	960 75	960 75
	14	1,070	375 50	
Ploughs from Great Britain—				
Total	46	1,815	635 25	
Manitoba	43	1,712	599 20	599 20
	3	103	36 05	
Ploughs from United States—				
Total	3,199	58,734	20,480 59	
Manitoba	2,997	56,402	19,667 03	19,667 03
	202	2,332	813 56	
Implements, N.E.S., from Great Britain—				
Total	.....	12,735	4,456 65	
Manitoba	.....	8,144	2,850 40	2,850 40
	.....	4,591	1,606 25	
Implements, N.E.S., from United States—				
Total	.....	64,603	22,616 82	
Manitoba	.....	11,370	3,997 55	3,997 55
	.....	53,233	18,619 37	
Fanning Mills—				
Total	618	6,910	2,418 50	
Manitoba	558	6,512	2,279 20	2,279 20
	60	398	139 30	
Horse Power—				
Manitoba	10	1,660	.....	580 95
Portable Engines—				
Total	42	25,974	9,090 91	
Manitoba	15	15,002	2,250 70	2,250 70
	27	10,972	6,840 21	
Threshers and Separators—				
Total	100	27,877	9,757 30	
Manitoba	86	26,492	9,272 20	9,272 20
	14	1,385	485 10	
Duty on Repairs	.....	.....	.....	1,915 49
				46,123 47

It has been contended in this House that practically we do not import any harvesters and binders. Now, I wish to say that the farmers in Manitoba realise that they have to pay an extra price for their harvesters and binders on account of the 35 per cent. protection; they realise that they pay fully 35 per cent. more for that article than it is sold for across the line. Mr. Maxwell informed me that they sold in Manitoba for $160 cash, or $180 on credit. That is the information I received from Mr. Maxwell, in St. Mary's, about a week ago, and I think that statement cannot be contradicted. These same binders are sold in Dakota for $120. This is the information given me by a man who purchased binders there recently. The duty on these machines does not amount to much, but we have to pay the same price for Canadian machines that we have to pay for the American machines, consequently if the duty was reduced, we would get the benefit of that reduction. The Ontario manufacturers have had to combine in order to keep up the price on account of the tremendous expense and outlay they have to meet in buying the raw material that they require. There are other articles less important that the farmers of Manitoba have imported from the United States, and on which they have paid duty; but, I have not taken the trouble to enumerate them. It further appears that Manitoba has paid on lumber, an article that must be used by every settler, $17,714. When this amount is added to the duties paid on implements, it is found that Manitoba contributed last year directly to the revenue no less than $64,058. While we are endeavoring as best we can to secure the rapid and complete settlement of Manitoba, the Government are not acting with sufficient liberality, and I do not

altogether approve of the means of distributing the small amount they do expend ; and I desire to point out that the Government by their system of taxation, collects in duties on necessary implements for the settler, and the lumber required to erect his house, $10,000 more than they are spending this year on immigration. This is a matter that should receive the consideration of the Government, when they are endeavoring to induce people to go into Manitoba and the North-West. Last year I submitted a statement of the extra cost to a settler starting in Manitoba as compared with Dakota, simply on account of the duties he is called upon to pay, and I showed that $240 more was required by a settler in Manitoba as compared with one on the south side on the international boundary line. In addition to these items to which I have drawn attention, there is that of fencing wire, and on that article I contend that the consumer pays the full amount of the duty in every instance. Further, there is binding twine, an article which I contend should be placed on the free list. It is estimated that this year there will be 1,000,000 acres under cultivation in the Province of Manitoba, and as regards the North-West Territories, we have no figures on this point ; but it is safe to say that there will be 1,000,000 acres under crop, taking Manitoba and the Territories together. On an average, two pounds of binding twine are required to bind for an acre under crop. The duty on binding twine is 1¼ cents a pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, or about 2¼ cents. Admitting that we do not pay the full duty, we undoubtedly pay a duty of 2 cents a pound. On 2,000,000 pounds of twine, we will accordingly pay a duty of $40,000. This is a subject which should be considered by the Government. It must also be remembered that binding twine is not a large industry, for all the rope-walks do not employ more than 400 or 500 men, and many of these are cheap laborers. That being the case, the people of Manitoba could afford to bonus these establishments to go out of business, and as there are only five rope-walks in Canada manufacturing binding twine, the people of Manitoba could afford, out of the extra amount paid, to bonus each factory to the extent of $8,000 a year each to go out of the business. Under these circumstances it is evident that this is a very heavy tax imposed on the people of the North-West. On a farm of 160 acres the settler is paying 4½ cents an acre for the privilege of using twine to bind his crops. We also find that instead of advocating what we suppose they favored, unrestricted trade with the United States, and we on this side of the House do not ask commercial union, but unrestricted trade, hon. gentlemen opposite now appear to view such a proposition with disfavor. I had hoped from the speeches delivered last year that the Government favored unrestricted trade, and especially so when they placed green fruits on the free list, which was a great benefit to the people of Manitoba. While we can grow the small fruits, such as currants, fruits such as apples and plums are imported from the United States or the eastern Provinces. A duty on such fruit becomes a serious matter when this duty has to be paid on the whole consignment, while probably one-half is spoiled. I regret very much to notice that the Finance Minister again places these goods on the dutiable list. He does not adopt this action as one beneficial to a large portion of the population, but he does so to meet the views of the growers in two or three counties, who cannot supply even the local demand ; and yet, in order to meet their wishes, the hon. gentleman imposes undue taxes on the people at large. I think Manitoba, situated as she is geographically, and removed from those eastern portions of Canada which may to some extent—although I think otherwise—benefit by the protective tariff, should have some exceptions made in her favor, especially as regards articles required by the settler. If we expect people to come there, we must show them that it is a cheaper country to live in and to start farming in than the States to the south of us. I am not here to speak of Manitoba, as I have heard some gentlemen speak for the Provinces they represent. I have no doubt in my mind, from what I know of the Province of Ontario, and from what I heard from gentlemen on this side of the House, with regard to the indebtedness of the farmers of that Province, but that the statements they make are absolutely correct, so far as I can speak as a representative of the Province of Manitoba. I say that, comparatively speaking, Manitoba is in a flourishing condition. Manitoba, I believe, is to-day the best country in the world open for immigration. We have a better country than they have to the south of us. We have natural advantages there which they have not to the south. On account of their elevation they are troubled more with drought and frosts than we are, and we are unacquainted with the terrible cyclones they have in summer, and the fierce blizzards they have in winter in the States to the south. We have the finest country in the world for agricultural purposes. I have lived thirteen years in Manitoba, and I have seen thirteen crops reaped in the surrounding country of the town in which I live, and I can say, from my experience, that I have never seen a failure of a crop either from drought or frost. It is true that some portions of Manitoba have suffered from these inconveniences, but you will find such exceptional districts in all portions of the Dominion of Canada. Naturally, we hear more about frost and drought in Manitoba, on account of its being a new country. For instance, if we were to take the condition of the people around Kingston a year ago as a sample of Ontario, it would not be fair to Ontario, and so, if we were to take some isolated sections of the Province of Manitoba that had suffered by drought or frost, we would not be speaking fairly of Manitoba and the North-West generally. Situated as we are geographically, and considering our facilities for manufacturing, and our easy access to the markets to which we can send our produce, I do maintain that if the Government expect that Province to grow, as we hope it will grow, and as it must grow, they must move in the direction indicated by the resolution of the Local Legislature of that Province. It is of the utmost importance that we should have freer trade relations with the people to the south, not only for the purpose of obtaining our supplies, if we can get them cheaper, but also to find a market for our produce. To-day we are situated in rather an awkward position in the Province of Manitoba. There is a duty of 15 cents per bushel on wheat,

and, so far as that duty is concerned, the freight charges for bringing the wheat from, say, Winnipeg, to any portion of Ontario, is just about the duty in excess of the freight charged in shipping wheat from Duluth to the eastern portions of Canada. That being the case, it is of great importance that we should have the market of the United States for our grain. The wheat-fields of Minnesota are failing, and are not yielding the large crops for the last few years as they did formerly. The result is, that the millers of Minneapolis, where they have capacities for grinding immense quantities of flour daily, want to get our Manitoba hard wheat. If we had unrestricted trade with the United States, Minneapolis would be an enormous market for our No. 1 hard wheat. In the United States they have competition in railway freight rates which we have not as yet in Manitoba. We have, it is true, since the Northern Pacific Railway went in there, better freight rates than we had a few years ago, but that railway has not yet its connection in the east and we have not the same competition as they have in the States. The freight from Minneapolis to Montreal is 32½ cents per 100 pounds and from Winnipeg to Montreal 46 cents per 100 pounds, which shows the disadvantages under which we are placed with regard to railway transit. South of the line they have railway competition and their freights are lower. It is true that where railways have a monopoly in the United States they charge all they can, for I believe that corporations have no souls and they will take no less than they possibly can get. As I said before, we have in Manitoba and the North-West the best field for immigration open to the world to-day, and we are endeavoring to induce the Government to increase the expenditure for the purpose of making our country known throughout the world as a field for immigrants. One of the best arguments that could be used in favor of people settling in that country is, that we could tell them that we have unrestricted trade with the United States. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has asked us what we understand by unrestricted trade with the United States? My idea of unrestricted trade is, that I shall be allowed to sell my products in the dearest market, and that I shall be allowed to buy what I want in the cheapest market. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are not advocating commercial union. I believe myself that commercial union might lead to political union, and so far as I am concerned, and so far as the people of Manitoba are concerned, they have no wish for political union. But, if there is one thing that will drive the people of the western portion of the Dominion into seeking and asking for annexation, it is the policy at present pursued by the Government. If we have freer trade relations with the people of the United States, we are perfectly happy and content with the laws under which we live, but, under existing circumstances, as I have pointed out, notwithstanding the number of years the National Policy has been in existence, and notwithstanding all the efforts to protect our manufacturers, we are still importing a large quantity of American implements which are necessary for the cultivation of the soil. That being the case, you cannot expect the people to submit to a high rate of unnecessary taxation. I shall not detain the House longer, but I hope that members from the west will take a similar line to what I have taken in my remarks to-night. I have tried to show the natural advantages of our country. I have tried to show the disadvantages of our country, which, I am happy to say, are artificial and can be removed, and I think it is the duty of the representatives of the people from Manitoba to also point out these disadvantages and to show how they can be removed with benefit to the country. I shall hope that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), will ably endorse the remarks which I have made here to-night. He was the chairman of a committee that reported a similar resolution to this, which was passed by the Local Legislature of Manitoba. In fact, that resolution was taken as the basis of the resolution proposed by Attorney General Martin in the Manitoba Legislature a few days ago. The hon. member is not in his place to-night, but as this debate is to be carried over until Tuesday, I have no doubt that hon. gentleman will have seen no reason to change his views, as expressed in that resolution at that time, and will take a similar line to what I have taken to-night.

Mr. PORTER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has, I am happy to say, evinced that he is not devoid of all feeling for his country, but has some patriotism left in his politics. He does not adopt the *role* that has been adopted by so many gentlemen on that side of the House, of decrying the country in which they live, or of depicting it as in a decayed or ruined condition. He says, and I believe he says truthfully, that Manitoba is in a most flourishing condition; and I am sure that every member of this House and every person in the Dominion is pleased of that statement, because I think every one in this Dominion should rejoice in the welfare and prosperity of any part of the Dominion, even if his own section should not be so flourishing as he could wish. But the hon. gentleman, although evincing a patriotic spirit, nevertheless cannot entirely divest himself of the partisan feeling of a party man, but must show in his utterances that he has an animus against the Government in regard to their fiscal policy. The whole burden of his speech was undoubtedly directed to show that the policy of this Government is injurious to his section. I think, however, that if the hon. gentleman would consider for a moment, he would see that no Government would be justified in adopting a sectional policy. All policies must be constructed and devised for the welfare of all, and he will admit that although certain things may be burdensome to some parts of the country, yet, in the spirit of wisdom and fair play to all, it is necessary for a Government to construct such a system as will be best for the general good. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House this afternoon and heard the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who spoke very calmly and very wisely, and gave us reminiscences of nearly thirty years ago, he would have learned that the object of the Canadian Government was not to foster a sectional feeling, but to unite every part of British America into one united whole and make us a nation if possible. In order to accomplish that purpose, there must undoubtedly be some things which certain sections

would prefer not to have, and other things which they would prefer to have, but which would not be reasonable or fair to all; and if the hon. gentleman would consider this matter, I think he would not blame the Government for the policy they have adopted. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, every session the fiscal policy of the Government has been assailed by hon. gentlemen opposite with unflagging strength and diligence. No repulse will check or stagger them, no argument convince them; but with a versatility that would be admirable if it were not mischievous, they persevere continually in assailing this policy, and if their assaults were successful, I think it would be calamitous to the Dominion of Canada. Every device which clever men can invent, every weapon which they can forge has been used; and but that the members in this House or the people outside of this House are convinced of the wisdom of this policy, it would be almost impossible to resist the fierce and interminable onslaughts of these hon. gentlemen. They have endeavored to set class against class, the producer against the consumer, the rich man against the poor man, capital against labor; and to throw an air of profound wisdom over it all; they have deluged the House with an immense array of statistics, accompanied with dissertations on the principles of political economy. But, Sir, the experience of the past eleven years has taught these hon. gentlemen that if they are ever to hope to drive the present Government from the Treasury benches they must adopt some other course; the old guard must be brought to the front, and recourse must be had to every means of assault, or their efforts will fail. What is the burden of their melancholy song which is now heard in this House? The central figure in the picture which they give of the ruin of Canada is the poor Canadian farmer. When these hon. gentlemen contemplate this oppressed personage they pour out volumes of sympathy and rivers of tears for his condition. When listening to their utterances, we are almost led to believe that the Canadian farmer at the present day is almost as overburdened and borne down by his Government as were the Russian serfs in former days. The burden of the complaint of these gentlemen consists of four propositions, and I have endeavored to extract these propositions from the speeches of hon. gentlemen, and I will direct my attention to them for a short time to-night. The first proposition they announce to this House is that the National Policy has reduced the prices of farmers' products. They tell us that since the National Policy was introduced prices have fallen so low as to be scarcely remunerative at all. Now, Sir, I wish to ask hon. gentlemen, without going into figures on this question, has the National Policy in any way lowered the price of a single article that is produced by the Canadian farmer? Will any hon. gentleman in this House go into a farmer's barn or granary and say to him: "The National Policy has reduced the price of your wheat 5 cents a bushel, your barley 5 cents a bushel, your oats 5 cents a bushel?" Will he go to his dairy and say: "The National Policy has reduced your cheese 5 cents and your butter 5 cents?" Will he go to his barnyard and say: "The National Policy has reduced the price of your cattle 2 cents a pound, your pork 2 cents a pound, and everything on your farm that you have to sell 2 or 3 cents a pound?" Can any hon. gentleman say that this is the case? Will you mention to me a single article which the National Policy has caused to be lowered in price by the mere fact of its existence? If the National Policy has not caused any of our articles to be lower in price than they would otherwise be, before these gentlemen undertake to disturb our present fiscal arrangements, it is incumbent on them to show that the abolition of the National Policy will cause these goods to increase in value. Can they go to a farmer and say: If you abolish your present tariff, you will get 5 cents more for your wheat, 10 cents more for your barley, 5 cents more for your cheese, and more for your oats, butter and everything you have to sell? Will any hon. gentleman, who understands business, and who notes the prices in Canada and the United States, say that if our National Pocily was abolished the Canadian farmers would be one cent the better off? Is it possible to believe that they would get better prices for their stock, consisting of pork and beef, living and dead, if they were brought into competition with the stock of the United States? Can it be argued that Manitoba wheat would sell one cent dearer if it were brought into competition with American wheat, which is a little inferior in quality and cheaper in price? Will any one contend that our dairy products would be increased in value if the National Policy were abolished, or that our butter and cheese would improve in price? The cheese industry affords a valuable illustration of what is meant by a protective policy. At the time of Confederation, we were attempting to develop the dairy industries of Ontario and Quebec, but we were met by this difficulty that our markets were supplied by foreign goods, and worse than that, that the inferior goods manufactured across the lines were shipped into Canada, and then re-shipped to the various markets of the world, especially England, as Canadian goods; and in this way they were destroying the character and reputation of our goods and the hopes and prospects of our dairy industries. Shortly after Confederation, a duty of 3 cents per pound was imposed upon cheese, and from that time forward the cheese industry has been one of the most valuable industries in the Dominion. At present the export of cheese has increased by 250 per cent., and of the 201,000,000 pounds imported into Great Britain, Canada has supplied about one-third. Were it not for the fostering care of protection, that cheese industry would to-day be little more advanced than what it was at the time of Confederation, or probably have altogether failed. It is quite evident that the National Policy has not caused any of our goods which we export to be cheaper, nor would its abolition cause any of these goods to be dearer, while, in many instances, not only the cheese, but also the cattle industry, it would operate very much to our disadvantage, and cause almost the complete extinction of a great and valuable industry. The second proposition hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to demonstrate is, that the National Policy has caused a decrease in the value of farm land. They told us that, in later years, in the Province of Ontario, land had decreased in value. For my part, I am not going to deny the partial truth of that proposition. Speaking fairly and candidly, I do not think any one will deny that, during these last few

years, some farm lands, at least, are not worth as much as they were some years ago, but that is not at all due to the National Policy, but to other causes not chargeable to any policy of the Government. The causes of the decrease in the value of farm lands are: first, the depression from which not only Canada but other countries has suffered, and I may say here that if there is depression in Canada at present in the agricultural industry, we are not alone in that respect. There is no civilised country in the world which has not felt that depression, no matter what its tariff may be. The depression is not at all owing to any form of tariff, but to circumstances which no fiscal arrangement can control. Since the times became bad and prices low, capitalists do not care to put their money into cultivated farms, as they fancy they can derive larger interest from their money by investing it in some other industry. Another reason for the lower price of land in some parts of the country in this: that since prices are so low, the products are not so remunerative; this is not owing to the National Policy, but to other circumstances. The farmers themselves do not think it wise to invest money in property which will not yield as remunerative production as it did several years ago. Another reason is that men of enterprise, men embarrassed in circumstances, men with large families, think that by selling their property which is still treble the value in the older section of the country, and moving away to other parts of the country, where free land are pressed upon them as a gift, they can better their circumstances, and in this way the value of farm lands is very materially affected. So that the National Policy in this respect, does not affect the value of farm land. Then there is another argument, which these gentlemen use, and it is a very serious charge against the National Policy, and, in my opinion, would be fatal if it could be established. That is, that the National Policy takes out of the pockets of the farmers of this country and other people, large sums of money which never reaches the Treasury. Hon. gentlemen opposite use very indefinite language on this subject. Some say that immense sums are taken out of the pockets of the people in this way, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said; some say eleven times, some say four times, and some say twice as much is taken out of the pockets of the people as goes into the Treasury, but we are not furnished with any actual definition of the amount. As these gentlemen use such vague language, everyone is left to put his own interpretation upon their words, but we are not left altogether without a clue to what they mean. There is a writer on political economy who has stated that of all moneys raised by indirect taxation, only one-fourth reaches the public chest. If we assume that this statement is true, let us look at the consequences of the assumption. In the last year, the Customs and Excise duties in Canada amounted to $30,613,522. If this assumption is true, the people of Canada paid $125,000,000 in duties of Customs and Excise. During the last ten years we have derived from Customs and Excise the sum of $262,362,430. According to the proposition to which I have referred, there must have been taken from the people of Canada in that time, $1,050,447,720 in taxation. That is a thing which no reasonable man will believe, considering the amount of our population and the character of our resources. There must be something wrong about the calculation. In order to arrive at the truth as nearly as we can, in order to arrive at some satisfactory knowledge of what really is taken from the people more than the exact duty, I have made a calculation which I will present to the House. It is based upon the present duty of 21 per cent. We will suppose that a wholesale merchant obtains goods of the value of $100. The duty is $21, which, for the sake of argument, we will assume is added to the amount of his purchase, though that is a very debatable point. That makes $121. Of course, it is reasonable that he should make a profit on what he sells. Suppose the profit to be 20 per cent. That would give $24.20, which, added to the original cost of the goods, would make the cost in the wholesale merchant's warehouse, $145.20. Suppose the retail merchant makes a profit of 25 per cent. on this, that would be $36.30, making a total of $181.50, so that these goods, which had originally cost $100, when they reached the consumer would cost $181.50. Now take another calculation. The average duty when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power was 16 per cent. Allowing the same profit to the wholesale and retail merchant, I find the cost of $100 worth of goods at that time would be to the consumer $174. In order to arrive at the amount which is taken out of the pockets of the people, we will suppose that there has been no duty at all, but that these goods have been admitted free. In that case, allowing the profit to the wholesale and retail merchants, $100 worth of goods would cost $150 to the consumers. Thus the difference between $150 and $181 is the difference between free goods and goods under a duty of 21 per cent, and the difference between $150 and $174 is the difference between free goods and goods under a 16 per cent. tariff. It may be said, let us look at the percentage of this. If we do that, we will find that the amount paid over the original cost averages about 50 per cent. so that the calculations which hon. gentlemen opposite have made as to the vast sums which are represented to have been dragged out of the pockets of the people are singularly exaggerated. If we consider the difference between direct and indirect taxation, though that is a question upon which I am not called upon to pronounce, I do not think the people of Canada have ever given any indication of their desire to depart from the present system of indirect taxation. Again, suppose we adopt a direct system of taxation, what would happen? Even this 50 per cent. might not be reduced, because we know that in any system of direct taxation the burden must fall either upon real property—and in that case it would be crushing upon the farmers of the Dominion, and would not be thought of—or it would fall upon the income of merchants, manufacturers and professional men, and they, of course, would add the tax to their services the same as merchants do now to their goods. Therefore, it is doubtful whether there is much difference between our present moderate system of taxation and the direct taxation which hon. gentlemen urge occasionally upon the floor of this House. Now, if my argument is correct, it is quite evident that our present system is one which, under all the circumstances, is well adapted to our condition as a people, and from the results that have been manifested in years gone by, it is also adapted to enable us to obtain sufficient funds

to develop the great resources of this country. We have many things to do in this country. We have canals to dig, we have railways to build, we have public buildings to erect, and we have the northern half of a continent to develop. For these purposes we must have money, it must come in some way, it must come by indirect taxation or by direct taxation, whichever mode you choose, the money must be obtained for these purposes. I think there is no gentleman in this House who would wish to see the progress of Canada marred or checked; I think everyone is anxious that we should go on and develop our great heritage, and that we should do what lies in our power to make this a great country, and in order to accomplish this end, in order to obtain the victories of peace, money is just as much the sinews of those victories as it is the sinews of war. These general observations, in reference to the duty, apply to the whole population of this country, but there is one class—the special favorites of hon. gentlemen opposite—the farmers. Oh, the dear farmer! How very fortunate it is for us farmers, who are in the majority in this country, that these gentlemen should take such a sudden liking to us. They do not call us hard names now as they used to do. We were a very stupid lot of people on the 18th of September, 1878, but now we are a very intelligent class of people, and these gentlemen have now awakened to the situation in which the National Policy has placed us. They tell us that we are a long-suffering and an ill-treated people; they tell us this tax is grinding the money out of our pockets, that it is ruining us, and that the great burden of taxation is causing depression in our business. But I challenge hon. gentlemen to come down to particular facts and reason them out, and show wherein the farmers of this country are being over-burdened by the present system of taxation; I challenge them to show that the farmer is paying any more in taxation than any other person in an equal station in life, and owning the same amount of property. There is not a farmer in Canada who wants to shirk his responsibilities as a citizen. Neither do we wish our interests to be overlooked for the sake of others; all we want is that, when the general interests of the whole country are being considered, our interests also should be considered; and, I think that, in the present arrangement of the tariff, the Government have, very wisely and very judiciously, considered the circumstances at the present time. Times change. Twelve years is quite a space in the history of a young nation. Twelve years ago things were much different to what they are to-day, and twelve years hence they will be much different to what they are now; and the Government, with that prudence, with that wisdom, which, I believe, has characterised all their actions, have certainly caught the spirit of the moment, and have attempted, by every means in their power, to advance the interests of the agriculturists of this country by giving them a fair protection against all outsiders, no matter who they may be. Sir, in making this argument which I have been laying before the House, it will be observed that I have used no statistics, that I have not wearied you with a deluge of dreary figures. I have avoided that, especially for the purpose of not causing this House to feel bored, because it is very annoying to have to hear so many figures when we cannot grasp their meaning.

Mr. PORTER.

Not only that, but I have learned, in the four years that I have been in this House, to look with a great deal of mistrust and circumspection upon any argument into which figures enter largely, or in which figures form the basis for a judgment. I believe that statistics, to be of any value, must be exact and full, and to be profitable to us, we must consider all the relations and conditions surrounding these figures; otherwise, although figures won't lie, yet they will lead an inattentive observer very far from the truth, and will lead him into conclusions that would be very ruinous and injurious to himself. Let me give an illustration which will explain why I am so very careful in the use of statistics, unless I have fully digested and analysed them. Last night the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan)—who is not in his place at this moment—spoke of the burdens of taxation which were crushing and pressing down the farmers of Ontario; and more especially he spoke of the burden of taxation borne by them in the purchase of their implements and in the duty paid upon them. He enumerated a large list of implements, binding machines, drills, forks, harrows, harvesters and binders, and so on through a list that I need not detain the House in reading. But he said that the agriculturist in the Province of Ontario, on the articles which he requires to cultivate his farm in a proper manner, pays an annual duty—because he said that these implements would last ten years—of $34 and some cents. Last year the hon. gentleman placed that duty at $32.50. Now, we will suppose that in the Province of Ontario there are 250,000 farms—there are somewhere between 200,000 and 250,000; I will take the latter figure. If each farmer, according to that hon. gentleman, pays $32 yearly in duty upon his implements, the farmers of the Province of Ontario pay each year in duty upon agricultural implements, 8 million dollars. But that is not all. The value of implements imported into that Province—even taking the vast array of figures given by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson)—was $192,913, paying a duty of $71,795.38. Now, the people of the Province of Ontario, according to this calculation, paid 110 times as much money in duties as went into the Federal chest, for implements in every part of the Dominion. That is one instance that has rendered me very careful in trusting to any argument based upon figures. I know very well that the hon. gentleman, when he was making his speech, used these figures believing them to be true. He wished to be strong, and his idea of strength is to prepare an enormous array of figures and hurl then at the heads of inoffending listeners. No matter what the figures may be, no matter what the relations may be, these figures must be accepted, and, therefore, he thought that he was making a very strong argument. Another illustration used this Session was one which will be in the minds of many hon. gentlemen, and it is one that has been repeatedly referred to. Many illustrations of the utter worthlessness of a mass of bare figures may be found in the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The other evening, when replying to the Finance Minister, and while he was daubing the black upon his picture, not with a brush but with a trowel, in order that the work might be artistically finished *à la* Cartwright, he spoke of the great

indebtedness of Ontario. His first statement was this, that 10,200 acres were burdened with mortgages of $139,983. That would be a very serious matter indeed, if the hon. gentleman had come to his conclusion after a full investigation and analysis of the whole surrounding circumstances. But he did not do so. No doubt much of that money, and this is within the knowledge of every member of this House who has any acquaintance with business, had been paid. I also have no doubt that in many instances while a mortgage for, say, $1,000 may appear on the registry books against certain property, all the debt will have been liquidated except perhaps $200 or $300. So that this amount of money standing on the registry books against the property does not, by any means, show that the whole amount of that money was owing ; and, therefore, the hon. gentleman when he made that statement did not properly analyse the debt and state all the conditions that surrounded it. But a careful statistician would have gone further, and have enquired into the nature of the debt. It may be that much of the money was borrowed for the purpose of buying land. This often happens. A farmer who has saved a little money, say $2,000, purchases a farm from his neighbor, and pays down $2,000 and borrows $3,000 more to pay the purchase money, $5,000. In that case the $3,000 mortgage represents a $5,000 property. If the debt had been liquidated still the farmer was $2,000 to the good. In other cases money is borrowed for the purpose of making agricultural improvements. Men sometimes wish to improve their farms by building large barns, and a well-constructed barn is a very remunerative investment. Men will also borrow money to procure valuable blooded animals for the improvement of their stock and the stock of their neighbors, and if this is properly managed and well conducted it also proves a remunerative investment. Others will invest in drainage, and that is the most profitable of all the channels in which a farmer can invest money. So if the hon. gentleman had investigated and analysed the figures and given all the relations of the transactions, as a true statistician would have done—of course I do not expect it from a bitter partisan—then it would have been seen that the debt, although apparently a large one, perhaps was not one-quarter as great as it was made to appear, and that even then it would not have been of any serious consequence. I might give more illustrations of that very objectionable mode of conducting an argument, but I have given sufficient to show that we should be very guarded in accepting an argument having figures for its basis. For this deplorable state of affairs which the hon. gentleman has attempted to picture, and which hon. gentlemen opposite say overwhelms the farmers of Ontario, and by implication all the farmers of the Dominion, hon. gentlemen opposite have a remedy, unrestricted trade with the United States. For a moment we will look at that remedy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have often been taunted with their lack of a policy. This reproach is, however, now taken away because they have now placed themselves on record in this country. On the south of us lies a great nation. The national life, the independent life of that country is only 100 years old ; that nation is the youngest and one of the foremost of nations. Her phenomenal growth in population, trade and commerce, her great development as regards natural resources and natural advantages, her rapid accumulation of wealth and all the luxuries and comforts that wealth can give, have been to the ignorant and poor in other lands as a fairy tale on a winter's night, and to educated men they have proved a fascinating study. No doubt it is quite true that the citizens of that country have shown themselves to possess shining abilities in every walk and pursuit of life. Their genius in money-making has become proverbial, their enterprise borders almost on the reckless, and in everything they undertake they display a vim and vigor which are certainly admirable and almost always successful. But above all these grand qualities and beyond all these qualities, these men, the sons of the Republic to the south of us, are distinguished by a quality and characteristic which is evidently lacking in some members of this House, for they are animated by a patriotism intense and ever vigilant. They have never grudged to give their money and to shed their blood for the maintenance of the unity, the honor, the dignity and the glory of that great Republic. This is an enticing spectacle, but "all is not gold that glitters." If we look at the people on the other side of the line, if we contemplate the condition of the agricultural population, we are led to enquire: Is their position so much better than our own that by unrestricted trade or commercial union (for I cannot find any difference in the two terms) we would be improving our condition by joining our lot to theirs ? Hon. gentlemen opposite are not quite decided on that point. They do not yet exactly know whether by opening our markets to those people and having their markets opened to us, the benefit would be decidedly in our favor. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), the other evening, in those ringing tones that awaken the echoes in the distant corridors, described to us that a certain portion of the United States, stretching from the Atlantic to the confines of New Jersey, was almost destitute of the necessaries of life. He delared that in all that country there were not 10,000,000 bushels of wheat grown and there were 10,000,000 of people, that in all that country they could not raise sufficient potatoes for themselves and that other vegetable products were scanty and in great demand ; and he said : Is it not wise that we should widen our relations with those people when we would be able to supply them ? I might observe that so far as wheat is concerned, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec would not be able to supply a very large quantity, and Ontario, I am sorry to say, is now turning its attention to something else, because wheat has ruled at low prices. So these poor, hungry, starving Yankees would receive very little wheat from us. But, Sir, when he was describing this great future for ourselves, and this great market for our products, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) no doubt differed from him, because, when he rose to speak he told us, that when a small quantity of any goods was introduced to a market where there was a large quantity produced, of course, the small quantity had to pay the duty. He told us that for our benefit. Now, it is quite evident that the member for North Norfolk believed that we produced what he called

a penny-ante quantity—whatever penny-ante may mean in the language of the saint, I do not know—and that all the goods we could sell to the United States was simply but a crumb from the loaf, or a drop from the bucket. With these sentiments I entirely concur. The large amount of cultivated land in the United States no doubt produces far more than supplies their own most extravagant wants, and although they import from us certain quantities of agricultural products, it would be a nice study for an impartial statistician like the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to find out how much of that importation they use, and how much they ship to foreign lands. Those who will read the report of the commission to the West Indies will see that even in the West Indies there were a quantity of Canadian goods that had reached those islands from the United States. However that may be, whether they consume all, or whether they only consume part, it does not appear to me that the opening of our markets in exchange for the opening of their markets would be a very great advantage to us, The hon. President of the Council has been taken to task very severely by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, in reference to his statement made the other evening, that he thought a free interchange of natural products would not benefit us—and by natural products I understood him to mean agricultural products, because he was speaking of the condition of the farming community. I am not a member of the Cabinet—and I do not know that I ever shall be unless the leader of the Government changes his mind very much—and my statement has no authority. I only speak as a private member of this House, as one who has lived for forty years among the farmers of Canada, knowing their circumstances well, knowing their feelings, knowing their condition of life, and knowing their principles as well as any member of this House. I venture to think, and I say that under the present circumstances—under the changed circumstances that have taken place within the last twelve years—in my opinion, a free interchange of all agricultural products between this country and the United States would not be in the best interests of the Canadian farmers. It may be that there are some things that we could exchange with them to our mutual advantage. It may be that there might be some arrangment made under which, by giving them some things and taking some things from them free on both sides, the commerce of our country would be materially helped ; but on the whole to break down this tariff wall—for which the Conservative members of this House are so severely berated by hon. gentlemen opposite—to break down this tariff wall entirely and completely, would, I think, have a most injurious effect upon the agricultural industry of this country. To use a physical illustration. We know very well that water will find its level. We have heard in this House, and it has never been denied, that the agriculturists of the United States at the present time are in a depressed condition, much more so than the farmers of Canada are. We have heard, and it has not been denied, that the lands in some of the oldest States, some of the best lands in the Union, are decreased in value much more than the lands in Canada. Do hon. gentlemen suppose, by any process, human or imaginary, that by annexing ourselves to these people we would increase the price of our products or increase the value of our lands ? Can any reasonable man suppose that ? Lay aside your party feeling—you are very anxious no doubt to come to the Treasury benches, the seals of office glitter in your eyes, and they obscure your vision—shut your eyes, and use your reason, and I ask you, can you really believe that by annexing ourselves to these people we would benefit the condition of our farmers ? I know it is quite natural that men in Opposition should seek for a chink in the armor of the Ministry in which to plant an arrow—a poisoned arrow it may be—if they can. Their object is to oppose, their object is to find fault, but in all their fault-finding, I think if they were Canadians, and if they had the interest of their country at heart, they would not seek to overthrow the Ministry by decrying their country or betraying its best interests. Sir, another point. It is said that the farmers of this country would be benefited by unrestricted trade or commercial union—and the hon. gentleman for Marquette (Mr. Watson) will pardon me for using the two terms as synonymous, because I can see no difference between them, and if he will take the trouble to show me some time at his leisure where the difference lies, I shall be infinitely obliged to him, We are told that the farmers of this country would be benefited by this commercial union. We are told that one of the greatest causes of depression in agriculture in this country, is the immense burthen of taxation which has ground the people of this country by what they call this iniquitous National Policy. I like that word "ground," because it is a classic word. Now, Sir, if this grinding of money out of the pockets of the people of this country is the cause of the depression, in what way do they hope to alleviate this depression, in what way do they hope to make it less burdensome by annexing us to a people where this grinding process is terribly intensified ? Are we to believe—using another physical illustration—that because a dose of poison kills, that, therefore, a dose and a half will cure you and make you well ? Which of these hon. gentlemen would try the experiment ? None, Sir ; for in a case of this kind they trust their instinct and their reason, rather than their party feeling. If the people of Canada are injured by the National Policy it is quite evident that their circumstances would not be benefited by joining with a nation that is intensely protective, and, therefore, it cannot be true when they tell us that the depression in Canada is caused by the present protective system. I have but a few more words to say in reference to this matter, and indeed I feel that I have detained the House much longer than I should have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PORTER. If the farmers of Canada are to be benefited in any way by the abolition of the present system, why, if it is well to have free trade with our neighbors, should we not have free trade with all the world ? If free trade with the United States is advisable and beneficial, why not have free trade all over ? I admit myself from my reading and from what observations I am enabled to make, that, theoretically speaking, free-trade with every nation is, perhaps, the best plan that man can devise. We know that does not exist anywhere ; it is a utopian theory ; it is not prac-

ticable anywhere. But if free trade with the United States is desirable, is it not desirable also with all the world? Why should we bind ourselves to the United States? Are the people of Canada not able to manage their own affairs? Are we sunk so low that we have not the courage or the intellect to control and guide our own affairs? Must we go whiningly and ask these people to have pity on us? Must we say to them: "Come and arrange our tariff, tell us what nations we shall trade with, and how we shall trade with them, and give us what money you please for us to carry on our Government?" No matter what treaty we have ever made with these people, they have construed it and acted upon it in the way that best suited their own views. Are we sunk so low that it is necessary for us to confess to these people our helplessness, our shiftlessness and our stupidity, and ask them to come and guide and control our affairs for us? You tell us that we should get a market of 60,000,000 people. Well, there may be parts of the Dominion of Canada which would be benefited, but we must not look to Prince Edward Island or to Quebec or to Ontario alone; we are one and indivisible, and we must consider what will be beneficial to the Dominion as a whole. In the United States there is to-day a great agricultural depression, a heavy mortgage debt, and a great depreciation of farm lands; even their great staple is used for fuel; and what could we expect to gain as an agricultural people by annexing ourselves to them. Well, you say, where is our market? The people of the United States are angry with you, and you are pursuing an irritating policy, and they will retaliate. Sir, that is strange language for free men to use. Hon. gentlemen talk abont holding out the olive branch of conciliation. When these gentlemen talk about conciliation they mean submission. We have never irritated the people of the United States. I defy any hon. gentleman to point to a word that has ever been uttered in this House contemptuously or defiantly of the people of the United States; the great Conservative party at least has never sought to irritate them or make them angry. But, as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) observed, there come times when a man must stand on his dignity; even a worm will turn if it is trod upon. In all the discussions that have taken place in this House, the leaders of this Government, and indeed all the members of this House, have spoken with respect of the Republic to the south; and if at the present time there are mutterings of hostility across the line, or if we are threatened with a tariff that will be prohibitive of many Canadian products, the fault is not ours. We know that that tariff was promulgated before it was known what the tariff of the hon. Finance Minister would be; and, therefore, it is absurd to contend that the feeling of hostility evinced by some people in the United States against Canada has been induced by anything said or done in this House. Why should we not construct our tariff for our own benefit? Why should we, in managing our own affairs, not look entirely to our own interests? Let us act gently and kindly towards all the nations of the earth; but every civilised nation does as we do, it controls and manages its affairs according to its own best interest. If we think that certain duties would be beneficial to certain industries, why should we not impose them? They do it themselves. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that it is our own fault that reciprocity has not been obtained years ago. I fail to see that Canadians have done anything to warrant that assertion. We have been willing to enter into a reciprocity treaty that would be favorable to ourselves and to them, according to our standpoint. We want a reciprocity treaty which will allow us to control the management of our own tariff, and is that not right? We are told that Canada displayed a hostile feeling towards the Americans during the war, and that this is the cause of the present irritation against Canada. I scarcely think that this is the case; for I think Canada gave no indication that it was hostile or unfriendly towards the people of the North. We know that many Canadians were in the Northern army and fought and bled and died for the maintenance of the Union; and from that day to this the Government of Canada have never by one word or action shown any hostility towards our neighbors. All we ask in Canada is that neither enemies from without nor traitors from within should mar the progress of this great Dominion. We ask that both now and in days to come men shall say that something good has been done in Canada, that something has been done for humanity, that some step has been taken in human progress, that something has been accomplished for which the world is happier, wiser and better, by those who have lived and died in this great north land.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has made a very interesting speech, but he has not, so far as I could observe, given any indication of what his views are on the proposed changes in the tariff. There is one point on which I agree with the hon. gentleman, that is, with regard to the little reliance to be placed on speeches containing statistics, for the hon. gentleman last year delivered a speech in this House, bristling with statistics, and when the *Hansard* came to me last year I took the opportunity on a foggy day to read his speech, and can corroborate what he says about the unreliability of a speech based on statistics, and treated in a purely party spirit, especially if the speaker is not thoroughly sincere in his views. It is not my intention to discuss at any very great length the question now in hand. Whatever my intention may have been, the speech delivered by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) this afternoon, dealing as it did so well with the position of the Province of New Brunswick, takes, to a certain extent, from me the ground I would otherwise have covered. Before I proceed, however, to refer to the particular matter in hand, I wish to call attention to some remarks made by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). The hon. gentleman began his speech by a criticism of the methods of the Opposition, which he considered very objectionable indeed; but he proceeded immediately to follow along the same line. He devoted a great deal of time to a comparison of the condition of the country when the hon. member for South Oxford was Finance Minister with its condition at the present time. He submitted a great variety of statistics to show that the country was not in as good a condition then as it is now, but it seems to me that his figures, carefully prepared as

they were, were very far astray, or rather that he did not take into account all the matters he should have in making a comparison of that kind. For instance, he made a comparison between the imports of a period of that time and those of a period of the present time, and he undertook to show that as the excess in the latter period was greater than in the former, therefore our condition could not have been so good then. But he entirely overlooked the fact that this country had gone into the markets of Europe and had borrowed a large amount of money, a great proportion of which must have come back to us in imports. That was the form indeed in which the larger portion came, but he gave no credit whatever to that in making his statement. The hon. gentleman also endeavored to make a point, which has often been made by the supporters of the National Policy, as to the effect of our manufacturing industries. He said it is quite true—and everybody who has had anything to do with the business in the Maritime Provinces unfortunately knows that it is quite true—that a number of industries have been started in those Provinces which have not paid; but, said he, we have given employment to a great many people. Can you conceive, Sir, a weaker argument to support a bad cause? Why does the hon. gentleman not take out of his own capital and go to work and employ thousands of men if he has the means? He will be giving employment, but the result will be the destruction of capital; and one of the great causes of depression, certainly in New Brunswick, is that for a long period of time, since 1880, in the effort to establish manufactures, a large amount of capital has entirely disappeared, by reason of the fact that it was invested in non-remunerative work. It appears to me it is a matter of common sense that unless you start enterprises which will pay, unless you start enterprises which will not only maintain intact the capital invested, but also yield a certain amount of interest, you will not carry on an industry at all beneficial to the country, and in the end must lose by it. The hon. gentleman also made, for a purpose I did not clearly understand, comparisons between certain Provinces of this Confederation and certain States of the Union. It appears to me that when we are dealing with the countries as a whole, we cannot make comparisons between particular States and Provinces. It may be very useful for certain Provincial purposes to make such comparisons, but in contrasting the conditions of the two countries we must take into account the countries as a whole. It is a fact that there is an outflow of population from the Eastern States to the west, but the people still remain inhabitants of the United States. They contribute by their industry to swell the profits of that country, they bear their share of the taxation, and every duty they have to perform as citizens is performed by them, no matter in what State of the Union they are. But it is a fact, as regards the Maritime Provinces, which cannot be denied, that a large number of our people are constantly leaving them and going to the United States. These people help to fill up that country, and hon. gentlemen opposite may find as much fault as they please and say you are decrying your country by stating these facts: they are facts which the statesmen of the country should look in the face and take measures to alter. If you take the States of Maine and Massachusetts, you will find there is an outflow of their population, but that outflow is made up, to a very large extent, by people who go there from our Provinces and who displace the population of Maine and Massachusetts. I know of whole sections of Maine into which the population of New Brunswick has overflowed, and in which these people really constitute communities by themselves; and I believe that is true also of the Province of Quebec. What is the use of hon. gentlemen endeavoring to found an argument on the fact that the population of Maine leave that State and go to the Western States) when the outflow is replaced by people from the Province of New Brunswick? Then the hon. gentleman made a long deliverance on the question of annexation. I assume that the effect of these frequent references to annexation in this House, where it is not a discussable question, will be some day to make it a discussable question. One thing is quite certain, and that is that hon. gentlemen opposite by continually putting this question forward, are constantly familiarising the minds of the people with it, and it is quite certain that familiarity will, if the question ever comes to the front, and it may come to the front, make of the question more than a theory, and it will be a question not so difficult to take hold of as hon. gentlemen think. It is bad policy on the part of hon. gentlemen who profess to be so opposed to annexation to be so continually talking of it in this House. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) the other night endeavored to found an argument on a quotation from the New York *Sun* which published an editorial pointing out that if Canadians wanted the benefits of the United States system they must become part of that country. Well, that is the doctrine of a single newspaper. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) quoted Senator Sherman and one or two others—I do not remember who they were—as giving opinions which should warn this House and affect the members of this House in any trade matters with that nation. Well, these are the opinions of individual men, speaking to their constituents, and endeavoring to induce people to accept the views which they hold on some particular questions. The true way, it appears to me, to deal with a matter of this kind, is to take the official utterances of men who speak with official authority. It has often been quoted in this House, but I desire to quote once more what Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, said in his letter to Sir Charles Tupper, in 1887, when they were endeavoring to open up negotiations with regard to the fisheries. Secretary Bayard, after expressing his desire to have an understanding with regard to the fishery question pointed out that:

> "The fishery trouble interferes, and seriously embarrasses the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which the treaty of 1818 is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement,—and there is but one way to procure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

It does appear to me that, as a matter of reason and common sense, the utterances of a public man

like Mr. Bayard, speaking with the authority of his position—the First Minister, in a measure, of that country—ought to have far more influence on men discussing, as a Parliament, a public question, than the statements which appear in a newspaper and which have no special interest beyond the events of the day or the utterances of men more or less addressing their constituents. However, I desire to refer more particularly to the increases in the tariff which have been proposed by the Minister of Finance. They are far more important to the Province from which I come than any other subsidiary matter can be. We, in New Brunswick are differently situated from the people in Nova Scotia. I do not think there is much compensation given to the Province of Nova Scotia by the duty on coal, but in New Brunswick we do not raise any coal to speak of, and the duty on coal is a serious tax upon us. I trust the Government, notwithstanding the influences which may be brought to bear upon them by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen), will not increase the duty upon coal. In New Brunswick, we are principally engaged in the lumber business, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) pointed out this afternoon. The total export from New Brunswick last year was $6,700,000 in round numbers. Of that amount $4,960,000 were the product of the forest, $3,793,000 being the product of the Province itself, and $1,695,000 the product of the neighboring State of Maine. Though the trees are cut on that side of line, and in the State of Maine, the lumber itself is made by residents of our Province. The supplies go largely through our Province, the lumber is floated down our rivers, and is cut at the mouth of the St. John river. It is, therefore, sufficient to say that of the export from our Province of $6,700,000, $4,960,000 is the product of the forest. The taxation which is proposed to be added to the taxes which are now burdening us so severely will affect that industry in the most crushing manner, particularly in regard to the duties upon pork and beef and lard which enter so largely into the consumption of those who manufacture the lumber. While there is a considerable amount of agricultural industry in the Province of New Brunswick, the bulk of the agricultural portion of the community do not rely upon agriculture alone. They live along the rivers and during one part of the year they are engaged in agriculture, and during another part they are engaged in lumbering. It might be better that they were engaged in agriculture alone, but that is not the existing condition of affairs, and it is the existing condition of affairs with which we have to deal. You might travel from the boundary line throughout the whole Province, along the Tobique river and the St. John river and all its branches, you might go into almost every house from the boundary of Maine to the Gulf, and you would scarcely see any fresh meat used. The farmers have to live on the fish they get out of the rivers, and on such salted meats as they can procure. This shows that the condition of the people is not such as to justify a large increase in the taxation. The next industry to which I will refer is the fisheries. Last year we exported $705,000 worth of the products of the fisheries. The greater portion of that is from the inshore fisheries, within the coast line and along the rivers. I understood the Minister of Customs to say that there would be a drawback allowed on the exports of the boat fishermen.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I said that the same concessions were made to vessels that left for the gulf as to those that left for the banks. The hon. member for Halifax understood that I said that the concession was extended to the boat fishermen, but that was an error.

Mr. ELLIS. Then, this concession is not made to the boat fishermen. There is no class of people whose lives are so close to what they earn as the boat fishermen. Their business is a risky one. They depend almost entirely upon the United States market, and they have to look to the conditions of climate. I live close to a community which carries on this industry. I know something of their joys and their sorrows, and I am within the mark when I say that they are constantly on the watch to make enough simply to live upon, that any accumulation of funds is a very unusual thing with them, and that to put an additional tax on pork or flour is to inflict a serious hardship upon them. The next industry is that of manufactures. That is a misleading word. We exported last year $362,759 worth. Some of these manufactures are of this character: Extract of hemlock bark, $34,533; grindstones, $13,770; junk and oakum, $5,775; lime, $116,355. In regard to the article of lime, I think we in the city of St. John have a good cause of complaint against the Government. Last year a representation was made to the Government that it was necessary, in the interest of that industry, to make the duty on lime entering this country the same as the American duty upon lime. This was a new industry, they were entering into close competition with the Americans in their own markets, and the lime manufacturers on the other side went to the Government of the United States and represented that they had to pay a duty of 20 per cent., I think it was, to get lime into Canada, but Canadian lime could go into the United States for about half that duty. Although every effort was made to get the Government to take the matter up, nothing could be done. There was a policy of delay, a policy of to-morrow. Now the lime manufacturers have got the ear of the American Government, as we see by the new tariff, and we anticipate results which will completely close that industry. Then take the item of ships—we sold $57,000 worth; of wrought stone, $22,141; wooden barrels, $7,644; of the same to Great Britain, $14,375; of the same to the United States, $2,475; we also sold some to the Argentine Republic, making altogether $266,314 worth of manufactures—not such manufactures as are usually spoken of in this House, made from imported materials—but manufactures made from the native raw material of our own soil and country. It will be seen that this increased taxation, therefore, does not help the manufacturers of New Brunswick, but it puts an additional burden upon the toilers, men who are creating these manufactures out of the natural products of the country. The same thing with regard to the mines. We exported products of the mine to the value of $105,692. This proposed taxation just reaches these miners. It adds to the tax on flour which they eat, to the tax on lard, and pork, and other provisions which they use, and, therefore, it makes their life harder. Putting these four items together it makes $6,700,898. In this sum are included animals and their produce, $346,215. I do not know whether they are the sole

products of the Province of New Brunswick; I do not know what the Customs arrangements are, but it is quite likely that some products of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia are included. Of agricultural products we exported only $171,000, so that when hon. gentlemen talk about protecting agriculturists, they entirely overlook the fact that, in the Province of New Brunswick, there are practically no agriculturists to protect, in the sense in which the farmers of Ontario are intended to be protected. Now, I bring these figures to your attention in order to show that the proposed taxation falls upon all the persons engaged in important labor in the Province of New Brunswick. It is true that we have a factory or two, I think we have two cotton factories in St. John, but, unhappily, they are of the kind referred to by the hon. member for Halifax, that give employment to the people at the expense of the capital engaged in them. From 1880, up to last year, the condition of things in the Province of New Brunswick was worse than I ever knew it to be before, in my residence of over thirty years in that Province. There can be no question that almost every industry was depressed, the capital invested in manufacturing and in public works was not remunerative. But within the last two years there has been a change in the Province, owing to the fact that the vessel property has been earning some money. I think I am quite within the mark in saying that the vessels owned in New Brunswick have, within the last two years, earned two million dollars, perhaps that is a low estimate. That money coming into the Province has relieved to a considerable extent the pressure which was upon us before, and it may be that just at this moment, the Province of New Brunswick is more favorably situated, financially, than the Province of Ontario itself, although, of course, I do not know enough about Ontario to state that positively. But while this has been going on, what is the result? We are not building new ships, our ships are disappearing at the rate of 15,000 tons a year so far as the city of St. John is concerned; at the rate of 20,000 tons a year, for the last four or five years, for the whole Province. I think that in ten or twelve years over one hundred thousand tons, not quite one-third of our shipping, has entirely disappeared. Men have not been able to replace it, and that industry is and has been seriously threatened. But supposing there is a revival in that business, suppose we are able to go on and build, as some men have made an effort to rebuild, ships, what is the effect of this tariff upon them? It burdens the provisions, it burdens flour, it burdens a great many articles which are used by the workingmen, and, therefore, increases the difficulty of the situation in our Province in respect to that industry. I regret to have to appear to be taking a purely provincial view of the matter; but these are the people among whom I live, these are the people whom I represent, these are the people whose interests are my interests, and the welfare of that community, I feel bound to say, is the first consideration with me. Now, what will you give us in return for the tax you are imposing upon that industry? If I were to express my honest convictions in this House—and I do not hesitate to speak them—I would say that I do not think it is worth our while to remain in this Con-

federation at all. I would not hesitate, if I were a younger man, to go among my people and tell them that the feeling of this House is one that will not give to the industries of the Maritime Provinces that just consideration which they ought to have. You have added on burden after burden. We came into this Confederation with a debt of $7,000,000, not all of which was an actual debt. To-day we owe nearly $20,000,000. Our share of the public debt, with our local debt, is nearly 20 millions. We are burdened in every direction. Every interest is pressed upon by the policy which prevails here. Although it may be a very satisfactory policy to some people in this part of the Dominion, it is not a policy which promotes the interests of the Province from which I come. It appears to me it would be a more statesmanlike proceeding to consider what would be best for all the Provinces of this Confederation, and to devise a policy which would be better for them all. It has always appeared to me that a policy which would give us trade with the United States would be better for all concerned. I regret to say that these new proposals of the Government are entirely opposed to that policy. It appears to me like the last straw which breaks the camel's back, to hear the President of the Council declare that he is opposed to reciprocity in natural products. I think every man in New Brunswick, I think that I speak for the Conservative party of the Province of New Brunswick as well as the Liberals—if my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner) were here he might be able to correct me, or my hon. colleague from the City and County of St. John, perhaps, can confirm me when I say that I think there is scarcely a man in the Province of New Brunswick, whether among Conservatives or Liberals, who is not in favor of the broadest kind of reciprocity with the United States. There is no division practically among our people on that question. To-day we send more than half our exports to the United States. The market is continually enlarging, and it is the only market in which we are certain of a profit on the goods we have to sell. The Government should make a determined effort to secure for us reciprocity with that country. Take, for instance, the coasting trade. We build a number of small vessels of a very good class, but we find that the men we train as captains, to run those vessels, are compelled by the conditions of trade to go to the United States. I know at least a dozen master mariners, men competent in every way, who within the last two years have moved to the United States, because the coasting trade of that country offers greater advantages than are presented by the coasting trade of Canada. I do not know how this is to be remedied, but I observe that no effort has been made to secure that trade for us. The condition of that trade should engage the attention of some one connected with the public affairs of Canada, for not only are the master mariners, trained and skilful men, leaving us, but the capital that was once engaged in building vessels is now passing to the United States. I do not know the means by which this is done, but a large amount of New Brunswick capital has been withdrawn from the coasting trade of our own Province and has found its way into the coasting trade of the United States. I do not know whether there

is any public man among hon. gentlemen opposite who thinks it is worth while to pay any attention to this subject, but if I were a public man charged with the destinies of the country I should think it worth while to devote attention to it. It appears to me that, perhaps, hon. gentlemen who represent western constituencies do not fully consider how very severely the tariff presses on the people of the Maritime Provinces. Take, for instance, clothing worn by workingmen. Such clothing is already heavily taxed, and yet it is proposed to increase it. Again, we are compelled to use Canadian oil, except that which we are able to smuggle from the American side, and there appears to be a pretty good smuggling arrangement in operation which the Minister of Customs does not appear to have been able to discover. But leaving that out, we are compelled to use Canadian oil at a very heavy duty and at heavy railway charges, whereas if we could bring in oil from the United States we would be able to carry it in our own vessels and lay it down in our own Province at almost the cost of production in the United States. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House further, I have made these statements in a plain and simple way. I have pointed out the effect of the increased taxation in still further adding to reduce the burdens already imposed upon us, which are exceedingly severe. I shall ask the Government to reconsider some items of the tariff, on which I shall have something to say at a later stage, but which I shall not enter into at the present moment; but I trust the Government will do one of two things: either reduce the taxation which bears so heavily on the people of the Maritime Provinces, and especially the Province from which I come, or, turn their attention seriously, honestly and faithfully, although I have very little hope that they will do so after hearing the speech of the President of the Council, to making a strong effort to secure greater freedom of trade with the United States. Unless that is done, as I stated to the House two years ago in a few observations I addressed to it, the people themselves will find some way to secure it. I am satisfied this increase of the burdens will intensify that feeling. Perhaps it is not necessary to do more than utter this word of warning. Under all the circumstances I feel bound to support the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, for second reading of resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Mr. Speaker, I think it is to be regretted that a measure of such importance and so momentous to this country should have been brought down at such a late period of the Session, and more particularly at a time when it is likely to seriously affect the business community by compelling them to pay heavy duties when they had made their arrangements on the faith of the old tariff. Seventy-one days of this Session had elapsed before the Budget speech was addressed to this House, and although the excuse made for the delay was that delegations had to be met, I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has found by this time that since the tariff has been made public, the delegations have not decreased, but are coming in larger numbers every day. Indeed, the delay in bringing this tariff down indicated the consciousness of the Government that the changes they were proposing to make would be universally condemned, and we find that their condemnation has been universal; all over the country public discontent with them is increasing day by day and hour by hour. The other evening, my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), reviewed the history of Confederation as it affected the Province of New Brunswick, and no member of this House is more competent to speak on that subject than that hon. gentleman. No more vehement or ardent supporter of that project could be found in the Province of New Brunswick; I think I may say that my hon. friend was the chief instrument by which that Province was induced to cast in her lot with the Union; and my hon. friend's frank avowal, the other night, that it was by misrepresentation he had been induced to urge the Province to join Confederation, did honor to him, and his statement, I think, will find a response, not only in the Province which he and I have the honor to represent, but in a large portion of this Dominion. I myself was opposed to this Confederation, and I can attest to the truthfulness of the statement made by my hon. friend in regard to the misrepresentations made to the Province of New Brunswick at that time. Enjoying a tariff of from 12½ to 15 per cent., the people of New Brunswick were led to believe that no greater burden of taxation would be imposed upon us, or that if our taxation should be increased to the same point as that of old Canada, the increased volume of business, and our increased prosperity under it, would more than compensate for the increased burden imposed. Further, we were told, that by joining this Confederation we should be enabled to have reciprocal trade with the United States. Those were the two cries raised at that time: First, that taxation would not be increased, and secondly, that the union would bring about reciprocal trade, which was universally desired throughout the Maritime Provinces. Such were the promises by which we were brought into Confederation; but eleven years afterwards, the gentleman who afterwards became Minister of Finance, complained to us that the tariff imposed by the Mackenzie Government was too high, that the Administration was an extravagant Administration, and that by returning,

to power the party now in office, which was then in Opposition, not only would the burden of taxation not be increased, but we should obtain reciprocity. That gentleman, in the city of St. John, in 1868, said :

"We want no increased taxation, but we do want the tax properly imposed. The duties on non-enumerated articles should stand at 15 per cent."

That hon. gentleman further said :

"I would vote against the duty on coal and flour, but if it came up as part of a general scheme in favor of reciprocity, I would vote for imposing the duty."

Then, we all remember that memorable and never-to-be-forgotten telegram from the right hon. Prime Minister to Mr. Boyd, assuring him that there was to be no increase of taxation, only a readjustment. These were the promises which were put forward before the Province of New Brunswick ; and when you look at the taxation of to-day and that proposed, no comments of mine are needed to show a contrast between the promises of that day and the actual facts as they at present exist. No promises were more distinct, or have more distinctly failed, than those made to the Province of New Brunswick ; and I feel, as a native of that Province, that now, after nearly a quarter of a century has elapsed, I have nothing to regret that I lifted my voice against the union then consummated. I have never regretted, though nearly a quarter of a century has since elapsed, having lifted my voice against that union. So far as our Province is concerned, considering our position, we look to the neighboring republic as our best market, and one of the great inducements which induced us to join Confederation was the hope that by that means reciprocal intercourse with the United States might be obtained. But now we find that is not the policy of the Government, but they have now an entirely different policy. So far as regards the question of increased duties, the tendency of a highly protective tariff is to become more and more protective, and no better exemplification of this can be found than in the course adopted by the Government since the National Policy was introduced in 1878. From time to time the duties have been increased and additional burdens imposed on the people. We find, in fact, that protection begets protection. From the largest industries to the smallest, from the sugar and cotton industries down to the smallest machine shop, from the heavy manufacturer down to the itinerant umbrella mender, they all seek protection in the shape of taxes on the miner, the farmer, and the laborer. In his turn the miner seeks to have duties put upon iron and coal, the farmer clamors for a duty upon flour to meet the increased prices he has to pay for agricultural implements, clothing and sugar ; and even now we find the laborer coming forward, demanding the passage of a law to debar the immigrant from coming to our shores, in order that labor in this country may be protected. Thus it goes on ; and, instead of this country being made a low-taxed country, where cheap living would induce immigrants to come in and fill up our vacant lands, we find ourselves in the unenviable position of having, with few exceptions, the highest tariff in existence. Such is the position in which we stand to-day. So far as regards the general principles of the tariff, the Government are proposing to impose additional heavy burdens on the people, which will give an increased revenue at a time when it is not needed. As regards our relations with the neighboring republic, this tariff is simply a retaliatory tariff formed for the purpose of creating irritation and ill-feeling with our neighbors by erecting barriers between the two countries, and instead of encouraging trade with our largest consumers, we are doing all we can to hamper it. And while we are doing this on the one hand, on the other we are sending a High Commissioner to Spain for the purpose of opening trade with that country ; and we have sent a Commission to the West Indies, and another to the Argentine Republic for the same purpose ; and, if report speaks truly, an hon. Senator and the hon. member for Hamilton are to be sent to Australia to see if trade cannot be opened with that country. Thus we are seeking to open up trade with these distant lands in competition with the very men with whom we are asked to believe that we cannot compete in our own country. So far as the prospects of successful results from the efforts of these commissioners are concerned, I need only refer to the Trade and Navigation Reports to show what little hope there is of success in that direction, and if the result of the Pan American Congress is to be the entering into of reciprocal treaties between the Argentine Republic and the other South American States, and the great country to the south of us, we will then be shut off entirely from competition. Concerning the effects of our tariff on our relations with the United States, I would call attention to an article from the New York *Commercial Bulletin* :

"The people of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada have now before them the views of their respective Governments on tariff revision, as expressed in newly introduced Tariff Bills. In both countries protectionist theories have formed the basis of proposed legislation, and it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that in the Canadian Bill retaliation against ourselves has also been a motive power in framing certain clauses. The intentions of the Ways and Means Committee with regard to the agricultural section of our own Tariff Bill, have been known quite long enough to admit of their exercising a very considerable influence on the Ministerial party in Canada in its tariff deliberations. Whether they have done so or not, we have the unedifying spectacle of two countries that ought to be, from their natural position and character, in close commercial relationship, engaged in legislation calculated to still further widen the existing differences between them.

"In both Tariff Bills the farmer and his interests play an important part. The United States farmer is to be protected against the Canadian farmer and the Canadian farmer against the United States farmer. Farming interests in this country are said to be suffering from the inroads of Canadian competition, whilst, according to the Montreal *Gazette*, 'of late years American farm products of various kinds have been gradually overrunning the Canadian market to the injury of our agriculturists ; and especially has this been the case with beef and flour.' We do not attempt to explain the inconsistency of the two positions, as they are mutually destructive and much stronger evidence in favor of an unrestricted interchange of such commodities as each country can best produce than in favor of increased 'protection.'

"The changes in the Canadian Tariff Bill most affecting ourselves are as follows : The duty on flour to be raised from 50 cents to 75 cents per barrel ; mess pork and pork, from 1 cent to 1½ cents per lb. ; all salted and fresh meats, from 1 cent to 2 and 3 cents per lb. ; prepared meats, from 2 cents to 3 cents per lb. ; tried lard, from 2 cents to 3 cents per lb., and untried lard, from ½ cent to 2 cents per lb. Live cattle, hogs and sheep to have the duty raised from 20 to 30 per cent., and fruits, plants and shrubs, which had been placed on the free list in 1888, to be restored to the same rate of duty as existed before that date, with a slight concession in favor of blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries.

"These revisions affect a considerable proportion of the exports from this country to Canada. Taking the Bureau of Statistics' figures for the last fiscal year, the total

value was four million dollars, of which eleven million dollars, or 27½ per cent., was made up of the agricultural products referred to."

Evidently a mistake in the figures, as they should be $40,000,000.—

"As the advances in duty range all the way from 50 to 250 per cent. on existing rates, this outlet for our excess farm produce will be very seriously interfered with, and in some instances closed altogether. Our imports of agricultural products and stock, affected by the McKinley Bill, from Canada, were valued at eighteen million dollars, out of a total import of forty-three million dollars, or 42 per cent. As, however, the import figures are complete, and those for export confessedly short, the difference between the two is certainly less than shown above. In any case, the other changes in the Canadian tariff make it a drastic measure of protection against the United States, and quite as retaliatory in effect as if conceived in a spirit of reprisal.

"It is the radical weakness of protectionist policies that they have no logical resting place. They are less under the control of the country favoring them than of outsiders, inasmuch as they are entirely dependent for their supposed value on the cost of production by those outsiders. If that cost sinks below a certain level upon which a protective tariff has been based, further revision is incumbent, or the interests affected are no longer protected. Both Canada and the United States are illustrating the force of this, and building the protection wall higher and higher as the general cost of production falls lower and lower. They are building against one another, under the mistaken idea that their respective positions will be improved by each additional stone added to the barriers against free commerce. The policy is an unnatural one, and the only present consolation to be derived from it is the certainty that the higher the walls of protection are built the sooner they will topple over, and the more complete will be their fall."

We have heard statements quoted from newspapers, but I think the expression of opinion given by Secretary Bayard is far better than any of those. We find that Sir Charles Tupper put forward the principle, at the time of the introduction of this policy, that it was desired to bring about reciprocity within a short time, and that that could be accomplished by building up a wall to defend the industries of this country. The effect of the course we are now pursuing is to build up walls much higher than those which were then indicated. And those walls at last will become so high that they will tumble over and crumble to the ground. Another result of the system adopted by the Government, is that which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has endeavored to counteract, but which I fear he will fail in doing, as long as this policy exists—that is, the combination of the manufacturers by which the prices to the consumers are enhanced. But even this is not sufficient for protectionist purposes, and the public works are pressed into the service in order to enable the manufacturers to reap larger profits. We find that our railways are carrying our fuel and other materials at unremunerative rates. Mr. Schreiber, in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, congratulated himself there was less loss, owing to less coal being carried at unremunerative prices. The workingman has to pay the cost of this National Policy in three different ways. In the first place, he has to pay the impost of the Customs duty; secondly, he has to pay the enhanced price under the combines; and thirdly, he has to pay the amount required to make up the unremunerative cost of transportation. Thus the burden becomes more and more oppressive every year, and we are in this way as much bound under slavery as were the Israelites in Egypt. In regard to the changes which are now proposed, if we accept the statement of the Minister of Finance that there are large surpluses expected, and yet that it is proposed to add still more to the burdens of the country by increasing the revenue, we should ask on what principle an increased Customs tariff should be adopted. In the first place, the Customs tariff should be levied to meet the requirements of the country, and the expenditure necessary for the advancement of its works, as well as for the ordinary services, and that should be so levied as to fall equally upon all classes in the Dominion. Secondly, if it is necessary to levy such a tariff, it should be so levied as to afford some protection to the manufactures by the free admission of raw material in order to enable the people to obtain cheap goods, and so to reduce the burden of taxation as the manufacture increases in value as to made it commensurate with the burden of taxation. Now, we are drawing from the people more than is necessary for the expenditure of the country and for the expenditure which is required on the works necessary for its advancement. No one can look at that tariff and say that it will bear equally upon all parts of the Dominion, or that it will not bear very heavily upon the Maritime Provinces. I appeal also to my hon. friends from Manitoba and the North-West, as I do to those from the Maritime Provinces, to state whether this tariff will bear fairly upon them. Instead of protection to the manufactures being given by allowing the raw material to come in free, we find the raw material is taxed, we find that the food and the fuel of the people are taxed, and, instead of the price of living being reduced, it has practically been increased to the workingmen. The Finance Minister has stated that there was a surplus of $2,700,000 last year, and that he expected a surplus of $2,000,000 this year, and yet he proposes to add to the burdens of the country. The principle adopted in the mother country has been that, when the revenue increases, the taxation should be reduced. That principle was put forward by Sir Charles Tupper when he was in Opposition, and that was the principle adopted by this side of the House when it was in power. That principle has not been carried out. Even in the neighboring republic, we find that principle adopted to a certain extent. But how is our surplus expended? I am sorry to believe that in many cases it is expended in debauching constituencies and obtaining the election of members to this House for the party in power, in erecting buildings which are not required, and constructing railways which are not in the interest of the country. We find there is a continual decrease in the receipts from certain articles on which the tariff is levied Taking the Toronto *Mail*, I find a statement showing that there will be reductions in the receipts from taxation on paperhangings of $19,811; on common and ornamental glass, $29,712; on molasses, $46,030; making a total reduction under the proposed tariff of $95,523. On the other hand we find the following increases:—

Flour, 258,831 brls	$ 64,703
Bacon and hams, 3,658,967 lbs	36,639
Beef, 3,806,397 lbs	76,126
Mutton, 174,944 lbs	3,498
Prepared meats, 1,010,026 lbs	1,010
Pork, 15,206,172 lbs	152,061
	$ 333,987

FRUIT.	
Apples	$ 29,168
Berries	52,268
Cherries	926
Peaches	33,273
	$ 115,635
CLOTHING.	
Blankets	$ 2,855
Cassimeres	17,001
Cloths	34,805
Coatings	32,059
Doeskins	35
Meltons	1,763
Overcoatings	1,493
Tweeds	30,793
Felt cloths	522
Yarn	4,126
	$ 125,452
MISCELLANEOUS.	
Animals	$ 30,409
Fancy goods	91,814
Gloves and mitts	17,303
Plants	5,000
	$ 144,526

This makes a total increased burden of $719,600. Deducting from that the reduction, in round numbers, of $100,000, it leaves the net increased burden $619,600. I believe, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said, it is impossible to say whether the actual increased burden may not extend to a million and a half. In regard to the general prosperity of the country, I am willing to admit that, as far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, we are enjoying a greater share of prosperity than we did a few years ago. This is owing to a great change with regard to our ships. Our freights have risen, and lumber has also advanced. Handicapped as our lumber business has been by the duties imposed by this tariff, still it became more remunerative, and it is owing to these facts that we have enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity. But there is no use in disguising the fact that the exodus from our Province is large, and I think no member from that Province will deny this. So far as the district I represent is concerned, I do not believe there is one household where you will not find one or more vacant chairs of persons who have gone to another country; it may be that in some instances they have gone to our North-West, but I am afraid that in the greater number of instances they have gone to a foreign country. Immigration has also ceased, and as regards the several thousands which were stated by the Minister of Agriculture to have settled in New Brunswick during the last year, I must say that I have been unable to ascertain where any of them have been located. These are facts that it is no use to attempt to disguise. It is not disloyalty to speak the truth, and to go on in blind ignorance of the facts, is simply to live in a fool's paradise, and I think that it should be the honest endeavor of every member of this House to ascertain the truth, and to find a solution for the difficulties of our position. I believe that our troubles have arisen from the oppressive and burdensome system of taxation under which we now live. Such, I contend, are the results which have flowed from the National Policy inaugurated in 1878, and so far as regards the Province from which I come, I can say without hesitation that the tariff is the cause of the evils which I have described. With regard to these particular burdens which the Minister of Finance proposes to put upon us, my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has already pointed out many instances in which it will affect New Brunswick. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) and my colleague from St. John (Mr. Ellis) have also given many instances in which these propositions will affect New Brunswick and the Maritime Provinces generally. However, these details will have to engage the attention of the Committee. When my hon. friend from Halifax said that the lumbermen would have to pay a less duty on pork, I think he will find, on reflection, that the same duty will fall upon the fishermen. Both classes will fare alike and will have to pay the $6 a barrel. The other evening my hon. friend from Northumberland, in the paper he read, showed clearly that the lumbermen of New Brunswick will have to pay $6 a barrel for pork. The Minister of Customs said the other evening, in reply to the member from the city of St. John, that the fishermen going to the banks would not have to pay this duty. It is true that fishing vessels may be relieved from this duty, and I think that even before they were entitled to take their pork out of bond without paying the duty. But with regard to the boat fishermen, who were described by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) and the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis), they will have to bear a heavier burden. With regard to those in my own county, men who toil in boats in the bay, endeavoring to eke out a precarious living, they will have to pay this duty. I think my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will say that the poor men along his shores, who toil from morning to night in order to gain a livelihood, will have to bear this additional burden, while the wealthier men, who fit out schooners for the great fisheries, will be free from it. But even the families of these men who are left behind will have to pay this additional duty on the food they eat. Such will be the effect of the pork duty in New Brunswick. Now, the Minister of Finance said that we would be compensated, in regard to the flour duty, by the reduction of the price of molasses, and by the rebate on corn. Sir, this is a tacit admission that the price of flour is increased, and the only object of making these reductions is that the Government may be able to put an additional price on flour. This is the principle that was put forward by Sir Charles Tupper a few years ago, when he said that the duty on flour paid by the Maritime Provinces would be compensated by the duty on coal paid by Ontario. Now, I find that last year 927,014 barrels of flour were brought over the Intercolonial Railroad, and most of it remained in the Lower Provinces. We find that a large amount was also brought into those Provinces by sea. Upon all this flour the duty has got to be paid by the workingmen, by the fishermen and the lumbermen. I believe it is estimated that in the neighborhood of 300,000 barrels of flour are consumed annually in our own Province, and I believe that figure is rather under than over the mark. If we have to pay the additional 25 cents a barrel, that would amount to $75,000 on that item alone. True, it is said there is a compensation on the molasses. Last year the duty on molasses consumed in New Brunswick amounted to $15,000; but if, as I understand, a specific duty is to be put on molasses, the duty will become heavier. Molasses above fifty-five is to be subject to a higher duty,

and I see that the molasses chiefly imported into New Brunswick ranges about fifty-seven; so it is very questionable whether we shall not have to pay an increased duty on molasses. Besides that, we shall have to pay duty on the casks, which we never did before, and that is the compensation we are to get for the duty on flour. Then we are told there is a rebate on corn; that means that we can give up our wheat-flour, which every man is entitled to eat, and come down to mush and molasses, for the purpose of getting more revenue for the country. That is the way we are being dealt with in the Lower Provinces. I would also call attention to the freight on flour over the Intercolonial Railroad and the duty which we have to pay. To St. John, the freight on a barrel of flour is 55 cents, and the duty now will be 75 cents, bringing up the extra cost to $1.30 which we will have to pay on flour. That flour could be imported by our little schooners sailing from the Lower Provinces for from 12½ cents to 15 cents a barrel, from Boston or New York. To the town of Newcastle, in the County of Northumberland, the duty on the carriage of flour is 70 cents, and the duty is 75 cents, making $1.45, while it could be imported by sea for 25 cents; so there is a difference of $1.20 which we shall have to pay additional. It is said the price to the consumer is not enhanced. Why, then, is this additional duty put on? Why is this difference of from $1.15 to $1.20 added to the price the consumer will have to pay for his flour? It is for the purpose of enhancing the revenue of the country, and of protecting the millers. The best evidence of this was the statement of the hon. member for Halifax the other day. Speaking of the flour coming into Newfoundland, he said that of the whole quantity of 278,000 barrels imported into that colony, 268,000 came from the United States. With regard to the effects of this tariff, I desire to call the attention of the House to the view taken in our Province, and I take this view from the St. John *Sun*, the organ of the Government, and a paper which has supported this Government ever since it was founded. It says:

"We publish to-day the views of a number of business men on the tariff changes. The consensus of opinion is rather against some of the new features of the tariff. Business men as a rule do not like tariff tinkering. They are not so much troubled by high tariffs as by changing and uncertain tariffs. * * * Most of them are not speculators in the stocks they hold, but expect to make true profits by small margins of gain on all transactions. Tariff changes confuse business men by closing up or obstructing old channels of trade and by causing abrupt and arbitrary fluctuations in the value of stock already purchased but not received or already sold but not delivered." * * *

I think that applies with peculiar force to the Maritime Provinces, for we find that to-day many of our merchants have purchased stocks in foreign countries, on which they now find they will be called upon to pay increased duties. It goes on to say:

"The general opinion appears to me that the Government has overdone the thing in some directions. Notably in the very large increase in duty on salt meats."

I will now submit for the consideration of the House a statement from a leading firm engaged in the dry goods trade. Macaulay Bros. & Co. said:

"Are directly opposed to the changes, as far as their business is concerned. Two members of the firm were seen. The changes are directly in the interest of the Upper Province merchants.

"Their season is a couple of months earlier than ours, and these changes made just now give them a big advantage.

"The Upper Province men are to be found in the markets of Europe securing their fall and winter stock when we, down by the sea, are securing our summer goods; so that now we have to put our goods (which will have to pay the increased duty) into competition with the Upper Province men, who have got their goods in before the tariff changes. This is decidedly unfair, and the Government, when contemplating such radical changes, should give at least thirty days' notice.

"Take the extra duty put on coatings—which will never be made in Canada. Then take corset steels; they are to pay so much a pound. Why, it is beyond the comprehension of the trade, except it be that some little manufacturer wants te get a start. Again, there are umbrellas and parasols, which are not made in Canada to any extent. There are fifteen lines—purely dry goods—which show a total increase of 50 per cent. in duty, and this increase will naturally have to be paid by the purchaser.

"Messrs. Macaulay believe in the duty in grey cottons, shirtings and in grades of coatings, or in any line of goods which can be manufactured in Canada, but object, as they put it, to duty being put on goods not manufactured here."

I have also the opinion of Mr. C. H. Fairweather, of Hall & Fairweather, another gentleman engaged in the same trade. He said:

"No difference in flour was expected. Their firm had not been importing from the States and saw no reason to anticipate they would. He had hoped that the duty on cornmeal would be reduced one-half and thought it would have satisfied the millers just as well, for they can see the danger of overdoing the business. The reduction of duty on molasses was a direct gain to that extent, provided the test is such as to allow the customary regular grade of molasses to come in. He did not see why there should be any difference in the duty on pork. Mess pork has been for years selected as the grade for speculative purposes. He had seen it run up and held for weeks at $10 a barrel over a normal price. It is at the present moment held about 30 cents above a barrel of clear, which is always worth one dollar a barrel more than mess. Through speculation mess is held higher. This duty directs the whole Canadian demand on mess, preventing our people from buying clear pork, which costs less and is worth more. As to seeds, he regretted to see the duty put on. He imported five cars every spring, and was doubtful if Canada could supply the demand. The duty would increase the costs."

H. J. Thorne, of Clarke, Kerr & Thorne, hardware merchants, said:

"The changes of the tariff affected their business very slightly. He was glad to see the duty reduced on glass; it should never have gone on. Mechanics' tools had been advanced from 30 to 35 per cent., and he would rather have seen them remain as they were, as many of the more delicate tools were not manufactured in Canada, but the reduction on glass would fully offset any slight measure made in other lines."

G. Wetmore Merritt, of Turnbull & Co., said:

"That the duty of 3 cents a pound on lard, including the net, would mean a duty of 3½ cents on lard and would increase the price. Canada, he thought, could not at present produce enough to supply the market, and would, therefore, have to import. Regarding pork, he said that the major part of the pork imported here is short cut clear, on which the duty is $6 per barrel. On mess pork, the rate is only $3. The two rates opened up a fine chance for smuggling. Long cut clear pork, under the Inspection Act rate, pays as mess and enters at $3. It would be very easy since both are in precisely similar barrels, to brand short cut clear as 'long' cut clear and enter it as such. It would be necessary to examine every barrel, to learn whether it might pay the $3 or the $6 rate of duty. That would necessitate a whole army of inspectors. Canada does not and cannot, for some years at least, produce enough pork, and will, therefore, import the American. Of course the mess pork will be the kind, though clear is the favorite. While their firm paid duty the other day on 150 barrels mess, they paid on 650 barrels of clear. The rate should be made uniform. Mess pork has gone up $1 a barrel and lard one cent a pound since the duty was changed. Clear pork is being held to see if the rate

will not be uniform with mess. If not, it will have to go up much higher than mess. As to the American beef on hand the price of that will be governed by what Canadian packers can do. Quotations have been asked for from the Upper Province packers, but no reply has been received as yet. The article has already gone up here, however, $3 per barrel. It is not known yet at the Custom house, whether any rebate will be allowed on goods bought up but not delivered before the duty went up. With regard to the duty on seeds, there seemed to be an indefiniteness in the statement of the tariff. The rate on large parcels was 15 per cent., and on small parcels 25 per cent. It seemed hard to say where a small parcel merged into a large one. The duty on seeds would increase the price. Their firm have now to pay $150 duty on a consignment just received."

George McAvity, engaged in the brass and hardware trade, said :

"The duty on sheet brass and brass wire would increase the cost of production of their goods, and to that extent be an advantage to United States competition, inasmuch as there was no increased duty on the manufactured product. If the duty on their line of manufactured goods had been made 35 per cent., the same as on hardware, they would have been satisfied. The new duty adds 3 to 4 per cent. to the cost of production.

"While speaking on the subject Mr. McAvity said the old duty of 10 per cent. on copper, still retained, operated against any export trade. They were just about to ship a lot of samples to Thomas A. Ashton, Sheffield, England, where they were assured a considerable trade could be worked up. They had also opened up some trade with Barbadoes. Not unless we got copper wire made free or a rebate, say, of 5 per cent. on the invoice were allowed, a large export trade could not be developed."

I have called attention to these statements, as they are statements from persons practically engaged in business. I find that, since the new tariff, O'Neill Bros., of St. John, have made an importation of meat, on which the duty payable before the tariff was $36, whereas it is now $108 ; and another firm have made a like importation on which they would have had to pay a duty of $201.65, but they now have to pay $601.65. Such are some of the effects of the proposed changes in the tariff. We have recently been building up a trade in lime, but, in view of the adoption of this retaliatory tariff, I fear the duty in the United States will be so increased as to prevent its development, while we had hoped that this industry, which had rapidly developed from a few thousand barrels, would have grown into half a million barrels this year. Another question of vital importance to the Maritime Provinces is the export duty on logs. It is at present $1 per thousand on spruce logs, and we find that the American tariff provides that while the duty may be reduced from its present standard of $2 per thousand, the amount of export duty shall be added, so that the duty on spruce logs going to the United States will be $3 per thousand, which will be practically prohibitory. We send from New Brunswick to the United States, spruce logs to the value of $700,000 or $800,000, and $1,160,000 of American lumber which comes down the river St. John. We now have to pay this $2 additional export duty in the Province of New Brunswick, and the result of this will be, that practically that trade will be destroyed. That export duty in that Province last year only produced $1,017, and even that duty was only collected upon small wood, cut out by the farmers and the poor people of the country during the winter time, a class who are least able to pay duty. This duty also affects us in the large amount of coasting trade which we enjoy with the United States. Look at the daily reports of the vessels inwards and outwards from the port of St. John, and you will find that our small coasters are laden with cargoes of lumber outwards, but their holds

are empty on the inward voyages. If you put on this extra duty our poor people will have to pay it in addition to the present duty, and it will be so much withdrawn from the market, and will prove a great loss of employment for our small coasting vessels. I protest on behalf of New Brunswick against this export duty, and I say, it is a violation of one of the terms under which we entered into the Union. Under the British North America Act, the export duty which we then had placed upon all lumber was secured to the Province of New Brunswick and given to it as its right, subject only to the condition that it should not be increased. That duty we held for six years after Confederation, and, until by the Treaty of Washington, the Imperial Government undertook that they would use their influence with the Dominion Government and the Government of New Brunswick to extinguish that export duty, and so negotiations were entered into and a final arrangement was made between the Province of New Brunswick and the Dominion Government on one hand, that, for a certain sum, New Brunswick should surrender that right —but she surrendered it to be extinguished, and not to be transferred. We maintain that the understanding was in good faith, that that export duty which had belonged to our Province, should be extinguished, and it is in violation of that understanding, and in violation of the position we took at the time of Confederation, that this duty should now be imposed. The position is now, that whereas the New Brunswick export duty was levied upon all alike, Dominion and foreign, the Dominion duty to-day is levied upon the Canadian alone. Such is the position in which we stand under this Confederation, and such are we harassed under this tariff. As has been graphically pointed out by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), the imposition of this duty is a violation of the understanding on which we entered Confederation. Our Province in this case is in a most unfortunate position, and, more unfortunate still, she has been placed in that position by those who belong to her. The first heavy duties levied upon New Brunswick on this matter were made by an hon. member of this House who now sits in the gubernatorial chair of his native Province. My hon. friend, the present Minister of Finance, is also a son of her soil, nurtured in one of her universities, and honored by the representation of one of the finest districts of New Brunswick. These are the men at whose hands our Province has been so badly treated. I might say of my hon. friend, as was said of Rehoboam of old : that while Sir Leonard Tilley scourged us with whips, the present hon. Minister of Finance has chastised us with scorpions. Our Province is in the unfortunate position that her own sons have burdened us with this heavy taxation. In conclusion, I might use the words of the dying eagle transfixed by the hunter's dart feathered with her own plumage :

"Keen were her pangs, but keener far to feel
She nursed the pinion that impelled the steel ;
That the same plumage that had warmed her nest,
Drank the life-blood of her bleeding breast."

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow closely the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman comes from one of the Lower Provinces, while I come

from the other end of the Dominion, and probably it will be better for me to leave a reply in the hands of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who come from the Province of which the hon. gentleman has the honor of being one of the representatives. I shall confine my remarks, principally, to a reply to the speech made the other night by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), but in reference to the remarks on the duty on flour, made by the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), I feel it necessary to say a few words. I ask that hon. gentleman if he, or any other member on the opposite side of the House, can say that the price of flour has been raised in the Maritime Provinces since the increased duty was announced the other day? Until such time as an increased price on flour in the Maritime Provinces has been occasioned by this duty, it does not lie in the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite, or of any person else, to say that the people have been prejudiced by the duty. On the other hand, I may say to the hon. gentleman that the farmers of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, as well as the flour millers of these Provinces and the flour millers of Ontario, are going to be benefited to a large extent by that increase in duty upon flour, and instead of the Americans being able to compete with us in the markets of the Lower Provinces, our millers will be able to supply them with flour of equal or better quality, at the same price, and probably at a less price, than they paid formerly for American flour. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) pointed out, the other night, that a resolution had been lately passed by the Local Legislature of Manitoba, asking that this Parliament should undertake to bring about unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman forgot to tell this House that that resolution was moved in the Legislature of Manitoba by the Hon. Mr. Martin, Attorney General; and the hon. member for Marquette forgot, also, to tell the House that, upon different occasions, the Hon. Mr. Martin has announced himself as an avowed annexationist.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; he said so in this city.

Mr. DALY. I say yes. The hon. member for Marquette forgot, also, to say that that Legislature is composed of thirty-six members, and out of that number thirty-two of them were elected to support the present Government of Manitoba, and if they were in this House they would be opposed to the existing Administration here. There is nothing of importance in this resolution being passed, except that four of the members who supported it belong to the Conservative party. I have not the slightest doubt that if these hon. gentlemen had looked into the question as I have looked into it, and as, I think, I shall be able to present it to the House, they would come to the conclusion that, so far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned, she and her people are not in such a bad position as they are sought to be made out by hon. members of the Opposition in this House. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) referred to the fact that the resolution he spoke of quotes a report of a Committee of the House of the Manitoba Legislature, made in 1884, and he states that during that time the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), now a supporter of the Government in this House, was a member of the Local Government and was chairman of the committee who made the report. It might have been well if the hon. member for Marquette had told the House that, at the time that resolution was passed, the people of Manitoba and the North-West had not through connection with the Eastern Provinces of Canada, that all the goods and all the produce brought into that country then, were brought through the United States, and that, in consequence of the high rate of freight, and of our not having railroad communication with the eastern markets of Canada, we were obliged to import largely from the United States. Why, Sir, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that, in 1883, under the one item of agricultural implements, we imported into the Province of Manitoba from the United States, 1,093 mowing and reaping and threshing machines, of the value of $141,516, upon which we paid a duty of $35,505.10. We imported in that year, from the United States, ploughs to the value of $108,367, upon which we paid a duty of $27,178.05. We imported from the United States, portable steam engines, valued at $39,473, upon which we paid a duty of $10,206.75. We imported agricultural implements, not elsewhere specified, to the value of $107,104, on which we paid a duty of $26,930.05, making the total imports of agricultural implements from the United States in that year $396,460, on which we paid a duty of $99,819.95. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman gave figures to the House, the other night, to show that the people of Manitoba paid in 1888–89 a total duty of $46,123.47 less duty by $53,696.48 than was paid in 1883, a year previous to the adoption of the resolution to which he referred in the Manitoba Legislature. The hon. gentleman stated that the people of Manitoba last year paid a duty of $17,714 on lumber. Now, I find, on looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1883, that we imported into Manitoba from the United States in that year lumber to the value of $564,314, on which we paid a duty of $112,868.25, whereas in 1889, having in the meantime had communication opened up with the Rat Portage lumber district, from which we get the bulk of our lumber, the importation was only to the value of $88,621, on which we only paid a duty of $17,714.20, or a difference between the duty we paid on lumber in 1883 and in 1889 of the magnificent sum of $95,154.05. If you take the difference between the value of the lumber we imported from the United States in 1883 and the value we imported in 1889, you will find that last year we put into the pockets of the lumber merchants of Rat Portage, and that neighborhood, the sum of $475,693; and but for the tariff on lumber that amount and probably more would have gone into the pockets of our American neighbors. Moreover, since the opening up of the communication with Rat Portage and the Eastern Provinces, the price of lumber has been reduced in Manitoba below what it was in 1884 when that resolution was passed. I have no doubt that at that time the people had a right to complain of the price they were paying for lumber; they did not then enjoy the direct communication with the Eastern Provinces which they enjoy at the present time; but since the opening up of that communication,

the price of lumber, as well as the price of all other necessaries, has decreased. My hon. friend, in his speech the other night, stated that the farmers of Manitoba were injured, not only by the duty on lumber, but by the duties on agricultural implements, and he dwelt with great gusto especially on the duty on binding twine. In that connection he made the extraordinary statement that in the coming season the farmers of Manitoba would pay $40,000 of duty on binding twine. He stated—and in this I agree with him—that there would probably be a million acres under crop in Manitoba this year, and as the farmers use about 2 lbs. of twine to the acre, they would require 2,000,000 lbs. to harvest the crop of 1890. They may require more ; I hope they will ; but when the hon. gentleman stated that the farmers would pay $40,000 of duty on that twine, he stated not only what was ridiculous, but what he must have known at the time was false, because the hon. gentleman has access to the Trade and Navigations Returns, and if he had looked at them he would have found that, last year, the total quantity of binding twine brought into Manitoba from Great Britain was 35 lbs., valued at $10, on which a duty of $2.50 was paid, and that the total quantity from the United States was 3,649 lbs., valued at $714, on which a duty of $178.50 was paid.

Mr. WATSON. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to misrepresent what I said. I stated that we would pay $40,000 more than we would pay but for the duty on twine.

Mr. DALY. I will read what the hon. gentleman said :

"The duty on binding twine is 1½ cents a pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, or about 2½ cents. Admitting that we do not pay the full duty, we undoubtedly pay a duty of 2 cents a pound. On 2,000,000 lbs. of twine, we will accordingly pay a duty of $40,000."

Now, Sir, on this question of binding twine, I have had occasion to inform myself. I find that in Canada there are at present six rope-walks manufacturing this twine. We have the Dartmouth Rope Company of Halifax, Thomas Connors & Sons of St. John, N.B., John Brown & Co. of Quebec, A. W. Morris & Bro. of Montreal, Bannerman Bros. of Lachute, the Brantford Cordage Company of Brantford, and a small concern at Toronto the name of which I could not get. I find, from communications with these gentlemen, that the production of binding twine is sufficient for the demand at present and for some years to come. I had also occasion to communicate with the Massey Manufacturing Company of Toronto, one of the largest manufactories in Canada, asking them from whom they bought their twine. I have a reply from them to the effect, that last year they sold 300,000 lbs. of binding twine in Manitoba and the North-West, that every pound they bought last year and the year before was bought in Canada, and that on no occasion do they buy any from the United States, except in some extraordinary year when the supply runs short when they get some in Minneapolis, because it is nearer than Halifax. These gentlemen say :

"First. The present cash price of our standard 3 A binder, delivered freight prepaid to Brandon or any other station in the Province of Manitoba, is $160, or on time payments to farmers, $180; whilst we have another machine that we are selling for $10 less, namely, at $150 cash, or $170 on time payments.

Mr. DALY.

"Second. The selling price of our binders in the year 1883 and 1884 was about $320 cash, and $340 on time payments.

"Third. The quantity of binder twine that we sold in Manitoba and the North-West last year was about 300,000 lbs., which was, of course, limited to so small a quantity owing to the unfortunate circumstance of a bad crop. The price varied, according to quality, from 19 cents to 20 cents a pound. That which we shipped to Manitoba was manufactured in Halifax by the Dartmouth Ropeworks Co. We did not sell any American twine last year, and neither have we any year, only at such a time when there has been a shortage shown at the last minute, and when we have been able to find a small lot possibly carried over by some dealer or manufacturer in St. Paul's or Minneapolis, and from whence it should be got much quicker than shipment from Halifax at the last moment of the season. Therefore, what we have handled of this has been of a very limited quantity indeed.

"Fourth. We certainly consider twine made by the leading manufacturers of this article in Canada to be fully equal and in some instances better than that made in the United States. The price of a standard twine manufactured out of half manilla and half sisal hemp we believe is worth in Chicago to-day in wholesale consignments of say 100 tons, about 13½ cents to 14½ cents a pound, while pure manilla is worth from 15 cents to 15½ cents a pound, with a discount of 3 per cent. for cash, at ten days. It might possibly be a little higher than this now, but certainly not any less, as a rule; and we can vouch for the past two or three seasons that binder twine of equal quality has been retailed in the United States at a greater price than in Canada. To further substantiate the price named above we enclose you herewith a clipping from the *Farm Implement News*, published in Chicago.

"'You will notice that the lowest quotation made to us in 100 ton lots is 9 cents per pound f.o.b. cars, New York city. We might say for this same twine, which is being manufactured by the Dartmouth Ropeworks Company of Halifax, and which we are using a goodly quantity of, we are retailing to Ontario farmers, payable on the 1st day of October next, at 10 cents per pound, and in Manitoba delivered at farmers' stations at 13 cents a pound. The standard manilla twine as indicated above, we retail in Ontario at 15 cents, and in Manitoba at 17 cents, which goes to show that we retail twine to farmers in Ontario at about the equivalent price as it is being wholesaled by the manufacturers and dealers in the States, and only a bare addition of 2 cents a pound, to cover the additional freight and expenses incurred in the Manitoba trade.'"

The clipping from the *Farm Implement News*, referred to in the letter, is as follows :—

"The binder twine situation has not improved. Those whose interests are merged with the association, are persuaded that established card prices are bound to prevail a little later on in the season, on a basis of about 16½ cents for pure manilla sold out of St. Louis. In support of this position they cite the fact that seventeen mills of the National Cordage Company have been sold, so as to permit the cleaning out of the old stocks. But the demoralisation of prices goes on merrily in spite of all warnings and admonitions; and it is to be noticed that more cheap grades of twine than ever are offering. For instance, there has been a wonderful increase of the American and New Zealand hemp article, whose usefulness is claimed to be greatly advanced since the fibre is presented in single rather than in the three-ply form in which it went to the market two or three years ago. Furthermore, dealers complain that certain jobbers are having sisal made up on half-and-half, one-half being colored to represent manilla. In such circumstances the low price people are getting the lion's share of the trade going; but buying is, nevertheless, not to say active. The prices ruling for the business are about as follows:—Manilla, 15c. in car lots, and 15½c. in less than car lots; standard, 13½c. and 14c.; hemp, 11½c. and 12c.; jute, 10½c., 11c. and 11½c. These are close, too, if they are not the lowest quotations obtainable by half a cent."

Now, I may state that the manufacture has arisen in the United States of a new kind of twine called the silver composite twine. That is now also being manufactured by a Halifax company, and it is being offered by the Massey Company to the farmers of Ontario, payable the 1st October following, at 10 cents per pound, and to the farmers of Manitoba delivered at farmers' stations at 13 cents per pound, while the lowest quotation from

New York is 9 cents per pound delivered free on board cars at New York in wholesale lots. Yet those gentlemen are retailing the same kind of twine at 10 cents in Ontario. The next question which the hon. gentleman took up was the price of binders. He stated that binders were sold in Manitoba for $160 cash or $180 credit, and I believe the hon. gentleman's figures are correct, but he went on to say that they could be bought in Watertown, Dakota, for $120, whereas it is a fact that the price of binders in Dakota last year was $180 in two payments, or an advance of $5 additional when supplied with a sheaf carrier. These figures are equally reliable as those produced by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman told us that the 35 per cent. duty on agricultural machinery weighed heavily on the people of the North-West. Well, I asked the Massey Manufacturing Company for the prices at which they sold their machines in 1884, when this resolution referred to was passed by the Local House of Manitoba, and I was informed that their selling price for binders was $320 cash and $340 time, payable in 1883 and 1884; whereas to-day they sell a better article to the farmers in Manitoba at $160 cash and $180 credit. Thus the effect of the increased duty was to enable the manufacturers in Ontario to have more confidence in their business and to supply the people, not only of Ontario, but also of Manitoba and the North-West, with a cheaper and better machine than they could get before the increased duty was put on. More than that; if the farmers of Manitoba desire to have American binders, we find that the American manufacturers have reduced their prices in the same proportion from 1883 and 1884 to the present day. Taking the figures which the hon. gentleman gave, we find that the total number of harvesters and binders imported by Manitoba from the United States last year was only 21, the value of which was $2,745, and the duty on which was $960.75, while the Massey Manufacturing Co. alone sent into Manitoba last year over 1,000 binders, over 700 mowers, over 600 rakes, over 500 seeders, over 500 harrows, over 1,200 waggons, over 500 buggies, over 40 threshing outfits, over 1,400 ploughs, and other implements in proportion. If we had not these increased duties, and had not shut out the American manufacturers who were prepared to flood our country with inferior machines, these people would not have been able to send that quantity of goods into that Province, and the Massey Company is only one of several firms of implement manufacturers. There are the Harris Sons & Co., and the Patterson Bros. Co., who are also sending large quantities to that Province; and just as the population of the country increases and the demand increases, the manufacturers of these articles in the Lower Provinces will increase their business, and the demand for labor will increase; as the demand for labor increases so will the consumers increase; and as the consumers increase, so will increased prices be obtained by the farmers of Ontario for the products of their farms. The hon. gentleman said the other night that the resolution passed by the Legislature of Manitoba, represented the opinions of 90 per cent. of the population of that Province. I beg to take issue with him on that point. I want this House to understand, that during my election in 1887, I held thirty or forty meetings, at every one at which this question of the National Policy was discussed, and in every one of which I took the same ground that I now take. Yet, in spite of all the efforts made by gentlemen of the same calibre as the hon. gentleman and representing similar views, I was elected by a handsome majority. I say that the constituency I represent have shown by that vote that, in so far as they are concerned, and they represent the opinion of the greater proportion of the population of the Province of Manitoba, they are satisfied that they are not oppressed by the present tariff, as the hon. gentleman and the Local House, by its resolution, would fain make us believe they are. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact, and I was glad he did so, that, so far as he was concerned as a representative of Manitoba, he could not follow the same line of argument which was taken by gentlemen from the other Provinces. I am glad to say that I can agree with him in his statement that in Manitoba we are not in the dark, woeful condition in which hon. gentlemen opposite have pictured Ontario and the Maritime Provinces to be. But I do not know that that condition is to be improved by the mode of procedure taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know that the advantages of the North-West are likely to be appreciated by people living in foreign lands, if hon. gentlemen opposite keep continually crying out that the population of the other Provinces are in a downtrodden position. All that we ask in Manitoba is that the people of the older Provinces should recognise this fact, that, so far as the National Policy is concerned, it has been established in the interests of the whole Dominion, and that although possibly it may oppress the people of Manitoba, yet the people of that western portion of the Dominion are proud of the fact that they are Canadians, and are prepared to support the policy which is in the interest of all Canada. Although I am willing to stand up here and advocate the interests of Manitoba, as I have always done, I cannot forget that I am still a Canadian; I cannot forget that that Province is only a part of Confederation, and that the National Policy has been established for building up this nation as a whole. We look at it in this way: that unless this policy is maintained as a whole, the fabric of Confederation must go. The hon. gentleman spoke as if this question had never been discussed in this House before or among the people. He seems to have forgotten that the question was discussed before the people in 1882, just as it is being discussed now, and that it was discussed again with equal vigor in 1887, and that the people on both occasions gave their verdict by a very substantial majority in favor of the Government. The amendments made to the tariff this year have been made in the interest of the whole people. They possibly may bear heavily on the people of the Maritime Provinces; but only give it time to work, and then these people will find that it has worked in their interests in the long run. All sections must work harmoniously, and each be prepared to contribute its share to the general welfare. The West cannot expect to have everything from the East, nor can the East expect to have everything from the West, if we are to build up a strong confederation, as we have been seeking to do ever since we introduced the National Policy. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that we had competition in Manitoba to-day in railway rates. I would ask him, where is that

competition ? I am aware of the fact that he supports the Government in Manitoba, which has spent some $750,000 of the people's money to obtain a so-called competition, but rates have not been reduced.

Mr. WATSON. They have.

Mr. DALY. Not by the expenditure of $750,000 of the people's money, not by the fact of the Northern Pacific Railway coming in there at all, for although that company has been called on time and again to show in what particular they have reduced the rates, they have not been able to do so. The hon. gentleman has stated that our people in the West do not go in for political union with the Americans. Of that there is not the slightest doubt. Although far removed from the older Provinces from which most of us come, we are just as loyal as before we settled in that country, and just as desirous of maintaining the confederacy as any other section in the Dominion. I speak for the majority of my constituents, when I say that our people are perfectly satisfied to maintain their present position under the sovereignty of England, and that they have no desire for political union with the States or annexation. No more loyal people can be found to the Crown of Great Britain than those who reside in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, but those people want to say, and I want to say, to the members who come from Ontario and Quebec, and to the members of the Opposition also, if you will assist us to move the Government to increase the vote for immigration, we will show a people in that country that will redound to the credit of the Dominion. If that question is properly dealt with, a market will be opened to the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, of which at present we have a very small conception. Instead of those hon. gentlemen opposite condemning the Government for their fiscal policy, I think it would be more in the interests of the Provinces and of the constituencies they represent, if they would assist those who are endeavoring to get the Government to adopt a better immigration policy. I heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) express his agreement with the reduction which has been made in the appropriation for immigration. If he had the interests of the people at heart, he would urge the Government to increase that vote in the interests of the people of Manitoba and the North-West, and until that is done there will be no certain influx of population. I have spoken a good deal about my own Province, and I will show that I am justified in saying that we have great hopes of our country, that we have great aspirations for that country, that we believe we have a soil and a climate which are not excelled in any of the States to the south of us, and that, though the population has not increased as it should have increased, yet we have made immense strides, that our internal resources are being extended to the fullest, that according to the table given by Mr. Greenway, the Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba—and that, I think, will not be disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite—we have obtained an amount of prosperity which is at least equal to that of any of the States of the Union or of any of the other Provinces of the Dominion. The following statement will give hon. gentlemen an idea of our increase during two years :—

—	1887.	1889.	Increase in 1889.
Total acreage prepared for crop	636,295	893,402	257,107
Number of Horses	29,915	45,746	15,831
do Cattle	101,682	148,209	46,528
do Sheep	12,540	31,341	18,801
do Pigs	35,713	51,657	15,944
do Entire Horses	411	642	231
Acres of new prairie brok'n	87,444	135,649	48,205

As a further evidence of the progress of the country, the Canadian North-West Land Company make the following interesting announcement regarding the sales of their farm lands during the six months ending 30th June last, as compared with the corresponding period in 1888 :—

	Acres Sold.	Value.
1889	32,320	$191,402 65
1888	20,620	113,432 80
Increase	11,700	$ 77,969 85

In addition to that we have the crop report issued by the Manitoba Government, which shows that the average yield of spring wheat per acre in 1887, was as follows, in the different localities referred to :—

Manitoba	32·4 bushels
Ontario	11·6 do
Wisconsin	10·3 do
Minnesota	11·6 do
Iowa	10·0 do
Nebraska	10·1 do
Dakota	14·3 do

Last year, owing to the drought, our average yield of wheat was 12·4 bushels per acre, as against 32·4 bushels in 1887, but, although last year it was so much less than it was in 1887, it was only two bushels less than it was in Daokta in the year 1887, which is well known to have been one of the most favorable years for crops in the North-West. In fact, our yield last year was more than that of any of the States or Provinces in 1887, except that one of Dakota. Taking the counties in the North-West, you find even a larger yield than appears there. In the County of Dufferin the average in 1889 was 14 bushels per acre ; in Lisgar it was 16·5 ; in D'Iberville it was 12 ; in Morris it was 19·7 ; in Marquette it was 13·7 ; in Portage la Prairie it was 19·5 ; in Norfolk, 15·6 ; in Westbourne it was 23·4 ; in Beautiful Plains it was 16 bushels ; in Minnedosa it was 14·8, and in Russell it was 13·5. Thus we have a number of counties in the Province of Manitoba which have a yield in a dry year greater than that in Dakota in such a favorable year as 1887. These figures should show enough to any hon. gentleman who is desirous of learning and of explaining to the world the advantages which that country offers to immigrants, to convince him that, if they or their friends go to that country, they would be justified in taking up their abode there. Further than that : we have statements from some of the highest authorities in Europe as to the quality of our wheat, and they state that its quality exceeds that of any other wheat. I will now quote from the *Canadian Gazette* of 20th March :

"Mr. John Dyke, the Canadian Government Agent at Liverpool, when in the North-West last year, requested Mr. Waugh, of the *Nor'-West Farmer*, to select some samples of Red Fyfe wheat and send them forward to him for exhibition purposes. Two samples of Red Fyfe wheat, one grown by Mr. Limlay, of Rapid City, and the other by Mr. T. H. Harris, of Bridge Creek, near Minnedosa, have been received through the Department of Agriculture, and have been submitted to some of the highest authorities in Great Britain. Mr. Woodward, a leading member of the Liverpool Corn Exchange, and the representative of the corn trade on the Mersey Docks and Harbor Board, and probably one of the best judges in Europe, writes thus of them:

"'As an experienced judge of the article (constantly engaged in arbitrating questions of quality in various descriptions of wheat), I may say that I consider the two samples you send are about the finest, in every respect, I ever saw in the shape of red wheat. Such quality would meet a ready sale at the very top price of the day here.'

"Other British agricultural authorities declare themselves as follows, as to the value of the samples of this wheat submitted to them:—

"'*Bell's Weekly Messenger*:—Those who have ever been in Manitoba and the North-West, and have seen and tested the qualities of the grain grown on the extensive prairie wheat-fields, do not need to be told anything of the high-quality wheat grown. For years the Ministers of Agriculture for the Dominion at Ottawa and for the Province at Winnipeg have been working hard in order to improve the sorts grown, so as to make them command the top price in the British markets. An important stimulus to the importation of Canadian wheat is likely to be given by a verdict which has been passed upon samples just received at Liverpool. The samples, consisting of two large sacks of Red Fyfe wheat, have been received by Mr. John Dyke, Canadian Government agent at Liverpool, from the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. Mr. Dyke thereupon submitted them to the judgment of one of the leading members of the Liverpool corn trade, who has a large practice as arbitrator in disputes as to quality of grain, with the result that the wheat is pronounced to be the finest Red Fyfe wheat seen in the Liverpool market, and of a quality to command a ready sale at the top prices of the day. We have also received samples which fully bear out this high opinion. They are first-class millers' wheats—heavy, plump grain of a fine bright color.'"

Now, Sir, coming from such high authorities as I have quoted there can be but one conviction in the minds of hon. gentlemen who have heard these quotations, namely, that in Manitoba and the North-West Territories we can produce the very finest wheat grown in the whole world. I have shown you by statistics that the average yield of that magnificent wheat is greater in Manitoba than it is in any other Province of Canada, or in any State of the Union. Having these facts before us, can we arrive at any other conclusion than that there is a great future before that North-West country, and that it is in the interests of the whole of Canada that the Government should take immediate and vigorous steps to promote immigration and to bring in people to fill up that country? If that country is filled up the manufacturers of the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario will reap the benefit of an increased market for their products. Now I come to another point, and that is the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the condition of the Eastern Provinces. Having been born in the Province of Ontario, I naturally take a great interest in that Province. Those of us who come down from the West every year, if we keep our eyes open, cannot have failed to be impressed with the immense strides that Province has taken during recent years. I ask any fair-minded man who has taken a trip from this city to Toronto over the Canadian Pacific Railway, or from Toronto westward into the heart of the best agricultural districts in the Province of Ontario, if he does not see every year most substantial evidences of increased prosperity along that line of railway. As far back as I can remember I have been travelling over the Grand Trunk Railway between Stratford and Toronto, and every year I have seen increased evidences of prosperity along that line of railway. The Province has been increasing in population, it has been erecting public buildings, and more than that, the passenger traffic on the railways has greatly increased. Every day almost every train that leaves the Union Station at Toronto is crowded with well-dressed, respectable, well-to-do passengers. When I look back ten years from the time I left the Province of Ontario, I can see increased evidences of prosperity. I see that the people are better dressed, they live in better houses, they live more comfortably, and they seem to have more money to spend in travelling about from one place to another. I have not heard any hon. gentleman quote statistics as to the increased mileage of railways, but I hope before this debate is closed, if the House is not too fatigued, some hon. gentleman will do so, because I think there is no better evidence of increased prosperity than the increased mileage on railways. Why, Sir, the increased traffic returns of the Canadian Pacific Railway alone, in the Province of Ontario, should be evidence to any person who desires to look at the fact with an unprejudiced mind, that the Province is increasing in prosperity. I am satisfied that it is only a matter of a few years at least, when the Province of Ontario will stand as high in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite as it does in the eyes of hon. members on this side of the House, although I believe that time will never come until hon. members opposite sit on this side of the House, which I hope they will not do for a long time to come. I have listened with a great deal of patience to the funereal remarks made on the other side as to the condition of the people in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and as to the condition of the people of the Maritime Provinces. These statements are all made for the purpose of making the farmers of this country believe that they are being down-trodden by the tariff, that it is oppressing them, that their farms are decreasing in value, that their farm products are not being sold at a proper price, and that, if the door was only open to them across the line, they would receive better prices for their farm products, that their farm lands would increase in value, and that consequently they would be more prosperous and happy than they are to-day. When I was going up in the train the other day, I picked up the Buffalo *Express*, dated Sunday morning, April 6, 1890. This paper, I may state, is published in the State of New York, immediately across the line from the Province of Ontario. I found in this paper an article headed, "New York Farmers," and it says:

"GOING OUT OF THE BUSINESS BY THE SCORE—MANY FORCED SALES.

"A Saratoga correspondent writes to the New York *Times*:

"Although the ice cutters have not wholly forsaken the lake, preparations for the season when ice is used, not made, are rife in this village, which invariably takes time by the forelock in arranging for its summer gayety. There are already many nibbles for cottages, and a few weeks later the gleeful real estate agent, who gets 5 per cent. on rentals, will see the hooks swallowed.

"Never, within the recollection of the oldest inhabitant, have the roads been in such execrable condition as now.

Why should not the State of New York have Roman roads? Unless, indeed, the members of the Legislature pay more attention to the needs of those engaged in agricultural pursuits, and decent roads is one of them, there is likely to be a change in the personnel of that branch of the Government. Thoughtful people know and regret that the farmers in this and all parts of the State are not in a flourishing condition. Conservative as a class, and slow to join new parties or to take kindly to isms, their circumstances are driving them to join leagues, associations, and societies that profess to be in the interest of the farming class. The decline of agricultural pursuits in the New England States is an accepted fact. It is scarcely less so here.

"One has only to observe the numerous notices of sales by auction posted at the various four corners, post offices and taverns, to be convinced that farming does not pay."

Here we see it stated that farming does not pay in the State of New York, and yet we are told by hon. gentlemen on the other side that as soon as the markets of New York and of other States are open to us, farming will pay in the Province of Ontario:

"These auctions, by the way, have some curious features. One of them is the 'vendoo note,' so called. A lawyer fresh from city practice would be puzzled to know how it differed from the ordinary promissory note, but he would presently find that it took its name from these sales, which are called vendues, and that it is a promise to pay a sum of money for property purchased at a country auction. The 'vendoo note' is generally given for one year, three months without interest if paid when due, and if not interest from date. A farmer is liable to pay twice as much as an article is worth for a year's credit. Money that is earned by the sweat of the brow is slowly parted with; hence these auctions are profitable to the seller. The sale itself is possessed of no little interest. It is generally held from five to fifteen miles from a railroad station, and the attendance takes in all the residents of surrounding country. Whole families come *en masse* and make a day of it or longer, as frequently two days are consumed in selling off an old estate. When the house is exhausted, the yard and barn, filled with implements and vehicles of all sorts, are still a treasure mine to the crowd. Odd and rare objects are frequently cried. Spinning wheels over 100 years old, brass and irons of curious pattern, ancient sideboards and mahogany dressers of great intrinsic worth, plates and dishes, tankards and flagons that would delight a Fifth-avenue collector, all often go for a trifle.

"At a recent sale, the bread-tray used by some of Burgoyne's officers was sold for 20 cents to a gentleman who would not part with it for any price. The *Times'* correspondent, two years ago, at one of these country vendues, purchased as a curious relic a small trunk covered with horse-skin and studded with brass-headed nails. In a slit in the cover on the inside was found a package of love-letters, written in 1801 by a young man in New York to his affianced. Their interest is fascinating. They are couched in language as choice as Addison's, and breathe an air of tenderness and chivalry that impels one to believe the tender passion flourished with a purer glow a hundred years ago than in these days of love *versus* lucre.

"The number of these sales this year is unprecedented. Farmers are leaving their farms, and more are giving up the life altogether than are settling upon new ones. There is not only no money any longer in the business—there does not seem to be even a living. Hay has been sold as low as $4 a ton, oats at 26 cents a bushel, and corn at 40 cents; cows bring only $20, and other farm necessities are proportionately low."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, that is the market which the farmers of this country are told by hon. gentlemen opposite is going to make them rich if it can be opened to them.—

"The wages of male help are as high as $25 per month, and the hired man at the end of the year has made more than his employer. Many farmers in this section do not intend to plant this year.

"They run behind the best way they can manage it. A farmer with his place free and clear is more than likely, after paying his farm hands, to be in debt after harvest. Add to the situation a mortgage, on which interest must be paid, and the outlook becomes gloomy for the farmer and not bright for his creditors. Many foreclosure sales of farming lands will take place before the year is out.

"The result of this state of things is that the farmers are banding together to enforce legislation. They complain that real estate is heavily taxed, and personal property escapes its just share of the public burdens; that the legal rate of interest is too high by at least 1 per cent.; that the canals should be supported by the General Government, as they are used as waterways to bring the produce of the far West into competition with home production; that Congress should increase the duty on potatoes and other edibles, so that Scotland cannot flood the New York markets with them, thus forcing the price down to less than $1 per barrel—these are some of the things the farmer is demanding.

"Farming has no attractions to offer to young men. In Vermont and New Hampshire there are over eight hundred abandoned farms, and unless speedy relief comes to the agricultural classes in this State the only profitable farming will be done by the play actors in such drames as 'The Old Homestead,' 'The Country Fair,' and 'The Midnight Bell.' A seeker for political preferment in the future must be right on all questions that affect the farming interest or he will find that his vote in the rural districts will not materialise."

I ask any hon. gentleman who has heard that speech read if he can fail to come to but one conclusion, and that is, that the farmers of the State of New York are in a far worse position than are the farmers of Ontario. In circulating their speeches, as no doubt they will do, among the electors throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to extract this paragraph from my speech and paste it on the speeches they are sending out, and thus the farmers will obtain both sides of the question, and be able to arrive at a proper conclusion. But it is most humiliating that any man, or any set of men in Canada, should rise and take the position hon. gentlemen opposite are continually occupying on this question of the tariff. As I have said, the people have pronounced on it; they have declared by their votes, and by the majority they have sent to this House to support the First Minister, that they will have none of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that they will still entrust the affairs into the hands of the First Minister and his colleagues, that they are satisfied with their conduct of affairs, and just so sure as the right hon. Premier secured a victory in 1882, and again in 1887, victory will crown the efforts of the right hon. gentleman's party in 1891. I will not occupy the time of the House further than to say that, although my views on the tariff, as expressed, may be in direct opposition to the resolutions passed in the Local Legislature of Manitoba, I have the courage of my convictions. On platforms in my own county and in other constituencies I have expressed these views, and I still maintain them. So far as I can read as an intelligent man, the position taken by the present Government, upon the question of reciprocity and upon the tariff resolutions before the House, is the correct position so far as the true welfare of Canada as a whole is concerned. The people in the west feel in some instances that they are pinched owing to the duties imposed upon certain articles, but at the same time they must remember that they are a part of this great Confederation, that they must give in a little on these matters, and the figures I have given to the House will show that they are not in the position they occupied in 1883 and 1884 when the resolutions to which I have referred were passed. I am satisfied to go to my people at the next election, if I am chosen a candidate, and take the same stand as I have taken in this House, and, notwithstanding any speech made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and any resolutions that may be passed by the

Legislature of Manitoba, I am satisfied the people will take the same view as they did in 1887, and send me back to this House by even an increased majority over that which I received at that time.

Mr. SEMPLE. I desire to offer a few remarks on the question now before the House, for if I failed to do so I would not be doing justice to the constituency which I represent. Although at the present time the amendment does not pronounce directly in favor of unrestricted trade with our neighbors of the United States, it is because this is not the proper time to submit such a motion. We feel, however, how important it is that this should be carried out and that there should be no room left for disputes. When the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was entered into, it took six years to discuss it before it was fully carried out, and no doubt this question of unrestricted trade, which the Liberals desire, may take some time to accomplish, but undoubtedly it will be brought about sooner or later, and the longer it is delayed the more injurious it will prove to Canada. It was my privilege to be engaged in selling grain and other products of the farm at the time the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 came into effect, and I am aware, from practical knowledge, the immense advantage it conferred on this country. I have sold all commodities raised on the farm, the buyers buying for shipment to the United States, and for which good prices were paid. It has been asserted by hon. gentlemen opposite that grain coming into Canada from the United States would reduce the price of our coarse grains. I know that such was not the case, and we heard nothing of it during the twelve years the Treaty of Reciprocity lasted. The first year of the Reciprocity Treaty the amount received from the United States from our agricultural products was $9,000,000, but the last year of the treaty it reached $54,000,000, and this was proof that the American market was the best market for everything we had to sell. It is well known that the nearer the market the better it is for the seller. No doubt it is advantageous to have a home market; but we have not a sufficient number of people in this country to give a home market, and, therefore, the next best thing is to have a market as near this country as possible. In order to obtain such market it is necessary to remove all the shackles from trade. Two years ago we expected we would be in a better position, from the reports we received that the Democratic party would no doubt rule at Washington. However, as elections sometimes go contrary to expectation, our anticipations were not realised. The Democrats were always more favorable to developing trade with this country than were the Republicans. I will read to the House some remarks made by a very eminent gentleman, who once occupied a distinguished position here, touching what he considered the near approach of free trade. Sir Charles Tupper said:

"We have made concessions as I have said, but we have made them with the avowed object of placing all our people, not only the fisherman, but the agriculturist, the lumberman, every man in this country, in a better relation with the United States than he was before. What is the result? As I have said, Mr. Bayard told us, the American plenipotentiaries told us, that there was but one way of obtaining what you ask. You want greater freedom of commercial intercourse. There is but one way to obtain it. Let us by common concession be able to meet on common ground, and seek to remove this irritating cause of difficulty between the two countries out of the way, and you will find that the policy of this Government, the policy of the President and House of Representatives, the policy of the great Democratic party of the United States, will at once take an onward course in the direction you propose, and accomplish that which you would desire above everything else. These were not empty words, those were the sober utterances of distinguished statesmen, who pointed to the avowed policy of the Government of the United States as proof of the sincerity of what they said. What has happened already? * * What have we got? Why, the ink is barely dry upon this treaty before Mr. Mills, as the representative of the Government, and chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, brings forward a measure to do what? To make free articles that Canada sends into the United States, and upon which we last year paid $1,800,000. * * I am very sanguine that this Bill will pass during the present Session. Modified it may be, but I am inclined to think the amendments will be still more in the interest of Canada than as the Bill stands to-day. If this is the case, I think we may congratulate ourselves upon securing the free admission of our lumber, upon which we paid no less than $1,315,450 last year to get it into the United States.

"On copper ore, made free by the Mills' Bill, we paid $96,946. On salt $21,992 was paid. Of wool we sent last year $1,319,309 pounds of one kind and a variety of other kinds, upon which duty was paid to the extent of $183,852. Now, as I say, on articles of prime importance and interest to Canada the removal of duty by the Mills' Bill amounts to no less than $1,800,193 a year."

Now, Sir, at the time this distinguished ornament of the House of Commons was speaking on this subject, he was very sanguine that we would be able to have unrestricted reciprocity with our neighbors on the other side. Matters have changed since then. It appears that the Government do not, at the present time, want reciprocity at all, but I, for one, shall endeavor to do all that lies in my power, in the interest of the farmers whom I represent, to have free trade with the United States, so far as it is obtainable. If it cannot be obtained we shall do what we can towards securing it. As I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper showed that we paid $1,800,000 in duties upon articles of prime importance going in the United States, which, if they had been admitted free of duty, that amount of money would have gone in the pockets of the people of Canada. I shall quote to the House statistics to show the extent of our exports te the United States, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1889:

EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES.

—	—	Value.	Duty Paid.
		$	$
Horses	17,277	2,113,782	422,756
Horned Cattle	37,360	488,266	97,653
Sheep	307,795	918,334	183,666
Pease (bushels)	332,027	312,650	33,202
Hay (tons)	82,308	822,381	164,616
Potatoes (bushels)	717,668	192,576	107,650
Barley (bushels)	9,934,501	6,454,603	993,450
Total duty			2,002,993
Apples, green and ripe (barrels)	144,618	230,108	
Wool (lbs.)	1,011,017	216,918	
Hides, Horns and Skins		454,105	
Total value		890,131	
Eggs (free of duty) (dozens)	14,011,017	2,156,725	

EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES—*Concluded.*

—	—	Value.	Duty Paid.
		$	$
Oats	337,185	130,632	
Oatmeal	21,982	78,988	
Total value		209,620	
Wheat (bushels)	490,905	471,121	
Flour of Wheat (barrels)	131,181	646,068	
Total value		1,117,189	

These figures show that there were $829,916 more realised from the sale of eggs in the United States markets than from the sale of wheat, flour, oats and oatmeal put together. It is a very important fact for the farmers to bear in mind, that when such a seemingly unimportant item as eggs goes free into the United States, the export of which is spread all over the country, a sum amounting to $2,156,000 is realised, which exceeds by $829,916 the amount realised from such important articles of our produce and manufacture as oats, oatmeal, wheat and flour. At all events one thing is clear, and that is, that there need be no alarm that oatmeal will be imported into this country from the United States. But at present large quantities of oats are shipped from the United States in bond, the oats ground in Canada and the oatmeal shipped to Great Britain. I was speaking, a short while ago, to a gentleman who is extensively engaged in the egg trade, and he informed me that last year the average price of eggs was 13 cents per dozen, while the effect of this mad policy of the Government to-day is to reduce the price to 8 cents per dozen. Another hardship on our farmers is the increased duty on clover seed. It has been advanced 50 cents a bushel, which will have to be paid by those who want to seed down their farms. Clover is really our best crop to keep the farm rich. It is really the best fertiliser we have got, and the more encouragement given to farmers to sow it the better. I may here remark, that if the people of the United States wish to have a tariff like that proposed in the McKinley Bill, the Government of Canada is powerless to prevent it, but our Government should at least show a little foresight and prudence, and conduct their line of policy in such a way as not to provoke the people of the United States into retaliatory legislation. The financial statement this year shows that there is a surplus, notwithstanding the fact that very few changes in the tariff have been made since 1887. There is evidently no need that money should be raised by increased duties, and why, then, does this Government bring in a tariff measure which is irritating to the people of the United States, and burdensome to the people of Canada. The Government tells us that, notwithstanding the duty, flour, pork, meat, apples, trees, shrubs and many other things come into Canada from the United States, and that they want to prevent this and to keep Canada for the Canadians. This policy has intensified feelings in the United States, and that country will very likely say to us: "We will take you at your word, and allow you to have Canada for the Canadians, but we will have the United States for the Americans." If this policy is adopted by the United States, it will strangle our most profitable export trade with that country, from which we obtained last year $44,000,000. We will have the satisfaction of knowing that we, on this side of the House, in advocating unrestricted trade with the United States, have been acting in the best interests of our country. The Government have pursued a policy that is certainly irritating to our neighbors, and if they retaliate the Government will be justly held responsible. The Liberal party have been endeavoring to bring about a better state of things between the two countries. In regard to the manufacturers, we have heard a great deal about what they are doing for this country. I have not statistics to show how many manufacturers there really are in the country; but it was said in 1878 that the balance of trade was against us. In that year our imports were $93,081,787 and our exports $79,323,667, leaving a balance of trade against us of $13,758,120. It was said then that we bought too much from abroad, but that if we encouraged the manufacturers, this would be changed, they would manufacture all we wanted, and the balance of trade would be turned the other way; but what do we find? We find that after the manufacturers were protected to their heart's content for five years the imports in 1883 amounted to $132,254,022, and the exports to $98,085,804, leaving a balance of trade against us of $34,169,218. This did not show that the manufacturers were increasing very fast or were doing very much to stop the balance of trade against us. The same state of affairs has continued; and when the manufacturers say they are not prosperous, they come to this House and ask for more protection, and they generally get it. In the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1889, we imported $115,224,931 and exported $89,189,167, showing a balance of trade against us of $26,035,764, nearly double what it was before the National Policy came into existence. The manufacturers are wise in their generation. They do not want to sell at a low profit, but they simply want to shut out outside competition, and as soon as they get the duty increased, they raise their prices. There is one thing certain, the manufacturers cannot sell anything outside of Canada at any higher price; consequently it comes out of the consumer, and every increase of duty is in the same direction. A few years ago Sir Charles Tupper made some very fine promises to us as to what the iron duties would do. He told us of the large deposits of iron and coal and lime which we had in different parts of this country, and the prosperity that would come if we had a duty put on iron. He stated that this policy would give employment to at least 20,000 men, which would represent an increase in our population of from 80,000 to 100,000, and he expected an increase in the revenue of about $500,000 a year from the increased duty on iron. We have realised that increase of revenue; but what was the effect of the change? It was only a short time in operation when all the manufacturers of iron met in conclave and raised prices, so that for everything the farmer used into which iron entered, he had to pay more than before. Mention has been made of the depression of the farming

community in the United States. I do not dispute that depression exists among the farmers of that country; but that is not a proof that free trade with the United States would not benefit our people, because we know that large quantities of our sheep and lambs and other products find a market at Buffalo and other points in the United States, and if the duty on them were removed, so much more would go into the pockets of our farmers. Then, some parts of the country are particularly well adapted to the growing of potatoes. A year ago potatoes were sold at 25 cents a bag, and shipped to the United States, where a duty of 22½ cents a bag was paid on them, so that the duty was within 2½ cents per bag of the price of the potatoes, while had the duty been off the price to the farmer would have been 47½ cents per bag, which would have been profitable considering the good crop of that year. There has also been a fresh duty put on fruit trees. The very best fruit trees in this country are those that come from the United States, and they are highly appreciated, but this duty will prevent our people buying those trees and planting them as they formerly did. It has been said by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) that we should expend more money on immigration. But I entirely agree with the hon. Minister of Agriculture in reducing the immigration expenditure, and I have good reason for doing so, because I find from the report of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that when there was twice as much spent on immigration as we spend now, we had less immigrants; now they brought more money and goods with them, cost less, and were of a better class. When that is the case, I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture ought to be congratulated on his efforts at making a reduction. I notice that during the last few years more immigrants have gone to Manitoba than formerly. This is because the railway monopoly has been done away with. Formerly, a man who took a farm in Manitoba, and raised a large quantity of grain, had to pay the railway companies most of the profit, and he got very little left; but now, when the railway monopoly exists no longer, we find more immigrants going into the country, they bring more money with them, and they are brought in at less expense. That is very gratifying. We are told that it is a magnificent country, and that it is making great strides. When that is the case, there will be plenty of immigration, because the greatest encouragements for immigration into that country are the favorable reports of the people themselves to their friends. Now, I wish to pay a little attention to the remarkable statement of the hon. President of the Council. That hon. gentleman is probably aware that the Government appointed Mr. Webster to visit Dakota, giving him a kind of roving commission to look after things in general, and he is certainly an expert delineator of desolation. I asked in the Committee if he knew anything of Valley City, Dakota, and he said not, that he had never seen it, so that I came to the conclusion he was looking out for the bad land and poor people to be found in Dakota. The statement of the President of the Council will go a long way to counteract that statement of Mr. Webster, for he informed us that the best lands could be got in Vermont for $10 an acre. We must certainly put a good deal of dependency on the word of a Minister, and if the land, which he states, can be got in Vermont at $10 an acre, is up to the standard for pasturage purposes, a person could sell 100 acres in Ontario, and, with the proceeds, purchase 400 acres in Vermont, on which he could raise sheep and sell them, saving the duty at 75 cents apiece more than they could be sold for in Canada, or he could go into the dairying business and realise larger prices in the New York market than he could in this country. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has any property in Vermont or not; but judging by his statements, he would be an excellent agent to induce people to leave this country and take up lands in Vermont and New Hampshire. He tells us:

"It is because we have given protection to our farmers in our markets, so that the products of the farm may be sold at fair prices in the local markets."

You would infer, Sir, from that statement that we can get higher prices in Canada than in the United States. I was curious to ascertain what the prices were in the different markets, and on referring to the *Empire* of 27th March, 1890, I found that wheat in Toronto was selling at 86c. to 87c., and in Buffalo, at 86c.; barley No. 1, in Toronto, at 50c.; barley, 63c. to 65c. in Buffalo; oats, 29c. to 30c. Toronto, and 28½c. to 29c. Buffalo; but it must be borne in mind that there are two pounds less to the bushel in Buffalo than in Toronto. Pease, Toronto, 53c.; none quoted in Buffalo. But we find that corn is 35½c. in Buffalo; so that we could import corn at 35½c., which would make it 40c. in Toronto, and sell our pease at 53c., and our farmers would gain by the exchange. I believe we have nothing to fear from competition with the United States. The hon. gentleman has said that we stand in a better position because our farmers are protected. Sir, you cannot protect the farmers. They do not want protection; they are able to compete with the whole world, and we have to compete with the whole world whether we like it or not, and have to keep the infant spoon-fed industries in existence besides. So that it is all nonsense to say the farmers are protected. The President of the Council went on to say:

"That being the case, if we are not inundated and overwhelmed by the products of the United States coming into competition with the products of our farmers, it is due in a very large degree to the superior condition of the farmers in Canada to that of the farmers of the United States. Even now, does the hon. gentleman suppose that we for one moment could compete on even terms in the markets that are common to Canada and the United States, if we were one country? Can we produce corn as cheaply as they can? Can we produce the equivalent of corn as cheaply as they can? I say we cannot. Our barley is the equivalent to their corn for feeding purposes and is nearly as valuable. The introduction of their corn reduces our barley from an average of 50 to 40 cents a bushel. That would be the effect upon the coarse grains which the farmers do produce, and will produce, notwithstanding the high scientific farming that is coming by-and-bye. The effect of an intimate relation with the United States, of being upon even terms with them, would be to bring down the prices of our own coarse grains to the corn standard, and not only the coarse grains, but even the products of animals that are fed upon coarse grains. Our prices would be brought down to the corn standard of the United States, as against the barley standard of Canada, if we were brought down to a level with the United States. Their prices control our prices."

That is rather extraordinary, that their prices should control ours. Our prices are nearly the same as theirs and we have nothing to fear. In fact there are times when we can sell oats to the Americans, although there is a duty of 10 cents a bushel, and we have sent them pease, and I believe

there is no reason why we should fear their competition. I heartily endorse the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, who goes on to say :

"That in fact the values of farm land have greatly diminished and the amount of mortgages thereon have been much increased throughout a very large portion of this Dominion since 1879."

It is a fact, judging from the sales I have heard of, that the value of the land has decreased about 35 per cent. We have been referred to the Bureau of Industries, in which an honest attempt has been made to arrive at the correct values, but the one essential element necessary in compiling these reports, namely, accurate information, is wanting. It is very easy to ask for reports as to the values of farms, and the owners will, no doubt, put on a good large value ; but it is only when land is sold that its real value is arrived at. My experience in sales has been that the values of lands have decreased 35 per cent. during the last ten years. The rental of land in Wellington is about 5 per cent. of the value of the farm, so that a farm valued at $4,000 would be rented at $200, and if that farm increased in value so that the rental could be raised to $250 that would make the value of the farm $5,000 ; and any taxation the people have to pay takes from the value of the farm. If you have an additional $50 to pay over five years, you reduce the value of a farm worth $4,000 or $5,000 by $1,000. This has been one reason why farm lands have decreased in value. I will read a short extract from a Kingston newspaper, which will give the House an idea of the condition of the people in that district, although if there is any place the sun shines on it ought to be Kingston, which is so ably represented by the First Minister :

"Doctors, Christian visitors, relief committees, and ministers, whose work lies among the poorer classes, all testify that such a time of distress as the present is almost unexampled. Our relief societies will need largely augmented funds for when there is sickness as well as poverty, none in want can be refused. Those who know what it is to have sickness in the house with plenty of beef tea, lemonade, and all the comforts of the sick-room at hand, can judge what it must be with an empty cupboard and almost empty stove. If you have not yet given your mite to our relief societies, send it in at once. If you have done so, make it more than a mite if you can. Instead of costly entertainments to rich neighbors, enjoy the pleasure of feeding the hungry, giving those who need no luxuries merely the higher pleasure of social reunion. Remember there are half-starved families all around you."

You see that there is a great deal of hardship in the old substantial city of Kingston, but it is left to a Conservative member to give the worst picture of the distress. Here are the remarks made by Mr. Blythe, a Conservative member in the Local House :

"Mr. Blythe spoke of the difficulties the settlers in Muskoka had to contend with, and remarked that the Government could not afford to desert them, for they were so poor they could not be taxed."

These were the words of a Conservative member. Hon. gentlemen say that we on this side draw a dark picture, but we must dissent from that. They have been the artists themselves, and we simply direct attention to it, and have drawn the picture, and they have the opportunity of knowing that at all events things have not changed for the better. The latter part of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) reads as follows :—

"That the additional taxation which it is now sought to impose will still further increase the burthens of the people and is likely still further to aggravate the distress unhappily existing among a large portion of the farming population of this Dominion, and that under such circumstances it is the bounden duty of this House, instead of adding to the existing oppressive taxation, to apply itself to the reduction of the burdens now impeding the progress and prosperity of the principal producing classes of the Dominion, and for this purpose to abolish or reduce the taxes now imposed on articles of prime necessity to farmers, miners, fishermen and other producers."

This is strictly correct, and in accordance with a resolution passed by the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario. Farmers from the different parts of Ontario met in Toronto to compare notes and to give expression to their views, and they put on record the statement that it was desirable that there should be a reduction of taxation "in such articles as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is now laboring." Representing an agricultural constituency, I deem it my duty to point out the difficulties under which the agriculturists are laboring. One farmer told me not long ago that such hard times as prevailed now had not been known for forty years. Others say that they do not know what will become of the country if the McKinley Bill, now before the United States Congress, is carried out ; they believe it will destroy the trade of this country. It is hard to foretell what will be the result of that, but if anything so disastrous should occur as the destruction of the trade between this country and the United States, the Liberal party will not be responsible for so deplorable a result. I hope that the Hitt Bill may be carried, and that the Government may appoint commissioners to see what can be done to bring about a result which would be so desirable to all classes.

Mr. WARD. At this late stage of the debate, I do not propose to detain the House at any great length, but I desire to offer a few observations upon that portion of the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—who, I regret to see, is not now in his seat—in which he dealt with the mortgage indebtedness of the Province of Ontario. No one with any practical knowledge of this subject can regard the utterances of the hon. gentleman otherwise than as a slander upon the Province of Ontario and the Dominion at large. Statements of this nature, involving as they do attacks upon the prosperity of a magnificent Province, should not be made without reliable data. If the hon. gentleman intended to make a point against the Government—and, I think, it is not uncharitable to suggest that he might have such a motive—the sources of information from which he drew should have been very carefully selected. As the hon. gentleman stated, his sources of information were the statements received by him from the registrars of Ontario. From a practical knowledge of the registry laws of that Province, I am certain that no registrar can give any reliable figures upon which to found such statements. The registrars of Ontario can only furnish the information which appears upon their books, and that can only include the mortgages upon any particular property, and the amounts of such mortgages at a stated time. I do not intend to weary the House, by giving the reasons why they cannot give reli-

able information, because hon. gentlemen on this side have already gone into this subject very extensively, but I may have to refer casually to these reasons at a later stage. I will refer to some of the figures submitted by the hon. gentleman in his speech, as it appears in *Hansard*. He says :

"At this present moment the total assessed value of the entire Province of Ontario is something like $429,000,000, and it needs no great degree of calculation to see what a proportion such a mortgaged indebtedness as I have alluded to would involve."

I have no doubt the hon. gentleman had the opportunity of revising his speech before that statement went into *Hansard*, and, therefore, he is responsible for whatever mistake may have occurred. I have here a statement of the assessed values of fifteen cities and towns in Ontario, taken from the assessments of the past year, and I find that their aggregate assessed values amount to $232,405.778, and, as these are the only ones from which returns have been received, I think it is fair to estimate $40,000,000 for the rest of the cities and towns, which would make $272,000,000 of assessment for the cities and towns. Taking that from the assessed value of the Province, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, it would leave $157,000,000 as the total assessed value of the farms of Ontario. That is not correct, and cannot be, judging from a subsequent reference to this subject in his speech. According to this statement, the farms in Ontario are mortgaged for double their assessed value, or, according to another of the hon. gentleman's statements, half the farms in Ontario are mortgaged for four times their assessed value. That statement is not correct, for, in examining the report submitted by Mr. Blue, you will find that the total assessed value of the farms of Ontario is about what the hon. gentleman has stated as the assessed value of the entire Province of Ontario. The assessed value of half the farms of Ontario would, then, only be $214,000,000, subject to a mortgage indebtedness of $300,000,000. I think that proposition would be equally absurd. Now, I wish to give a memorandum taken from the statements of the assessed value of the cities of Ontario for the year 1889, to show the difference between that and the assessed value of 1887, which is the latest given by the report of Mr. Blue. The assessed value of the cities of the Dominion for 1887 was $132,839,465 ; the assessed value for 1889 for the same cities amounts to $219,663,725. Surely that ought to give some comfort to the hon. gentleman, and lead him to suppose that we are not progressing in the wrong way, as his speech would appear to indicate. I can further comfort the hon. gentleman by stating that the assesssd value of the city of Toronto has just doubled in two years. Two years ago it was $69,469,969 ; last year it had attained the magnificent figure of $137,230,778, showing that the city of Toronto in 1889 had a higher assessed value than all the cities of Ontario in 1887. Now, the hon. gentleman gives the result of his researches in the registry offices of certain counties of Ontario. He shows that ten concessions have an average indebtedness of $96,000, and as a natural result each township in the Dominion has a mortgage indebtedness of $960,000, assuming ten concessions as an average for each township. Now, I have taken the trouble to get a return from the registrar of my own county, and I do not believe that my county is any more prosperous than the other counties of the Dominion. I procured this return in order to satisfy myself that the country was not in the terrible condition that the figures of the hon. gentleman would appear to show. I wrote to the registrar asking him to give me the mortgages actually standing on the books for the fifth concession of each township and the return shows a very different state of affairs in my county from that which exists in the other counties as set forth by the hon. member for South Oxford. The indebtedness in my county amounts to an average of $69,671, or $27,000 less than the indebtedness which the hon. gentleman would make it appear exists all over the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the length of the concession ?

Mr. WARD. In two cases twenty-five lots, and in the others, thirty-five lots. They would average about the same as the hon. gentleman's figures with regard to acreage. In examining these statements sent to me by the registrar of East Durham, I find several cases where mortgages appear against property worth, perhaps, $8,000, amounting to a larger sum than the actual value of the property itself. There is one case of a property worth about $8,000, upon which there is one mortgage for $4,000, and another for $5,000 ; so it would appear on the books of the office that there were two mortgages of $9,000 altogether existing against that one property worth $8,000. Now, any one who is familiar with the dealings of loan companies, and with their mortgages, would be satisfied that the second mortgage of $5,000 is the only one unpaid upon that property. When a mortgage is taken by a loan company it is frequently the practice, and I can speak from personal experience, to get the previous mortgage, which they are paying off, discharged, place the discharge inside the mortgage, and file it away in their vaults with the other title deeds affecting the property. As a natural consequence there are two mortgages apparently existing against that property, whereas there is only one really unpaid and a charge upon the land. There are several mortgages of that kind in the statements furnished to me, but I will not detain the House by referring to more than one or two of them. There is one in which there are six mortgages against one lot, clearly showing that those six mortgages cannot possibly all be unpaid ; some of them must have been discharged, and the discharges are in the hands of the loan company. I know from personal experience in examining titles that plenty of these cases occur ; and from my knowledge of the payments which farmers in my section of the country have made during the past year, I have no hesitation in saying that this average indebtedness of $69,000 would be reduced by payments and by mortgages paid, but not discharged on the registry office books by fully 25 or 30 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you ascertain how much that would be for 100 acres ?

Mr. WARD. No, I did not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I noticed just now it was $2,760 per 100 acres.

Mr. WARD. The hon. gentleman can see these statements at any time he cares to look over them. I will give the hon. gentleman one or two circumstances which have come under my personal knowledge, in order that he may know more about these mortgages. In one case a farmer who was going to the North-West sold his farm for $6,500 to a neighbor, and the latter, desiring to purchase that property, borrowed the whole amount upon another farm belonging to him and the farm which he bought. That mortgage was created in order to buy property from one who was going to the North-West. There is a great number of these cases where men sell out and go to the North-West, and the mortgages thus created do not show any additional burden upon the people, but simply that the burden has shifted, and that the money has gone to the North-West for the benefit of men who intend to farm in that country. This will account for a large number of mortgages that are in existence in Ontario. Every county, I fancy, is situated somewhat as mine is, and a large number of its best men go to the North-West and take their money away with them ; but this shifting of burdens, this removal of money from one part of the country to another, is not in any way an injury to the Dominion. Now, I can give the hon. gentleman a little more comfort with regard to the state of the Province ; I refer to the reports of the different loan companies doing business in the Province of Ontario, and I think they afford a very fair index as to the condition of the farmers who are borrowing from them. The Home Savings and Loan Company report that $814,000 is invested in mortgages, and the payments during the past year have amounted to $95,000. The Guelph and Ontario Loan Company's report states :

"During the year, borrowers have met their payments very satisfactorily, and the company has no property on hand."

The Ontario Industrial and Loan Company report:

"Payments on loans have been very satisfactory."

The Hamilton Provident and Loan Society report:

"Business eminently satisfactory. Loans, $3,476,456; repayments, $84,485."

The Ontario Loan and Deposit Company report:

"We have reason to be gratified with the character of payments by rural borrowers in a season of defective crops and low prices."

These are brief extracts from reports which appeared in the *Monetary Times* of 28th February and 7th March. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will find that the farmers of Ontario are a shrewd, thinking and reading people ; that they are quite as capable of judging cause and effect as is the hon. gentleman himself, and I think that, with the exception of a very few who regard the hon. gentleman as an oracle on all questions relating to the well-being of the Dominion, those farmers will come to a different conclusion from that at which the hon. gentleman has arrived. I do not desire to detain the House longer, and, in conclusion, I will only add that I believe the Province of Ontario, so far from being in the state of depression which the hon. gentleman has pictured, is in a fairly prosperous condition on the whole, and the farmers as a class, contented and looking forward to a better state of affairs in the near future.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. WARD.

After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON. I rise, as no other hon. member appears to desire to take the floor at this early hour of the evening, to offer a few observations in reply to some remarks made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) a few evenings ago. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman desired to mislead the House while discussing this question, but I feel that he himself must have been misled, otherwise he would not have made the assertions which fell from his lips. Discussing this question, and referring to the increases of duty on several articles, he came down to the question of flour and pork ; and he said :

"They now propose an increase in certain articles of large consumption in the Maritime Provinces. Well, Sir, the Maritime Provinces have to pay the increase. We raise very little beef or pork there except in Prince Edward Island, where a good deal of pork is raised ; and our hardy fishermen pursuing their hazardous and uncertain calling, our mechanics and laborers, and all classes which go to make up the general community will be called upon to contribute towards these half million dollars which this tax imposes. Our fishermen will pay $6 a barrel on pork and beef, and at least $1 a barrel more on flour than they would have to pay if they could get it from the United States,"

In answer to the question of the increase of the cost of pork in the Maritime Provinces, I may say, that in the county which I have the honor to represent, there is no difficulty at any time in securing first-class pork at from $8 to $10 a barrel, that our fishermen and mechanics in that part of the country can at all times secure pork at that reasonable figure. I cannot, therefore, understand how the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) could have come to the conclusion that this tariff would increase the price of pork in the Maritime Provinces by $6 a barrel. It, also, must not be forgotten, that Prince Edward Island produces more pork than is required for home consumption in the Province of Nova Scotia, and a great deal more pork than we import from outside ; in fact, very little is imported into Nova Scotia from outside, and it can be raised as cheaply in the Maritime Provinces, including Prince Edward Island, as in any other part of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman went on further to say :

"Some say the flour will be no dearer, and the hon. the Minister of Finance, the other day, in his desire to make it pleasant on both ends of the Dominion, assured us that his increase of 25 cents would make flour no dearer in the Maritime Provinces. If it does not make it dearer in the Maritime Provinces, I fail to see what advantage is going to accrue to the millers of Ontario and the West."

The explanation is a very simple one. The object of the Ontario farmers and millers is simply to retain the home market, and if they can secure that market for themselves at a figure as low as the figures at which the goods can be imported from the United States, there must be great gain to the millers and farmers of Ontario. The hon. gentleman went on further to say :

"Their object is to keep out the American flour, and if this tax does not keep out the American flour, then, of course, they have no advantage."

That is certainly an erroneous idea, because, as I have already stated, if they have the market of Canada secured to themselves by this tariff, it must be a great advantage to the Ontario farmers. The hon. gentleman, referring further, said :

"The hon. gentleman was afraid to admit, as he should have admitted, that while this tax might, under certain

circumstances, not always cause an increase directly, still, indirectly, from the nature of our position, and from the nature of our trade with the United States, there must always naturally be a very considerable difference between the price of our flour and that of the United States. The hon. Minister asked me what difference this tax would make on flour, and I answered frankly, $1 a barrel. I will prove to him, I think, how that is. The Island of Newfoundland is a large consumer of flour, and Conservative authorities in Halifax have said to us: 'Why, look at Newfoundland; they have no duty, and the American flour enters Newfoundland on precisely the same terms as the Canadian flour does.' I confess that, when I began to consider it in that light, it did strike me as singular that, with both American and Canadian flour entering on the same terms, the people of Newfoundland should get so much flour from Canada as was stated to be the case. I, therefore, took the trouble to write to one of the largest flour importers of Newfoundland, and this is his reply:

"'We think the whole import of Canadian flour in 1889 did not exceed 10,000 barrels out of 278,000 barrels imported. Out of about 100,000 barrels which we and the bakery in which we are interested imported, not over 6,000 barrels were Canadian.'"

Now, Sir, I have before me the last sessional papers from Newfoundland, which show conclusively that the information furnished to the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was erroneous; in the first place, because the Government of Newfoundland does impose a duty on flour, and secondly, because the import of Canadian flour is very much larger than the hon. gentleman's correspondent represented. In the earlier part of that year, 28,000 barrels of flour were imported into Newfoundland from the United States, at a duty of 25 cents a barrel, and at the latter part of the season, 24,599 barrels were imported from the United States. In the latter part of that same year, at a low duty, 184,452 barrels of Canadian flour were imported, and during that year a very large quantity of Canadian flour was imported into Newfoundland, more, in fact, than was imported from the United States, and yet the statement made by the hon. member for Halifax was that only 10,000 barrels of Canadian flour were imported into Newfoundland that year. That is unquestionably, to say the least, an erroneous statement. I would like to know if my hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax, would like to have the Newfoundland tariff, which he calls a free trade tariff, applied to the poor fishermen, to the poor mechanics, and to the poor farmers of the Maritime Provinces? The tariff of Newfoundland is, in fact, so very similar to the tariff which was in operation during the Mackenzie Administration in the Dominion of Canada, that I am not at all astonished that he would be enamoured with it, but I quite disagree with him, that the farmers, the fishermen or the mechanics of the Maritime Provinces would tolerate any such tariff, as compared with the tariff which now exists in the Dominion of Canada. The fishermen of the Maritime Provinces have, for instance, their lines and twines for the fisheries free; they have salt imported for sea or Gulf fisheries free; iron for vessels free (by drawback). They have all articles ex-warehouse for ship stores, for all fisheries free; they have wire rigging for vessels free, they have tea and coffee free, and practically, now, they have molasses free. In addition to that they have the products of their fisheries protected by the National Policy, in other respects by the imposition of duties on fish of all kinds imported in the Dominion of Canada. Now let us apply the Newfoundland tariff, which is a so-called free trade tariff, to the articles consumed by the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, and we will see what will follow. We find that coffee, which is free under our National Policy tariff, is taxed in Newfoundland 5 cents a pound for green coffee and 7 cents a pound for roasted coffee. Molasses, which under our new tariff will be only taxed one and a-half cent a gallon, is taxed 7 cents a gallon in Newfoundland, or more than 400 per cent. greater than is the duty on it in Canada. We find that tea is taxed in Newfoundland 20 per cent. *ad valorem* and 6 cents per pound specific duty, while it is free in Canada; we find, also, that anchors and cables, copper and composition metals for ships, including bars, bolts, sheathing and nails of the same material, canvas, sail-cloth and tarpaulin, canvas for ships' use, cordage, rope and hemp and manila cables, corks and cork wood, fishing tackle and salt are all well taxed in Newfoundland, while they are free in Canada, when used by the fishermen. I would like to know if my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) would consent to have that free trade policy of Newfoundland, or the revenue tariff policy of the former Government of Canada, applied to the poor fishermen, to the poor farmers and to the poor mechanics of the Maritime Provinces? The present tariff system is so admirably adapted to the county which I have the honor to represent, and, I believe, to the farming industries all over the Dominion, that I did not feel it was necessary to say a word on the question, except for the purpose of correcting the very erroneous statements which were made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That hon. gentleman maintained that the price of flour will be increased $1 a barrel by the new tariff, and he puts words in the mouth of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) which misled that hon. gentleman to believe that the price of flour would be increased by the present tariff by $1.45. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in his speech, said:

"My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax has handed me a memorandum showing that the duty on flour is 75 cents, and the freight for carrying it on the North Shore is 70 cents, making a total of $1.45."

This statement, to say the least, is misleading, because I believe we can purchase Canadian flour in the Maritime Provinces at a shade lower price than it is sold in any section of Canada. That may seem strange, but flour is an article that has an intrinsic value, and the millers know it. They place flour in the Maritime Provinces at wholesale figures, at a lower rate than they ask in the home market. That may seem strange to those who have not enquired into trade questions of this kind, but I can assure the House, that just in the same way, fish can be purchased at a lower price in the city of Halifax than it can in the counties where fishing is carried on. There is a home price for fish, and there is also a market price. The home price for the twenty-eight years in the fishing sections of the Dominion has not changed, to my knowledge, to any extent whatever, while the market price has invariably changed to a greater or lesser extent. As an authority against my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax, in reference to the probability of an increased price of flour, I shall now quote a person who is looked upon as a

good authority, namely, Mr. W. W. Ogilvie, of Montreal. In an interview with the Montreal *Star* he said:

"The increase of the duty on American flour simply removes the greatest anomaly of the Canadian protective tariff. It puts a stop to the collection of a higher duty on the raw material than on the manufactured article, but it does not yet place the Canadian miller in a fair way to compete with the Americans, who are protected by an *ad valorem* duty on flour of 20 per cent., amounting to about a dollar a barrel. We ask the Dominion Government to give us the same protection, but this addition of 25 cents a barrel only gives us a total protection of 75 cents a barrel as against the American miller's dollar. The change places exactly the same duty on American flour as is charged on American wheat. To give you an idea of the utter absurdity of the old arrangement, I need only tell you an incident in the history of our own firm. We brought in American wheat to make 1,000 barrels of flour at the same time that a merchant imported 1,000 barrels of American flour. To get our wheat out of bond we had to pay $650 in duties, while the merchant had to pay only $500 for his American flour. In 1878, when the Canadian crop was short, we millers had actually to shut down our mills and bring in American flour; if such a contingency should occur again we shall be able to import American wheat. This change, however, practically gives the Canadian miller no protection, for this reason: The Americans have their through cut rates of freight so arranged that the low rates obtained by the western American miller pay three-quarters of the present duty."

"'How will the price of flour to the consumer be affected?'

"Not at all. There appears to be a general impression abroad that we shall put up the price of flour at once, but I can assure you the prices will not be advanced a single cent. We have had numerous enquiries from all parts of the country asking us what the rise would be, and to all I have replied as I do to you. Here is a telegram I have just sent to Hall & Fairweather, of St. John, N.B., the largest produce firm in the Maritime Provinces, offering to sell them twenty car loads of flour at yesterday's prices."

This proves conclusively that the existing tariff does not increase the price of flour, the object being merely to secure the Canadian market for the Canadian miller and the Canadian farmer. It was not my intention, as I have stated, to speak at all on this question, and I would not have done so but for the misleading statements made by my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) who I am glad to see now in his place, and I am sure I would have very great pleasure in having my hon. friend come down to Inverness and meet me on the platform and deliver the same speech in that fine agricultural county which he has delivered in this House. If nothing else would secure my re-election, such a speech as that would certainly do it.

Mr. BARRON. It is, Sir, because the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is designed particularly to benefit the farmers of this country, and because the proposals from the other side of the House are calculated as far as possible to help the onward progress of hon. gentlemen opposite in their efforts to make this country a dear country to live in, that I deem it my duty, at this late hour of the debate, to rise from my seat and give my views on this very important question. It is neither my intention nor my inclination to enforce any of my arguments by giving statistical information. A vast amount of such information has been given by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House; but I do think that any fair-minded man, hearing the information given and the arguments advanced during this debate from this side of the House, must come to the conclusion that the farmers of this country have been compelled, in the past, to sell almost everything they have had to sell in the cheapest possible market, and to buy everything they have had to buy in the dearest possible market. I had not the pleasure of hearing the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) this afternoon, as, unfortunately, I was absent; but I am told that with simulated indignation he questioned the figures given in this House a few nights ago by the hon. member for South Oxford. I am told that he argued that so unreliable were those figures that the hon. member for South Oxford could not have got them from the registry offices at all, and yet the hon. gentleman, in the very next breath, produced, figures which he said he himself had got from the registry office. It does appear to me very extraordinary that hon. gentlemen opposite will persist, speech after speech, in questioning the figures given by the hon. member for South Oxford with regard to the mortgage indebtedness of this country, while they studiously refrain from accepting the challenge from this side of the House, given by the hon. member for South Oxford, to grant a committee of enquiry to ascertain the true state of the facts. So long as they will not accept that challenge, it is unfair and unmanly in them to keep reiterating the statement that the hon. member's figures are not correct. So far as my information goes, I beg to corroborate those figures; I took the trouble of verifying them with regard to two of the best townships in my county, and I can say that so far as that particular locality is concerned, they are literally correct.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BARRON. Some hon. gentleman says no. Perhaps he knows my county better than I do myself. That is just like hon. gentlemen opposite: they talk about things they know nothing about; they assume everything. They have never been in my county; yet when I state that which I know from actual research, they say no. Now, we are a surplus-producing country, which nobody can deny, and so long as that is the case, the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is a bad and a wicked one for the farmers. The hon. Finance Minister cannot deny that we are a surplus-producing country, and with that admission out of his own mouth comes the condemnation of his own policy. So long as we produce a surplus, we must sell that surplus in the cheap markets abroad, and our farmers must buy what they require in the dear market which we have at home. Now, I want to ask the House to allow me to read a few passages from an article written by a very celebrated man on the other side of the line—a man at the head of the Democratic party of the United States, who I believe was at one time speaker of the House of Representatives; that is, Mr. John J. Carlisle. The article is headed: "The Tariff and the Farmer," and is contained in the *Forum* for January, 1890; and as it applies to the farmers of this country as well as to those of the United States, I will ask the kind attention of the House while I read it:

"Unless a commodity can be sold here for a higher price than it can be sold for in the country where it is produced; it will not be brought here; nor will an article be exported from this country for sale abroad unless the price there is higher than it is here. If the farmers of the United States would recognise the truth of these self-evident propositions, they would see at once that the protective system, whatever may be its effect upon other classes of producers, cannot possibly increase the prices of the articles they have to sell, because without it they

could have no foreign competition in their home market, and with it they cannot escape the most severe competition in the foreign markets where they must sell their surplus.

"And in this connection it must not be forgotten that the prices of all the principal agricultural products which the farmer sells at home, are fixed in the free markets abroad where he sells his surplus, while the prices of nearly all the things he has to buy are fixed in the protected markets here, and are largely increased by the total or partial exclusion of foreign competition and by reason of the unnecessary taxes imposed upon the materials used in their production. The fact that the home prices of such articles as we produce in excess of the home demand and therefore export to other countries, are fixed in the foreign ports where they are sold, is admitted by every intelligent protectionist; but if it were denied it could be easily established by a simple reference to the daily market reports in the newspapers. This is a most important fact for the consideration of farmers, and yet the protectionists generally ignore it entirely when they undertake to show the great value of the home market which, they allege, their policy has furnished for agricultural products. * * *

"It must be admitted, however, that if the farmer had a sufficient home market for all his products—that is, a market in which the demand was equal to, or in excess of, the supply, so as to enable him to exercise some influence in fixing the prices—he would be in a far better condition than he is now; but it is certain that a century of protection, in a greater or less degree, to the owners of mines and manufacturing establishments, has not secured such a market for him, and the question he has now to decide is whether he will continue to tax himself for an indefinite period in the future, in order that the impossibility of success may be thoroughly demonstrated. Finding himself at the end of a hundred years compelled to export a larger percentage of his products than at the beginning, it would seem that no argument ought to be necessary to convince him that he has been the voluntary victim of a policy which guarantees a home market and high prices for the producers of the articles he has to buy, and leaves him to get such prices as he can in the open markets of the world for the articles he has to sell."

Then he goes on to say:

"While protection cannot, for the reasons stated, increase the prices of our domestic agricultural products, it does largely increase the prices of a great part of the manufactured articles which the farmer is compelled to buy and use. It is clear, that the purchaser and consumer of an imported article must pay, not only the original cost abroad and the whole amount of the duty, but also the profits of the dealers on that cost and the duty; and it is equally clear, that this enables the domestic manufacturer of the same kind of article to add the whole, or at least a large part, of the duty to the price of his article. This is the sole object of a protective tariff. When the price of a commodity is so low here that our manufacturers cannot profitably produce it, they immediately demand the imposition of a duty, or an increase of the duty if one already exists, in order that the consumer may be compelled by law to pay them such a bonus upon their investment as will enable them to commence or to continue the business as the case may be. For instance, there are no tin or terne plates made in this country, but we import all we use, although they are subject to a duty or tax of $22.40 per ton. Notwithstanding this duty, the prices prevailing here are so low that our manufacturers say they cannot afford to produce that class of goods. They are, therefore, demanding that the duty shall be more than doubled, because, they know that this would so increase the prices here as to enable them to go into the manufacture of the article, and realise a profit at the expense of the farmers and other consumers of their product.

"It would not be difficult to show by a citation of authentic reports of the markets here and in other countries, that, in almost every instance, the domestic producers of protected articles have added the whole, or a large part, of the duty to the foreign prices of the same kind of articles, and thus forced the farmers to pay millions of dollars more every year for their clothing, medicines, paints, glass, salt, earthenware, agricultural implements, board and wire fences, barns and other buildings, waggons, harness and other necessaries, than they would have been required to pay if the duties had not been imposed, or had been properly adjusted and fixed at a reasonable revenue rate."

These are the words of a great man and a great student, and they are entirely apropos to the condition of things in this country to-day. But we are told that, because the prices upon some of the articles which the farmers consume are less to-day than they were in the year 1878, protection must be a good thing. That is a most fallacious argument. It has been used, I believe, by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward), but it is perfectly preposterous, because all such articles are much cheaper to-day in the foreign markets, and were it not for the excessive duties to which they are subjected every one of them would be cheaper in Canada to-day than they are. Let me illustrate that, although it is hardly necessary to do so, the proposition being plain. However, we hear that argument advanced in the country and supported by hon. gentlemen opposite, that, because some things are cheaper now than in 1878, protection must be a good thing, and I wish to illustrate its absurdity by one or two figures relating to steel rails. These figures are taken from the same authority I quoted a few minutes ago. In 1871, in the United States, steel rails were quoted at $91.80 per ton; and we are told what a grand thing protection is, because in 1882 the price per ton was reduced to $57. But those who so argue are careful not to tell the people that in England the price per ton had been reduced in 1882 to $31.10, while in the United States it had only been reduced to $57. The following table will show the unnecessary burden imposed upon the American people by their tariff upon this single article during a period of twelve years, from 1871 to 1882, inclusive:—

Year.	Tons of Steel Rails made in the United States.	Price in England in Gold.	Price in United States in Gold.	Difference in Price per Ton.	Excess of Cost under Protection over Cost under Free Trade.
1871	38,250	$54 99	$91 18	$36 19	$ 1,284,267
1872	94,070	67 64	98 43	30 79	2,839,973
1873	129,015	80 05	103 91	23 06	3,971,372
1874	144,944	68 75	85 76	17 01	2,475,495
1875	290,863	44 28	59 75	14 97	4,344,226
1876	412,461	32 12	44 97	12 75	5,258,878
1877	432,169	29 20	42 08	12 88	5,565,040
1878	559,795	25 55	42 00	16 45	9,208,628
1879	693,113	26 88	48 25	21 37	14,811,824
1880	968,075	34 36	67 50	33 14	33,180,005
1881	1,355,519	31 53	60 00	28 47	38,534,686
1882	1,460,920	31 10	57 00	25 90	37,837,828
	6,579,194				$159,312,216

But we are told, notwithstanding all this, that the farmer is prosperous and ought not to complain of his lot, because his lot is as good as it ought to be—that while the manufacturers, forsooth, may come down to Ottawa and complain about their condition, the farmers ought not to complain because their condition is good enough. On behalf of the farming community in my constituency, I resent such a statement. If I forget not, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) the other night tried to convince this House that the farmers were satisfied and contented with their condition, and that the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) regarding the state of the farmers was entirely incorrect, and his information unreliable. Yet, on that very day, the Grand Jury of the County of Simcoe, where, I believe, the hon. gentleman lives, made a presentment to the Judge

of Assize on that occasion, and this is what the farmers in the hon. gentleman's own county state:

"We feel that our agricultural community should have legislation to help them out of their financial difficulties, as, it appears to us, that, if there is not something done along that line, it will soon become a matter of landlord and tenant; and, whereas, the chartered loan companies now in the Province get the bulk of their money from the old country at a very low rate of interest, and re-loan it at a high rate, that the Government might do something toward relieving this difficulty."

I will leave the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to settle with the farmers in his own county, who represent that state of things directly opposed to what he himself led the House to believe. But what is the other defence that hon. gentlemen opposite are driven into? When we endeavor, as is our bounden duty, to point out the condition of this country, hon. gentlemen opposite are driven to make the charge that we are decrying our country. They seem to think, so egotistical are they, that they are the country, and that, when we attack them, we are attacking the country. We live in the grandest country the sun ever shone upon. If I had time at my disposal I could show that the crops per acre in the Province of Ontario are greater in the last five years than in any State of the Union. I refrain from that, but I state that there is no State in the Union to be compared with the Province of Ontario, and that we have the best country in the world.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And the worst Government.

Mr. MASSON. In the Province.

Mr. BARRON. But, what did hon. gentlemen opposite say, when they were in Opposition, prior to 1878. At that time, this country, like all other countries, was passing through a period of depression; but I want to read the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, in which he relieved the then Government of Mr. Mackenzie of responsibility for the condition of the country. Speaking at Millbrook in October, 1877, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"Now I do not say,—I have never said on the floor of the House or on the public platform—that this great and unhappy change which has taken place over the whole face of Canada, as respects the condition of the people, is entirely due to the present Government. I have never pretended, for a moment—and I do not now pretend—that there have not been causes outside of anything that any Government could do that would largely tend to bring about such a result."

Now, notwithstanding these words, with marvellous agility, the hon. gentleman swallows himself, for, speaking in the House, he said:

"The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country. It has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labor, the finest sons of Canada, to a foreign country to obtain employment their own country denies them."

It is all right for hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are on this side of the House, to make statements of that kind: but it is all wrong for us. In the same way, we find Sir Charles Tupper further reported in the *Hansard* of 1878 (page 448) to have said:

"Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to propose in the present disastrous state of affairs? What has he to propose in view of the suffering industries of this country? What has the hon. gentleman to propose by which the present depressed state of things in this country may be changed, or the people inspired with the slightest hope for the better?"

And further he draws a picture of the people in a state of absolute starvation. Then, what does the hon. gentleman who now leads the House say, and he is the one member who is always specially charging members on this side of the House with crying "blue ruin." He is the member who should set the example for that side and this side to follow. In 1878, he said:

"We have no work-people: our work-people have gone off to the United States. They are to be found employed in the Western States, in Pittsburg, and, in fact, in every place where manufactures are going on. These Canadian artisans are adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation instead of adding to ours. Our work-people in this country, on the other hand, are suffering for want of employment. Have not their cries risen to Heaven? Has not the hon. the Premier been surrounded and besieged, even in his own Department, and on his way to his daily duties, by suffering artisans who keep crying out: 'We are not beggars, we only want an opportunity of helping to support ourselves and our families.'"

These are the words of hon. gentlemen opposite at that time, showing to the world, and especially to the United States, how the people were, as they stated, leaving this country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Deputy Minister, Mr. Lowe, at that time, said it was not true.

Mr. BARRON. I am reminded by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Landerkin) that Mr. Lowe said that statement was not correct. At Sweetsburg, the Premier said in 1877:

"It grieved me to the soul as a Canadian when in Sherbrooke the other day to be told that there in that beautiful and rising city, which had grown, in my recollection, from a village to a town, and from a town to a city, that the population had actually decreased under the malign influence of the present Government and that the young men and young women who had gone into factories there, unable to support themselves and unwilling to be a burden to their parents, were obliged to expatriate themselves and add to the strength and prosperity of the United States."

It must grieve the right hon. gentleman still more in his soul now, because since 1881 the population of Sherbrooke has decreased from 12,221 to 10,477.

Mr. DAVIN. How do you get at the figures?

Mr. BARRON. I take the figures for 1881 from the census of Canada. Vol. I, page 403. I take the figures for 1888 from the municipal statistics of the Province of Quebec for 1889, page 122. Then, further, see how the Premier cried "blue ruin" in 1878. Speaking at Toronto on the 30th July, in that year, he said:

"Is not our population leaving this country? (Cries of 'Yes.') Are not the young men actually going to the United States? Oh yes, it is said 'make this a cheap country to live in.' Gentlemen, this will be a cheap country to live in when property becomes valueless, when you can buy land for next to nothing, when a man finds himself poorer every year in consequence of the shrinkage in the value of his property; when there is a shrinkage in the value of all kinds of goods. Why, there has already been a flow of population out of this country. The skill, energy and enterprise of the country are leaving Canada and going to other countries where such energy, and skill, and enterprise are better rewarded and protected than in this country."

Then at Montreal he said:

"Our credit was good in England, in the United States, and all the world over; but, gentlemen, what do we see now? Instead of confidence there is distrust, instead of solvency, look at the Official Gazettes, and every Saturday they show a long string of insolvencies. Look at our manufactories closed. Look around you, and you see the horny hands of toil asking leave to labor. They are

now beggars, they do not desire to have silver spoons placed in their mouths, but they desire to have a fair day's wages for a fair day's work. (Loud cheering.) But what do we see? We see them drifting off to the United States: we see the skilled artisan, the strong-handed young men of Canada, and the active young women of Lower Canada, drifting off to Lowell, to New Hampshire, to Maine, to Connecticut, adding to the wealth, to the power and the strength of a foreign nation, and depleting poor unfortunate Canada."

Now, I ask, in the words of my hon. friend beside me: Could there ever be a picture of greater ruin than that drawn by the hon. member himself? And yet when we on this side of the House point to a similar state of things for which the Government opposite are positively responsible, we are charged with crying blue ruin. The state of things existing prior to 1878, on the statement of Sir Charles Tupper himself, which I have read from his speech at Millbrook, was one for which the Government of that day was in no way responsible. I might proceed almost *ad libitum* reading statements to a similar effect by the Premier and by the Postmaster General. I wish to refer before I close to the extraordinary statement made the other night by the President of the Council. We have been told time and again that we on this side of the House pictured affairs on the other side of the line, in too favorable a light, that we ought not to applaud the Americans as some people justly do. But what did the President of the Council say the other night? Speaking of the State of Vermont, in answer to an hon. gentleman from this side of the House, the President of the Council, speaking for the Government, said:

"If he tells you of these beautiful pastures, those hill-side pastures in Vermont, which are unsurpassed in any part of this continent for dairy purposes, for pure water, for luxuriant feed, if he says we have better pastures in Canada than those for dairy purposes, I tell him he does not know Vermont as well as I do."

Mr. LANDERKIN. He has gone into the immigration service of the United States.

Mr. BARRON. Let it be understood now by the farmers of the country that at last the Government have expressed themselves beyond any possible doubt upon the question of reciprocity in natural products. We have the statement of the President of the Council the other night to that effect, and let it go from end to end of our land, especially amongst the farming population, that the Government have stated distinctly, through that hon. gentleman, that they are not in favor of reciprocity in natural products, and that in face of the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper and of the Premier himself regarding such a policy. I will merely content myself with asserting that Sir Charles Tupper, when speaking in this House in 1878, page 465 of *Hansard*, expressed an entirely different opinion; I content myself with saying that the President of the Council himself, when speaking in this House in 1878, page 1047 of *Hansard*, spoke in an entirely different strain. What did the Premier himself say, speaking at Park Hill on 3rd July, 1878:

"The feeling in 1865, however, was very strong in favor of doing everything in our power in order to induce the Americans to renew the treaty. The Government did everything it could, and while its members were exerting themselves in that direction it would have been a suicidal course—it would have been thwarting the very purpose in view—if they had increased the taxes at that time even to inaugurate a national policy. Because the Americans could have said: 'How can we give you a Reciprocity Treaty when you are increasing the duties on our goods?' Therefore, from year to year, so long as there was any hope of a renewal of the treaty, Canada declined to raise a larger revenue than was absolutely necessary to carry on the Government."

Now, these words ought to satisfy this House and the country that the Premier knows perfectly well that increasing the duties on imported articles, as against the Americans, is calculated to delay our chances of reciprocity. I say, that reading these speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are to-day utterly inconsistent with their past utterances. I was surprised when the member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) was speaking, to hear the Postmaster General applaud him; I was surprised to see that hon. gentleman look particularly pleased when the member for Hamilton spoke about savings banks deposits, and argued that this country was prosperous because savings banks deposits were greater now than they were a few years ago. I do not acknowledge that consequence to follow. Sir, what did the Postmaster General say in 1878, speaking of what an hon. gentleman had said before him, alluding to the large amount of money in the banks as a proof that the country was prosperous? The present Postmaster General then said:

"The hon. gentleman had alluded to the large amount of money in the banks as proof that the country was now prosperous; but, on the contrary, this was always evidence of depression in commerce and in manufactures. When commerce was active and manufactures were flourishing, people did not deposit their money in the banks, but, instead, invested it in manufactures. Consequently, the argument which the hon. gentleman made use of in this relation was true in a sense opposite to that in which he intended."

I think the time has come for the people of this country to call a halt in the way the Government are managing our affairs. It is perfectly true, and no one can deny it, that the Government are, I may say, the abject slaves of the manufacturers of our country. Time and again the manufacturers have come down here, and hon. gentlemen opposite dare not refuse them their request. Why? Because they know that prior to every general election a certain very prominent member of the Government goes up to the Queen's Hotel in Toronto, and there has a consultation with the leading manufacturers, and the result puts them in such an extraordinary position that on the eve of every general election the manufacturers are able to come down here and ask the Government to do that which will benefit them at the expense of the general consumers of this country. Sir, I say that hon. gentlemen opposite are managing the affairs of this country not for the many but for the few, they are regarding the classes and not the masses, and inasmuch as the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford is in the interest of the masses, I shall gladly give it my support.

Mr. MASSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt, at this late hour of the debate, to follow the hon. gentleman who has just sat down in all the various statements and arguments he has chosen to address to this House. It would be, to a great extent, a waste of time to follow many of the old arguments that were worn thread-bare years ago, and I only rise on this occasion, late as it is in the debate, to express my satisfaction with the tariff changes that have been proposed and made. I feel it my duty to express that satisfaction, for the reason that I represent a riding that will most decid-

edly be benefited by these changes. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat quoted from a presentation by a grand jury, wherein they asked that legislation be enacted to assist the farmers; and while that was being done, this Government has been introducing legislation that will most decidedly benefit the farmers of this country. The increased duty on pork and on fresh meat, on cattle and hogs, and on flour, will all tend most decidedly to the advancement of the farmers' interest. We have only to compare the prices of these products in the American market and in our own market to see exactly the position these markets occupy. We do not require to go back to 1878 or 1882, but simply to look at the markets of to-day, and we find that in the great western market, I refer to Chicago, the price of pork during the last two years has ranged from $2.50 to $3 below the prices in Toronto and in the towns bordering on Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. The cost of delivering it there is but trifling, and, except for the duty, our farmers during the last year would not have received within $2 of the price they obtained. During the years the Canadian Pacific road was being built along the shores north of Lake Superior and Georgian Bay, a large quantity of fresh meat was sent to that district from the portion of the Province in which my constituency lies. Owen Sound was one of the principal ports for shipping cattle to supply fresh meat to the men employed in building that railway, and, but for the duty, not one bullock would have been sent there; and now, since the road has been built, and since means have been arranged whereby fresh meat in a frozen state can be sent there, that market, increasing as it is every year by the opening up of the mineral districts, by the establishment of towns and villages along the route requiring such products, is occupied by American fresh meat coming in, and during the last few winters the whole supply taken into the country in the fall was obtained from the American side. I hold, therefore, that to the western portion of Ontario this increase of duty on fresh meats will be a decided and appreciated boon. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, said that the farmers were asking for legislation. But did the hon. gentleman or any of his friends on that side of the House propose any means that will increase the price of the products of the farmers? Not at all. They propose reciprocity with the United States, free trade with the United States, commercial union, call it what you like, the free importation of American products. That is what they propose to do for the benefit of the farmers, who, they say, are now suffering from low prices; while a comparison of prices to-day, not to speak of prices in 1878, 1882 or 1886, will show that, except for duty, the price of grain in Ontario would be, on an average, 10 cents a bushel less than it is at the present time. I will not detain the House by giving many figures to show that fact; but the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to some figures and gave quotations for 1878 and and 1889, which, unfortunately, I will have to show to be inaccurate. I do not consider it necessary to refute these statements in themselves, but to show that the comparison I wish to make is a correct one. The hon. gentleman said:

Mr. MASSON.

"The figures are as follows:—

FARMERS' PRICES.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Rye.	Pease.	Oats.
Oct. 1, 1878..	$1.10 to 1.24	50 to 65	63c.	70 to 73	36 to 38
do 1, 1889..	0.81 to 0.90	40 to 50	52 to 53	53½ to 00	25½ to 27

There was an absolute statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), setting forth that, because the prices were less in 1879 than in 1889, that was an argument against the National Policy. To use the language of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron), it was a most fallacious argument. Whether the prices are lower or higher, is of very little material moment, for it is a comparison of prices that shows the position. I say I shall have to refute these prices, not from any desire to refute them, but in order to make my comparison. I think the hon. gentleman made a mistake in taking 1878, and he should have taken 1883, the figures for which year would have answered the purposes of his argument equally as well as those of 1878, and, therefore, I do not impute a wilful, but an accidental error, in giving the figures for 1878. In order to show the exact state of affairs, I will quote from the *Globe*, which hon. gentlemen opposite will admit is a pretty fair authority. From that journal I find in the table of prices of 1st October, 1878, not wheat from $1.10 to $1.24 as stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, but from 85 to 90 cents. But, in order to follow the matter out, I will quote the language of the *Globe* at length. It is as follows:

"October 1st, 1878. Toronto—About 2,000 bushels of wheat, fall wheat bringing 85 cents to $1.01."

Instead of from $1.10 to $1.24, as stated by the hon. gentleman—

"Spring wheat from 70 cents to 97 cents."

As the hon. gentleman does not say these are Toronto prices, I refer also to the Montreal prices, and I find the price of No. 2 Canadian Spring is given at $1.01 to 1.02. But the hon. gentleman does not even say it is in Montreal, perhaps he does not mean it is in Canada, but I refer to New York, and I find the following quotations on 1st October, 1878: "Wheat, dull, sales 56,000 bushels, No. 2 red, cash, $1.07½;" so that he is evidently mistaken in the prices he has taken; and, I believe, he must have founded his figures on the quotations for 1883. The argument my hon. friend tried to draw is wonderfully weakened by this misquotation. I find that in quoting oats at from 36 to 38 cents, he evidently made a similar mistake, for on that same day he referred to, they were given in Toronto at 27 cents, and in Chicago at 19 cents, or about two-thirds the price he quoted. It was not, as I have said, to refute these figures that I referred to them, but in order to compare the prices in this country with the prices outside. We are told the great American nation, this producing people of 60,000,000, is our natural market, and that if this tariff wall were only thrown down, we would be able to send all our grain across the line, and get better prices. I would like to know where we would sent it to? Certainly not to Chicago, because there the price ranges from 10 to 12 cents lower than in Canada; and certainly not in New York, because for the last two years in that city the prices have been lower than in the city of Toronto. I will quote to the House the comparative prices of wheat and oats during October,

1889, in Toronto, New York and Chicago. They are as follows :—

1889.	Wheat.				Oats.	
	Toronto.	New York.	Chicago.	Toronto.	Chicago.
Oct. 1.	No. 1 hard, 92½c. No. 2, 85c. to 90c.	General price.	81¼c.	27c.	19½c.
" 5.	No. 1 hard, 99c. No. 2 hard, 92c.	85½c. to 86½c. General price.	82⅝c.	29c. to 32c.	19⅝c.
" 10.	No. 1 hard, 98c. No. 2 hard, 91c.	86c. to 86½c, No. 1, 91c.	80½c. to 81¼c.	32c. to 34c.	18½c. to 18¾c.
" 15.	No. 1 hard, 97c. No. 2 hard, 92c.	82c. to 85c.	80c. to 80⅝c.	32c. to 33c.	18¾c.
" 21.	No. 1 hard, 97c. No. 2 hard, 92c.	80c. to 83c. 90c.	79c. to 79¼c.	32c. to 33½c.	18¼c.
" 25.	No. 1 hard, 95c. No. 2 hard, 90c.	82c. to 83c.	78½c.	30c. to 31c.	18½c.
" 30.	No. 1 hard, 95c. No. 1, 92. No. 2, 82c. to 85c.	95½c. 90½c. 82½c.	78½c.	32c. to 33½c.	18½c.

We find that the advantage of price in wheat is all in favor of Canada, and it is the same with oats, as between Toronto and Chicago, which is the market for oats, which we have especially to dread. We find that oats was from 10 to 13 cents higher in Toronto during the same month than in Chicago. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is certain from all these comparisons that the legislation proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite would not benefit the farmers of this country in that direction. I will not attempt to follow the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) in his quotations from speeches made by the right hon. Premier in 1878, and from the speeches of the hon. the President of the Council, because I am willing to admit that in 1878, it was generally conceded and generally believed, that reciprocity in farm produce would be of advantage to us, and many of those who took part in the political discussions of 1878, took it upon the square ground that reciprocity in tariff was better than a one-sided free trade. Why was this the case? It was because in these hard times, people turned their eyes back to the good times that had been, during the years we had had reciprocity, and they were very apt at a casual glance to believe that these good times then passed away, were caused by reason of reciprocity. They forgot that in the first of the reciprocity years we had the Russian war; they forgot that immediately following the Russian war we had the East Indian mutiny, and that immediately following that again, we had the American civil war. All these wars tended to increase the price of farm produce and particularly the price of wheat, then the great staple product of Canada. We had not only these outside wars but we had also internal matters which did a great deal to enhance the value of our produce here, and to make money circulate freely. During these same years, we had the building of the Grand Trunk, the Great Western and Northern Railways, and people naturally did lean towards believing that a good deal, if not all of our prosperity then, was attributed to reciprocity. They forgot the other contributing reasons which caused the good times, and they also forgot that during the year 1857, right in the midst of the reciprocity period, we experienced the blackest financial page recorded in the financial history of Canada. But, Sir, it is not what we thought then, but it is what the experience of the last twenty years has proved, that we are to deal with now. I was greatly pleased indeed to hear the President of the Council state, in reply to a question put by the other side of the House, that he was not in favor of reciprocity in natural products. Most decidedly not, and why? Because he had studied the results which the experience of the last twenty years has proven, and it will tell any one who studies it that such reciprocity is not desirable in our own interests. Now, as the hon. gentleman for Victoria said, it is not comparison of a low price with a high price that proves anything, but it is the comparison with outside markets, and what are the causes which have produced the low prices of wheat especially? Every reading farmer knows that wheat is now grown in great abundance, and that the wheat-growing area has vastly increased all the world over. The farmers know that the products of wheat has been quadrupled during the last twenty years. I may quote to the House the figures given of the estimated crop of wheat for the year 1888. The total crop amounted to the enormous quantity of 2,152,000,000 bushels. We find that from the United States alone the yield was 416,000,000 bushels or thereabout, nearly one-fifth of the whole; from Russia, the yield was 254,000,000 bushels, or about one-ninth of the whole; from France, 273,000,000 bushels, or one-eighth of the whole, and from India, 266,000,000 bushels, while Canada produced only 38,000,000, or about one-seventieth of the total yield. These facts show conclusively that the greatly increased product of wheat has lowered the price the world over, and it is only by comparing our own prices with the prices in other countries that we can see what benefit the tariff has conferred. Let us go back one step and see how outside prices compared with ours prior to the introduction of the National Policy. If you go back to 1877 and 1878, you will find that the prices in Toronto were lower than the prices in New York, an average of 20 cents in 1877, 18 cents in 1878 and 18 cents in 1879. Then came the National Policy, and the effect was immediate and continuous. I will read from the Toronto *Globe* of 20th November, 1883, the prices prevailing at that time. In Toronto wheat No. 1 was $1.14; No. 2, $1.12; No 3, $1.08. Again, wheat, $1.12 for fall; $1.08 to $1.14 for spring, and choice Fife, $1.24. In New York, wheat was $1.13 to $1.13¼, and in Buffalo, $1.12; No. 2 hard, $1.11; No. 2, $1.02. These figures show that prior to the introduction of the National Policy our prices were governed by the New York prices; we sent our wheat to England *vid* New York; but in 1884 a change came, and from that time to the

present we have been holding our own in the Toronto market, and have generally had the advantage. So that, when we compare the condition of the market before the introduction of the National Policy with what it has been since, it seems to me that the argument is unanswerable that the change has been caused by the tariff. There is another view of the case, which was stated by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). He made a comparison of the prices of flour, and he was fair enough to compare the prices in the United States with the prices in Canada. Where he got his figures I do not know ; I have not had time to trace them up ; but he takes the years 1881 and 1886 for his comparison, and compares the price at Montreal with the export price in the United States. Now, the export price, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, gives the value per bushel. We find that in 1888-89 the United States exported in flour 9,374,803 barrels, valued at $45,296,485, or $4.83 per barrel, while Canada exported 131,191 barrels, valued at $646,068, or $4.92 per barrel, or 9 cents above the United States export price in favor of Canada. Making the same comparison with regard to wheat, I find that the United States exported 46,414,129 bushels, valued at $41,652,701, or 89 7/8 cents per bushel, while Canada exported of Canadian wheat 490,905 bushels, valued at $471,121, or 91 1/8 cents per bushel, which is 2 1/8 cents in favor of the Canadian price. This is the market in which hon. gentlemen opposite wish our farmers to compete. This is the market for which hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to sacrifice the best interests of the farmers of Canada. They want us to compete in a market that exports 9¼ million barrels of flour and 46½ million bushels of wheat, while we only export three or four millions of wheat and flour combined ; we are to compete in that market and get the advantage in the competition, although, at the present time we get more for our wheat and our flour than our neighbors do. There is another view of the case, which I wish hon. gentlemen to consider. It was said, by one of the first speakers, whom I had the pleasure of listening to on the opposite side of the House, that a million dollars or half a million dollars, was considered a light thing in this House, but was a very serious matter for the farmers. I quite agree with that statement, and I wish to say that a few cents difference in the price of grain, may be considered a very light thing in this House, but it is a very material thing for the farmers. We find by the report of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, that in 1888 the Province of Ontario produced 65,466,911 bushels of oats, 14,269,863 bushels of pease, 13,830,787 bushels of fall wheat, and 6,453,558 bushels of spring wheat, or a grand total of these three grains of over 100,000,000 bushels. Now, anything that depreciates the price of that quantity of grain, one cent a bushel, means a loss of $1,000,000 to the farmers of Ontario ; therefore, if the reduction should be, as I contend it would be 10 cents a bushel, it would mean a loss of $10,000,000 to the farmers not of the Dominion, but of Ontario alone.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. MASSON. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. member for South Grey says "hear, hear." For his benefit I would refer to the figures more minutely. I find that the County of Grey alone, of which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is one of the representatives, produced over 3,000,000 bushels of oats, 8,862,890 bushels of pease, and about half a million bushels of wheat, so that even for that county alone about 4,000,000 bushels of these grains were produced, which at 10 cents a bushel would mean $400,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We used to get about 15 cents a bushel more before the duty was put on.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman says they used to get 15 cents more per bushel before the duty was put on, and has therefore used what the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) called the fallacious argument. The hon. gentleman pretends to speak for the farmers, but the farmers themselves know whether they are benefited by the tariff or not, and I have a letter, received this afternoon, from a constituent of the hon. gentleman's, which he closes with this postscript. The letter is not from a lady, but still the pith is in the postscript, which is as follows :—

"I think the Government is making a mistake in not putting on a duty of 25 cents on corn. Canada can grow plenty of feed for her cattle. The idea of going to Yankeeland for grain when oats is 23 cents a bushel, and barley 32 cents. Send the wall up 25 feet."

Such is the opinion of a farmer in South Grey, and such is the opinion of the farmers throughout Ontario generally.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Give us the name and we will see if he is a farmer.

Mr. MASSON. The letter is private and I cannot give the name, but the name is legion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The name of the devil is legion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman had better not boast. He is living in a glass house himself.

Mr. MASSON. I will not detain the House longer as I promised to be brief, but I find there are so many points to be treated that one is tempted to proceed at too great length. I had intended to refer to the question of agricultural implements, but that has been so fully gone into by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) that I will simply confine myself to one point, concerning which I made personal enquiry, and that is as regards the prices of these articles in the Northern States. I refer to the northern part of the State of New York, in the vicinity of Watertown, where I found from personal enquiry that the prices of agricultural implements were, for reapers, mowers, and harvesters, from $5 to $10 above what they are in my own town, and I found on further enquiry that the time given for the payment of threshing machines and harvesters and the more expensive implements, were very much the same as in Canada, but while in Canada interest for the second and third year is charged at 7 per cent., in the State of New York, that highly favored State, the farmers are charged 10 per cent. I wish, in concluding, to congradulate the Government upon the changes they have made in the

tariff, feeling satisfied that these changes will result to the benefit of the farmers, and assist them out of their difficulties. I grant that the farmers may not be as well off as I would like to see them, for I would like to see them free from all those mortgages we have heard so much about. Of my own knowledge, however, I can refute the statement that they are mortgaged to anything like the extent hon. gentlemen opposite allege they are, and the evidence given by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is, to my mind, the most fallacious and deceptive material or argument of any that could possibly be produced. Can any registrar, looking over his books, say how many mortgages there are unpaid on any farm? In many cases, as has been stated, where the mortgages are paid off, especially by loan companies, the prior mortgages are left undisturbed. Many mortgages, besides, are paid off by instalments, and it is impossible for a registrar to say how much has been paid off in this way. Whoever has had anything to do with searching through titles, knows well it is a common thing to find three or more mortgages registered against a property than are actually existing at the time. From my own personal knowledge, the argument based on these registrars' returns are most deceptive and fallacious. I would like to refer to one change in the tariff on which I would congratulate the Government, and that is the free admission of the raw material of iron and steel to be used in the construction of iron and steel steamers. That is strictly in the line of the National Policy, and there are particular reasons why these things should be admitted free, arising from the peculiar circumstances under which we are placed through British ships being allowed to come in free. Besides that, we find that most of the vessels built in this country or built in the United States, are intended to trade between ports in the United States and Canada, which trade can be done by American bottoms as well as by Canadian bottoms, so that we have to compete with the American as well as the British vessels, and it has become a matter of grave necessity, if the industry of shipbuilding is to be carried on in Canada at all, that everything, not only iron and steel, which enters into the building of ships should be admitted free. While I congratulate the Government on having gone so far, I think they should go on farther, and let in everything, whether iron, steel, brass, copper, wood or tin which enters into the construction of a ship come in free, for the simple reason that it is a raw material, and in order to encourage a great industry which is bound to do great things for this country. In fact, although only a year and a half in existence, this infant industry employs five hundred to six hundred men and produces nearly a million and a half dollars worth of material. It is worth our while encouraging, not only the building of steel and iron ships, but also the building of wooden ships as well. Anything that will tend to encourage the building of Canadian bottoms and the use of Canadian bottoms should be encouraged to the fullest extent, and if that cannot be done by the direct removal of the duty, it should be done by way of rebate of the duties paid, or, as this industry is one of national importance, it would be well that even a bounty were paid in addition. I trust, that from year to year the Government will continue its policy of making such changes in the tariff as the progress of the country, the development of its resources, the enlargement of its manufactures and the promotion of its industries of various kinds demand, because tariffs, as was said by the Minister of Finance, are not by any means like confessions of faith. They are there to be altered as circumstances require, and when the Government in its wisdom deems the necessity arises, I trust they will have in the future as they have had hitherto, the manliness and the courage to make the changes necessary to suit the wants of the times.

Mr. HALL. I have no intention of entering into a discussion of the general features of this debate, with which this House, I understand, has been favored for a number of days, but I simply desire to correct an error made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) in reference to the population of Sherbrooke. The municipal council of that city have adopted the practice of making an enumeration of the inhabitants of the city, for municipal purposes, from year to year. I have great pleasure in stating, in apparent contradiction to the statement of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), that there has been a steady increase in the population of that city for the last ten years. Of course, it has not been so rapid an increase as we would like, but the census has been taken purely for municipal purposes, and upon that basis has shown a steady and uniform increase. It is hardly fair to compare an enumeration taken in that way and for that purpose, with the enumeration taken in 1881 for the Dominion census. I have no desire to enter into the general debate, but I did not wish it to go uncontradicted that a manufacturing city like Sherbrooke had shown a decrease in its population.

Mr. PLATT. There are two reasons why the statements made by the mover of the resolution need not be dealt with at any length. The first is the length to which the debate has already extended, and the second is the importance of the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which I think narrows the question before us down to a consideration of the present condition of the agricultural population, the cause of that condition, and the remedy to be applied. That is the real subject which has been discussed in the latter portion of this debate; but I cannot refrain from offering my congratulations to the Minister of Finance upon the manner in which he laid the financial statement before the country. Optimism and high color seems to have given way to ordinary human hope and human uncertainty as to the future. Moderation seemed to characterise his remarks from beginning to end, and I congratulate him upon that. I also congratulate him on the fact that he has determined that, in the near future, we shall be relieved from such an extravagant expenditure of public money, and that the public debt shall not increase after the next year. I am sure the people will be glad to hear of that determination on the part of the hon. gentleman. Of course, he spoke of the buoyant revenue which seems to have obtained for the last year or two, and of the prospects for the next year, and he points to that as an indication of prosperity in the country. I never could see that a large revenue was a proof of prosperity in the country. The revenue depends upon the rate of taxation

levied, and even a people more depressed than the people of Canada are now might have extorted from their pockets a much larger sum than that which has flowed into the Dominion Treasury. Again, I cannot accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that a surplus shows sound financial engineering on the part of the Government. A surplus simply means the extraction from the pockets of the people of an unnecessary amount of money which, for their own advantage and for the advantage of the country, might better have been left with them. The existence of a surplus has also a very deceptive and sedative influence. The average elector does not always grasp the fact that a surplus may exist and the debt of the country be continually increasing. We often hear it said that it is impossible that the debt can be increasing, because we have had a surplus for the last two years, and we could not increase the debt when we had a surplus. The separation of current account from capital expenditure goes far to blind the eyes of a great many of our constituents, and, if a simpler form of book-keeping could be adopted, the people would see more clearly how we come out at the end of the year. Take the last ten or fifteen years, and put the expenditure on capital and current account together, and compare that with our revenue, and the people will see that we have not had a surplus in any one of those years. But I must come to the other and, as I consider, the more important question, the condition of the Canadian agriculturist at present. I desire to study the cause of the depression which I claim, with others on this side of the House, does exist in this country. We claim, and it has been admitted by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that the agriculturists of Canada are not in a prosperous condition to-day. The President of the Council stated that in plain words in his speech. Very much has been said as to the figures which were given by the hon. member for South Oxford. In the course of his argument he showed that depression did exist in the agricultural community. I am not going to burden my speech or weary the House by giving any figures on this occasion; but in regard to the statistics given by the hon. member for South Oxford, I may say that I only hope they are wrong, but I fear that for the greater part they are correct. I shall content myself by saying that I believe every hon. gentleman in this House has the best means of judging of the condition of the agriculturist by looking around him when he is at his own home. What a member of Parliament knows of his own constituency in that respect he is justified in stating to the House, and I think the county which I have the honor to represent may be considered a fair average of the counties in the Province of Ontario. It is not the best; it is far from being the worst. By many people and by myself it is considered to be one of the best, but I will simply place it as being a fair average. I know the farmers in that county pretty well, and I only state to the House what is stated to me by them. They do not consider themselves to be in a highly prosperous, or even in a satisfactorily prosperous condition to-day. They look upon the depreciation in value of their estates as being something very serious, and there is a feeling, I will not say of despair, but of despondency amongst them to-day. That there has been a very considerable depreciation in the value of real estate is admitted on all hands, and the farmers say that the intrinsic or the selling value of their farms is similar to that of any other establishment; it is governed entirely by the producing power. They say that whatever amount of money they are able to make off their farms year by year determines what their farms can sell for now, and possibly what their value may be in the future. With regard to the exodus, or the loss of our population year by year, the best way is to judge of that by the same method. What does each of us know as to his own constituency in that respect? In the neighborhood of our own homes, do we not see and do we not know that many of our young men, that many of our population are leaving us, and do we not know their destination? There is not a member of the House who, if he thinks of those who were his associates or his neighbors a year or two ago, cannot remember some who have left this for a foreign country; there is not one who cannot think of many whom he regrets to know have been forced by circumstances to leave, perhaps his constituency, perhaps to leave the country, as the Prime Minister said some years ago, "to build up the wealth of a foreign nation, and help to deplete poor unfortunate Canada." A few days ago I purposely picked up an old school register some ten years old, knowing many of the pupils who then attended school, and I went carefully over the list to see how many of them still remained at home; and I think, Mr. Speaker, if you will do the same thing, and scan the list of those who were your former schoolmates, you will be surprised to find how many of them are now in a foreign country. Take another list in the hands of almost everybody, take the voters' list of five or six years ago, the list of any locality where you know nearly all the voters, and ask yourself how many of those on that list have disappeared from the present list. Trace these men who have gone away to their destination, and there is not an hon. gentleman who, after having made this examination, will come to any other conclusion than that the exodus from this country to the United States is something to be very deeply regretted. A few days ago I had occasion to converse with a gentleman who has recently opened a ticket office, I think for the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the town in which I live. This office had only been open four or five weeks, and I asked him if there were many people leaving for the far West, and he replied that on an average he had sold to people going West 12 or 15 tickets a week for the last month. I then asked him if he could tell me the destination of these people, whether they were going to Manitoba and our own North-West, or whether they were going to the Western States. He could not answer at the time, but he told me a little later that he was sorry to find that out of the fifteen who had gone away in one week, ten had gone to the Western United States, and five to our own North-West; and he added that such was about the proportion in which our own and a foreign land happened to be the destination of those to whom he had sold tickets during the month. Now, I believe, so far as my own locality is concerned, the information is reliable. Such are statistics which any hon. member can verify for himself in his own locality.

Hon. gentlemen, of course, can speak for their own constituencies as to whether any serious exodus has taken place from them to the United States. I think it must be generally acknowledged that the exodus of our young men at the present time is greater than it has been at any time during the last twenty years. Another statement which I think will not be denied is that there has been during the last five years a more rapid depreciation in the value of farm land than has taken place during any previous five years. Now, I trust I have stated my opinion with regard to the condition of the farmer in such a manner as that I cannot be accused of slandering either the farmer or the country. The accusation is hurled at us across the floor of the House now and then, that we who are showing the actual condition of the farming population, are slandering the country, and decrying the reputation of the farmers. Sir, I say that accusation is no argument, neither has it foundation. We are only speaking of the condition of a single class, and Sir, we might read column after column from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1876, 1877 and the beginning of 1878, describing what they called the unfortunate condition of the country at that time. We know that the Premier himself went through the country decrying, if I may use the term, its reputation, and declaring that our young men and women were leaving this country to build up a foreign nation, and using stronger terms in depreciation of this country than any that have been used by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I have already stated that the President of the Council admits that there is agricultural depression to-day. His words are: "Agriculture is not prosperous to-day." Now, Sir, every candid gentleman before me, I believe, will accept that as a true statement. What are the causes assigned by the President of the Council? What are the causes which have been assigned by other hon. gentlemen opposite? Their chief reason is that it is the competition of the foreign products which has been thrown upon the markets of the world. I grant you that is an important factor in the reduction of the price of our farm products. We have been told, and correctly told, that India itself is competent to supply a very large portion of the world. Russia, too, is becoming an important competitor. Our own North-West and the North-West of the United States taken together, in a very few years, will be able to supply the world with bread. The Argentine Republic is also coming to the front as a competitor with the products of the farm, and I grant you that foreign competition is a large element in the reduction of the price of our farm products. But, Sir, we are told to-day by hon. gentlemen opposite, that foreign competition is one of those things which cannot be combated by any fiscal policy, that no Parliament and no Government can meet and ward off the calamity which has fallen upon the farmers of this country through foreign competition. We were not told that ten years ago. We were then told that there was a panacea for that ill. We were then told that there was a remedy, and there was no stronger supporter of that opinion in the country than the hon. gentleman who is now President of the Council. But to-day he tells us that this foreign competition upon the markets of the world is beyond the reach of any fiscal policy. I have granted that this foreign competition is a large factor in producing the present depression in agriculture, but it does not stand alone. If it were the only cause, if there were not a conspiracy of causes, then I grant you that legislation would have very little to do with it. But, besides this great natural cause, there are unnatural causes, and I need not use many words in pointing out what I mean by that—I mean that legislative interference with our commerce which is embodied in the National Policy. I believe that the protection which has been carried out in this country and in the United States has been one of the chief conspirators against the farming population. Ten years ago we were told that a policy might be adopted by this country that would remedy the evil of foreign competition. We have tried the remedy, and we have found that it is useless, simply because in the administration of it, a greater burden and difficulty were placed upon the farmers of this country than already existed in the foreign competition. Some contend it is impossible by legislation, even where there may be a protective policy in existence, such as has existed here for some time, to relieve the depressed condition of the agriculturists. We have been told by one hon. gentleman opposite, the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), I think, that there is a remedy, and that we should set ourselves about its administration. And what was that remedy? To assist the farmer by lessening the cost of his production. How did he propose to do that? By teaching the farmer scientific farming. That is the method by which that hon. gentleman would lessen the cost of production, increase the result, give, as economists tell us, the maximum of results for the minimum of cost and effort. I take that as my ground. I say there is a remedy. I say we can assist the farmer of this country by lessening the cost of production; but I would not take the course laid down by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). I think there is a better method of applying that remedy, and that is by cheapening the cost of production, by cheapening, if possible, the cost of all the products he is called upon to consume. I need not go over the list of articles taxed heavily before they enter into the consumption of the farmer; every person knows there is scarcely any article in common use by the farmer that is not very heavily taxed to-day. And whenever an article of consumption is heavily taxed before it reaches the farmer, it must of necessity increase the cost of his products, and an increased cost of product lessens the profit he obtains from his farm. Thus, I say, with the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), let us decrease as much as possible. and assist the farmer in decreasing the cost of his production. The hon. the President of the Council told us it was not advisable to lessen the cost of production, that the raw material of the farmer should not be cheapened. He told us that the admission of free corn would bring whatever was the product of that free corn, beef or other products, down to a corn standard, that it would bring everything down to a corn instead of a barley standard; he, in effect, told us not to lessen the cost of production, but to use expensive feed for our cattle in order to keep up the price. He argued that, if we had free corn, beef must necessarily fall

in price, and we should not cheapen the cost of the farmer's product, but keep it up to the barley standard. Why not feed wheat, and keep beef and pork up to the wheat standard? I do not know who gave the hon. Minister that idea. I have never seen it mentioned by other economists; it seems to be an idea of his own, that we, in this country, must not cheapen the cost of production, because, if we do so, we will cheapen the price of the products. I will leave the member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) and the hon. the President of the Council to discuss that matter and settle it between themselves. But I will call upon the President of the Council to settle a dispute which exists between himself as President of the Council and himself as member for Stanstead in 1878. Then, that hon. gentleman, speaking on the floor of this House, his speech was sent broadcast throughout the Dominion (and I will give him the credit of saying that his speech had very much to do with moulding the opinions of the people), a different story from what he tells us to-day, that there is no remedy for depressed farmers; that a fiscal policy was of no use. In speaking of the condition of English manufactures, many years ago, when there was very great depression among all classes in England, the hon. gentleman did not say, then, that England did not know how to assist the manufacturers—he called it protection; I call it relief—and he used these words:

"If she wanted to protect an industry, how could she do it? Not by the imposition of further duties, because that would not amount to anything. If a Chinese wall had been built around England, it would hardly have given additional protection, because no other nation could compete with her in her own market. How, then, could she protect her industries? She could not do it by the imposition of high tariffs, because they would be nugatory; but she did it by reducing the cost to the manufacturer, by taking off the duties on the raw material and on the food, so that labor and raw material would become cheaper; and to that fostering policy her manufacturers were indebted for their present position. I maintain that the removal of duties from raw material and the imposition of Customs duties upon manufactured products, are equally measures of protection."

Why cannot that rule, which was applied to the industries of England years ago, be applied to the farmers of Canada to-day? Why is it that to-day their condition is beyond the reach of fiscal legislation? If it was possible in England in years gone by to afford a system of protection by the reduction of the cost of production and lessening the cost of food there, why is it not possible to apply the same principle to-day and improve the condition of the farmers by lessening the cost of production and by affording them an opportunity of obtaining a maximum result at a minimum of effort and expense? He further said on that occasion:

"When the protectionists were asking the Finance Minister to protect the sugar interest in this country,—when they represented that it was on the verge of peril, unless the Government did something for its relief, they told the Government that this might be done in one of two ways, either by a higher duty on refined sugar, or by reducing the duty on the raw material. Either of those means was protective, and the latter method would have given that industry the greatest advantage it could have in competition with the markets of the world."

The farmers are not asking for protection; they are asking for relief. They say to Parliament: Give us relief from taxation, lessen the cost of our production, and we will be able to hold our own. We were told a long time ago that this question of foreign competition could be very easily dealt with, and I will not trouble the House by reading what was said in 1878 and on another occasion; but the effect of the argument was simply this, that all we had to do was to shut out foreign competition, and the farmers all over the land would be benefited; and we had hon. gentlemen opposite, then sitting on this side of the House, pointing to the fact that upon the other side of the line, where they had a protective policy, foreign competition did not at all interfere with them. We were told that all we had to do was to adopt a similar system, and we would no longer suffer from foreign competition. To-day, we are told that we are powerless because it is foreign competition that is injuring our farmers to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite offer a consolation, I cannot call it a remedy; when they are bereft of all other arguments hold up the present condition of the farming population of the United States and say: Look there, farmers of Ontario, of Quebec, of Canada, take courage, take hope; as badly off as you are, they are worse on the other side of the line. I do not know that it will be a very great consolation for the farmers of the country who were told some years ago that to adopt the American protective policy would better their condition, if after ten years' trial they are now told: although the remedy is working badly with you, it has worked much worse in the United States. On the principle that misery likes company, the Government offers to the farmers of Canada that modicum of comfort. I am not going to dispute with these hon. gentlemen who say that the farmers on the other side of the line are suffering severe depression. I am going to grant you that the farmers of the United States, the farmers of Canada, and the farmers, I may say, of every portion of the world, are suffering a very deplorable amount of depression. I intend to substantiate—to fortify, I may say—the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, by reading a short extract from an article by the Hon. D. A. Wells:

"All over New England, farms in abundance can now be purchased for less than the cost of the improvements upon them,—yes, for less than the cost of the construction of their stone walls."

The catalogue of the abandoned farms of New Hampshire contains particulars of 352 of these; referring to which the State Commissioner says, and I wish to call the special attention of hon. gentlemen to this:

"In most instances these farms have not been abandoned because the soil has become exhausted, or from the lack of natural fertility, but from various causes appearing in the social and economic history of the State."

On 11th August, 1889, the New York *Tribune* had an article on the decline of the farming industries of Vermont, in which it said:

"Good lands are offered for sale as low as $3 an acre, and it is said that it will be necessary to make $5 an acre the maximum price for settlers, if the new Vermont boomers expect to compete with western lands. It may, as a vivid notion of the extent to which the depopulating process has gone on, be said that no difficulty was encountered in finding abandoned farms in one locality to furnish contiguous farms for the first proposed colony of fifty families. In fact, four such localities were found."

Now, Sir, I quote this for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who have been claiming that the American farmer was in a very depressed condition indeed. They have been told, in reply, that the same causes which produced the depression in Canada were ex-

ercising their baneful influence on the farmers of the United States, and I need not argue at length to show that this is the case. Writers upon the other side of the line have busied themselves more or less, during the last year, to point out the various causes affecting the farmers there, and able arguments—unanswerable arguments, I may say—have been published in the press, and by various essayists, showing conclusively that the present depressed condition of the farmers can be directly traced to the unnatural policy in force in the United States. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the hon. President of the Council to the very proud position he occupies to-day. He expressed a desire, or rather, a heartfelt wish, in a speech some ten years ago, and I believe he is now upon the eve of witnessing the realisation of his wish. What did he tell the farmers of Canada, ten years ago, when speaking on the floor of this House? He said, referring to New England, and to the policy of the United States at that time:

"The policy which I would like to see introduced into Canada, and which I believe is the true policy for Canada, is to make this section of the country which we now occupy on this Continent, the New England of Canada, and to plant here those same institutions which have been the harbingers of success in the neighboring States across the line. Our conditions are precisely the same as theirs. We have the same soil, we have the same facilities for manufacturing, we have all the conditions that are kindred to theirs, and we are shortly to have what they now have, a great North-West opening beyond and boundless, which is yet to be inhabited by millions of people. I desire to say to the farmers of Ontario—here is a lesson for you, consider it."

He wishes to make, he says, Ontario and Quebec the New England of Canada, and the hon. gentleman in a speech the other night, told us, and told the farmers of this country, what was the condition of their brethren in the New England States. He read to us statistics to show that good farms in the fertile valley of the Connecticut, and on the beautiful grazing slopes of the mountains there, were selling at from $3 to $5 an acre. He pointed to the abandoned farms of that country, where the forests were again growing; but, nevertheless, he says to the farmers of Ontario and Quebec, "what the New England States are to the United States I would have Ontario and Quebec become to the Dominion of Canada." How do the farmers of Ontario and Quebec like the picture which the hon. gentleman has drawn for them? How do they like the position which ten years ago he wished them to aspire to, and which they are now in great danger of arriving at? Concluding that same speech that hon. gentleman says:

"I welcome the day when the west will be opened up, and when Ontario and Quebec will occupy the same position relatively to that country, that New England does to the great Western States."

The hon. gentleman welcomes this day; he glories in the prospect which is now brilliant in the eyes of every observant man in Canada, and which prospect is that the farmers of Ontario and the farmers of Quebec, if we continue the system of protection now extant in this country, will very soon be in a similar position to what their brethren are in the United States; the farming population of Ontario and Quebec will be to the rest of Canada what the New England farmers are to the American Union. Now, Sir, I have spoken to you briefly about the conspiracy of causes which are exerting themselves to influence for evil the condition of the farmers of this country. The first is foreign competition, and the second is protection. One is an auxiliary to the other. Protection does not directly assist foreign competition in working for evil towards the farmer, but it prevents the farmer from withstanding the baneful effects and evil influences of foreign competition. Were it not for that system of protection, he would be in a condition to combat it. This protection, which seems to be built up mainly for the purpose of bolstering up manufacturers, is of such a character that though it can be applied in the case of manufacturers and large, wealthy corporations of every kind, to tide them over a time of difficulty and depression by taxing the farming population of the country, it cannot be successfully applied, and it never has been applied for the purpose of helping the farming community. The farmers are at the mercy of the great corporations everywhere. They are even at the mercy of the great corporations composed of members of their own class, who have bound themselves together to carry on extensive farming operations, who have seized on large tracts of country, and placed upon them the most improved machinery, and who are producing crops in abundance much more cheaply than they can be produced by any of the small operators on one hundred or two hundred acres of land. But you may say these large farming corporations are far removed from the home market, and that they are not near the cities of the New England States. How is it that we can give a market to our farmers, as you have told them, by building up large cities in their midst, when you point to these abandoned farms of New England, under the very shadows of the tall chimneys of the great manufactories! The people of the New England States are not fed by the farms of the New England States. Their food comes from the far West. These large bonanza farms send in their produce over the railways which the New England farmers have helped to build up, at the very cheap rates, at the almost marvellously cheap rates, I might say, at which these roads are able to carry the goods, simply because they have been assisted largely by the public funds. The railways bring in these western products right before the eyes of their competitors in the New England States, to supply the cities of that district, and to deprive the New England farmers of any profit whatever from their industry. If I had not promised the House that I would avoid figures, I might give statistics to show the condition of the farmers of that country, as compared with the persons who are engaged in manufacturing and other industries. I suppose, Sir, it would be considered unpatriotic if I were to point out the condition the farmers of Ontario are likely to occupy in the future with regard to foreign competition. I speak of foreign competition as the competition of any particular locality with that of any other locality. Protection cannot do anything for that, because the members of the same fraternity in the same country can produce at a less cost in some locality than they can in some other locality, and send their goods there for sale. That cannot be remedied. These farmers cannot combine like the manufacturers. A few corporations in the country can so arrange their trade under a protective system—and that system assists them in doing it—that if they have a surplus product, they

can shut down their mills for a few months until that is sold off. That cannot be done in the case of the farmers, and you cannot protect the home market of the farmers against the farmers of any other locality. Who are the greatest competitors of the farmers of Ontario and Quebec to-day? Are they not the farmers of the great North-West, who have been encouraged and assisted to go to the North-West, for whose sake we spent a hundred millions of dollars or thereabouts to build a railway to enable them to bring their products into competition with those of the farmers of the older Provinces; and what can hon. gentlemen opposite do to relieve the farmers of the older Provinces from that competition? I do not think it is possible for them to do anything; it is utterly impossible for the protective policy of the Government to promote the welfare of the farming population. It may crush it, as it is crushing it in Canada to-day; but it cannot help it. It is a very great relief to some farmers, I suppose, to be told that although they are poor, there are a great many rich men in their midst, that although the fiscal policy of the Government has been depressing them, it has been building up other communities. The tall chimneys and the millionaires among the manufacturers may be pointed out to them, and they may be told to look at the large cities; but what do the farmers care for millionaires or large cities so long as they are in want and cannot make both ends meet? It is no consolation to the farmer to be told that his neighbor across the way is better off than he is, or that although he is poor there are rich people in the cities. I do not think the growth of a few large cities is going to benefit the farming population very much. History does not show that. What benefits agricultural population is to have large and thriving towns scattered over the country; but go through the country to-day, and do you find the towns and villages thriving in proportion to the cities? Not by any means. Our town and villages are becoming weaker every day, and the smaller home manufactories are becoming fewer; they are being wiped out by the large concerns. In many of our towns and villages, where there were thriving and prosperous carriage works a few years ago, you find to-day under the protective system that the large concerns are gradually eating up the smaller ones. If there is still a village blacksmith, instead of being busy in his shop as he used to be, he is now occupied in his garden or somewhere else, and has no call to his shop unless a passer-by loses a shoe from his horse, because all the things he used to make are now made by the great concerns. In many of the other walks of life, we find similar results of the influence of the fiscal policy which we have been foolish enough to adopt in this country. I shall briefly allude, Sir, to the question of reciprocity, which has been referred to only casually in this debate. The question of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States is not necessarily in argument just now; but we have been told that that is the only panacea which we offer for the ills of the farmers, and we are asked whether we can expect to receive higher prices for our products when we cast them on a market of 60,000,000 people who produce and export everything which we produce. Well, if it would be useless for us to attempt to deal with those people with the barriers broken down, how foolish it is for us to attempt to deal with them now when the barriers are up? And yet, we are dealing with them to the extent of about $40,000,000 of our exports. That is a sufficient answer to that argument. But there is another argument. We do not propose largely to benefit the farmers of Canada by opening up a market for their staple products, the cereals that they grow; but changes are going on, and where we used to produce nothing but wheat, rye and corn, we are now producing a variety of articles with which we could enter into advantageous competition with our neighbors to the south, and of which we are already sending them large quanties over the tariff walls. We are not talking simply of reciprocity in the natural products of the farm. The hon. President of the Council has told us plainly—and I believe that the number of his disciples is increasing daily—that he does not believe in reciprocity in natural products. I think there is a great deal to be said for that view, and if I were a protectionist I think I would adopt it; I think I should say: Let us have protection all around. I think I have heard on the other side: Either have free trade all around or protection all around, and I think, perhaps, the hon. President of the Council is consistent in that position. But he seems to have changed his opinion on so many points during the last ten years that I hardly know where we shall find him before this debate ends. It has been pointed out that he was the most ardent admirer of the principle of reciprocity when the great resolution of 1877 and 1878 was proposed. It was because of the last clause of that resolution that he threw himself so vigorously into the fight. He told the House, then, that if he did not stand up boldly for that resolution simply on the ground that it tended to produce reciprocity with the United States, he would be guilty of gross inconsistency. I shall not trouble the House by reading any extract from his speech at that time; that has already been done. He was then certainly strongly in favor of reciprocity; he tells us now that he is not in favor of a limited reciprocity, that he is not in favor of reciprocity in natural products only; so that he evidently goes for the whole thing—he is evidently with us in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Either that or the two speeches of the hon. gentleman are contradictory. But this hon. gentleman told us some ten years ago that there was something in reciprocity. That does not appear to be his opinion now, because in a preface to that wonderful speech which he made on that remarkable occasion, and in which he apparently did not say all he intended—in the preface to the publication of his speech, a preface not prompted by the heat of debate or the excitement of parliamentary discussion, but written coolly and calmly, away from all public excitement—he made use of this argument in order to convince the farmers that there was something after all in the policy of reciprocity in natural products:

"That the American farmer has had the full advantage of this remarkable increase of price is not to be disputed. But that the Canadian exporter has had a similar advantage is by no means established. On the contrary, the Eastern Townships farmer knows that when an American drover pays to his neighbor living across the line two hundred dollars for a pair of oxen and pays him only one hundred and sixty-seven dollars for a pair of similar size, condition and quality, that the difference of $33

going to the United States Treasury is a direct loss to him, and not to the American consumer."

There he gave us an illustration showing the advantages which would flow from reciprocity in natural products. He went on to say:

"Similarly, the Nova Scotia farmer knows that the buyer of potatoes for the Boston market pays to the farmer in Maine 16 cents per bushel more than he pays to the farmer in Nova Scotia for a similar article, freights being the same, and that the loss falls upon him and not upon the Boston purchaser. The Prince Edward Islander knows that he loses the American duty when he sends oats to Boston. Ten or twelve years ago some lumber manufacturers in Ottawa thought the American consumer paid the duty upon Canadian lumber, but the hard experience of recent years has completely dispelled the pleasing illusion."

Here is another extract to which the hon. gentleman will listen with interest:

"In the long list of agricultural products, I think of only two in which the American consumer pays any appreciable part of the Customs duty, these are, combing wool and barley for malting purposes. These exceptions to the rule result from an insufficient home supply of the particular quality required for a special use. In these instances, the buyer is obliged to seek the residue in outside markets and pay the prices which prevail in the market of the country where he seeks them. As to the mass of our exports to the United States, large as it appears in figures, it is so small in comparison with the immense volume so abundantly produced in the United States, that it no more impresses the markets there than a little tributary streamlet swells the waters of the St. Lawrence."

He has there come down to the sensible doctrine, that when a people want anything they do not supply themselves, they have to pay part of the duty, at any rate, to procure it, but wherever the value of the article is decided by the product of the importing country, then the exporter pays the duty. If that be true, and I believe it is an economic truth, in almost every instance the Canadian exporter has to pay the duty when he sends his goods to the American market. There are one or two other illustrations to which I might refer to show whether or not the farmers of this country should believe that reciprocity will be advantageous to them. Let me give you, Sir, an object lesson. We have in the county I have the honor to represent, an industry which is yearly growing and which has already attained magnificent proportions, and one which has inspired in our farmers a great deal of hope. Now that the barley industry in the older portions of Ontario has ceased to be profitable, the farmers of Prince Edward County have gone largely into the production of garden pease—very expensive and fine varieties of pease—which are sold in the southern markets, where they will not ripen. This has become a very large industry in that county, and, if the tariff laws do not interfere, the dealers will distribute among the farmers there something in the neighborhood of 15,000 bushels of seed for the purpose of growing these pease. These seeds are distributed among the farmers on a written contract, by which the seedsmen who furnish the seed bind themselves to give so much per bushel for the entire product, and the farmers, on the other hand, bind themselves to sow this seed upon certain designated fields, and to sell the whole crop to the men who furnish the seed. This industry has assumed magnificent proportions, and is second only to the barley industry in the County of Prince Edward. But what has been the result of the prospective tariff known as the McKinley tariff, which is now threatened in the United States? It has completely paralysed both the farmers and the seedsmen, because if 40 cents a bushel are to be added to the cost of the pease imported into the United States, that will put an end to the industry. One of the seedsmen is reluctant to give out any seeds, and the other has got out of the difficulty by printing in red ink, across the face of the contract, the following words:—

"I bind myself to give——per bushel for this crop, provided there be no increase in the American tariff."

Every farmer receives this paper when he takes the seeds, and I fancy it would be pretty hard to remove from his mind, in view of this binding provision, the idea that the Americans will have to pay the duty on the fancy seed pease when sent across the line. There are various other small items in the tariff which I might mention, but to which, perhaps, it would be better to refer when we are in committee. I am not going to speak on the barley question, although I represent a constituency which is largely interested in that article, because it does not come up here; but I will refer to another question which has excited considerable comment in my section of the country and in many others. I was told by one of our farmers that he was glad the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) had at last been elevated to a seat in the councils of the nation, because there was one outrage against which that hon. gentleman had fought years ago, and which, now that he was in power, he would no doubt do his utmost to put an end to. This man told me that, some years ago the President of the Council in that pamphlet which he sent broadcast over the country, had denounced the enormous tax upon kerosene or coal oil as "legalised robbery." He accused the then Government of having perpetrated legalised robbery by their legislation on this question in 1876-77. I turned up that pamphlet, and I found in it the following paragraph, headed:—

"LEGALISED ROBBERY.

"Of all the industries in Canada, the production and refining of oil is, perhaps, the only one in which a monopoly is possible—and that is simply because the area of production is limited, and may, by finesse, be brought under one control. * * * When they put on the duty of 6 cents a gallon, oil was worth 10 cents a gallon; they swept away the whole Excise duty and recouped the country by putting it on tea; but to favor thir industry, the only one which could be abused by protecs tion, they levied a Customs duty of from 50 to 60 pecent., making, according to their theory, the consumers of oil, which is made in Canada, pay, not to the Government, but to the manufacturer, 6 cents additional for every gallon, or on additional profit of 60 per cent. Was that legalised robbery, or was it not? In whose interest was that perpetrated?"

Then he goes on to say:

"Did it put every dollar of the revenue into the Treasury? Did they not know that every gallon bought of a Canadian refiner had paid him, not the Treasury, an additional six cents? Did they not know that two-thirds of the oil consumed is manufactured in Canada, and that every gallon paid six cents more than it ought to pay in consequence of the policy of the Government? If they are proud of their inaction in 1876 and of their legislation in 1877, they are welcome to any satisfaction which they can derive from the contemplation of it. So much for the oil question."

If that was such an egregious blunder on the part of the then Government—and I am not now going to discuss the origin of it—if it was such an egregious blunder then, it is equally a blunder now, and although those who defended it then may attempt to defend it now, the President of the Council is precluded from doing so, and taking his argument I say

that to continue it is to continue legalised robbery. There is no one tax placed upon the people of this country, the removal of which would be so immediately felt, as that upon the common article of coal oil. There is no commodity that I can think of which enters into such general consumption. I tried to think of some commodity that I might compare with it, but I could think of nothing so generally used between the two oceans, and I had to make a suppositious case. Suppose that Indian corn was an absolute necessity in every house in Canada, that rich and poor alike had to use cornmeal, and that the County of Essex was the only county in which it could be produced. Suppose that corn could not be produced in Essex for less than 40 cents a bushel, while American corn could be had for 25 cents a bushel. What could you say; what would even the present Government say, if, for the sake of benefiting one constituency only, a duty of 25 cents a bushel was placed on corn under the circumstances? That is a parallel case. That is what has been done in the case of coal oil; and I say the case I have supposed would be no greater outrage than the continuation of the tax on this very common commodity. I apologise for detaining the House so long, and I shall refer to only one other subject, which is the removal from the free list of certain products which, for the last year or two, have been admitted free. I refer to the abrogation of the Order in Council of 13th May, 1888, by which green fruits, shrubs, trees, and so on, were put on the free list. I do not regard this as a very important change in the tariff, as far as the farming interests are concerned. Last year the Minister of Customs answered a question as to the value of imports and exports during the free period, and he stated that from the 4th April, 1888, to the 1st January, 1889, we had imported, of all these articles to which I have referred, $831,339 worth, and had exported $1,486,022 worth. So I cannot see that, if that year is to be taken as an index, any very great injury can accrue to our farmers from this change. But I refer to it now because it may affect a tariff to which the farmers are looking with some dread at the present time; and I think the impression has obtained throughout the country that this act of the Government will go a long way to justify our American neighbors in establishing what is generally known as the McKinley tariff. For ten years, a proposition has been held before the people of Canada and before the people of the United States as a flag of truce, as a standing offer. We have never been able to speak of reciprocity without having that standing offer thrown in our faces. The Government have said: We are for reciprocity; look at the statute, we are ready to meet the Americans on equal terms. That has been given, time and again, as a reason why we were not called upon to enter into negotiations for reciprocity with our neighbors. It might be contended that a simple offer on the Statute-book would not have any great international effect, that it was not binding as a treaty would be, though it was argued differently; but that contention was made on the floor of this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite took the ground that we were not obliged to fulfil that promise whenever the United States chose to select certain articles and place them on the free list. But the Government departed from that view. They yielded to the pressure from somewhere—I do not know whether it was from Washington or from their friends behind them—but they acknowledged that they were bound by that, and they met the Americans half-way, in consequence of that statutory offer, and, when we in this country did that, and placed these articles on the free list, I say, we sealed the bargain with the United States, and gave it all the effect of a treaty; and now, by a stroke of the pen on the part of the Government, without any notice as far as I know, this treaty has been abrogated. No doubt that will be used, I have heard that it has been already used, as one of the reasons why our American neighbors are justified in no longer extending to us the right hand of fellowship, in relation to the tariff. If that is so, I think it is the most unfortunate movement which the Government have made. Representing, as I do, an agricultural constituency, I thought I should say something on this matter, and, having eliminated all statistics from my remarks, I hope they will be received in the spirit in which they have been made.

Mr. SPROULE. This subject has been threshed out from every direction, and, were it not that such an attempt is made by hon. gentlemen opposite to show that no benefit is to be derived from these changes in the tariff by the great agricultural class of this community, I would have refrained from speaking on the subject. Before passing to the discussion of the subject proper, I will direct my attention for a few moments to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt). In his closing remarks he referred to our conduct towards the United States as one of a threatening character; he said that, instead of doing what we are doing, we should hold out the olive branch or the flag of truce to them as an inducement to them to return the same thing to us. What would that hon. gentleman think of his neighbor who had his farm fenced in for the benefit of his family, what would he think of a corporation which had built walls to protect the interest of their city, if the neighbor would say, I am prepared to throw down my fence and allow your cattle to roam over my premises, and destroy my crops, although you keep up your fence against me, because I think this may be an inducement to you at some time in the future to throw down your fences to me? Would that be a prudent farmer? He would be looked upon as being insane. I think that in this enlightened age of the nineteenth century he would be considered little less than insane and only fit for a lunatic asylum. It would be natural for him, as it is for all individuals, as well as for corporations, first to take into consideration the interests of his own situation, the importance of looking after those who were entrusted to his care, either by nature or from any other cause, of providing for them, and of keeping his own resources as much as possible under his own control, so that they might be used for his advantage, and keeping the outside world, as it ought naturally to be, and as the law of all civilised countries provides it should be, at a distance until it would reciprocate on equal terms. The hon. gentleman has at last come out as one of the members of the Opposition, and he tells us what the policy of that party is. He says: We are twitted with having no policy, but we have not yet abandoned our

policy of unrestricted reciprocity. I believe, if I remember correctly, that that hon. gentleman was the first one amongst the Opposition members of this House to declare that their policy was unrestricted reciprocity some years ago, even in advance of his party. He says our policy is still unrestricted reciprocity, we wish to take down that tariff line. We wish to do away with that wall around our country, and we wish to allow foreign manufacturers to flood our country with whatever they have to sell. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman, and I would like to ask the farmers of Canada, whether they would be willing to allow the bogus cheese and butter that is made by millions of pounds over in that country, to be sent into our own country to the destruction of one of our most important industries. Why is it that this season we have sent out over 88,000,000 lbs. of Canada-made cheese into England, for which ample remuneration has been returned to the farmers of this country. The manufacture of cheese is one of the most important interests of the country to-day. Why, Sir, if we allowed those cheese made in the United States, composed largerly of rotten lard, cotton-seed oil, and other injurious ingredients, to be thrown into our country in tens of millions of pounds, it would effectually destroy that industry. There is no farmer in Canada to-day that could prosecute that industry profitably as he now does, if we had unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. gentleman spoke about Manitoba and the North-West as being strong competitors with the Ontario farmers. That hon. gentleman I must say is either pessimistic in his views, or else he is very illiberal in his conclusions. Does he not know that that is one of the important integral parts of the Dominion to-day? Does he not know that that country is largely absorbing the surplus products of the manufacturers of the east, and that the harvesters and agricultural implements that are sent into the North-West afford our manufacturers a benefit from producing these implements from our own raw material? We find a market for them in our own country, and our railways receive a return in the carriage of the products of our manufacturers up there, and in the carriage of the products of those people who live in that country to the east. It is a mutual exchange of products to the benefit of both, and not by any means to the disadvantage of either. I think the hon. gentleman was very short-sighted if he imagines that either Manitoba or the North-West is going to be a drawback to this great Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman said that the farmers in every protectionist country in the world are suffering; and, although he did not say it in expressed words, he added, by implication, that it was not so with the farmers of free trade countries. Now, what is the history of the agriculturists of England, that free trade of free trade countries? Is it any better than that of the farmers of Ontario, or any better than that of the farmers on the continent of America? Why, it is worse. We find that in that country committee after committee has been appointed to ascertain, as far as possible, what means might be devised for bettering the condition of the agriculturists in that country. What is it that has caused so much trouble to unfortunate Ireland in the last decade? Is it not because the agriculturists of that country, where there are no manufactures, cannot find a home market for their farm products? They are confined to that one island, and they are suffering from competition with the agricultural products of other countries. I say there is no argument whatever, in the comparison the hon. gentleman has drawn from the condition of free trade countries. The hon. gentleman said it was an undeniable fact that wherever you cast your eyes the young men are leaving our country in dozens, he says in hundreds. He says: "Look around the locality where you live and see how many have gone abroad." He says he has looked over the school lists of years ago, and found that some of them had gone away and he asks: "Where are these people to-day? I find they are in foreign countries." Well, I can only say that if the young men of his country are subject to the education of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) and to the arguments he has given to this House to-night, I do not wonder that they go to those Elysian fields that are painted so brightly, and that are held up to them as the land of milk and honey. Many of them do go, I regret to say, and I believe it is largely due, in many instances, to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, coming from gentlemen whom they are accustomed to respect as men of intelligence, and who ought to know something of the situation. I will not follow the hon. gentleman further than that. I will say that I think we are entitled to congratulate the Finance Minister for the very clear, concise and logical financial statement he has been able to make to this House and the country. The hon. gentleman is in a situation to-day that he can say that the coffers of the country have money enough to carry on the requirements of this country. The tariff that was devised a few years ago, and that was said by hon. gentlemen opposite would not raise a revenue, has raised a revenue ample for the requirements of this country, and we have a magnificent surplus being collected, year after year, by reason of that very tariff. I wonder if the hon. gentleman from South Oxford ever thinks of the speech he made in 1879, when he said: If this iniquitous tariff is imposed I can tell hon. gentlemen, and I speak from some experience, that the very object they have in view, of being able to raise a revenue by virtue of this tariff, will not be attained, they will have to disabuse their minds of that idea in a very short time, because if they should ever put this tariff on the Statute-book, I can assure them it will not raise a revenue. At that time he told the people of the country that they were blindfolded, they were deceived, they were imposed upon, that in due time they would begin to realise the fact. But time has passed, 12 years have passed since then, and we find that the revenue of the country is expanding, and that it is ample for the needs of the country. We have a surplus from year to year with which we are able to carry on the government of the country, and to accomplish those objects for the purpose of which that tariff was devised. Then what are hon. gentlemen saying in regard to that tariff? The general line of argument taken by hon. gentlemen opposite during this present debate has been one of gloom; there has been general despair. Almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the subject has followed this line of argument. The initiation was made by the hon. member for South Oxford, and it was followed up by one member after another who followed him in rapid succession, until almost every member on

that side of the House seemed to catch the infection, for they could scarcely be up fifteen minutes before they fell into the same doleful strain of gloomy forebodings as to the condition of the country, its prospects, the condition of the farmers, the condition of the manufacturers, and the hard times that were existing in every part of the country. Notwithstanding all that, when we travel over our country we see in the prosperous appearance of the people that at least they have ample to supply themselves with in the shape of food; they are living in a healthy condition, they show all the signs of health, they go tolerably well clothed, they are able to keep themselves from the inclemency of the weather, their houses are comfortable, their barns are well stored with provisions and sustenance for their cattle, their fields are covered with flocks and herds for which they get remunerative returns whenever they wish to sell; and we find every indication of, at least, fair prosperity in the country, as much so, I think, as we can find in any other agricultural country under the sun. It is not to be wondered at that we have individual cases of want. It is not to be wondered that we have not as great prosperity as we enjoyed in 1882 and 1883 because the statistics show that in Ontario during the last three years there has been a falling off of, on an average, 7,000,000 bushels of grain per year? Is it to be wondered at that we do not experience such great prosperity now as we did formerly when the crops were up to the average of previous years? It is not. But, notwithstanding that falling off in the crops, the people of Canada to-day are as well supplied with the necessaries and comforts of life as are farmers not only in the United States and Great Britain, but in any part of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly directing attention to the Elysian fields south of the border, and they are drawing comparisons between the United States and this Dominion. It is said that comparisons are odious, but they serve to draw the public mind to important questions. It appears to be the aim and delight of hon. gentlemen opposite to prove to this House and to the country that on the other side of the line there is nothing but milk and honey, and that nothing exists there but prosperity; but if we look at items which appear constantly in the public prints we will find there is nothing in the condition of the farmers there to justify such contention.

Mr. BARRON. What can the hon. gentleman say in regard to the statement of the President of the Council that there is no land in this country like the State of Vermont?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will only keep quiet for a little while, I will give him my attention subsequently; and if he wishes to talk about inconsistency in statement, argument or logic, it will be found amply in his own case without appealing to remarks made by the hon. member for Stanstead. I have here a clipping from a paper in New Jersey. It goes on to say that in the southern part of New Jersey over 200 families are now homeless; that Sheriff Johnson, of Atalanta, has sold, within the past few days, 200 farms to satisfy mortgages in that part of the State, and has ejected 200 families. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes talk about the ungenerous influences that work in Ireland to-day, but the history of that country does not furnish a parallel to this record. Here 200 families were ejected from their homes in one day, and during the pitiless winter, when they had not sufficient to keep them protected from the elements and where they had neither food nor shelter. Such a record is not to be found in this country, and we have nothing in Canada to compare with it. I might read many items from different parts of the country to the same effect, although the cases might be greater or lesser in their severity.

Mr. BARRON. Give us now something about Vermont.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Grey in particular is anxious at various times to call out "hear, hear," when anything is said regarding the farmers of Canada, especially if it is anything against the interests of our farmers. He says that the farmers do not want protection, and are not benefited by it, but, on the contrary, a great injury is done to them. He says that if a duty is placed on pork, it is a duty which the farmers do not want. The hon. gentleman lives in an agricultural part of the country, and should understand the case better. According to our Trade and Navigation Returns, 15,865,139 pounds of pork were brought into Canada last year, principally into Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, but very largely into Ontario, and yet he opposes any effort to keep out American pork although it would benefit the farmers. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that this duty on pork is going to increase the price $6 a barrel, and at the same time they argue that it is not going to do the farmer any good. It assuredly is not going to benefit the lumberman. If, therefore, a farmer sells pork to a lumberman at an increase of $6 a barrel, is it not clear that he must benefit thereby, and the hon. member for South Grey possesses enough intelligence to know that they must be benefited. If the price advances only half a cent a pound, and it will be that at the very lowest computation, it means on 15,000,000 pounds of pork $76,030 for the farmers. Taking other lines of products, and beef, on which there will be a duty of 3 cents a pound, it is easily understood what an important advantage is given to our farmers.

Mr. BARRON. That was all mess pork.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes; it was mess and all other kinds of pork. What do we find to be the condition of affairs to-day? When I visited Toronto the other day, I was told that a car of meat from the wholesale butchers of Chicago passed through. It was opened first at London, and beef and pork were taken out and placed on the local market, and there sold to the detriment of our farmers. The head and feet were cut off the pig because they were not profitable on which to pay duty, but the other parts were entire. The car was afterwards closed, and taken to other points. Meat is thus brought in to enter into competition with the products of Canada, and it is retailed every day to the people in London, Guelph, Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal. This has been going on for some time, and the quantity is increasing. A farmer who saw this car arrive and the meat taken out, said it was a disgrace to our people that our farmers should be subjected to such unfair competition, and the Government should raise the duty sufficiently to keep American pork and beef out of the country.

I say so too. Our agricultural community, constituting as it does a very large majority of the people, should be protected by measures which would be beneficial to the whole people. Last year over 22,671,000 pounds of meat came into Canada in competition with the products of our own farmers, and the Government should make some effort to stop the inroads of American farmers to the detriment of our own farmers, and to their supplying our people, not only the lumbermen but the people of the towns and cities to the extent I have indicated. No less than 8,285,000 pounds of lard came into this country last year from the United States, this being another product of our farmers. It is not possible for our farmers to raise hogs profitably because the corn-fed pork and the soft rattle-snake pork of the west is brought into competition here. By this means great injustice is done to our farmers, and it is proper that the Government should devise some means by rasing the duty or otherwise to protect the farmers of the country. It is said by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron), who is living in a part of the country which I am told is not a first-class agricultural district, but the farmers raise these things and sell them to the lumbermen without profit, while the lumberman is making a good profit on his business. Surely he should not stand up and say it is an injustice to the farmer that this duty should be put on. The member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said the same, and although he told us that in his part of the country the farmers were struggling to get along, yet by this unfair competition he is willing to give the American farmer the Canadian home market which the Canadian farmer ought to have. The member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) seems to be imbued with the same idea, and every one of the hon. gentlemen opposite took up the same doleful strain, and endeavored to convince themselves and the country, if they could not convince the members of this House, that it is an injustice to the farmers that we should have this condition of things in the country. Now, I contend that the Government has done a good deal for the farmers in these changes of the tariff. They have put a duty of 40 cents a barrel on apples; they have put a duty on raspberries, strawberries, cherries, plums and cranberries. In my part of the country there is a great deal of attention given to raising plums; we ship about 10,000 bushels a year, and if it was not for this duty of 30 cents a bushel, our orchard owners would be brought in direct competition with the American fruit raisers. The Government have put a duty of 3 cents a pound on lard to protect the farmers, and they have put a duty on butterine, and olemargarine, to the extent that they have kept all bogus butter out of the country, which is a great blessing to the farmers of Canada. They have put a duty on mess pork, meats, dried pork and flour, and in all these things we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite the duty is going to do the farmers injustice, and that it will not do them any good. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to prove that the consumer is using something for which he is obliged to pay more than he ought to pay because of this duty, and they have also argued that the producer of the article is not benefited by the increased price of the commodity which is consumed. That is a kind of logic which is paradoxical, and it is a kind of logic which is peculiar to the members of the Liberal party in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, also, that this country is in a deplorable condition, notwithstanding the fact that our banking institutions show a very large increase of money deposits. I have yet to learn that a country with lots of money to deposit in bank is other than a prosperous country, especially if that money is divided among the people generally as it is in Canada. Our money is not hoarded by a few millionaires; it is divided among the people and benefits the people generally. We have in the post office savings banks the money showing the small savings of the agricultural classes, the wage-earners and the poor people generally. We have the deposits in the larger banks, showing the money which capitalists have accumulated in their business for the last ten or twelve years. We have also the money invested in the loaning companies, and in every one of these institutions, if we look carefully over the condition of the country, we can only come to one conclusion, namely, that the people of the country are not so much impoverished as they are represented to be. I have here, in the *Monetary Times*, a report of the Canadian Permanent Loan and Savings Company, a company which lends as much money as almost any two companies in Canada put together, and I find that their financial operations last year, both in taking in and paying out money, amounted to $11,265,000. The annual report of the company contains the following:—

"Among our receipts the shareholders will, I am sure, be struck by the large amount received on account of mortgages. The payments made by our customers last year were most satisfactory, never better, and speak well for the general character of our investments."

Does that indicate the extreme poverty of which we have heard so much from hon. gentlemen opposite? Does that indicate that the farmers are mortgaged to such an extent that the people are leaving the country by hundreds and going to the United States? Does that indicate that the people are unable to supply themselves with the ordinary necessaries and comforts of life? I think it does not. I have only given the report of one company, but I might go over the whole list of them, and show that the general tenor of their reports is to the effect that they are receiving their money back that they lent out on mortgages in very considerable quantities; that the companies were well pleased with the amounts they were being repaid, and that measured by their own experience they look upon the condition of the country as prosperous. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken about the scarcity of money in the country and the shrinkage of the value of farms. I hold that is no great detriment to the country, if the land only reaches a value where a man's labor will be paid a return which will be a fair interest on the money invested in his farm, and if a man cannot rent his farm to pay 5 per cent. for the money invested, the agricultural land is too high. If land comes down to its normal value to-day it is no great injury to the parties who are holding the land, because they do not want to sell it, but wish to continue carrying on their operations, and they receive a better return for their labor. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave us a peculiar illustration of the condition of the country, in stating that farms were extensively mortgaged, and that he took his returns, he said,

from the registry offices of the Province of Ontario. Now, for several years past, I have been sending payments on a mortgage for a farmer in my part of the country, who mortgaged one farm some nine years ago for $1,000 in order to buy another farm. He was to pay $100 a year, and I have sent nine annual instalments, leaving only $100 on that mortgage now due; but if you go into the registry office in South Grey you will find there is a mortgage of $1,000 charged against that farm, although $900 have been paid off. The hon. gentleman must have known that such are the real facts of the case in very many instances, and, therefore, I can only assume that he was attempting to deceive the people of this country by his statement in reference to the mortgages on farms in Ontario, because if he wished to make a fair argument, he would never have made the statements he did, without explanation. He ought to have known, and probably he did know, that hundreds of thousands of people in the country, must see how fallacious, how unfair and how misleading his argument was. It was stated also by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the people were leaving the country by thousands, because they had sent back this Government to power, and he told us that the hon. Minister of Finance and his friends are living in a fool's paradise; therefore, of course, by implement we must assume that the people are fools. And why are they fools in the eyes of the member for South Oxford? Because they did not see fit to place the hon. gentleman and his friends upon the Treasury benches, and because they decided to allow them to remain in the cold shades of Opposition where they would do less injury and more good for the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), speaking of the farmers who supported the Government, gave us an account of his dream or séance, in which he stated that these farmers were only fit to be sent to hell, to be hung up to dry, because they were too green to burn. I wonder how the farmers of Ontario will accept the compliment. I wonder how they will repudiate the insinuation made by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he asks them to return him again as a member of this House. I say that this statement of his was an insult to the agricultural classes of this country. It is a shame that an hon. gentleman who professes to be of the dignity and standing of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should make such an illustration, because it was a gratuitous insult to the farmers. It was intended to be offensive, it ought to be offensive, and when the time comes again that the hon. member will have to appeal to his constituents I feel they will resent it. We have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House make some very peculiar statements in Parliament, but the time will come when they will have to go back to their constituents, to ask their people to re-endorse their arguments and the position they have taken here, or to reject them, and send others in their places. But then and not till then we will find a change come over the spirit of their dream; we will find them again making excuses for their position and explaining it away; there will be another Malvern speech from the leader of the Opposition, and the people will be told that the country is committed to a tariff and that they dare not alter it at present, and on that ground they will claim the support of the manufacturers. It will take them as long to explain away their arguments of to-day as it does to explain their untenable position before the agriculturists of Canada; and I am afraid that the result will be about as pleasant to them as it was in 1882 and 1887. They will find that the people would rather live in a fool's paradise, as they are pleased to call it, and have some comfort, than enjoy the company of hon. gentlemen opposite, who could only drive the ship of state on the sands and shoals as they did before. The producing and manufacturing classes of this country will prefer to support men who have shown their disposition, their willingness and their ability to assist them as they are doing to-day. But what is the present Government doing for the great agricultural class of this country to-day? They have put a duty on the products of the farmers, in which competition from the American side is becoming injurious to them—on meats, lard, butter, corn and oats; on every one of these lines the duty is a direct benefit to the farmers of this country. Then, the Government have kept the markets of the old country for the Canadian farmer, who is able to send his cattle there alive without having them scheduled as American cattle are. They have kept the home market of this country for the Canadians, which has been built up by our manufacturing industries. The manufacturers of this country are consuming millions of feet of lumber as raw material, which has been got out by the farmers. An hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island said that this tariff benefits the class against the mass—that it benefits not the agriculturists, but the manufacturers; but the manufacturers of this country buy their raw material from the farmers, and thus by benefiting the manufacturers they benefit the farmers. If you go along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in my county to-day, you will see great quantities of elm, maple, beech, ash, birch, cherry, and all kinds of hardwood and softwood piled up in the railway yards waiting to be shipped to Toronto to supply the Massey and other manufacturing companies. This company turned out over 20,000 agricultural implements last year for the farmers of this and other countries. They exported to foreign countries over 2,000 agricultural implements last year, and we have men travelling all through the country during the winter season buying up timber as raw material for the manufacturers. Is not that a benefit to the country? I know farmers who if the season is propitious will make from $100 to $400 in getting out this timber and wood, and it is largely the protective tariff adopted in 1878 that has enabled the manufacturers to increase their output from year to year. and thereby consume the raw material. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), in dealing with this question, said that the farmers, instead of being benefited by this tariff, were injuriously affected by it. He undertook to compare the condition of the farmers to-day with what it was a few years ago, and he mentioned a number of implements needed to carry on the operations of an ordinary farm in Ontario, giving the cost of those implements without the duty, and their cost with the duty. The hon. gentleman forgot that these articles are manufactured at home, no duty being paid on them, and that the wood used

in their manufacture is produced by Canadian farmers. But he counted up the cost, and he found that every farmer in this country would need $994 worth of implements to carry on his farming operations on which according to his calculation, he would pay $376 of duty. I think in the case of almost any farmer of Ontario $376 would cover the cost of nearly all the agricultural implements about his place. Then the hon. gentleman went on to show how the Mackenzie Government encouraged the farmers of this country, and said :

"During that time we could get all our agricultural implements into the country free ; now we have to pay 35 per cent. ; waggons were free, they now pay 50 per cent.; buggies were free, they now pay 41 per cent. ; a hay-knife was free, it now has to pay 79½ per cent."

He mentioned various other farming implements which he said were then free of duty, but on which we have now to pay a duty. Now, I have a statement here of the duties paid on agricultural implements in 1878, and I say the member for South Huron in using the argument he did was only deluding the farmers of the country, and leading them to believe that under the Mackenzie Government they were getting those implements free, when such was not the case. I find that in 1878 agricultural implements not otherwise specified were imported to the value of $20,756, on which a duty was paid of $3,618.22, at 17½ per cent ; and yet the hon. member for South Huron said they were free. Ought the hon. gentleman not to apologise to the people of this country and to this House for making such an erroneous and misleading statement ?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The statement I made was that the farmers could get all their implements in through agricultural societies free.

Mr. SPROULE. I have read the hon. gentleman's own words ; it was afterwards he spoke of agricultural societies. I have a statement here showing that through agricultural societies there was imported only $1,901 worth. Then, I find that in 1878 there was imported $576 worth of chaff cutters, on which a duty was paid of $100.82 ; $1,391 worth of churns, on which a duty of $243.38 was paid ; $184 worth of corn huskers, on which a duty of $32.54 was paid ; $379 worth of cultivators, on which a duty of $66.36 was paid ; $28,909 worth of hoes, rakes and forks, on which a duty of $5,059.70 was paid ; $45,058 worth of scythes and snaths, on which $7,889.30 of duty was paid ; $34,437 worth of spades and shovels, on which $6,043 was paid ; and upon reaping and threshing machines, of which they brought in over $44,000 worth, there was paid $7,698 duty. In all $203,808 worth of agricultural implements of these kinds were brought in, on which $35,464 duty was paid, and yet the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) endeavored to persuade the farmers that under the Mackenzie régime they got their agricultural implements in free. I have gone over the hon. gentleman's statements in various lines, and if time permitted I could show that in every instance they are as misleading as is the one I have just exposed. The hon. gentleman, who is a practical farmer and is credited with a good deal of intelligence, should be ashamed to mislead the poor farmers into the belief that they were getting in agricultural implements free in 1878, and are paying so much now, when the reverse is the case. The hon. gentleman should apologise to this House and to the farmers of this country for having made so misleading a statement. From the little information I have had from the farmers since the new duties have been imposed they are very much pleased. Instead of the tariff being universally unsatisfactory, in my county, which I visited only two days ago, I did not find a single farmer, of either party, who was not prepared to admit that the protection given him was of the right kind. In fact the only objection he had was that it did not go far enough. They desire a heavier duty on pork and oats, and I think the farmers are entitled to an increase of the duties. I think, notwithstanding all the opposition on the part of the lumbermen, that it is not doing any great injustice to them that the farmer should get a little more for his pork. I see the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) applauding that sentiment. I know he is a lumberman and wants to get American pork in free of duty. But I think the farmers will not appreciate his good intentions when he goes back to them, and tells them that he is prepared to oppose the Government because they will not take the duty off pork and allow the lumbermen to bring it in free. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), said that our Government were exasperating the Americans in every particular. He said that last year they put an export duty on logs, which worked great injustice to our Canadian exporters of lumber. How does it exasperate the Americans? It exasperates the hon. member for North Norfolk a good deal more than the Americans. Why ? Because he is carrying on his lumber operations on the shores of Georgian Bay, and instead of buying his pork from the Canadian farmers, he crosses the lakes and buys it in Michigan. Instead of buying oats from the Canadian farmer he brings them over from Michigan, and if the export duty were taken off logs, he would tow them over to the American side, transfer his mill there, and sell his lumber, without paying any duty, in the American market. He would carry on the greater part of his operations on the American side, and the only benefit that Canada would derive from his enterprise would be in the employment of a few men in the lumber shanties. I know for a fact that mills have been transferred to the American side and the logs towed across, and that the Americans are sending men to cut the logs, and as soon as the logs are in the water, they take them across, and leave their Canadian men often without paying them their winter's wages, so that many of our Canadians are compelled to beg their way home after working the whole season in the woods. Is that for the benefit of the Canadian farmers ? We have a right to put a stop to this and legislate for our own people. These lumbermen are the wealthy men of the country. Those men who bought timber limits a few years ago and hold them to-day are rapidly becoming millionaires, and why should they not pay a little more for their pork and for their oats, and thus benefit the Canadian farmers who live among them and endure all the hardships and trials of life in the country ? I hope the Government will keep up that export duty on logs, or even make it higher. Let the logs be kept in our country, let them be manufactured here, let the oats and the pork of our farmers go to feed the horses and men of our lumbermen, and let our own lumber be manufactured here. Those hon.

gentlemen, whether they come from North Huron, or Grey, or Bruce, or Simcoe, or any other part of the country, will be condemned by the farmers when it is found that they oppose this duty, which is specially intended to benefit the farmers. I hope the Government will make the tariff higher than it stands, and I am sure the farmers will stand by the Government, which is doing its best in the interests of the whole people.

Mr. LAVERGNE. We have heard many interesting speeches on the subject before the House from the other Provinces, but I do not think that the protests coming from the Province of Quebec have been sufficiently numerous, and for this reason I deem it my duty to express my views on this matter. When the President of the Council rose the other day I expected that he would have treated this question particularly from a Quebec standpoint, but I must say I was disappointed in that regard, for the hon. gentleman devoted almost all his time to attempting to refute the arguments of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and limited his remarks to very general considerations concerning the whole Dominion; but perhaps the policy of the hon. gentleman, in not speaking about his own Province, was a wise one under the circumstances, for I know that the hon. gentleman has regard for the truth, and I have no doubt that he felt scrupulous about going into particulars with regard to the Province of Quebec, since he could not do so with any advantage to the position he has taken. Judging from what we have heard, more especially on this side, concerning Ontario and the Maritime Provinces, judging from the statistics which have been given us and also from the blue-books, I must say that there is no cause for satisfaction in the actual condition of our country, more especially the condition of the Province of Quebec. The President of the Council has expressed the opinion that he is opposed to reciprocity even in natural products, so that he has personally committed himself to oppose reciprocity in every respect; and considering the stand that the Government have taken on this question the prospects of the Province of Quebec are darker perhaps than those of any other Province in the Dominion. I intend to say but very little on this point, and will merely express my views in support of the policy proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). What has been the results of the policy of protection in the Province of Quebec? I admit that one single place in that Province has been favored by this protective system, and that is the city of Montreal. The rural districts and the towns and villages have not derived any benefit whatever from that policy, but have suffered many disadvantages. Take for instance the city of Quebec. In the division of that city represented by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) there is the manufacture of boots and shoes. That is prospering, but it was established before the principle of protection was adopted. These manufacturers do not want that system of protection. They have often voted on that question, and last time they returned a free trader with a majority of 2,000. Take the city of Sherbrooke. I was told to-day, by a well informed citizen of Sherbrooke, that the only new industry there is a corset factory, which was established in 1880. Take St. Hyacinthe. The industries there existed before 1879. They have increased since, but only by natural progress, and they protest against the present system by returning my hon. friend the present member (Mr. Bernier). Take all the other places in the Province of Quebec, the rural districts, the townships, the parishes, the villages and even the towns, and you will see that they have only suffered from this system. The hon. gentleman said he would protect the the farmers by causing new markets to be created. I ask him where are the new markets in the Province of Quebec, I do not know of one. The farmers who were to be benefited by this system have suffered instead of profiting by it. Perhaps they may have benefited in Ontario or in the North-West, but in the Province of Quebec we are bound to buy flour and corn and almost all the products of the farm from the western Provinces. It is a disputable question whether the duty on flour has increased the price or not. There is one thing which cannot be disputed, and that is that we pay the duty on the American flour that we buy. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, we bought 200,000 barrels of American flour last year, upon which we paid a duty of $100,000. If you divide this among the 65 constituencies in the Province of Quebec, you will see that each constituency paid on an average $1,500. We paid last year $47,000 in that Province in duty on corn, which is an average of $750 for each constituency. On the two items of flour and corn, $2,250 were paid in duty on an average in each constituency in the Province of Quebec. Now, there has been another 25 cents added on each barrel of flour, and, supposing we bought only the r same quantity next year, the increased duty will mean $750 for every constituency in the Province of Quebec. This year, if we are to judge from the statistics of last year, the people of Quebec will have to pay an average duty of $3,000 on flour and corn. What do we pay in duties on what we import for consumption? The total duties amount to about 23 million dollars. We have 215 constituencies, and this represents an average duty of over $100,000 in every constituency of the Dominion. This duty is more than the municipal taxes and the school taxes and the church assessments and the tithes and the local charges all put together. This is the result of protection. What will be the next result? The next result is retaliation. With the tariff which now prevails in the Province of Quebec, we can only export some articles to the United States, such as horses, cattle, hay, potatoes, eggs and some lumber. The duty now is high enough and leaves a very small margin for the producer. Now, on both sides of the line, we are raising a wall. The Americans are quick enough to retort to us. We are threatened with a tariff which will be double on some articles and as high on others as that which at present exists. This will amount to total prohibition in the Province of Quebec in regard to all that we export to the United States, and which we will now have to keep. It is said that those who sell hay ought not to do so, but ought to look for other pursuits. I say they have no right to say to these producers, you shall cultivate your land in other ways. There are many sections in the Province of Quebec, particularly on the north shore, such as Berthier and Maskinongé,

where hay can be profitably grown and is grown, but the river St. Lawrence covers the land at certain periods of the year, and it is impossible to cultivate cereals there. In those counties the hay business is the most profitable one, and I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite have the right to say: You must give up this pursuit and must look after others. The President of the Council challenged the member for South Oxford to discuss the question of reciprocity in natural products, on any platform whatever. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not have time to come to my county; but, if he passes through or near there, I shall be glad for him to come and discuss these questions before the farmers of Arthabaska. I would not promise him a very great success; I do not think he would succeed in making those gentlemen believe that it is beneficial to them to pay a tax on flour, that it is beneficial to them to pay a tax on corn. I must say that this custom, of buying corn for fattening cattle in the Province of Quebec although almost new, is increasing very fast. At Arthabaska Station, in my own constituency, for the past few months, as many as five or six car-loads of corn have been received every week. These pay a duty of $45 a car-load, $300, which the farmers of two or three townships pay every month for corn. I invite the hon. gentleman to make these farmers believe that it is to their advantage to pay a tax on corn, as well as on flour. We are told that this great National Policy has had the result of developing our North-West. Well, I must say that the way that has been done, and the way the Canadian Pacific Railway has been built, has been detrimental rather than beneficial to the old Provinces. I must also say that this development of the North-West and the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the way it has been built, have been accomplished under false pretences. What were the promises of the hon. gentlemen when they carried that measure? It was said about 9 or 10 years ago that in 1890 the population of the North-West and Manitoba would be about one million, whereas it is probable that next year, which was the date fixed by them for the one million, the population of that country will not have reached more than 200,000. Those hon. gentlemen, therefore, have made as light mistake of 800,000. We are also told that we would sell lands in the North-West to an extent exceeding 60 millions of dollars and that with this sum we would pay the money which we had expended towards helping the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, the time will shortly be up when we were to have received this 60 millions, and so far not one cent of this sum have we received. We have not yet derived from the sale of those lands enough to pay the expense of administering them. Now, the hon. President of the Council told us that there was no cause for the complaints which were made as to the condition of our agriculturists; he admitted there was hard times just now, and that there was some immigration, more especially of our young men. He told us that the young man is bold, fond of adventures, fond of seeing new countries and trying new enterprises. But, Sir, we know there are other causes for the exodus. Of course, I do not doubt the sincerity of the hon. gentleman in speaking of the County of Stanstead but in the section of the country where I live there are other causes to drive away the people. Almost every train that leaves the station of Arthabaska takes away five or six families to the United States. In one of the best township of Arthabaska, where there were 21 inhabitants in one range, there are now only five—the others have all gone to the States. No later than last week I met a man who came back from the States to see Mr. Mercier. He was the father of 12 living children, and he hoped that, as he had not been gone long away, he would be entitled to his 100 acres of land. Surely he was not a young man. Being the father of 12 children he must have had some little experience, and he had not been led away by a spirit of adventure. These examples might be multiplied. It is admitted generally that we are passing through a period of depression, that there is a crisis over almost the whole Dominion except, perhaps, in Manitoba and the North-West, which countries the members coming from them very properly take occasion to advertise in this discussion. The remedy the Government offers to us is additional taxation. We already pay a tax on flour, and it is proposed to increase it by 50 per cent. The Government propose a very general increase on almost every article, yet we have a surplus of over one million, and it is predicted that next year we will have a surplus of about two millions. Then where is the necessity of adding these taxes? Where is the necessity of increasing our burdens? The Finance Minister has been congratulated on his clear statement of the affairs of the country, he has been congratulated on these surpluses. I believe in the skill of the hon. gentleman, but I say these surpluses are no proof of his skill. Any one can make a surplus. The most incapable man in this House, if he were in the hon. gentleman's place, could have a surplus by increasing the taxation. As long as you have not decimated the population, and as long as you have consumers enough to buy goods, you will have a surplus. Now, the policy we propose is reciprocity with our neighbors. We believe that if we had a larger market where there are 60,000,000 of consumers, we would have a chance to improve our condition. But hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the Americans will not consent to it, because we cannot offer fair compensation. They say we are offering to the American producer a market of five millions only, while they would give us a market of sixty millions. I say this is no argument at all. If it were a good argument, it would equally apply to a proposition which would declare that it was no benefit to the other States of the Union to have free trade with the State of New York, because it has a population of only five millions. It would be advantageous to the States to parcel themselves off into groups and refuse to trade with each other. Another objection to our proposition is that it would bring about annexation. Well, I must say that I am not an advocate of annexation to the United States, but it is not because I dread it, I must say I can see several advantages in it. I can see that annexation might be favorable to the Province of Quebec, and that there might be more self-government in it. I do not, however, advocate annexation; but, if we were advocates of it, the policy would spread like fire. Who are its advocates in this House? The advocates in this House are to be found on the Treasury benches. They are virtually preaching annexation, and their

policy is bringing us to annexation very quickly. We have had hon. gentlemen raise the loyalty cry. It has been said that we should cultivate close relations with the old country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are able to say what they like when it suits their purpose; but when they came to adopt the present protective tariff they had no more regard for England than they had for the United States, and the duties on English goods are the same as on American goods. If you want to avoid annexation, and if you are as patriotic as you boast you are, you should not adopt this policy, and I say the members of the Province of Quebec—that Province which is the greatest sufferer from this system—should be unanimous in opposing this policy which bears so heavily upon us, and there should not be among us, at any rate, a dissentient voice.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night I do not intend to occupy the House for a long time; but inasmuch as a number of statements have been made during the debate in regard to the North-West, and in regard to the position we occupy there, and the failure in connection with the settlement of the country and in connection with the land policy and other matters, I, who have been intimately connected with it for a great many years, consider it is my duty as one of the representatives of that country, to say something before the debate closes. With regard to the tariff I might say that we in the North-West consider that during the past we have been one of the Provinces which has been a principal sufferer in that connection, inasmuch as we have nothing there that is protected. But under the new arrangement of the present session, the principal industry, in fact almost the only industry in that country of a manufacturing character, and that is the flouring industry, has been placed on a proper basis, and the duty on flour under the resolutions has been made equal to that on wheat, and that is a very satisfactory arrangement for us. With respect to bacon and pork, the new duty will, I am satisfied, give satisfaction to the farmers of the North-West and remove some of the past grievances. Much has been said during this debate as to the duty placed on manufactured articles used on the farms in tilling the soil. While duties have been imposed, there can be no doubt whatever of this fact, that agricultural implements are cheaper to-day in the North-West than they were some years ago, before this duty was placed on those implements, whatever the cause may be for this state of affairs. Another matter of interest to the North-West is that of fruit. In 1883 the quantity of fruit in air-tight cans and packages, both from the United States and Great Britain, amounted to 301,795 lbs., of the value of $23,184, on which a duty was paid of $9,053. That was the duty under the tariff in 1883. Fruit in air-tight cans, not sweetened: total imports, 508,786 lbs., of a value of $31,221, on which a duty was imposed of $10,175. What do we find in 1889? Fruit in air-tight cans, in packages weighing not over 1 lb., nothing. Fruit in air-tight cans, weighing over 1 lb., both from Great Britain and the United States, 58,425 lbs., of the value of $3,449, on which a duty was paid by the people of the North-West of only $1,752, as against $10,175 in 1883. I would ask, why do we in the North-West, if we be suffering in regard to these duties, continue to support this Government? One of the principal reasons is this: that we in the North-West have more confidence in, if you will call it so, the jovial optimism of the policy as indicated by the leader of the Government, in preference to the morose pessimism which decidedly characterises the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the whole of their speeches there is such sadness in style that each speech is a threnody in itself. We believe the people in the North-West, knowing the future of that country, and knowing the important part it has played and will play in the future of this Dominion, have more sympathy with the people who likewise have faith in the future of that country. In all the speeches delivered, especially the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), while the warp was made up of black threads, some of the weft threads had bright coloring, but they seemed to be introduced with the idea of throwing the dark shades more into prominence than as suggesting a bright future for the North-West and Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke about a visit he or some one had paid to Hades, where some innocent and misled Conservatives were dried first before being burnt. With respect to that visit, I do not know whether he indicated the position of affairs properly, but my idea is this, that men who vilify and misrepresent their country, when they get to Hades should not go through the process of even being dried before being properly disposed of. These gloomy prophecies have been going on for years and years. The *Globe* began them in 1884, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came down to Parliament asking for further aid. I may say that the *Globe* is the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that journal then indicated that it was impossible for a railway to pay west of Moose Jaw, unless alkali could be made a merchantable commodity. It went on to say:

"For the settlers who have gone far west cannot be left without a railway on which their very lives depend. Trains must manage to crawl out to them pretty frequently. Doubtless the country might save a great deal by paying out and recompensing for his losses every man settled in the more distant west.

"If so, the railway beyond Manitoba could be left unused till overtaken by close settlement."

That was the prophecy in 1884. What are now the facts? We have towns springing up west of Moose Jaw. We have ranches with over 100,000 cattle on a thousand hills, we have over 50,000 sheep and horses on those ranches; Calgary, one of the most important towns in Canada, springing into existence with all the conveniences of modern civilisation; Donald and Revelstoke, where are to be constructed smelting works to treat the ores taken out of the mountains of British Columbia; Kamloops, which is growing into importance; New Westminster, developing rapidly; Vancouver, which four years ago was a forest, burnt down and Phœnix-like rising out of its ashes with electric railways, gasworks, waterworks and all the conveniences of modern civilisation and a population of about 15,000. We go over to Vancouver Island, and we find Victoria growing in like proportion and taking new life and springing into a new existence, all since the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, notwithstanding the predictions of *The*

Globe of that date. Then, later on, we find that a member who represented South Norfolk (Mr. Jackson), stated in this House that there were 60,000 Canadians living in the State of Iowa and he was endorsed by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who always poses as a man who is thoroughly informed on what he speaks about. A short time after that gentleman made that statement the census of Iowa was taken, and instead of 60,000 Canadians being in the State, there were only 19,067, less than one-third of the amount stated by the then member for South Norfolk, and endorsed by the member for Bothwell. We find also from the census of that State that there were 2,010 less Canadians in 1885, than there were in 1880. That gentleman to whom I have referred also stated that there were 65,000 Canadians in Minnesota and 40,000 in Dakota, while the census of these three States I have mentioned show that there are only 97,973, whereas the statement made out there were 165,000 Canadians there. Those are samples of some of the statements made to this House time and time again, I may mention that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Carthwright) stated at a meeting some time ago that 50 per cent. of the settlers of a certain district in Dakota were Canadian-born, whereas the fact of the matter is that by the census of 1885, which I have also here, the actual number of Canadians was only 17 per cent. of the population instead of 50 per cent. Later, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated that there were as many Canadians in Dakota as there were in the whole of the North-West and Manitoba. Now what are the facts? At the census of 1885, in Dakota there were 33,413 Canadians, and in Manitoba and the North-West, at the census of 1886, there was a population of 90,612, or about three times as many Canadians in Manitoba and the North-West as in Dakota. Let us proceed a little further and enquire into these mis-statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. The member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), stated last year, at a meeting held in Toronto, that there were 1,500,000 people in Dakota. Now, at the census of 1885 the population of Dakota was 415,000, and the wildest boomsters of that territory during the last year, when they were agitating for being organised into two different States, only claimed a population of 800,000 or about one-half of what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in his generosity, gave them. A number of hon. gentlemen opposite have made the statement that half the people who went to Manitoba and the North-West crossed over to Dakota and stayed there. I secured from Mr. Nimmo, who was then the officer in Washington, who had charge of the statistics, and from the return he sent me, I find that from 1874 to 1884, at which time the United States Government gave up the collection of these statistics, only 4,767 Canadians crossed from Manitoba and the North-West Territories to the United States, and this migration was principally during the four years from 1881 to 1884. The greatest number that left Manitoba and the North-West Territories in any one year was in 1882, when 1,380 people crossed. Yet in face of these statistics, collected by the American Government, statements are made in this House that 50 per cent. of the people who have gone to Manitoba and the North-West have crossed the boundary and gone to the United States. When we consider our growth with that of the United States, I do not think we ought to be ashamed of the comparison. The increase of population of the States of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, from 1830 to 1880, was 41 per cent., while the growth of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, during the same period, was 169 per cent. Take the six New England States, and you find that in the same period they increased 105 per cent., while the old Province of Canada, during the same period increased 299 per cent., or nearly three times as much. It has been said that the rural population of Canada is decreasing, but it must also be remembered that it is decreasing in the eastern part of the United States. In the State of New York, from 1870 to 1880, the rural population was less in the last named year than in 1870, but the cities in New York State had increased their population 600,000 souls. In the State of Illinois which is comparatively a very new State, the rural population is not increasing anything like as rapidly as the cities of the State are. In Indiana, which is a very new State in comparison with the Eastern States, we find the rural population is holding it own and very little more. The last census of the State of Iowa, one of the very newest States, showed that the rural population had not increased while the cities and towns had increased, and the New York *Evening Post* stated in an editorial that this was to be expected, for the tide of emigration was moving westward and these States, considered new a few years ago, were now becoming old States, and they, in their turn, would supply the people for the most distant States and Territories, just as the Eastern States had originally supplied their population. This is the fact all over the United States, and it is nothing more than we can expect in Canada. But there are reasons why the rural population are decreasing. One great reason is that the style of farming has changed. In the old days when we had a good many farm hands, and before there was so much labor-saving machinery the rural population was necessarily larger, but now we have machinery on the farms and the number of hands is reduced. Another reason for the decrease in the rural population is that in many parts of Canada and in Ontario especially, the farmers are going into stock-farming. I know men in the County of Middlesex in (which I have the honor of being born) who are now raising stock on three or four farms and who have only one hand guarding the stock on each farm, while in my early days we had whole families living on each of these farms and with servants attached to them. Some of these people in the rural sections on account of old age and deaths in the family are selling out the farms and moving into the towns and cities. Then, of course, we have the western movement and that must follow as a consequence if we are going to have the North-West peopled. We must expect some of the people of Eastern Canada to move out west and settle our fertile plains, where farming can be done so far more cheaply and where so much more can be grown to an acre than in the east. You must expect the same movement in Ontario, as they have in the States, in New York, Illinois, Indiana and other Eastern and Middle States of the Union. A great deal has been said about the mortgages in Canada, but there are also mortgages in the United States, and to prove the extent of these mortgages in the United States, I might quote the following from a leading newspaper in New York :—

"The New York *Times* has recently published some startling statistics showing to what extent American agriculturists are handicapped and crippled by mortgages on their farms. The amounts represented by the faces of the farm mortgages in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Wisconsin, are :—

In Illinois	$ 620,000,000
Indiana	398,000,000
Iowa	351,000,000
Kansas	200,000,000
Michigan	350,000,000
Minnesota	175,000,000
Missouri	237,000,000
Nebraska	140,000,000
Ohio	701,000,000
Wisconsin	250,000,000
Total farm mortgages in the ten States	$3,422,000,000

"The actual value of the farms in the ten States in question being $13,931,000,000. It goes on to show that there is no hope of this enormous sum ever being paid, as the profits from agriculture in the United States are quite inadequate to remove so heavy an incumbus. It figures the matter out as follows :—

"'The interest money annually drawn from the ten States listed, if they pay 7 per cent. only, amounts to $239,000,000. The profits of agriculture do not warrant the payment of so great a sum. The total value of the farm products of the United States was, in 1879, $2,313,000,000. Of this value the ten States produced $839,000,000. This was the total value sold, consumed and on hand. Say that the ten States now produce to the value of $1,000,000,000. If but one-half the farms are mortgaged the produce they yield is worth $500,000,000. At least $139,000,000 of that value goes to pay interest money, leaving $251,000,000 of produce to support 886,000 farmers and their families, or $294 to each farmer. Out of this small sum they must pay labor, pay taxes, supply seed, buy tools, and they and their families live. The sum is utterly inadequate. It is not possible for these mortgaged farmers, as a class, to ever lift their mortgages.'"

This is the state of affairs represented by the New York *Times* to exist in some of the most prosperous States of the Union. Then, the *Farmers' Review* of Chicago sent out men to find the condition of the farmers in the following States : Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Kentucky and Dakota ; and the whole result shows an average of 38½ per cent. of the farms to be mortgaged in those States. But, Sir, I have a more recent report with reference to the State of New York :

"We have, on the authority of the annual report of the state assessors, which was laid before the New York Legislature on the 24th instant (March last), an authoritative report as to affairs in that State. The report is lengthy, even as summarised for the press, but its importance warrants its reproduction. It says : There continues to be a marked depreciation in the value of farm lands in nearly every county, and the depression among farmers continues, while the prospect for improvement is not good. Many assert that after paying expenses they cannot realise from their farms sufficient to pay the interest on mortgages, and, consequently, thousands of farms are falling into the hands of a mortgagee."

Then, a few counties of the State are mentioned, of which I select one or two :

"Chenango—A purely farming county : in 1887, the real property was assessed $19,153,708 ; and in 1888, at $16,162,513.

"Erie—There is a constant and rapid appreciation of values in Buffalo, but there is a depreciation of the towns of the county, with one or two exceptions.

"Genesee—The residents of this county show that the farming lands have depreciated during the last twelve years, 33⅓ per cent."

Mr. LANDERKIN. All that is against your system.

Mr. ROSS. Well, I want to show that we are no worse off than they are in the country you wish to drive us to. With regard to the State of Michigan, the Detroit *Free Press* the other day said :

"The mortgaged indebtedness is 46·8 per cent. of the assessed valuation of the farms covered by it, just as Senator Voorhees said. In other words, 47·4 per cent. of the farms of the State are mortgaged to the extent of 46·8 per cent. of their assessed valuation."

Yet, Sir, we are told that because our farms in Ontario are mortgaged to a very large extent, we must have trade relations with those people across the line, who by their own showing are more heavily mortgaged than we are. It has been said that the United States has been settled up much more rapidly than Canada. There are many reasons for that. One is that there was a continuous wave of immigrants pouring over that country from one State to the other. There was no natural line of demarcation between one State and another, and the tidal wave of immigration kept pouring on from State to State, the Eastern States settling up the Middle States and the Middle States settling up the Western States. It was almost entirely the native population of the United States that settled the western parts of that country. Illinois and Indiana were settled at the same time, Missouri and Michigan at the same time, Wisconsin and Iowa at the same time, Minnesota and Kansas at the same time, Nebraska and Dakota at the same time. In Iowa only 18 per cent. of the people are foreign, the rest coming from the Eastern and Middle states ; in Kansas only 10 per cent. of the people are foreign, while Illinois, Indiana and Ohio have sent to Iowa and Kansas 635,373 people. This is according to the State statistics of 1885, the latest on record. The conditions of Canada are entirely different. There are large breaks between the different parts of the country. Our Eastern Provinces are a long distance from Ontario, and between Ontario and Manitoba another large break intervenes, so that there is not that natural wave of immigration pouring from one Province to another that has marked the settlement of the United States. Then, it is said that our people are going to the United States. There is no doubt that too many of them have gone, but reasons can be given in explanation of that. The first reason is that a great many young men, owing to the superior quality of our schools, the vigor of our race, our climate, the intellectuality of our people, have become professional men, doctors and lawyers, and we have not the foreign immigration pouring into the country to supply the population on which these young men can operate or depend for subsistence. Then, other young men who have gone to business colleges and schools and have learned book-keeping and business habits do not find scope in this country, because we have not immigrants enough to provide a field for their energies, and they have gone to the United States, where, no doubt, many of them are doing well. But what we want in order to keep these young men at home is to adopt a vigorous immigration policy, to spend one or two million dollars for the purpose of bringing in immigrants to fill up the country ; then these young men will come home and will become the lawyers, doctors and merchants to supply the people coming from abroad. Another reason why we lost some of our people in the past was that our route lay through the United States, and a great many of our people on their way to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, having to pass through Chicago and St. Paul, were delayed by American immigration agents and were induced to settle in Minnesota and Dakota, and

never even saw Manitoba or the Canadian North-West. But, Sir, I am sorry to say that the very moment our own road was built on our own territory to the North-West, that very moment the Government, supported by the leaders of the Opposition, reduced the amount hitherto appropriated for immigration purposes, and to-day it amounts to practically *nil*. Instead of cutting down the amount for immigration, the Government should, in my opinion, have quadrupled it for the purpose of bringing people to this country and placing them on farms in the North-West. Many of the people who have gone to the United States have gone there to follow friends who preceded them from Eastern Canada, and not because they heard anything about that country superior in any respect to what it is in Manitoba and the North-West, but merely because their friends had gone there before, and they followed them. There is another reason, and it is a very important factor in connection with the settlement of that country, and that is the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the writings in newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, which have so misrepresented Manitoba and the North-West in this House and before the country, that they have induced many persons to go to the Western States. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that you can go, Sir, to points in Dakota to-day, and find that three-fourths of the Canadians who have settled there were, when in Canada, supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. Two or three hon. gentlemen specially have continually stated in this House that the land policy of the North-West was not at all equal to the land policy of the United States. But let any American come to our country and study up our land policy, and compare it with his own, and he will acknowledge that ours is infinitely superior; and if we have erred in any one point, it is in being too liberal to the settler, sometimes to his own disadvantage. The land policy of the United States is not to be compared with ours in point of liberality. People have gone to the States thinking the laws there were more liberal, that their land policy was more liberal, and that it would be infinitely better for them on that account to settle in the United States, but in this they have been mistaken. I wish to refer to what our land policy was in Manitoba and the North-West when hon. gentlemen opposite were at the head of affairs. On the 26th December, 1874, an Order in Council was passed. What was it? It was to withdraw from settlement and sale every acre of land along the railway belt, that is 20 miles on each side of the located line, from the western boundary of the Province of Ontario to twenty miles west of Fort Pelly. No settler could go in and settle on one acre of these lands, either as homestead or pre-emption, or in any way whatever. Another Order in Council was passed. What was that? It was to still further extend that reserve—to send it on to Battle River. A third Order in Council was passed, to still further extend it, from Battle River to Jasper House, ordering that the lands be withdrawn for twenty miles on each side of the railway, from a point twenty miles west of the Battle River to Jasper House, in the Yellow Head Pass through the Rocky Mountains. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the then Minister of the Interior, came to Manitoba and the North-West, and I, in company with some other gentlemen, called upon him in Winnipeg, and represented to him that something must be done in the interests of the country, that it would never do to block out from settlement twenty miles on each side of the railway. We spoke to him so strongly on the subject, that he assured us that on his return to Ottawa he would place our representations before his colleagues in the Cabinet. He did so, and an Order in Council was passed on the 9th November, 1877, an Order in Council the like of which, if this Government would dare to pass it, would create such a hue and cry from one end of the country to the other that the Government itself would not stand one day. Here is what the Order in Council said:

"The Minister of the Interior recommends that the lands in Manitoba, withdrawn as above——"

That is the lands along the railway belt—

—"be thrown open to actual settlement, but not for homestead or pre-emption entry, or for entry by military bounty or police warrants, or for ordinary sale. No person to be allowed to acquire more than one-half section or 320 acres, and such land shall be paid for by the occupant at whatever rate and upon such terms as may be fixed therefor by the Government, when the remainder of the lands in the Province of this class are disposed of."

No price is stated. It might be $20, or $10, or $5. And no time for fixing the price is stated. It might be twenty years, or ten years, or thirty years hence. It was to be fixed by the Government only when the balance of the lands in this class were disposed of.

"He further recommends that persons desiring to acquire such lands shall, previous to settlement thereon, be required to be entered therefor at the nearest Dominion Lands Office, and in order to prove their good faith, the applicants shall be obliged in each case to make a payment in advance at the time of entry of one dollar per acre in cash on account of the purchase, and further be required to settle on and commence to cultivate the land within one year from the date of entry, or, in default thereof, the payment so made to be forfeited."

A perfect system of landlordism. In addition to that:

"No scrip of any kind, or military bounty, or police warrants to be receivable in payment of the lands above described."

A number of farmers had settled in the county I have the honor to represent in this House. They were not able to get an entry, but when this Order in Council was published they were able to get an entry, had to pay $1 per acre, and they never knew how much more they would have to pay, or when the balance would be demanded. Nor could they, when they had improved their land, borrow $1 on it, as they could not get a title. When there was a change of Government, although I was not then supporting this Government, but was a member of the local House, I made representations to the Minister of the Interior and his deputy, and a number of others did the same thing. We induced this Government to change the policy of their predecessors, and every farmer in my district not only got his lands free, but if he had paid any money the money was refunded to him and his lands were given to him as a homestead. When we hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the number of Canadians who are leaving this country and going to the United States, we find there is a certain strain of sadness mixed with a certain element of pleasure in their tones. One would almost think that with the one hand they were playing a lament and with

the other playing a wedding march. There is a sort of wail among them at times when they hear about so many hundreds and thousands of Canadians going to the other side—the expression is almost heard: "Not lost, but only gone before." We in Manitoba are pleased with our growth. It has not been so satisfactory as we expected, or so large as we think the country is capable of. There have been a number of circumstances against us, but still our growth has been wonderful. Take the crop of oats, wheat and barley in 1881. The total returns were 2,567,545 bushels, and in 1887, six years afterwards, the total returns of these three kinds of grain were 22,022,000 bushels, making nine times more in 1887 than in 1881. I think that is a very satisfactory progress. A writer from an Ontario paper went to Manitoba a short time ago and visited a settlement near Glenboro', where he came across some Icelanders, and I may state to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that no settlers have gone to our country who have shown more satisfactory results, and adapted themselves better to the growing wants and requirements of the country, than those very Icelanders. They come there poor, they are willing to assimilate with our people, they are willing to work for the benefit of the country, and they have been very successful. I hope the hon. gentleman will succeed in bringing many more to the country. I will read you the result of this gentleman's visit to show the progress these people have made:

"Skapti Arson, settled in 1881, capital at time of starting $400; now worth $7,000. Paul Arnason, settled in 1887 without means, now worth $1,400. Thornstein Jousson, settled in 1881, capital $240; which is now increased to $8,150. Bjorn Walterson, homesteaded in 1883, capital $80; now worth $6,300. I might cite a score of other cases equally favorable, but enough has been said to illustrate the wealth of the soil, and what it will give to the worker."

These are results from the settlers who have gone to that country. On the whole they are very satisfactory, and nothing can be shown in any part of the United States more satisfactory to the individual than these results are. There is one thing for which I have to find fault with the Government. They have adopted the National Policy, the idea of which was to build up a great country on the north of the United States and to keep within ourselves the products of our own soil as much as possible and help to build up our own industries. Then, with a boldness and nerve which was wonderful, they took hold of the rapid construction and development of the Canadian Pacific Railway and completed it from ocean to ocean. In this they have also shown their wonderful foresight, and in this they were opposed by the Opposition in this House. The Canadian Pacific Railway is developing the internal commerce of the country by bringing the products of one Province to the other Provinces. This internal commerce is a very important factor in any country. In the United States it has been estimated that the internal commerce is seven times greater than the foreign commerce. It is likely that the internal commerce here would be the same. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was a great factor in building up a great nation on this side of the boundary line, from ocean to ocean. But there was another thing to be done, and that was to get people, and we in the North-West complain that both sides of this House have been recreant to their trust in not inducing more people to come here to settle up the country. If they had done this there would be more credit given to the National Policy, more work for the Customs Department, and more work for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The moment you get the people there, untold results will accrue. What is it that is keeping up the factories and the spindles in Connecticut and Massachusetts? It is the population of Indiana and Illinois, it is the farmers in Dakota and the west who are filling up the towns and cities of the east by their demand for goods. If you were to blot out the Western States of America, where would be the New England States? Seeing this development of the manufacturing industry in the United States, it seems strange that our people have not got the same idea that they should help to build up our great west and by that means to settle and increase the prosperity of the east. You in the east have just as much interest—every town and village in Eastern Canada is just as much interested in this question as we are. Individually you are more interested, because I think we could get on as well if we had no relations with eastern Canada. The farmer would get as much from his soil, but the eastern population would not derive the benefit of his custom. One thing the Government has to do is to adopt a vigorous policy in regard to immigration, and to bring across the ocean people who are suitable to settle that country, and secure the speedy construction and completion of the Hudson Bay Railway, by which we will get a shorter outlet for produce, and bring immigrants by a short land journey into the heart of the North-West. By adopting this policy the future of the North-West and Canada is assurod, for everything depends upon the successful development of the greater Canada. They have established coloniesof people who have come from Iceland, Russia and Sweden, they have encouraged people to come from the old country, and these people for the most part went to the North-West and settled without having the advantage of an all-through rail carriage as they have now. The moment you feel that the country can be made prosperous by encouraging immigration, that the towns and cities in the east can obtain markets by establishing farmers on our great lands more rapidly than any other way, and in more prosperous shape than by placing any reliance on connection with the United States, the sooner this country's prosperity will be built up. When once the future of that great country is assured—no doubt it is new—but when once you get that country moving in the right road, from that moment Canada will commence to progress more than she has ever done in the past. It has been said that the North-West is a land of illimitable possibilities, and it will become a land of glorious realities. There are many hon. gentlemen here who have not seen the greatness of that country, who do not understand the vast extent of country which is open to our people. They think, when they hear you telling them of the beauties of that great west, that you are telling them fairy tales. It is, however, certain that 75 per cent. of the wheat growing country of this continent is north of parallel 49, and that country is ours, and we must take possession of it. Then we can successfully compete in the markets of the world with any wheat that comes fromIndia or any other country. That coun-

try which we have in our possession is so great and so vast that it is impossible to find words to describe its capabilities. I believe in the future of Canada, but I know that the future of Canada depends entirely upon the future of the North-West, and I know that in that North-West there are possibilities which we can scarcely dream of. When the farmers take possession of that great territory, and their produce in wheat and in bacon is sent to British Columbia, the people of British Columbia will send in return their fruit, their fish and their lumber. The farmers of the North-West will send their products to the miners who are honeycombing the mountains of that Pacific Province, and are taking out, and will take out, the untold millions of wealth therein contained, to the fishermen and the lumbermen, and by the return which they will make they will prove that one part of this great country can help the other, and that, if eastern Canada ceased to exist, the west would still be a glorious reality an independent and self-sustaining country. In Canada it will be very long before the words "Go West" will become either decrepid with age or threadbare with use.

"Westward the course of Empire takes its way;
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day,
Time's noblest offspring is the last."

Mr. DAVIN. The North-West has been heard a good deal of in this debate, but up to this time nothing has been heard from a member of Parliament from the North-West itself. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) made an exhaustive speech characterised by his usual ability, and now my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross) has made the speech which we have been anticipating for some time, and, as a member from the North-West, I feel grateful to him for the admirable manner in which he has placed the position of the North-West before the public. I need hardly say that very little is left for me to say, but I do not intend to keep the House more than a short time longer in order to complete the case which has been so admirably made for the North-West Territories. I would, however, point out that we are interested in the National Policy in a way which has not yet been shown to this House. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that, because we have no manufactures in the North-West, we are not interested in the National Policy. In the North-West we have such a fine ranching country that nothing in the United States can be compared with it. The great ranching men from the United States have come over there; they have visited the country south of Regina, of Maple Creek, of Medicine Hat; they have spoken to me; they have driven over the country, and have told me themselves that that was the country for the ranching kings of this continent. Suppose we had unrestricted reciprocity and they could bring in their horses and cattle without any embargo being laid upon them by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, they would bring in their cattle and their horses, and they would take the grasses of that country for those animals, and then would take them over the Northern Pacific to Chicago and leave the country as the grasshoppers did when they swept everything that was fruitful in Egypt. They would not do anything for Canada or for the interests of the North-West, but they would send a few cow-boys and a few horsemen over the line and would sweep the grass which should belong to our own ranchemen. So that, from that point of view, we are deeply interested in the National Policy. But I may say this, that even if it were not as my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) proved, if it were not so that we were able to purchase machinery cheaper, actually cheaper than before the National Policy existed, I can assure this House, and I can assure the hon. members from Ontario, Quebec and the Lower Provinces, that our farmers have again and again said in my hearing: "Even if we do pay more for our machinery, we are well content to do it. It is true that we are Nor'-westers, but before we are Nor'-westers we are citizens of the Dominion of Canada, and we believe in building up a nation here." Now, I confess that this debate has disappointed me. It has disappointed me in this way: That having boundless faith, being of a sanguine temperament, and hoping all things, I had cherished the fond belief that this debate would bring forth something new. I have had the honor of a seat in this House now for four years, I have heard four debates on the Budget and the four debates are, so far as the mode of attack is concerned, so far as the missiles that have been used, so far as the tactics which have been adopted by my hon. friends of the Opposition are concerned, the four debates are as like as four peas. There has been nothing new whatever.

Mr. EDWARDS. What about the defence?

Mr. DAVIN. I am coming to the defence by-and-bye. Now, let me say that so far as I can ascertain, even in regard to Ontario—and I have some friends in Ontario whom I constantly meet, and who tell me what they find—some hon. gentlemen on this side tell me that I am misinformed—but I am assured by gentlemen who know Ontario well, that the farmers are laughing at the description of their condition given in this House. Now, Sir, must it not be so? There was one subject brought forward here by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), to which I must allude. Both of these hon. gentlemen are men of great power; they are men that I think would take a leading place in any assembly of the world. Nevertheless, for some reason or other, though the hon. member for South Oxford has given great attention to finance—it is probably presumptuous on my part even to whisper such a thing—but it seems to me that he does not understand the science to which he has given so much study. He moves over the surface of the science of finance, the bubble of his own presumption. I never find anything in his long drawn speeches year after year, that shows me that he thoroughly understands finance. What did he say in this debate? He actually brought forward the old bugbear of the balance of trade. My hon. friend the member for Brant, too, started before our eyes that phantom. I believe the hon. member for South Oxford professes to be a follower of Adam Smith. Well, Sir, if the ghost of Adam Smith could come up and confront his phantom, the phantom would be scared away. Because I can tell him that when he brings forward here the theory that the balance of trade is a thing to frighten people, he is lapsing, he is backsliding, into the old mercantile system, and, from the point of view of Adam Smith, is guilty of gross heresy. Now, will the House bear with me for a

few minutes while I talk about this balance of trade? I will show them that this thing which has been made a rhetorical bugaboo from session to session, has nothing whatever in it.

Mr. FISHER. Brought forward by your own leaders.

Mr. DAVIN. I am not talking about my own leaders now, I am talking about this financial bugaboo, and about your leaders. I was fishing in my own stream, so *taisez-vous, Lisette.* Now, Sir, the statement is made that our exports for the last year were some $89,000,000 odd; our imports were $115,000,000 odd, and they say there is a balance of trade against us of $26,000,000. The year, before, I think, there was a balance of trade against us of $20,000,000, and the fact of there being a balance of trade of $26,000,000 against us this year shows that the aggregate trade, which was a point, I think, dwelt on last year, is increasing. Now, what must be done in order to take a true view of this question? Has it never occurred to the hon. gentlemen who talk about this balance of trade, that it is a very extraordinary thing that we are not ruined? It is not yesterday, or of to-day, that the balance of trade is against us. The balance of trade has been against us year after year. How is it we are not ruined? How is it that hon. gentlemen on the Government side dare stand up and say that the farmers are prosperous, and we know they are prosperous? How is it, I say, that we are not ruined? Is not the balance of trade to the extent of millions of pounds sterling—not dollars—against England the whole time? How is it that England is not ruined? Now, I want to call the attention especially of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is a well instructed man in these matters, to the fact that the balance of trade is against the whole world. How is it that the whole world is not ruined? It is a permanent fact that to the extent of $1,080,000,000, the balance is against the whole world. Here is another fact for hon. gentlemen to digest, a nut for them to crack. How is it that the balance of trade is against all progressive nations? It is only in the case of unprogressive nations that the balance of trade is in their favor. There is something for them to discuss. Now, I will try to solve this matter. I will show that there is nothing whatever to fear with respect to this balance of trade. It surely must have occurred to some hon. gentlemen, in trying to make a point about this balance of trade, that they must have left out some factor necessary to the equation. You must first add on at least 5 per cent. to the $89,000,000 odd, in order to meet this fact: that the exports of goods are valued at the port of exit and the imports are valued at the port of entrance, and, of course, in order to equalise matters, you will have to add on the carriage, and that, I am told, will be about 5 per cent.; that will give you, speaking in round numbers, $4,500,000. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke the other night of the large amount of interest we paid. We send across the Atlantic every year $7,500,000, which represents millions borrowed at 3 and 3½ per cent., and brought into the country where money is worth 6 and 8 per cent., and when it was borrowed, more than that. Why, Sir, that money must be very badly employed if it does not represent a profitable transaction, and as it is mainly employed in productive works, it does represent a profit, so that you have to add on to the $4,500,000 about $7,500,000, which gives you about $12,000,000. Mind, I do not say the $7,500,000 represents directly purchasing power, but indirectly it does, and in any case it must be taken as an export just as the millions sent over the Atlantic by emigrants, and to rich Americans in Europe, must be taken to swell the exports of the United States. But there is another consideration that I will ask my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces to look to. There is a very large amount exported every year that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs does not, and should not, take note of—that is the amount of our shipping. We have at the present moment some 7,142 ships with a tonnage of 1,100,000 tons. I do not know exactly what the tonnage on the lakes will be; but if we take it at 100,000 tons, that leaves 1,000,000 tons. I am told the cost of building a new ship is $40 a ton, and the average value per ton of our shipping will probably be $35 a ton. That would give $35,000,000, and as earnings we should take 25 per cent., or a little more, and that would give $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. There you have $20,000,000 to take out of $26,000,000, and the sum is at once reduced to about $6,000,000—really, when counting the odd figures, only a little over $5,000,000. Is that a thing to scare us? You have then to take into account, what has been referred to incidentally in this debate, our immense internal development, the immense amount of wealth accumulated within ourselves; because remember that when hon. gentlemen of the Opposition make a point about the balance of trade, what they mean is this: we are living not on our income but on our capital. If we are in part piling up money, and if this is invested in houses, railways, canals and different works, if our private citizens are increasing in wealth—because in the case of a commonwealth it is not sufficient to take into account the wealth of the Government, but you must also take into account the wealth of every citizen in it when you are considering how it is increasing in wealth—so when we see wealth increasing around us, when we see this vast railway built, commerce expanding, and Canada pluming herself more and more for still higher flights, it seems to me the most absurd thing that people should be scared with respect to a few million dollars, as though they were living on their capital, and that it is just as ludicrous as it was of the Roman epicure who, with a quarter of a million in his chest, poisoned himself lest he should die of starvation. When we speak of this internal development I want to call attention to one or two facts which are representative of dozens of similar facts that could be brought before the House on this question. First, I will take this one fact. In 1883 there were made 53,513,032 lbs. of cheese in the country. In 1888, 65,638,656 lbs. were made. In 1888 the price was higher than in 1883. We exported only 12,945,099 lbs. of cheese in 1888, as compared with 16,415,872 lbs. in 1883. What does that show? It shows that we consumed 15,500,000 lbs. of our own cheese in 1888 more than in 1883. What does it prove? It proves an expansion in wealth, an expansion in the purchasing power of the people,

and, of course, notwithstanding all that has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, the next census will prove an expansion in population as well. Then the importation of raw material is going on along the whole line. I will take one fact. In 1887 we imported 6,000,000 lbs. of raw wool; in 1888, 8,000,000 lbs. We know what that means. We are manufacturing more within ourselves; the National Policy is producing its natural fruit. Take another fact. In 1878 we imported and consumed 97,104,336 lbs. of refined sugar; in 1888 we imported 224,426,999 lbs. of raw sugar. The cost of the raw sugar was very little more than the cost of the 97,000,000 lbs. odd of refined sugar, and I am told by refiners that the amount of loss on material in the making of raw sugar into refined is very small. Look at the amount of sugar consumed which has been made here; look at the money invested in the factories here, and the number of men employed, and you have a light thrown upon the internal development of our wealth which should throw the $26,000,000 into insignificance, even if I had not accounted for it in the way I have done, namely, by the fact that—and it has not hitherto been brought out in this debate—that we actually export purchasing material in the shape of shipping. Let me call the attention of the House very rapidly to one or two principles in regard to shipping. A non-carrying nation, provided it did not borrow or lend, ought to show in its accounts an approach to equality between imports at the place of arrival and exports at the point of departure, and a nation that does one-half of its carrying trade would be entitled to an excess in imports over exports to the full value of the cargoes carried one way; a nation that did its whole foreign carrying trade would be entitled to bring in goods to the value of the carriage both ways; and if a nation did carrying for other countries, it would be entitled not merely to what I have already stated, but entitled also to what it earned in carrying for other countries. What is the fact about ourselves? We are the fourth maritime power in the world. There is not a sea which our keels do not plough; there is not a harbor where our flag is not seen. We touch at China, at Japan, at the Brazils; we traverse the Mediterranean, we plough the Baltic; we sail in the Arctic and Antarctic seas. And that will explain why it is that we have a large apparent balance against us. Let me illustrate it by looking at the United States. I once stopped for a couple of hours on Staten Island. I saw the moving panorama of an immense commerce—steamers and vessels passing out and in. What flag did I see floating from the mast-heads? The stars and stripes? Not at all. The little piece of bunting to which the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) referred a few nights ago, that little bit of bunting that no pilgrim from the British Isles can see without having his heart swell within him and his eyes sometimes fill.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. An hon. member cheers, but it is a very feeble cheer compared with the cheer he would give if he saw that flag flying at the mast-head. Look at the United States. Immigrants to the United States send over a vast sum to their friends, a vast sum is sent by way of interest on investments, because there are billions of dollars invested in the United States, and a vast sum is sent over to Europe to the scions of millionaires who are enjoying themselves there. But in addition you must take the immense amount they pay for the carriage of their goods. These few remarks will, in my opinion, throw some light, at least I have the presumption to hope they may do so, on that phantom of the balance of trade that has been brought up, and will scare it away. I will say this, that sometimes I really regret that hon. members of the Opposition pursue this course of constantly referring to the United States, referring to it as though the United States was, to use the language of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), an Elysian country. I am sorry they do it, because I know this: I took the pains last year to make myself acquainted with the condition of Dakota. I know that the farmers in Dakota are not nearly as well off as are the farmers in the North-West. I saw they had not as good houses, that they were not as good farmers, and I will tell the House that, in my judgment, there is no comparison between Dakota and the North-West as a favorable land for settlement. The misery of these people has become notorious. I regret that men of distinction and of great power, such as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that they should come here and perpetually speak as though they were speaking in the interests of the United States. I confess to you, Sir, that an analogy has sometimes been forced upon me. As I sat here listening to those hon. gentlemen my mind has sometimes been taken away to the time when the very existence of a great nation, and a great civilisation, was being struggled for; when the orators of Philip were insidiously playing their part at Athens against a patriotic statesman, until at last they were successful in overturning that nation and overturning that civilisation. But, Sir, there is this great difference. We have resources that country did not have. We are alarmed and awake, as that country was not, to the dangers that beset it, and I believe that those who outside cherish machinations against us have neither the centralised power nor the mental resources that belonged to the enemy of Athens and of Greece. But I say this: that the orators of Philip, in trying to circumvent Demosthenes, who was endeavoring to save his country, could never have taken a course more sinister than some of my hon. friends on the Opposition side of the House take. I hope, Sir, that we have heard the last of it this Session. I hope that next Session they will invent some new machinery, because I can assure them that the people believe no longer—in fact they never had any faith in the nostrums advertised by these hon. gentlemen, and having examined them they know very well that the diagnosis of the condition of the country that my hon. friends have made, is defective, and they believe that if they were to take the remedy offered them by these gentlemen, the result would be disastrous to the Dominion.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth), Barron, Béchard, Bourassa, Bowman, Brien, Campbell, Cartwright (Sir Richard), Casgrain, Choquette, Couture, Davies, De St. Georges, Dessaint, Doyon, Edwards, Eisenhauer, Ellis, Fiset, Fisher, Flynn, Gauthier, Geoffrion, Gillmor, Guay, Holton, Innes, Jones (Halifax), Landerkin, Lang, Langelier (Montmorency), Langelier (Quebec), Laurier, Lavergne, Lovitt, Macdonald (Huron), McIntyre, McMillan (Huron), McMullen, Meigs, Mills (Bothwell), Mitchell, Perry, Platt, Préfontaine, Rinfret, Robertson, Rowand, Ste. Marie, Scriver, Semple, Somerville, Sutherland, Trow, Turcot, Watson, Weldon (St. John), Welsh, Wilson (Elgin), Yeo.—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges), Barnard, Bell, Bergeron, Bergin, Boisvert, Bowell, Brown, Burns, Cameron, Cargill, Carling, Carpenter, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Cimon, Cochrane, Colby, Corby, Costigan, Coughlin, Coulombe, Curran, Daly, Daoust, Davin, Davis, Dawson, Desaulniers, Desjardins, Dewdney, Dickey, Dickinson, Dupont, Earle, Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.), Ferguson (Welland), Foster, Freeman, Gigault, Gordon, Grandbois, Guillet, Haggart, Hall, Hesson, Hickey, Ives, Jamieson, Jones (Digby), Kirkpatrick, Landry, Langevin (Sir Hector), LaRivière, Lépine, Macdonald (Sir John), Macdowall, McCulla, McDougall (Cape Breton), McGreevy, McKay, McKeen, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McNeill, Madill, Mara, Masson, Mills (Annapolis), Montague, Montplaisir, Patterson (Essex), Pope, Porter, Prior, Riopel, Robillard, Roome, Ross, Rykert, Shanly, Small, Smith (Ontario), Sproule, Stevenson, Taylor, Temple, Thompson (Sir John), Tyrwhitt, Vanasse, Wallace, Ward, White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Wilmot, Wilson (Lennox), Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), Wright.—97.

Amendment negatived, the main motion agreed to.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DESSAINT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) has not voted.

Mr. GODBOUT. I am paired with the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas). If I had voted it would have been for the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. The member for Albert has not voted.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I am paired with the member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden). I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. WATSON. The member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), has not voted.

Mr. KIRK. I am paired with the member for Shelburne (General Laurie). I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BOWELL. I move that the resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of Ways and Means, for consideration.

Motion agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE *MODUS VIVENDI*.

Mr. MITCHELL. I asked a question the other day when the right hon. the Premier was not in, in relation to the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had returned from Washington, for some time, that the *modus vivendi* had expired or was about expiring, and that it was very desirable the country should know what was to be the condition of things during the fishery season. The then leader of the House promised me that an explanation would be given at an early date. I ask the Frst Minister now to give the House any information he can without detriment to the country. I do not wish for anything which it would not be advisable in the interest of Canada to state.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came from Washington to confer with the Cabinet, and he has returned there to resume his duties. With respect to the *modus vivendi*, a motion is on the paper for its renewal during next season.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FISHING LICENSE TO W. GAUTHIER.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Whether it is correct, as alleged in a communication which appears in the *Empire* of 1st April, that one W. Gauthier, a fish-

erman, has obtained a lease or license to fish with pound nets in the waters surrounding Duck Islands or in Big Channel, Cape Roberts, Bone Island and Bay, Grant Islands and North Shore, South Bay or Manitoulin Gulf, Mississauga Point and River, John's Island, both sides, and Spanish River, also Thessalon Point? If so, is it the intention of the Department to continue the privilege to Mr. Gauthier while refusing it to the fishermen of the Georgian Bay?

Mr. COLBY. The statement as alleged in a communication which appears in a copy of the *Empire* of 1st April, is not wholly correct. Mr. C. W. Gauthier does hold licenses to fish in the vicinity of Duck Island; he owns the island, having purchased it from the Indian Department; he also holds licenses to fish at Cape Robert, at Grant's Island, Serpent River Bay and John's Island; but not at Bone Island Bay, not at South Bay or Manitoulin Gulf, not at Mississauga Point, not at Spanish River, nor at Thessalon Point. No licenses to fish with pound nets have been issued in Georgian Bay since 1885, except two, one each to Captain Allan and David Porter, in 1888. These were issued in connection with the operation of procuring ova for the hatcheries. No fishermen have been refused licenses to fish in waters in which licenses were subsequently granted to Gauthier. It is not the intention to grant or continue licenses to Gauthier, to the exclusion of the fishermen of Georgian Bay, or any other applicant.

BREAKWATER AT MIMINEGASH, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Minister of Public Works has given instructions to repair the breakwater at Miminegash, P.E.I.? If so, is the work now going on?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No instructions were given, as stated by the hon. gentleman. When the survey was made, I think two years ago, the report was that the repairs would cost $3,500.

LOCKMASTER CALDWELL.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, 1st. Whether Lockmaster Caldwell, of Iroquois, on the St. Lawrence Canal, has made application to be superannuated? 2nd. If so, what is the age of the said Caldwell, and upon what grounds does he make application for superannuation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In answer to the first question: Yes. In answer to the second: Age sixty-five. Incapacity for duty through bodily infirmities, which he ascribes to an injury received some sixteen years ago, through a fall into the hold of a vessel, while on lock duty. Supported by medical certificates.

MONTREAL HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. CURRAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Government if anything has been done towards appointing the commission to report upon plans for the Montreal Harbor improvements? It is desirable that the commissioners should be able to observe the present condition of the harbor while the ice is there, and the ice may move out at any moment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This question is now engaging the attention of the Government.

I.C.R.—FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to ask the right hon. the Minister of Railways if he is prepared to lay on the Table the amended Intercolonial Railway tariff which he promised to lay on the Table after the recess. There is a great deal of agitation and complaint about it in Nova Scotia, and I hope the Government have arrived at some decision, and will at an early date let us know what it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must admit that I had forgotten that matter, but the tariff shall be brought down at once. I may say that we have had a good many representations from the Maritime Provinces on the subject, and I have no doubt those representations will have their due effect in bringing about some alterations. I can lay the tariff as it was originally settled on the Table at once, or within two or three days I can bring down the tariff as it will be in force.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Better bring both.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You shall have both.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am aware of the difficulty the Government have been laboring under in reference to the transfer of different classes of goods, but, I think, they might have kept the old classification for the large local traffic on the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it would be well to have a special classification, even for local traffic. It is expedient that the railways all through the Dominion should have the same classification. If there is to be any amelioration of the tariff, I think it will be in the rates and not in the classification. I should be inclined to adhere to the classification, because it is absurd that what is described as first-class by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and other railways should have a different classification on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There always has been a different classification on the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, up to the present.

FREDERICTON CANTEENS.

Mr. GILLMOR. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Militia to an article which appears in a paper printed in Fredericton, N.B. It is as follows:—

"AN IMMEDIATE CHANGE REQUIRED.

"'*Open rebuke is better than secret love.*'

"There is a growing evil in this city which is being perpetuated by the Dominion Government, whether they are aware of the fact or not, and as repeated reference to the matter has no effect on those who are the participants in the unholy alliance it becomes necessary to be plain and open in our remarks. Like the Middleton scandal, this has also reference to the Militia Department. We wish again to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and the Government to the fact that for some eleven or more years the Canada Temperance Act has been the law of this city, repeatedly endorsed by the citizens and recently in a most emphatic manner.

"That, in violation of this law since it was declared in operation by the said Dominion Government, there have been three public bars open, with and by the consent of the Dominion Government, in this city, namely, the canteen, the sergeants' mess, the officers' mess.

"Again, that citizens are enabled through their intimacy and friendship with the various officers commissioned and non-commissioned, to obtain liquor at these places, a fact which has been repeatedly shown by the press of this city, and which is notorious.

"That in the canteen, ales and porter are sold to men, a beverage prohibited by the C. T. A. That what are known as 'hard liquors' are sold at the sergeants' and officers' mess.

"We call upon the Government then, in the name of the representative business men, the temperance men, the christian men of this city, to close up these public bars, and thus assist the citizens in their endeavor to carry out existing laws, and protect young and old against the evil of strong drink.

"We are bold to make this indictment in view of the sad scene we witnessed on Monday, and which the canteen and messes are directly responsible for.

"On Monday afternoon a number of the short term men completed their time and left the city by the train for their homes in Nova Scotia and elsewhere. A representative of this paper was on board the train and witnessed the beastly state of intoxication in which a number of the men, particularly a number of young sergeants, were in, and ascertained some facts from men returning home, with reference to the School, that caused our hearts to burn in shame for an institution in our own fair city that would turn our loyal-hearted, true sons of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to their homes and mothers in a condition hardly less debasing than that of the brute, making the car resound with blasphemy and reeking with the fumes of liquors received at the mess, ere leaving.

"Young men coming from the rural districts of Nova Scotia—the banner temperance Province of Canada—who have never known the taste of liquor, to return home in the fair way to fill drunkards' graves. Is this all? Ah! we wish it were. Sunday debauches as the result of the canteen system; men by the dozen unfit for parade on Sabbath through the effects of the liquor obtained from the canteen; and oh, so much more to make our hearts ache for their friends and mothers at home.

"We call upon the Government to order an investigation into the whole matter at once. We would not be true to the principle we have held, or to the Government we profess to support, if we did not point out the fact that they are being held responsible for these doings, and that there will be a day of awakening, both for them and their representatives in this Province—that will not be pleasant."

I have been asked to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My attention has not been called to the facts referred to in the article which my hon. friend has read; but, if he will kindly send over to me the article in question, I will immediately take steps to investigate the matter, and ascertain the correctness of the statements.

ALLEGED OUTRAGE ON THE STEAMER *BALTIC*.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to ask, in reference to the outrage which was committed on the *Baltic* last summer, what course has been taken by the Government in reference to it? I was informed some time ago that an enquiry would be instituted into the charges which were made against the captain in command of the *Baltic* at the time the outrage was committed. Hon. members will recollect that a young lad was assaulted in a violent manner on that steamboat by the crew, that he had a coat of tar and feathers applied to him, and it is said that turpentine was put into the tar, and the result was that he was so tortured that he became mentally disordered and jumped overboard and was drowned. Several of the crew were tried and were sentenced to be sent to the Central Prison for longer or shorter periods. It is said that the captain was aware of the occurrence; it is said that the captain knew that the lad had jumped overboard, and he declined to stop the vessel in order to go to his rescue. The friends of the young man and the community generally feel very much outraged at the crime that was committed. I have had a number of applications made to me in reference to it. Only a short time ago I had letters with reference to the matter, and the people feel that if the captain was aware of the fact that the young lad was overboard and declined to stop the vessel or to go to his rescue, that he should not be allowed a license to sail any longer. I thought it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the Government. On two occasions I have asked questions about it. It appears some action has been taken; a commission has been appointed to enquire into the matter, and I would like to know if the Government propose to place before the House the proceedings of that commission.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report is not made yet. The hon. gentleman is quite right in following up this matter, inasmuch as, from the statements that have been made, and the rumors connected with it, there was a great outrage committed; and if it be true that no effort was made to save the young man after he had plunged into the sea, there has been wrongdoing somewhere. The Government have issued a commission to Capt. Gordon, who, as the hon. gentleman knows, is an officer of the Royal Navy. He is a civil servant of standing, he has commanded our fishery fleet on the Atlantic coast, and, altogether, is a gentleman of very good standing. He will make a thorough investigation into the matter, and the hon. gentleman may depend upon it, that if any fault is shown, it will be punished.

Mr. DAWSON. I would say that, in so far as Captain Robertson is concerned, the reports have been, as I learn, very much exaggerated. There can be no doubt that a brutal outrage was committed by the crew of the *Baltic* upon one of their number, and that an unfortunate young man was drowned, but I believe that Captain Robertson was not, at the time, aware of the circumstance. I have here a little slip from the *Empire* newspaper, which seems to state the matter clearly and truthfully. It is dated Collingwood, March 28:

"Lieutenant Gordon, R.N., has been here two days conducting the Government investigation into the circumstances connected with the *Baltic* outrage. From the evidence it appears that Captain Tate Robertson did not obstruct or interfere with Constable Pierce, or any other constables in the discharge of their official duty, and Constable Pierce himself states that Captain Robertson did not make even a pretence at interference. It also appears, on the contrary, that he afforded every facility for enquiry and investigation, going so far as to forward Crown witnesses at his own expense, they not having been served with subpœnas. It is also clear that the outrage was committed so quietly that Captain Robertson knew absolutely nothing about it until all was over."

Now, Sir, I believe that to be a true statement of the case. Captain Robertson has been engaged from his youth upwards in the navigation of the great lakes. He stands deservedly high in the opinion of everybody who knows him, and I would be very sorry to believe that he was in the least concerned in any wrongdoing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to enquire of the Government if the commission is to be open to the public?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really do not know. I will enquire.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would scarcely satisfy the public if an investigation were made, and the public were excluded from it. I think the greatest publicity should be given to the investigation, not only in the interest of the captain, but in the interest of every person who has a feeling in the matter. I may say that for myself I have no interest in the matter and no feeling in the matter personally. I never saw the captain, and I do not think I ever heard of his name until I saw it connected with this matter. I am only endeavoring to find out whether the captain was guilty of the charges made against him, and to see, if he is guilty, that he shall not be entrusted with a vessel again.

THE LATE MR. CHISHOLM, M.P.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I deem it my duty to inform the House that within a few days after the decease of Mr. Perley we lost another one of our colleagues, and I have no doubt that both sides of the House will feel deeply affected by this evidence of the uncertainty of human life. Mr. Chisholm, who has just left us, was, as hon. gentlemen know, a gentleman of great ability and of great respectability, who had earned his position by acquiring the good-will and respect of all those who knew him on the shores of the Pacific. He came here by the choice, I think by the unanimous choice, of his constituents in New Westminster, whom he worthily represented in this House. Unfortunately, he was not long able to perform his duties. Illness overtook him, and at last he succumbed to it. I have no doubt that this House feels great sympathy with those whom he has left behind, and regret very much the loss of another friend. I am quite sure that this mention will be fully responded to by hon. gentlemen opposite.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

3. By repealing sub-section 1 of section 5 of said Act, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:—"The importation of any goods enumerated in Schedule "D" is hereby prohibited, and any such goods if imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown, and shall be forthwith destroyed,—and any person importing any such goods shall in each case incur a penalty of two hundred dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. The only change is the addition of all the words after the dash, after the word "destroyed."

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very desirable that the Customs Act should be made as simple as possible in order that it may be easily understood by the people. There are only five or six articles mentioned in schedule B, and they should be set out in this clause. It must be remembered that in the country districts copies of the statutes are not plentiful, and unless a merchant could obtain a copy of schedule D he might be unable to ascertain what it covered.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When the Bill has passed through committee, perhaps the Minister will have the whole Act reprinted?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. What are the changes made in schedule D?

Mr. FOSTER. At present there is simple forfeiture; but it is proposed to provide a penalty.

Mr. LAURIER. I can understand immoral books being destroyed, but surely the Minister does not intend to destroy all reprints of Canadian copyrights that come in against the law?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 57 of the tariff he will find the following articles are prohibited to be imported under penalty of $200, together with the forfeiture of the parcel or package of goods in which the same are found: Prints, drawings, paintings, photographs or representations of any kind of any immoral or indecent character, or prints of Canadian copyrights, and reprints of British copyright works which have been also copyrighted in Canada. Under the present law a publisher securing the copyright of an English work has the sole control of it in the Dominion, and any importation from a foreign country is prohibited. That is under the Copyright law.

Mr. LAURIER. What will be the law as amended?

Mr. BOWELL. The same.

Mr. LAURIER. No. Respecting all that class of articles mentioned in section B, it is provided they shall be forfeited and destroyed.

Mr. FOSTER. The present law provides that goods enumerated in schedule D shall not be imported, but if they are imported, they shall be forfeited and forthwith destroyed. It is proposed to add a personal penalty.

Mr. MULOCK. Part of the penalty is in the enacting clause and part in the schedule. It is now proposed to place all the penalty in one clause.

Mr. BOWELL. That is provided for in paragraph 3 on the first page of the new tariff. It is provided that any goods enumerated in schedule B shall be forfeited to the Crown and forthwith destroyed, and any person importing such articles shall in each case incur a penalty of $200. This is made part of the general law, and these goods will be absolutely forfeited, with an additional penalty.

Mr. LAURIER. Then there is no change beyond a change in language.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Minister of Customs says the only change is twofold: to make absolute forfeiture of the goods, and to impose a penalty. Here we have the penalty and the forfeiture stated, and there is no change so far as I can understand.

Mr. FOSTER. On section 5 you have the destruction stated.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As I understand, the only difference is that the penalty is put in the schedule and not in the statute, otherwise it is the same?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance has not referred to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that the prohibited articles should be set forth on the face of the Act. The consequences of the violation of this

section are so serious that persons should be able to see plainly what they cannot import.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem necessary to repeat the prohibition. When this Act is passed it will be bound together by the Customs Department and everyone can see the prohibition.

Mr. BOWELL. The object of placing these clauses in the general provision is to make it cover everything of that character, so that if you change the tariff in the future this clause will cover it without repeating the whole thing.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you contemplate any new changes?

Mr. BOWELL. When you cross to this side of the House, perhaps.

Mr. PLATT. Regarding the prohibition of oleomargarine and other similar substitutes for butter, would it not be well to include that in schedule D, so as to bring it prominently to the notice of persons. I think you should have all the prohibited articles under that schedule.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that is necessary; they are all provided for in the general schedule.

4. By enacting that all medicinal or toilet preparations imported for completing the manufacture thereof, or for the manufacture of any other article by the addition of any ingredient or ingredients, or by mixing such preparations, or by putting up or labelling the same alone or with other articles or compounds, under any proprietary or trade name, shall be, irrespective of cost, valued for duty and duty paid thereon at the ordinary market value, in the country from whence imported, of the completed preparation, when put up and labelled under such proprietary or trade name, less the actual cost of labor and material used or expended in Canada in completing the manufacture thereof, or of putting up or labelling the same.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know exactly how this differs from the present law, in the first place, and what object the hon. gentleman proposes to attain by any alterations he is making? The clause is very curiously worded and looks almost prohibitory on the face of it.

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this clause is to provide against a repetition of the Ayer case. The interpretation in the past of the Customs Act, as it stands on the Statute-book, has been to charge duty on the relative value of any parts of an article imported and to be completed in this country. The object of the clause is, that if an article is brought into the country in different parts, simply to be put together when they are brought here, they shall pay the same duty as they would pay in the United States, when completed, less the expense of completing the article in this country. This is a new clause altogether, and it arose from the fact that on our former decisions upon questions of this kind, which had been the practice since Confederation, the court decided that we had no power to exact the duties in the manner in which they had been exacted. In order to provide against a repetition of that, this clause was framed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Will it not be very difficult to carry that out? As far as I understand the Ayer case, certain articles were imported and then mixed here, while in reality the value of the article arose from its being labelled and described as a certain article. It was, I think, similar to the Johnston Aniline Pill case, which we had in New Brunswick. As I understand, the Minister proposes to charge duty on the basis of the price these articles are sold at in the United States, less the cost of labor in Canada. I think that would be very difficult to get at.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite correct and I will give him a practical illustration of this, in reference to what are termed Carter's Pills. They are sold in New York at $18 per gross. There is only one manufacturer and one wholesale house which has the sole control of them in the United States, and which fixes the price. They bring them in here in bulk and they have no value in the market until Carter's label is put on. This is what was represented to me, and I did not dispute the point, as I think it is not altogether incorrect. They bring the pills here in bulk, import the bottles, labels and corks, on which they pay a duty as well as on the fictitious value of the pills. Then they employ some hands to put them up and label them. In order to arrive at the value, I ascertained the cost of the label, the bottle, the mucilage, the labor of putting them up, and allow for insurance and interest on the investment; I add these together, and deduct the total from the price at which they are sold in the United States, and the balance is the value for duty. The House will readily understand that unless we adopt a principle of this kind, particularly with regard to patent medicines, nearly all the articles would be completed in the United States and brought into this country in bulk and then bottled. This is the principle on which my deputies tell me the Act has hitherto been administered.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand that in most cases the compound is not a secret, so that anybody could bring in the ingredients and make up from the formula.

Mr. BOWELL. Some preparations are secret, and their ingredients can only be ascertained by analysis. There was a time when locomotives were imported in pieces, on which the lower duty was paid, and in that way the duty on the whole locomotive was evaded.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not easy to understand the full meaning of this clause. I should like to enquire of the hon. Minister of Customs whether, if any single ingredient were brought in, the duty would not be levied, irrespective of cost, on the whole value of the preparation. So far as I can see, that expression, "irrespective of cost," might admit of that interpretation.

Mr. BOWELL. That was certainly never intended. I felt the same difficulty as the hon. gentleman has suggested, and this clause was submitted to the Minister of Justice, and it is really the result of his framing. However, I will draw his attention to the point raised.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I know a case in which certain pills were put up in barrels in Detroit and brought into this country, and then put up in boxes and labelled. There was no mixture of the compound in this country.

Mr. BOWELL. That case would come within the meaning of the law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How would the hon. Minister follow these articles? A druggist imports a quantity of a certain article, enters it at the Custom house, pays the duty on it, and does the same with another article. After he passes these articles through the Custom house, can he not do

what he likes with them? If he puts them together, can the Government then step in and say to him, you must pay additional duty on these articles?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government never attempt to reach anything of that kind. If a druggist in this country desires to manufacture Ayer's Pectoral, for instance, he can import all the ingredients of which it is composed separately, and pay the duty on each, and do what he likes with them. But if the article is imported in a completed state, and only requires to be mixed here, this clause is intended to cover it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What additional revenue does the hon. gentleman expect from the operation of this provision?

Mr. BOWELL. We do not expect to collect anything additional. We propose to carry out the law in the future as it has been administered in the past. There will be no advantage taken, so far as I am aware, of the importation of the ingredients of these different compounds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that apparently you now derive from proprietary medicines about $68,000. I should be inclined to think that under this clause a considerably larger sum would be likely to be collected, so that it practically means a pretty large addition to the taxation. Whether that be or be not for the advantage of Her Majesty's lieges, is a question.

Mr. BOWELL. It will not affect them in the slightest degree.

Mr. LAURIER. I should like to know how this provision will work in practice. Take, for instance, the case of Ayer's Cherry Pectoral. It is composed of sugar, spirits, and certain drugs. If the ingredients are imported separately, and then mixed in Canada, how is the duty to be arrived at? One day the spirits may be entered, the following day the sugar, and so on; how are you to arrive at the duty to be charged for the whole article when finished? I am afraid that this will lead to many complications.

Mr. BOWELL. If a man imports spirits, he pays the spirit duty. If he imports sugar, he pays the sugar duty. If he imports bark or something to give the mixture a taste, that may be free. If the druggist imports them separately, we never interfere; but if these mixtures are made up in the United States, we will take the wholesale value in the United States, and then deduct the expense of putting the mixture together, charging the duty less the expense of putting up.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the effect of the clause will be to kill the manufacture of these articles in Canada and have them made up in the United States. Perhaps this is what the Minister desires to accomplish, for that, it seems to me, will be the effect.

Mr. BOWELL. It has quite the contrary effect. A number of establishments have been moved from Detroit to Windsor for the purpose of putting up these medicines, on account of the high duty now imposed upon them. In cases where they bring over all the original ingredients, they pay the duty upon them and manufacture the article in this country, and what we desire is to stop the manufacture in the United States.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand the Ayer case, two different mixtures were introduced which were mixed together in Montreal, constituting the mixture known as Cherry Pectoral. When mixed together they acquired a special value, and were known as Cherry Pectoral. If one of these articles is introduced with the intention of having it mixed with another to be introduced later, how much will be charged upon the one and the other, so as to collect the whole duty? This clause will lead, not only to the objection to which my hon. friend refers, but to many of these harsh measures of the Department of which the public has complained.

Mr. BOWELL. In the Ayer case they brought the mixture in in puncheons ready for bottling, and they bottled it at a nominal rate. We analysed it, and found it to contain a large proportion of spirits, and insisted on the spirit duty. They might possibly, when they brought the article over, have put in a little more alcohol to preserve it, or a little more sugar to sweeten it, but these, of course, they purchased in this country. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is in error as to the practical operation of this clause, because the principle has been enforced since Confederation, and it was supposed to be the law which provides for imposing a proportional duty upon the parts of the article which is imposed on the complete article when it comes in, and it was only when the courts decided that interpretation was not correct, that we made the change.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I could understand that in the case of a mixture like Cherry Pectoral the ingredients could be ascertained, but in the case of pills it would be different.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a case it is impossible to follow. If a druggist imports pills, he may put them up into every conceivable shape and give them any name he pleases, but in cases such as the one I have referred to, the article is given a special label which gives it a special value.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that the three different substances which might enter into one of these articles would come in at the ordinary rates of duty charged upon them separately, whether used in a preparation of this kind or not, or will the duty be the full duty as prescribed for the finished product?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not. For instance, Peruvian bark is used very largely in all these medicines, and you might import a ton without paying any duty. It is not for us to know what you do with it. If you import a plum pudding, the raisins, the citron, the sugar, the flour and everything that goes to make it up is charged, as a whole, at a plum pudding rate. We do not propose to analyse the pudding once it is made, in order to charge a separate duty on each article.

5. By enacting that regulations respecting the manner in which molasses and syrups shall be sampled and tested for the purpose of determining the classes to which they shall belong, with reference to the duty chargeable thereon, shall be made by the Minister of Customs, and the instruments and appliances necessary for such determination shall be designed by him and supplied to such officers as shall be by him charged with the duty of sampling and testing such molasses and syrups; and the decision of any officer (to whom is so assigned the testing of such articles), as to the duties to which they are subject under the tariff, shall be final and conclusive, unless upon appeal to the Commissioner of Customs within thirty days

from the rendering of such decision, such decision is, with the approval of the Minister, changed, and the decision of the Commissioner with such approval shall be final.

Mr. BOWELL. That simply applies the law as it stands on the Statute-book regarding the the polariscopic test of sugars to molasses, as it is proposed to introduce the same principle in the testing of molasses.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why not say at once, that molasses are to be tested by the polariscopic test, and thus avoid ambiguity ?

Mr. BOWELL. The resolution providing for a change in the mode of collecting duties upon molasses declares what the rate of duty shall be upon a test of strength to be ascertained by the polariscope, as is now the case in regard to sugar. I may say that, as to some molasses, it is impossible to find out what it is by the polariscope. We had samples a short time ago which actually indicated what is called the inverse proof ; that is, the test did not indicate that there was a single degree of saccharine strength in the molasses, and the only way in which we could arrive at that was by analysis.

6. By enacting that any goods or packages being the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, and having been exported therefrom and intended to be returned, may be admitted free of duty on being re-imported to Canada, provided such goods or packages were entered for exportation, and branded or marked by a Collector or proper officer of Customs, and fully identified by the Collector or proper officer at the port or place where they are so re-imported ; and further, provided that the property in such goods or packages has continued in the same person or persons by whom they were exported, and that such re-importation takes place within one year of the exportation thereof.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire of the Minister of Customs, whether it is the case, as I have been informed, that packages which have been brought into Canada enclosing smaller packages of goods, and have once paid the duty, are compelled to pay the duty again, and again, if they are used a second, a third, or a fourth time. I am informed, that that is specially the case in regard to the importation of certain fruits. It appears to me, that if a package has once been used, and has paid the duty, it ought to be free, at all events during the year, if it were sent back and used again.

Mr. BOWELL. In the case referred to by the hon. gentleman, there would be no duty. No package which is used exclusively for importation is dutiable. If, however, an American barrel of oil, or of pork, comes into Canada, and duty is paid upon the contents and upon the barrel, that cannot be taken back and refilled and brought in again without paying the duty. But any article of Canadian manufacture can be brought forwards and backwards. This provision is not new. I am only transferring the provisions of an Order in Council which has been in force for years into the Tariff Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking of packages which are the product of Canada, but of other packages which enclose smaller packages, and I understand that, contrary to the statement made by the Minister, in certain cases duty has been charged upon those packages over again, they being of foreign manufacture.

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman state what cases he refers to ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is chiefly in regard to fruits. For instance, strawberries are usually put up in boxes of small weight, and there are forty or fifty or sixty of these in a crate which is generally locked. I understand that the crate has been charged duty more than once, and that is unusual, and, I think, is contrary to the intention of the Act, as I understand it. I also understand that, when those crates have been returned empty and have been sent back, they have been re-charged with the duty. Do I understand the Minister to say that is not done ?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I do not say that. If a package containing fifty or sixty small packages of strawberries was exclusively for exportation, it would not be dutiable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of importation.

Mr. BOWELL. If that is the manner in which they are sold in the market from which they come, they would be dutiable, and every article of American manufacture would be dutiable. That is the same as the American law on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be true, but it practically doubles the amount of duty which Parliament intended to levy on these goods. Bad as the duty is in itself, I think it is made ten times worse by charging the duty on the outside package.

Mr. GUILLET. I understand that these trunks will weigh as much as the baskets and the fruits and all which they contain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I am informed.

Mr. GUILLET. Thus the duty on these large weighty trunks would double the price.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; that is not the case.

Mr. GUILLET. But, according to item 52, the weight of the package is to be included in the weight for duty.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the small package.

Mr. GUILLET. Then I think that should be specified.

Mr. BOWELL. It has never been the practice to charge on the weight of the outside package. It is only the weight of the small box or basket or case which contains the fruit, and the reason for that is that when the weight was not included in the value for duty, it was almost impossible to get at the *ad valorem* duty of these little baskets. The case referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has never occurred. The crates are never included in the weight for duty. I understood that the point to which he specially called attention was that articles of this kind of foreign manufacture, having once come into the country, should be permitted to be taken backwards and forwards in the same way as articles manufactured in Canada. That would be opening the door to the use of those foreign articles in the same way as those manufactured in this country. If an importer or trader desires to carry on a business of this kind with the United States or any other country, he can obtain these articles in this

country, and then can carry them backwards and forwards as long as he likes, or as long as the article will last, without the payment of any duty. For instance, we allow them to take staves from the Maritime Provinces to be made into barrels in the West Indies and returned to Canada filled with sugar or fruit, and returned without payment of duty. They are taken out in what is called the knock-down state, and put together in the foreign country, without paying any duty upon being returned to Canada.

Mr. WALDIE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the practice of the fruit-growers in our section. They ship their early strawberries and early fruits to our own markets, because when early fruits become ready for market, they are in competition with the American fruits; but at a later season they send them to the American markets, when the American markets are bare of their own fruit; and they use the same package to send the fruits to Buffalo that they use in sending them to Toronto. I want to know from the Minister if the package, when returned, will duty be charged on that strawberry case when it returns from Buffalo? Fruits are going to Buffalo until late in the season; there is quite an extensive trade of that kind in the return of these packages. I know the American Customs are, as the Minister states, very arbitrary and unfair.

Mr. MITCHELL. They are no worse than our own.

Mr. WALDIE. Yes, they are worse than our own; but that is no reason why the intelligence of this House should not construct for the people of this country a better law than they have in the States, and that is what I want to assist in doing. I hope the Minister of Customs will take that into consideration, and not shut these growers of fruit in Canada out of the American market by charging an excessive duty on the return packages. The fruits are perishable, and cannot wait for three or four days. They want the packages back immediately to fill them and send them back again.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not chargeable. The clause is clear enough. They must be so marked by the collector, or by the party exporting, as will enable the collector to identify them when they come back again, to see that they are Canadian goods. Those who are carrying on that export trade can easily make some mark, or their own initial. We have never had any difficulty in the past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has, perhaps, noticed that certain dealers in fruit were under the impression that these outside packages would pay duty. That is an error, I understand.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

7. By enacting that any person who sends or brings into Canada, or who, being in Canada, has in his possession any bill-heading or other paper appearing to be a heading or blank capable of being filled up and used as an invoice, and bearing any certificate purporting to show, or which may be used to show that the invoice which may be made from such bill-heading or blank is correct or authentic, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to a penalty of five hundred dollars or to imprisonment to a term not exceeding twelve months, or both, in the discretion of the court, and the goods which may be entered under any invoice made from any such bill-heading or blank shall be forfeited.

Mr. BOWELL. I move to strike out the word "or," in the sixth line, and the words "or both," in the seventh line, and to substitute the word "and" to the word "or" in the sixth line, so that it shall read:—

"And liable to a penalty of $500 and to imprisonment to a term.—"

Mr. DAVIN. Should it not be "for a term," not "to a term?" You cannot say imprisonment "to a term."

Mr. BOWELL. You could say it, but it would not be correct. I will make the correction. This is a new provision, and the reason we ask the House to adopt a clause of this kind is, because, in a number of cases in the past, it has been discovered that the agents who were acting for parties in a foreign country, were sending goods into Canada and sending with them blank invoices certified to be correct, leaving the agent in this country to fill them up. There was, on one case in Montreal, which came under our notice the other day—and by which the offenders paid a penalty of some $6,000—where the parties had been in the habit of importing their article, and having these blank invoices in their possession, they would reduce the price paid for the article in the United States in order to bring it under a section of the Act which imposed a smaller duty, and by that means defraud the revenue. Not only is that the case in reference to the particular article to which I have referred, but it has been discovered also in reference to goods of various other kinds. The House will see at once that this is one of the worst kinds of fraud that can be committed. The parties who make the change not only reduce the value of the article for duty, but they actually swear to it as correct. Perhaps we have been too lenient in dealing with cases of this kind, where we have not prosecuted parties for perjury, instead of imposing a penalty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In fact the immorality encouraged by a high tariff is quite awful.

Mr. MITCHELL. The tendency of the hon. gentleman's tariff to promote immorality, is marvellous. Here it has taken him ten minutes to point out what heinous crimes are committed under the auspices of a high tariff. They are doing something like what they are doing in relation to annexation. They say they do not think they are promoting annexation, yet by the course they are pursuing in putting up a Chinese wall around this country, they are clearly driving us into annexation. Now they are driving the country into immorality by the enormously high tariff they are putting on, encouraging people to resort to all sorts of falsehoods and subterfuges. The hon. gentleman should look after the morals of the country, and endeavor to protect them by reducing the tariff as well as the revenue.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This is a very good clause, but the difficulty will be in enforcing it. How are they going to get the man who sends in these blank invoices? I do not suppose this crime will be included in the Extradition Treaty, and we will not be able to reach the man who sends the invoice. We may reach the man who brings it into the country, but in that case I am afraid that if the Minister of Customs enforces the law,

he will lose the services of a colleague, because the man who will bring it into the country will be the Postmaster General; it will be brought in through the mails. He is the man who will bring it in, and are you going to enforce the law against him?

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend is a little facetious. It is quite evident that he has not read the clause. My hon. colleague at my left (Mr. Foster) intimates that my hon. friend is anxious for the vacancy.

Mr. MITCHELL. We all know that he is fishing for that.

Mr. BOWELL. Therefore, he has suggested a mode by which the Minister of Customs might get rid of the Postmaster General. However, to speak seriously, these invoices are not usually sent in by mail. The difficulty in administering the Act suggested itself not only to the officers of the Customs, but also to the Minister of Justice. If the hon. gentleman reads the clause he will find that it provides for the punishment of "any person who sends, or brings into Canada, or who, being in Canada, has in his possession any bill-heading," &c. All we expect to reach in this case will be the agents who receive and falsify these blank invoices after having been brought into the country, and it will be a warning to the exporter who sends these blank invoices to his agent here to know that his agent can be fined $500 and imprisoned for twelve months at the discretion of the court.

Mr. MITCHELL. This appears to me to be a rather extraordinary state of affairs. An agent for an exporter in a foreign country of a particular class of goods may be a perfectly honest and respectable man. He visits the post office, and receives some invoices in blank from the exporter. On his way home he may be arrested by a police officer, and, as these blank invoices have been found in his possession, he may be fined $500 and imprisoned. It is a hard case that a man should be liable to be arrested for such an offence, of which he has not knowingly been guilty, for he may not have known that the articles he received at the post office would render him liable to a charge which might send him to the penitentiary.

Mr. BOWELL. The same principle would apply to counterfeit money.

Mr. MITCHELL. But this is a case of business, where an agent who is probably a fair and straightforward man, occupying a good position, acts as foreign correspondent to an exporter, and receives from such exporter a letter, the contents of which he does not know, but the fact that blank invoices are found in this letter renders him liable to be sent to the penitentiary. The proposal is an outrage.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understood the Minister correctly, a party in Montreal who committed a fraud by false invoices had been fined $6,000.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, in connection with others.

Mr. LAURIER. If a person proved guilty of fraud against the revenue by means of false invoices can be fined $6,000, the law is ample to protect the revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. So it is, provided they are discovered. Why should not the exporter know that there is a law on the Statute-book which will render all his goods liable to forfeiture by using blank certified invoices, which are filled in by his agent, who cannot by any possibility know when he received those invoices how they should be filled up. This provision is made in order to prevent this kind of fraud.

Mr. LAURIER. The Customs Act is already very severe. If the law at present allows the Minister to secure the infliction of a penalty of $6,000, he has ample power to protect the revenue, and this is the only object which a provision of this kind can have in view. It is now proposed to take new powers, although the Minister has already ample powers.

Mr. DAVIN. Robbery is a criminal act, and we have an analogous provision to this in the criminal law. For instance, if a "jimmy" or other burglarious instrument is found in possession of any man, he is liable to be prosecuted for being in possession of burglarious tools, unless he can give a satisfactory account. In the case covered by this clause, the agent is found in possession of a blank instrument, which is intended to rob, just as much as is a jimmy, hammer or pry found in the pocket of a burglar. The hon. and learned leader of the Opposition did not, in my opinion, put the case fairly. As the law at present stands you can only punish after the crime has been committed. This is a provision to prevent the crime being committed, and to prevent large fines being necessary. As regards the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), I do not know whether he meant it as a joke, whether it was one of those elaborate humorisms that require a week to appreciate, or whether it was a carefully drawn argument. If it was a joke, I have no doubt after two or three weeks I shall find myself laughing heartily. If it was an argument, then I may say that the person who brings anything through the post is not the Postmaster General; he is not the person whom the law recognises, but the person to whom the letter is addressed.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will see the danger which exists in giving more power to the Minister of Customs and his agents, for it is giving power for persecution. The clause uses the words "having in his possession any bill-heads appearing to be blank headings or blank invoices capable of being filled up." This gives to the agents of the Minister of Customs power to go into a store and search for these invoices. They may be perfectly innocent in themselves, but they may have a bad appearance, and on that ground alone a man may be dragged into court and subjected to the annoyance of a lawsuit. The Minister is aware that already complaints are made, and with great reason, that the Customs Act has often been made an instrument of persecution. Yet under this provision you are giving more power to the agents of the Customs, who have already too great power.

Mr. BOWELL. It is most extraordinary that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House will rise and not, perhaps, defend the most flagrant acts that can possibly be committed under the law, but they will at least excuse them and say that you should not punish the parties who committed them. This clause provides only for the punishment of a man who has blank invoices in his possession which are

certified to be correct. What right, let me ask, has any person to have in his possession a document certified as being correct when it is in blank, and when the person sending it cannot by any possiblity know how his agent is going to fill it up? The law provides that an invoice shall contain a description of the goods sent into the country. It also provides that, before proper entry can be made, it shall be certified by the exporter to be a correct account both as to the value and quantity of the goods sent. When that is presented to the collector, it is passed if there is no evidence of fraud or undervaluation. But in order to commit fraud and invade if possible the punishment that would be inflicted, this method of certified blank invoice has been adopted. How can this invoice be truthfully certified to as correct, when it is not filled in; and how can the exporter certify to the correctness of a blank invoice, which is to be filled in by his agent in this country? Why should not these parties be punished? The hon. gentleman said there are complaints in regard to the administration of the Customs Act. There are complaints, and there always will be complaints so long as there is a Customs Act to administer, and an Opposition to find fault and assist dishonest importers, and make political capital; more particularly will these complaints be inforced when they are endorsed with the talent and suavity of manner which the leader of the Opposition has shown to-day. My sole object in presenting this clause is to show exporters that if they send in false blank invoices in order to evade duties, they will be punished.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman by this clause could reach the parties who send the false invoices, I would have nothing to say. But an exporter in a foreign country with a guilty motive sends blank invoices to his agent, and the moment they reach their destination, the agent, never having had any intention to use them, is liable to the penalty because they are found in his possession, and if they are found in his possession, though he may have had them for only one single moment, and though he never had intended to use them, still he becomes liable to the penalty. Under such circumstances the argument of the hon. gentleman has been directed, not to the case of a man who sends the invoices, but to the case of the man who receives them, for he cannot reach the sender. If the receiver profits by this, if he commits a fraud by such invoices, we can punish, and the hon. gentleman has told us that an offender in that manner has just been punished to the extent of $6,000. It seems to me that under such circumstances the powers already vested in the Minister to detect and punish fraud are ample, and the objection I make to the whole of this Act is, that too great powers are already placed in the hands of the Minister. Of course, I do not pretend to defend offenders, but the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, that his agents, with the object of discovering offenders, have committed persecutions untold upon certain business men. Such powers, therefore, are always dangerous, and should not be extended where there are already adequate powers to protect the revenue.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not surprised at anything that the hon. Minister of Customs may do or say when he is endeavoring to get an arbitrary Customs Act through this House. It is not the first occasion on which I have felt it to be my duty to criticise, and to criticise severely, the formation, the framing, and the arbitrary manner in which these Acts are forced through this House. But, Sir, it was reserved until to-day to have a charge thrown across the floor of this House by the Minister of Customs in his official capacity, that gentlemen who may choose to criticise the arbitrary enactments of a Bill which he proposes, shall be charged with aiding and abetting men who are trying to commit fraud on the revenue. Who is there on this side of the House who is open to this charge? Yet it is the inference to be drawn from the infamous remarks of the hon. gentleman on the other side. What do we hold our position in Parliament for? Are we here to pass any arbitrary law which may be submitted to this House, or are we here to see that the interests and rights of the people shall be protected? While the revenue of the country shall be properly guarded and its collection protected; while the officers of the Crown shall be secured in the execution of their legitimate duty, we are here to see also that an arbitrary Minister of the Crown shall not pass through this House, a measure which may place an honest man within the trammels of the law. Sir, what was said about the action of the Customs detective officers, three years ago, in the city of Montreal? Was there not an outcry from the whole commercial community against the arbitrary exercise of the powers which the existing law gave to these officers?—or, at all events, whether they possessed that power or not, against the construction which they put upon the law. The outcry was such as to demand a repeal or modification of these laws. The hon. gentleman ever since he has been in power, and from the first day he took the position of Minister of Customs, has upon every occasion on which an amendment or a consolidation of the Customs Act was proposed, endeavored to make its provisions bear more harshly upon the importers and upon the trade of the country. As I say, it is not the first time I have had occasion to remark upon this. To-day, he proposes a most outrageous provision. He tries to make it law, that one of the first merchants in the city of Montreal, mayhap, who receives a consignment from a foreign house, may be punished, although he has no intention whatever of committing fraud. It may be that that foreign house wishes to take advantage of the law, and if they choose to send this blank invoice to be filled up by an honest merchant, he can be punished if it is found in his possession. Is it possible that it can be proposed that the mere receipt on the part of that merchant of the highest respectability in the land, of a fraudulent invoice, shall lay him open to the penalty of being fined and sent to the penitentiary? The Minister of Customs had better alter that section of the law, and confine it to the actual criminal knowledge of the individual who receives the invoice, or his cognisance or the exercise of a criminal act on his part. The law should not be such that a person who may be obnoxious to an official may be laid open to the charge of criminally outraging the Customs Act, although he may never have intended to do so. It is quite possible that the enemies of a man may put up a plant upon him, and send him one of these blank invoices, wait for him at the post office when he receives his letters, and then arrest him and

charge him with an offence for which he is liable to go to the penitentiary. I say, Sir, that this is a condition of things which ought not to exist in a free country.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This section is a very strong one and entails very serious penalties, and as it reads at present, a person having this invoice in his possession, innocently, may be punished. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) contended that while the law was sufficient to punish when crime was committed, the object of this law was to punish a man before the crime was committed, and this seems to be the intention of the provision. The hon. member also said that it was analogous to the criminal law in the case of a burglarious instrument being found in the possession of a person, but, Sir, the mere possession of a burglarious instrument is not sufficient to convict, for the possession must be with the intent of committing crime, and it seems to me that a conviction should not be obtained under the law we are now discussing, unless intent to defraud is proven. The criminal law says :

"Everyone who is found by night armed with any dangerous instrument, with intent to break into a house, or to commit any felony thereby, without lawful excuse, the proof of which excuse shall fall upon him——"

and so on, shall be subject to the penalty. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Customs that there should be inserted in this provision, the words :

"Having in his possession with intent to defraud the revenue."

I think that provision would meet the objection. There is no doubt that there are attempts made to defraud the revenue, and, of course, the more ingenuity the Government displays in their attempt to enforce the high tariff, the more ingenuity they are met with to evade it on the other side. It seems to me that if these words I have suggested were inserted, it would protect an innocent party, and enable the Customs authorities to reach any person who attempts to defraud the revenue.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) The suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is a good one, but I think that the objection taken by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), to the Minister of Customs, in some of his dealings, would hardly apply to this clause, if I read it aright. Exception has been taken to the Minister of Customs taking extra powers, but I do not understand that, in this clause, the Minister is taking any extra powers to himself, as the matter is not to be within his cognisance at all, but within the cognisance of the courts to decide.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not that taking extra power ?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand it, he cannot himself order a seizure and have it adjudicated on without an appeal to the court.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have not these officers power under the Customs Act to enter and search for papers, &c. ?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has he not the right to search a man for papers, and if they are found upon him, although an infamous job may be perpetrated on the man, to punish him ?

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand it, the Minister cannot himself impose the penalty.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see your point clearly enough, but, as I understand it, the Minister would not be taking extraordinary powers on himself, as it would be wholly a matter for the court to adjudicate upon.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As this law stands, the officers of Customs are authorised to search, and if the invoice is found in the possession of an individual, no matter how innocently it may have come into his hands, the mere fact that it is found in his possession is all that is required to convict, which I think is contrary to the rule in matters of this kind. Therefore, considering the great power Customs officers have, to make searches, I think the ordinary principle of the criminal law should be applied in this case, and that it should be necessary to a conviction that the party should have the invoice in his possession for an unlawful purpose, namely, for the purpose of defrauding the revenue.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I started out with the proposition that it would be necessary to adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) ; but I am simply pointing out that in this clause, the Minister is not asking as great individual powers as he has done in other cases, for the matter is not adjudicated by him, but by the court. I think the Minister was not fair in charging a desire on the part of any member of the Opposition to do anything to assist frauds on the revenue. Perhaps most of us are engaged in trade, and anything designed to prevent frauds on the revenue, ought to receive the support of both sides of the House ; but it is different with arrangements likely only to cause annoyance to men who have no intention of fraud. If you can imagine that there is a business man in Canada who is anxious to defraud the revenue by means of a duplicate invoice, he ought to be punished in the interest of the honest trader.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The clause as drawn is, of course, a very severe one ; so is every law for the administration of the revenue. The present instance has been paralleled in a dozen cases, not only in the Customs Act, but in the Excise Law. For example, it is a highly penal offence for anyone to have in his possession an empty cigar box that has been used, which, I fancy, is no greater moral offence than for a man to have a fraudulent invoice in his desk, which no one can suppose to be for any other purpose than to defraud the revenue. I think the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was perfectly correct in drawing the analogy he did, between this provision and the one read by the hon. member for St. John. A person's offence does not consist in having the burglar's tools in his possession, for the purpose of committing a felony, but simply in having them in his possession without lawful excuse, and the proof of its lawfulness shall be upon him. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has cited the case of a man receiving something of this kind from the post office. Just as in the case of the cigar box, public policy requires, under a severe penalty, that an invoice of that kind should be destroyed immediately by any person receiving it. If people should be allowed to have these invoices in their

possession and to keep them, all chance of checking fraud would be destroyed, and, therefore, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. John would render the clause worthless, as we should have to prove the intent to use the paper for a fraudulent purpose, which would be impossible unless the man himself confessed that his intention was to use it for a fraudulent purpose, or unless he actually uses it, when it would be too late to prove that it had been certified in blank. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) called attention to the difficulty of punishing the sender of the invoice as well as the receiver. There is a great difficulty in that; but if the sender should be in Canada, it would certainly be an anomalous thing if the receiver should be liable to a penalty while the sender would not be. But I would suggest, with the view of making the cases more parallel—and I hope the suggestion will meet the views of the hon. member for St. John—that we should adopt the same words as the Act he read contains, by enacting that the person in whose possession the invoice is found shall be liable unless he proves that he has it for a lawful purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a very important point—this cigar box business, and I have sent up to have the stamp erased on an empty cigar box in my possession, so that I might be free from prosecution. It is outrageous that because a gentleman may have an empty cigar box in his possession, on which he has not erased the stamp, he is liable to fine and imprisonment, but the Minister of Justice quotes that as a precedent for enacting a still more iniquitous law. The very illustration given by the hon. gentleman, is an additional reason for our not adopting any such law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All laws for the administration of revenue are severe and arbitrary, but the best evidence that this law with reference to cigar boxes is not oppressive is the fact, that although it has been for years on the Statute-book, the hon. gentleman was not aware of it. It has been applied solely for the protection of the revenue, and has not been used oppressively.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not suppose there is one man out of five thousand who has ever read that paragraph relating to the destruction of stamps on cigar boxes, but that does not render the law less liable to be abused, and it is no excuse for passing an iniquitous law, which will render a person liable to imprisonment, simply for having in his possession one of these bills, about which he may know nothing, and which may be sent to him through the post office without his having any will or intention in the matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. the Minister of Justice has shown a great deal of skill in the suggestion he has made and in the defence of the Minister of Customs. The provision of the law which the Minister of Customs proposes is, that certain facts shall be deemed a conclusive presumption of wrongdoing, subjecting the party, on these facts being proved, to punishment for misdemeanor. The Minister of Justice proposes certain words which will convert the conclusive presumption into a *primâ facie* presumption, involving the necessity of proving actual wrongdoing before a person can be convicted. That is a radical change, and I think the suggestions made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) and the Minister of Justice are in effect exactly the same.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Minister of Customs needed any defence it was my fault, for the clause was drawn up under my instructions. I see, from the objections of hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is capable of improvement, and am prepared to improve it.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the Minister of Justice might have put a stronger case in reference to stills. A man may have had a still in his possession for a number of years, though not in use, but the fact of his having it in his possession subjects him to a penalty, and there is no discretion on the part of the courts in regard to it. I have no objection to the amendment suggested by the Minister of Justice, if it suits the views of the House. If my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) will compare the Customs Act now with what it was before I assumed charge of the Customs Department, he will find that powers which were then vested in the head of the Department have been taken from him, that, in fact, every amendment which has been proposed, though the penalties have been made more severe for infractions of the law, has not conferred additional power upon the head of the Department or any of its officers. When I introduced the first consolidation of this Act, I took away from the Minister certain powers which were absolutely given to him. The question was then put to me, I think, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), whether I had no confidence in myself, and my answer was that I thought no Minister should have such powers as those, but that the matter should be relegated for final decision to the courts. It is true that the Minister or the Commissioner must give a ruling in most of these cases, but there is no case in which the person affected cannot appeal to the courts.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The penalty is made $500 or not more than twelve months' imprisonment. I think it would be better to say that the fine should not exceed $500.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act respecting punishments declares that, when any penalty of that kind is provided, it may be made less according to the judgment of the court.

Acetic and pyroligneous acid and vinegar, 15 cents per gallon and one cent additional.

Mr. FOSTER. This carries out the principle of charging on the strength of the acetic acid for every degree over proof. Heretofore, acetic acid of any strength was allowed to be imported.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is the same change which you have applied to spirits.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same principle, and seems to be a fair one.

Acetic and pyroligneous acid of any strength, when imported by dyers, calico printers or manufacturers of acetates or colors for exclusive use in dyeing or printing, &c., 25 cents per gallon and 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. This is the old duty on acetic acid, and it is thought well to allow these manufacturers to have these acids at the same rate of duty as before at any strength.

Acid phosphate, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new item. Acid phosphate is largely used in the manufacture of cream of tartar and of baking powders, where it is used as a substitute for cream of tartar, It is made to bear the same rate as starch, which is another ingredient used in baking powders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the supposed commercial value of that, per pound?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the information here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should have that information, because it may be a small duty or a very heavy duty, and we cannot tell unless we have the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine the duty is pretty heavy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is it supposed to represent, *ad valorem?*

Mr. FOSTER. It came in before unenumerated.

An hon. MEMBER. 75 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That looks like an absolute prohibitory duty. 75 per cent. is an outrageous rate of duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is 75 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it manufactured here?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Precious stones, polished but not set or otherwise manufactured, and imitations thereof, 10 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. This is instead of several clauses, and simply groups all of them together, and adds also another item, which is found here, of imitations of precious stones, in the same category, and at the same rate.

Animals, living, viz.:—Cattle, sheep and hogs, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The old duty was 20 per cent., which we increased to 30 per cent., as being about a proportional addition with reference to the duty to be placed upon dead meats.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the anticipated increase of revenue?

Mr. FOSTER. On the importation of last year, it would be about $12,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister look for the same importation?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter which can hardly be forecast. Probably there will not be so much importation.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to enquire whether, upon hogs imported, slaughtered and packed in Canada, the actual product of the hogs imported must be exported to obtain a rebate of the duty, or whether an equivalent would be sufficient to entitle the packer to obtain a rebate?

Mr. BOWELL. It must be the actual product. You will find that the Customs Act provides for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this is a very objectionable proposition. In the first place, I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. gentleman, by imposing this additional duty, is putting a very strong argument into the mouths of the advocates of additional protection in the United States. He knows very well that at the present moment there are propositions in Congress largely to increase the duty on animals exported from Canada to the United States. Such a clause as this is a direct invitation, a direct aid and inducement, offered by the Canadian Government to those parties in the United States who are desirous of imposing additional duties on Canadian animals imported into the United States. I can hardly conceive a more unwise thing than to do that, at the present stage of affairs in the United States. If the hon. gentleman and his friends desire to add to the duties on every animal exported from Canada to the United States, this is the way to do it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the Finance Minister will give that consideration to the remarks just made by my hon. friend that they deserve. There can be no question about the soundness of the view which that hon. gentleman has taken of this question. Just now, beyond all doubt, is a most inopportune time for any advance in the duty upon live stock, or any movement in this direction, while Congress have their Tariff Bill under consideration, and the features of that Bill will not be fully settled until after Parliament is prorogued. We are simply inviting, by action of this kind, retaliation on their part. This it is unwise to do, aside from any question as to the rate of duty, which, I believe, is an excessive one in itself.

Mr. MULOCK. I just this moment looked into the Trade and Navigation Returns, to see what our trade in sheep was for the year 1889. I find, that we imported from the United States last year sheep to the value of $3,489, and we exported in the same year to the United States sheep to the value of $918,334. I may have made a mistake, since I have only glanced at it hastily, but I think these figures are correct. You will find the exports on page 661 of the Trade and Navigation Returns. The number of sheep is put down as 307,775, and the value I have given. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) hands me just now figures, showing the total amount, as set forth on page 4; to be somewhat more than I stated. It appears, that the total value of the imports was $81,863, less than one-tenth of what we exported. Now, is it proposed to imperil that trade? In order to exclude $80,000 worth of sheep, it is asked that we should imperil a trade involving nearly $1,000,000. Now, does trade up to the present moment justify this action? Why should we increase our import duties 50 per cent. greater than the Americans have imposed against us? We are challenging them, because the Administration have declared that they have adopted a policy to impose just such duties as the Americans impose, and, of course, we have to expect to have the same treatment awarded to us.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the implication lies, in the first place, that the object of imposing this duty upon cattle, sheep and hogs, has been to retaliate against the United States. I do not think that the objection can lie, either, that it is done with any purpose, on the part of the Administration, of inviting retaliation. My hon. friends on the other side, two of them at least, who have

spoken, may have peculiar sources of information, and may know more intimately of what they speak than other members of this House. It seems to me that there are two things that we may safely affirm: the first is that we must always look upon ourselves as related to the countries with whom we trade and who lie near to us, and the second that we must more especially look to our own interest and form our own policy; we must do what we consider best for the country in which we live, always, of course, having reference to the relations that this country occupies to the countries with which it trades. It is simply and solely in pursuance of that object that this, as a part of the policy of the Government, has been adopted. The Government has come to the conclusion that farmers' products can be better protected than they have been, and it has determined to protect them. It has, therefore, placed duties on those articles that it is believed the Dominion of Canada is able amply to produce and supply in sufficient quantity, not only for the consumption of the Canadian people, but as well for foreign export; and it would, of course, be altogether absurd to place a duty upon dead meats with the idea of protecting those products and not place a corresponding duty upon the live animals out of which those dead meats are produced, and this addition is simply put as a proportional increase. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are to go on from year to year and from century to century doing nothing in what we consider to be the best line for a country like this great in extent and in resources and with a population, which is respectable in numbers, and undoubted in its energy, its enterprise and its power? Are we to go on from year to year and from century to century doing nothing because, forsooth, a threat may be held out against us, that, if we adopt measures for our own interests and do what we honestly consider best for our own success, another country near us or far away may retaliate and annoy us? I do not consider this is a principle which Canada at the present time is disposed to adopt. We come back here year after year with hope deferred, so far as reciprocity in natural products with the United States is concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen may greet the words "hope deferred" with such cheers as they please; but the facts are against them, and facts are more powerful than cheers or sneers. Since the very first year of the enactment of the old Reciprocity Treaty we have found no approach to a spirit of larger and broader international trade with this country on the part of the United States. That treaty had no more than commenced its operations when dissatisfaction began to be expressed with it across the boundary along the whole line of the 45th degree of latitude, and it culminated at last in the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, against the wishes and the desires and the repeated efforts of the Provinces of Canada at that time. And from that time to this, although efforts have been constantly made, although no Government has ever existed which did not make patent to the world its desire and its readiness to come down and frame a fair treaty of reciprocity with the United States whenever the United States were disposed to do so, although that has been the case, and the offer has been repeated not only by statutory provision, but also by diplomatic effort, nothing has appeared to give us the least hope that to-day the Government of the United States is one whit nearer to us in a desire for a reciprocity treaty which would be fair and equal on both sides. I say that the facts are against the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, what about this present proposal? It is said that this is retaliation.

Mr. MULOCK. A challenge.

Mr. FOSTER. I disclaim that this tariff has been framed with the idea of retaliation; I disclaim that it has been thrown out as a challenge, and the absurdity of a charge of that kind is shown by the trend of events in the United States, both for the period of which I have been speaking, and also for the last two or three years. When the contest took place which resulted in the election of the present President, and the present Congress, the elections were run upon the simple question of a degree of protection which we would consider high and a degree of protection which was still higher. It was not a question of free trade and protection; there was no party which went to the polls under a flag upon which was shown the legend of free trade for the United States of America. It was a question between a high tariff and a still higher tariff. And after all that took place in the discussions in the United States, the party which came out triumphant at the polls was the party that promised, and which now shows determination to implement its promise, to add to the protection of the various industries in the United States, and to do nothing which would take away from the industrial protection of that country, whatever it might do with respect to the raw materials which enter as a basis of its industries. That President came into power, that Congress came into power, the party which was triumphant holds the power, it may be by a small vote in one branch, and it is able to do what the former Administration was not able to accomplish, viz.—to control both branches of the Congress of the United States. What are the tariff indications? That they are going back on their promises, and on their platform, on which the election was run? Not at all. But days and months before this tariff saw the light, all the indications in the United States were that protection was to be pushed further, especially in the line of the agricultural interests; and the report of the Ways and Means Committee, of that section of the committee which represents the dominant party, amply fulfils that prediction, and amply proves what is to be policy of the dominant party in that country. This is not retaliation. We have been looking for the last 25 years in vain for an offer of a reciprocity treaty between us and the country to the south of us, and when at last the trend of events irresistibly shows that we shall not obtain such a treaty, we may as well tread our independent path; we may as well be a country now, and do what we honestly consider to be best for our country through and through, and if we meet difficulties we will meet them like men, we will not act the part of cravens, and simply sit down and do nothing. I will say one thing more. I hold it to be criminal almost—I may say without that restriction "almost," that I hold it to be criminal for

any party to endeavor to create the idea in this country, and in the country to the south of us, that we are animated with a malicious motive of retaliating against them, and to use that idea and opinion as a means by which passions may be aroused, and political action may be taken, which will have the result which hon. gentlemen opposite, from their advocacy of this view, sometimes appear to me to desire, viz. :—of creating an impression among the people of the United States that we are actuated by a malicious desire to retaliate, and that, therefore, we should be punished in kind. I wish to state here, and to state it with all the emphasis that I can command, that the Government have had no intention to retaliate or to fling out any challenge against the United States, but that it has simply looked at the state of the country and endeavored to do what it considers, upon the whole, to be the best for the interests of this Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Government of Canada are not cravens they are writing themselves down precisely what one of their supporters, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), described them the other evening. I will say this, that looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, I never yet in all my life saw an instance of more utter imbecility, a more utter want of statesmanship, a more utter want of comprehension of the general interests of this country than has been displayed by hon. gentlemen opposite. What is this hon. gentleman doing? Here is a trade of four or five millions in sheep, horses and cattle, and, if I add eggs, a trade of seven millions.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). You fixed that down at Washington.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would do it infinitely better than the whole lot of them on the other side put together, because I understand more of what the real working wants of the people of this country are—not of their paymasters, the combines—but of the real working people of this country, than the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches have attained to. Now, Sir, what are those hon. gentlemen doing? A trade of many million dollars per annum is put in jeopardy for a miserable tax on an importation of perhaps one hundred thousand or two hundred thousand dollars. I turn to our statement of exports to the United States, and, first of all, I find we sent them last year, $2,169,000 worth of horses, we sent them $494,000 worth of horned cattle, we sent them $900,000 worth of sheep, and millions upon millions dollars worth of eggs and other articles of that kind; and I find that this trade is going to be put in peril, and in many cases utterly destroyed, for the sake of a trade of $80,000 or $90,000 all told, or may be, a couple hundred thousand dollars. I say that every agriculturist in Ontario, every agriculturist in the Maritime Provinces, and every agriculturist in Quebec sees one of the most valuable portions of his whole business put in jeopardy, and likely to be exposed to an almost prohibitory tax, for the purpose of these gentlemen airing a little clap-trap here to catch a few votes.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what these hon. gentlemen are doing. I say, that if these hon. gentlemen suppose that such actions as theirs will not be taken as a challenge on the part of the people of the United States, they show an ignorance of the temper and feeling of the United States, almost as gross as that which they exhibited a couple of years ago, when the High Commissioner described us as on the verge of war.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Minister of Finance does not know what he is doing, let him consult the late Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper. That hon. gentleman went down to Washington, and we know that he told us we were on the verge of actual war—at any rate, of commercial war. We know what that hon. gentleman did with this Cabinet, when he came back from Washington. We know that when he found them attempting to embark, in one or two instances, on the foolish path they are marching now, he took them by the neck and compelled them within three days to do what they had declared was traitorous and treasonable. That is what the late Minister of Finance did. I am sorry to say, that the present Minister of Finance does not appear to possess anything like the same grip, or vigor, in dealing with his colleagues that the late hon. Minister did, or I am sure, his better sense would lead him to imitate his predecessor, and to do precisely as he did;—eliminate those most objectionable provisions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not carried by any means.

REPORTS.

Report of the High Commissioner for Canada, with reports from agents in the United Kingdom, for the year 1889—(Mr. Carling).

Report of the Director and officers of the Experimental Farms, for the year 1889—(Mr. Carling).

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House resumed consideration of item 5:

Animals living, viz.:—Cattle, sheep and hogs, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before this item passes, I wish to say a few words with regard to the duty itself, which it is proposed to impose by this resolution, and also in reply to some remarks made by the hon. Minister of Finance, whom I am glad to see is in his place. The object of this increase of 10 per cent. in the duty upon cattle, sheep and hogs, I can quite readily understand. The Government find it necessary to placate the agriculturist of this country; and the Government of the United States find it necessary to move in the same direction, and the agriculturist of both countries has the idea dawning on his mind that the operation of a protective system is not in his interests. The farmer is beginning to suspect that the taxes imposed by the protective system are bleeding him at every pore, and the Governments of both countries are realising the fact that they must throw a tub to this agricultural whale, or there will be trouble with the agricultural vote, and, consequently, we have this proposal to increase this duty, which I think I will be able to show is absurd and unneces-

sary, taking into consideration the trade between the two countries in the animals mentioned in this resolution. Now, Sir, I have said the agriculturist is uneasy. He is beginning to understand that the great volume of Customs duties collected in this country, amounting to about $23,000,000 last year, did not measure to him and to the other producers the burden of taxation. He is beginning to realise that that amount of Customs duty forms part of the cost of the article furnished to the consumer, and that upon the duty as a part of the cost is assessed wholesale and retail dealers' profit, making the actual cost to the consumer 50 per cent. more than the Government receive, and making the tax to the producers of this country $34,000,000, in round numbers, for the $23,000,000 secured by the Government. He is beginning to realise that the increased cost, due to the tariff, on all the goods produced in this country, is a still more serious burden upon him and upon other producers, than the duty itself, and that the added cost of the Customs duties is a part of the cost of the article. He is beginning to understand that this system takes from the producer $3 in order to give the Government $1, and that it is building up monopolies. He sees the bright, intelligent farm lad working from sunrise to sunset, for perhaps 50 cents a day, and the artisan who works ten hours a day, receiving from $12 to $18 a week. The idea suggests itself that there is something about this system that is not advantageous to him or to the class to which he belongs, and the consequence is the Government find themselves in the position that they must endeavor to induce the farmer to believe they are doing something for him; and that, under the general system of spoliation called protection, some one has to be spoiled for the benefit of the farmer, to compensate him for being obliged to suffer for the benefit of somebody else.

Now, Sir, if we look at the statistics of the live stock trade, I think the House will be convinced that this duty is unnecessary—that it is, in fact, absurd. Our imports of animals from all countries in the last fiscal year were as follows:—

	Number.	Value.
Horned cattle	748	$ 21,750
Horses	4,105	149,836
Sheep	43,255	81,863
Swine	3,809	37,002
Total		$290,451

During the same year we exported, not to all countries, but to the United States alone:

	Number.	Value.
Horses	17,277	$2,113,782
Horned cattle	37,360	488,266
Swine	1,033	4,448
Sheep	307,775	918,334
Total		$3,524,830

Thus we find that our export trade in these four classes of animals to the United States was considerably more than twelve times as great as our import trade in these animals from all countries; and yet the Government proposes to increase the duty 10 per cent. on that trade. I think the farmer will understand, that this threatens a very important interest of his. He will see that the import trade amounts to very little, while the object of prime importance to him is to put the export trade on a proper basis.

Now, Sir, the system of protection is calculated to build up, and will continue to build up in this country and in every country that adopts it, a ring of monopolies and monopolists, who will naturally be the most liberal contributors to the election funds of the party that adopts their policy, and the party that adopts the protective system will, in all cases, derive its financial support chiefly from the interests which it protects. That is the case with the Conservative Government of Canada, as it is with the Republican Government of the United States, both of which act according to the behests of the great interests which they protect, and in return they depend on them for liberal contributions to carry the elections; and in any professions they may make of a desire to benefit the farmers by protection, they are merely trying to hoodwink and deceive that class of the community, because it is impossible for them to contribute to the benefit of the farmers one cent's worth where they take one dollar from them. The protective system builds up such establishments as that of Andrew Carnegie in Pittsburg, whose profits are $12,000 a day, who has amassed a fortune of $40,000,000, who was not worth $100 fifteen years ago. That man would have been abundantly successful if by industry and thrift during that time he had accumulated a fortune of $500,000 instead of $40,000,000; it would have been better for himself and for the country; and any system that enables individuals to amass such fortunes, is in the interest of monopolies, and not of the masses.

The hon Finance Minister, I see, does not propose a duty on horses; and I will give the statistics regarding cattle, hogs and sheep, the animals on which the duty is increased. Last year we imported of cattle, horses and sheep from all countries $140,615 worth, and exported to the United States alone $1,411,000 worth. In other words, our exports of these articles to the United States alone, was ten times greater than our imports from all countries, and the hon. Minister of Finance proposes to imperil that export trade by the imposition of the added duties. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, imagine that the farmers think this is a good thing for them, but the hon. gentleman must know that it is not. He is inviting a policy on the part of our neighbors, the Americans, which will injure the farmers in a trade of $10, for the possibility of benefiting them in a trade of $1.

The hon. Minister of Finance, in his remarks before dinner, spoke of the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty by the United States in 1866, and led the House to infer that it was an entirely unjustifiable act on the part of the United States—an act of wantonness. That the operation of that treaty was, in the highest degree, beneficial to Canada, there can be no doubt; under it our exports to the United States increased from $10,000,000 to $40,000,000 per annum in round numbers, during eleven years, and the country was prosperous; but the abrogation of that treaty was owing to the United States believing that a fair reciprocity treaty would be one that would enable them to sell to Canada the products of their labor which we desired to buy in return for the products of our labor which they desired to buy. They believed that a reciprocity treaty which enabled us to sell to them all our natural productions, of

which they were purchasers to a large extent, but which would not allow them to send us, in return, those articles of which they were sellers to a large extent, was not a fair treaty. But there was another circumstance that had much to do with the repeal of that treaty—that was, the sympathy evinced by Canada for the Confederate cause, especially by the manifestation of applause in the Canadian Parliament at the defeat of the Federal Army at Chancellorsville. It was the spirit manifested by that demonstration of sympathy with the enemies of the Union that did, perhaps, more than anything else to bring about the abrogation of the treaty in 1866.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. CHARLTON. Who asks this question? If there is any man in this House so ignorant of the fact that the American Cousul General at Quebec transmitted this intelligence to the American Government, he had better rise and say so.

Mr. BOWELL. And that a certain gentleman belonging to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite telegraphed to the Detroit Convention that if they intended to ask for a renewal of the treaty, not by any means to do it, because they would thereby drive Canada into annexation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who sent this telegram?

Mr. BOWELL. You know who sent it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Name the person.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman not know who the gentleman was, in Montreal, who sent that telegram?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I do not; give the name.

Mr. BOWELL. It was the gentleman who was then at the head of one of the telegraph companies of this country, from which he was dismissed afterwards.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Give the name.

Mr. MITCHELL. That gentleman was an American.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose he was, he was acting in Canada and was a Canadian subject, so far as I know, and acting on behalf of gentlemen with whom the hon. gentleman was intimately connected.

Mr. MITCHELL. What has that to do with the Liberal party? More than that, that gentleman was promptly dismissed by the Canadian company at whose head he was.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. CHARLTON. Whatever orders any one individual in Canada may have given to the Government of the United States, or to a convention at Detroit, I do not think they had very much influence on the Government or on the sentiments of the American people. But the fact that the Canadian Parliament had, in an open manner, shown their sympathy for the Confederate cause, and the realisation of the fact that the Reciprocity Treaty was one which, in any event, required revision as to its provisions, were the two causes that led to the abrogation of that treaty. The Finance Minister tells us that no evidence has been given by the United States of any desire for the negotiation of a treaty for reciprocal trade between the two countries. In making that statement, he has made a statement which is calculated to convey a false impression to the country as to the desires or wishes of the people of the United States, as a body, with regard to this matter, and a statement, moreover, which is not warranted by the facts of the case. Have we not the fact that last Session of Congress a resolution was passed by the popular branch of the United States Legislature, laying down a proposition with regard to reciprocity? Have we not the fact that this year the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives has unanimously reported to the House a resolution empowering the President of the United States to appoint commissioners, whenever Canada shows its readiness to enter upon negotiations with a view to arranging the details of a reciprocity treaty? That resolution, of course, has not passed Congress. It has not reached that stage; it has not been acted on by Congress——

Mr. BOWELL. Is it to be?

Mr. CHARLTON—but it has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, consisting, in almost even proportions, of Democrats and Republicans; and the sentiment of that committee is one, in my opinion, indicative of the action the House of Representatives will take when that question comes before that House. I ask the hon. gentleman by what authority he tells this House and the country that the United States have shown no desire or disposition to make any arrangement with regard to reciprocity, when the House of Representatives of the United States formally passed the resolution I have referred to, and when it is well known that the Senate, if it had not been so late in the Session, would have also passed that resolution, inviting this country to enter into reciprocal trade relations, and when, this very Session, a step in the same direction has been taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, indicating, so far as that movement has gone, that the United States Government are ready to enter into negotiations with us for the arrangement of a reciprocity treaty on a fair basis. I hold that the Government, in not responding to that resolution of last Session, in treating it with contemptuous silence, took the very course calculated to destroy that feeling which is necessary to lead to the negotiation and consummation of a reciprocity treaty. Then the hon. gentleman told us that this Government has continually held out an offer of reciprocity to the United States, that we have a standing offer of reciprocity on our statutes. So we have; and a standing offer of reciprocity which we know will never be accepted; which we know is not an offer of reciprocity at all, but a jug-handled, one-sided kind of offer, the advantages of which would be entirely on our own side—just that kind of offer which points to a treaty similar to that which the Americans abrogated in 1866, and which certainly they would not grant now, since they told us, in effect, that if we are ever to have a reciprocity treaty, we must have a true reciprocity treaty—one which will give them the privilege of sending something to us, as well as giving us the privilege of sending something to them. When the hon. gentleman talks of our readiness to enter into

reciprocal trade relations with the United States, he is talking of a mere deception. Every intelligent man knows that there is no hope of reciprocity on the basis of the standing offer which hon. gentlemen opposite profess to make to the United States. We have shown no desire to get a fair treaty; we have made no attempt to get one; we have, in fact, declared that we would not have a fair treaty, even if we could get one. The President of the Council, the other night, informed us that he considered reciprocity, even in natural products, would be a disaster, and the rest of the Government say they might possibly take that, but they would not go further; and the whole world knows that unless we do go further, we cannot get the thing at all. The country is not to be deceived by the position taken by the Government, —by the pretended desire of the Government to get reciprocity, and their determined action not to take it.

Then the Minister of Finance told us that the action of the Ways and Means Committee at Washington with regard to the Bill which has lately been reported, or is to be reported, the substance of which is pretty generally known, indicates merely the fixed policy on the part of the United States Government with regard to this matter, and that nothing like bitterness of feeling or a desire to retaliate for fancied wrongs which they may have, in their estimation, suffered at the hands of this Government, has to do with it—that, in fact, they never took into consideration at all the attitude of the Canadian Government and people with reference to the fiscal relations between the two countries. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I believe that the acts of the Conservative Government of this country in various matters of policy towards the United States, has irritated and produced a state of feeling in the United States which is not conducive to liberal trade relations between the two countries, and is not in the interests of the people of this country at all. We took, in my opinion, in the past, with regard to the fishery question, action which was not judicious or wise in attempting to enforce, in an arbitrary and offensive manner, the provisions of an antiquated treaty, which I do not think is defensible on the ground of international comity. The idea of telling the captain of a schooner coming into a Canadian port that she could get wood and water under the provisions of the treaty but could not buy a cask to hold the water; that she could buy material to mend a sail that was blown away, but could not buy any supplies of any description, and that she could not even land a sick man. What is the use of making regulations of that sort, which are only calculated to produce, and which did produce, the most irritating effects? We did enforce these regulations in a spirit which the Americans conceived to be a barbarous spirit, and we did produce irritation and ill-feeling, and acted in a way just the reverse of the course we should have taken if we had in view the promoting of our own interests. We have the right of sending and receiving any goods in bond through the United States by rail and of making connections with our own railways; we have never been denied access to their ports in sending goods through in transit, and yet we deny them the privilege of shipping from our country the fish they catch in our waters, and sending them in bond to the United States. We impose on them differential tolls on our canals; a vessel passing through the Welland Canal has to pay 20 cents a ton, 18 cents of which is refunded if she goes to the Canadian port of Montreal but the full amount of which is exacted if she goes to an American port; while, in the face of that, the St. Mary's Canal, which belongs to the Americans, is open to our vessels free. It cannot be asserted that this course is a friendly one, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that it has produced a great deal of irritation on the part of our neighbors. There is a little matter with which the Minister of Customs is connected, to which I may refer When we took the duty off their fruit trees and peaches, our Government had to show its animus by imposing a little tax on the peach baskets; and while we were exporting to the United States $2,000,000 worth of eggs annually, which were admitted to that country free of duty, we had the meanness to impose a duty on the boxes which contained those eggs, when they were brought back. In all these little matters we have shown a spirit which has produced irritation and invited retaliation, and the consequences of our exhibition of that spirit we are now beginning to see; and when the hon. gentleman tells us that the attitude of the Canadian Government has not had anything to do with the course taken by the American Government, I must say to him that, in my opinion, he is mistaken. Now, it is proposed to increase this duty on cattle. We propose to put an increased duty of 10 per cent. upon an import trade amounting to $140,000 a year, in order to invite the American Government to increase their duty on an export trade ten times greater, a trade amounting to $1,400,000. The whole thing is absurd. It is sheer fatuity on the part of the Finance Minister. I do not think the Finance Minister is acting in the interest of Canada or in the interest of the farmer. I desire, as much as any one, to see the farmer protected. If anything can be done to give the farmer something out of this general plunder, it should be done, but it is of no use to attempt to do anything which will not help the farmer, and, therefore, I believe that this is not a wise policy, and I believe that the general policy of this Government in its dealings with the United States has not been in the interest of this country. For these reasons, I think the Government should drop this proposed duty. It is not very material one way or the other to the farmers, so far as protection is concerned, but it is material if it invites the United States to put a heavier duty on the articles which we export to that country.

Mr. FREEMAN. I think, when the friends of the American Republic in this House are contending for the interest of the United States, they had better give up the old story they have so long repeated to this House in reference to the American fishermen being ill-used on our southern shores. I believe that the charge they bring against the Dominion Government, that they instructed their cruisers to treat the American fishermen in a manner different from that in which they should be treated by civilised, christian people, is utterly unfounded. I have some knowledge of the fact. The treatment of those fishermen came under my own observation when these gentlemen were looking after the Ontario farmers, and I think they know nothing at all about it. They have taken

up the story of some American fishermen here and there who have not been successful in poaching on our fishing grounds, and they are endorsing those statements and retailing them without any justification. Many of these stories have been proved to be false, and those hon. gentlemen know it, and yet they persist in accusing us, as Nova Scotians or as Canadians, of improper conduct, and they have gone so far as to say that the treatment of the American fishermen was brutal. That statement is unbecoming of them, it is disrespectful to their fellow-countrymen and to the flag under which we live. If those gentlemen desire to be considered as truthful in any respect, they should give up that style of debate. They accuse us of not treating the United States according to national comity. I say that we have treated them far better than we were required to do under the conditions of the treaty, and, when hon. gentlemen present the American side of that treaty to this House, and tell us that we are to be governed by the American view of it, I say they are not speaking in the interests of the people of Canada or of the fishermen of Canada, or in a way that will tend to increase that respect it is our desire we should command as a young nation. Then they talk about reciprocity. The sooner they give up wasting the time of the House in discussing reciprocity, the better. They repeat the old stories which I have heard ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has repeated the same thing four or five times to my knowledge, and I think he had better devise some new story. It will sound better and will better show that he is honest in this matter. We have heard a great deal about Mr. Hitt's resolution. What is it worth? It is worth just as much as the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was worth in this House yesterday; it is worth about as much as the paper upon which it is written. Who is Mr. Hitt, that we should regulate our legislation here according to his views? Is he the President of the United States, or do his resolutions carry more weight than the views and resolutions of any member of the United States Congress? I can give views which are of some consequence to us, views which are of some consequence in the United States Senate, and, I believe, also with the President of the United States, and those are the views of Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State. He is a man of influence, and, if we take his views into consideration on these commercial matters and on the trade relations between the two countries, we are taking hold of something of weight, something to which we might with some propriety pay attention. Let us see what Mr. Blaine's views are in regard to closer commercial relations with this country. I have here his views as he expressed them at a public meeting, either shortly before or just after the election of President Harrison. Mr. Blaine says:

"I am opposed, I am teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag and paying British taxes, and at the same time the actual cash satisfaction of entrance to the American markets."

There can be no doubt that Mr. Blaine holds those views up to this moment. He says:

"They cannot have both at the same time. If they come to us, they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, who have no part or lot with us, but choose to be foreign from us,—it is an absolute wrong for a Democratic Congress to say that they shall have the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have. So far as I can prevent it, I do not mean that they shall be Canadian and American at the same time. They can choose their side of the question and remain there."

Those are his views, and I have no doubt that the President of the United States holds the same views. While this is the case, talking about reciprocity with the United States, talking about conciliating the Senate of the United States and the American people, talking about regulating our legislation to suit their views, talking about withholding duties here and there to suit the American people—why, Sir, we are not acting like free men, we are not acting like independent men, we are not acting like those statesmen who have legislated in this Parliament in years not long gone by; I say, we are not looking to our own independence, we are not looking to our own character and to our own position, and to the building up of our own country, if we pay such attention to the people on the other side of the border. I contend, then, that it is to our interest, it is to our dignity, we owe it to ourselves, that we should legislate on the principles that were enunciated an hour or two ago by the Minister of Finance. I was pleased to hear that declaration made by him, and I venture to say, that the great majority of the members of this House were pleased to hear it, the country will be pleased to hear it, and I venture to say, that the electorate of this Dominion will uphold those principles when they next have an opportunity to speak. They will say that our legislation should be guided by the principles enunciated by the Minister of Finance, and, we have every reason to believe, that those principles are held by the right hon. the First Minister and by the other members of the Cabinet. Those are the principles of the party now in power, and if the House consults their own dignity, and the dignity of this young nation, they will adhere to them strictly.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I was rather astonished to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, mention the friends of the American Republic. I hold, Sir, that the strongest friends the American Republic has got in this House, are the Government and their supporters, and they are doing more to create an American sentiment and to kill a national sentiment in Canada, than all other influences combined. We were told that some of us had been up amongst the farmers in the Province of Ontario, talking to them and hearing their reports. I am one of those farmers who live in the Province of Ontario, and have farmed for forty-seven years. I have been up amongst the farmers of that Province, and I know their feeling and sentiments to-day, and I think I will be able to show that the tariff about to be imposed, is not in favor of the Ontario farmers, even in respect to cattle and sheep. I find that last year there were imported of sheep into the Dominion 43,215. Now, let us examine into what parts of Canada these sheep are imported. There was one imported into the Province of Ontario; into Manitoba there were imported 6,742; into British Columbia, 33,816; into the North-West Territories, 2,696. Now, I would ask, what protection the farmers of

the older Provinces are getting from the increased duty of 10 per cent. upon sheep, when only one comes into the Province of Ontario, not one into the Province of Quebec, and not one into any of the Lower Provinces. I would ask the representatives from Manitoba, from British Columbia, and from the North-West, whether this increased duty upon sheep is not an injury to the farmers of those Provinces? I would ask if the sheep brought into those Provinces are not for the purpose of stocking their farms, in order that the people may carry on farming? I hold that in this way the Government have retarded the progress of those new countries, by placing enormous duties upon what the farmers really require to stock their farms. Now, we will take cattle. I think I will be able to show, also, that no cattle come into any of the Provinces by which the farmers will be benefited by protection upon them. The total number of cattle imported into the Dominion of Canada from the United States was 748. Of these, 172 came into Manitoba, 551 into British Columbia, and 25 into the North-West Territories. From Great Britain, 59 head of cattle came into the Province of Quebec. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, unless for breeding purposes, not a single head of horned cattle was brought into the older Provinces. Cattle, also, are taken into the new Provinces, where they benefit the farmers and the settlers, and it is imposing an unnecessary tax upon them without benefiting any other class of the community, to place this duty upon cattle, when we take into consideration the great interests that are at stake in Canada, and that the duty that is being imposed upon sheep and cattle is not going to benefit the farmers in any part of Canada, but that there is every prospect that they will be grievously injured. The exports of sheep to Great Britain were 43,477; the exports to the United States were 307,775; and if the United States Government impose 30 per cent. upon sheep in the same manner that the Canadian Government now propose to do, that will destroy our trade in sheep, because I want the Government to understand that this number of sheep going to the States, is composed mostly of lambs, which we cannot export into the British market until they are one or two years old: and that has been one of the most profitable branches of sheep husbandry within these last two or three years, when the farmers could sell their lambs for $4 or $5 a head, as they could do in Ontario this last fall. If that market is destroyed, they must keep their animals, under the present stringent circumstances, and the farmers will labor under a great hardship in that respect. Now, for the 37,360 head of cattle that go into the United States, we have no other market where we could send them, under the present circumstances. They are cattle that it will not pay to fatten and take to the English market; they are the scrubs of all the stock fattened in the Province of Ontario, to a great extent. The United States is the only market we have got, and if that duty is imposed in Canada, in all likelihood the United States will raise their tariff to as high a figure, if not higher. $10 a head on cattle would entirely prevent stock of that description from being exported from the Province of Ontario to the United States. I hold that it is in the true interests of the Canadian farmer to-day to relax the duties as far as we can, if we cannot get them entirely removed from between these two great countries. The interest of the Canadian farmers is to get free trade with the United States, or reciprocity in natural products, at least, but if possible, in all products, both agricultural and manufactured. I can assure the Government that if this present tariff goes into effect it will cause a feeling in the Province of Ontario, at least, that will not be very easily allayed. They feel that the present Government is imposing burden after burden upon the agriculturists and upon the laboring men of this country, whose burdens are already too grievous to be borne, without benefiting to any extent any class of the community. The item we are discussing will not benefit the farmers in any part of Canada, and in the newer Provinces it will injure them to a great extent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I sympathise, to some extent, with the Minister of Finance. He had a splendid opportunity of doing something for his country this time. He came before Parliament and boasted he had a surplus; he regretted that the condition of the country was not all that might be desired, and apparently his surplus was not as much as he desired; and, although from one end of the country to the other there was a feeling of hard times sorely felt among almost every class of the community, the Minister, with what some of his friends would call a stroke of statesmanship, endeavored to improve the hard times by adding to the taxes of the people something like half a million dollars. This is one way of making the people better off, and it is the idea of the Minister of Finance that when he has a surplus from the revenue taken out of the pockets of the people, and when the people are complaining of hard times, that, in order to do something for the country and show that he is alive to its wants and necessities, he should come down with a tariff imposing another half million of taxes. The people are more heavily taxed now, I regret to say, than the people of almost any other civilised country in the world; indeed, I know of no country with a population of five millions which has to bear such enormous burdens as those of Canada. We have a land of which we feel proud, we have a land of great possibilities, and of great resources; but we are oppressed by taxation, and by a system of government which is restrictive in its character, tending to delay, retard and interfere with the development of the great resources we possess. We have latterly had considerable trade with our neighbors to the south of us, and it has been a valuable trade to our people. The Americans are our best customers in farm products, in everything we produce in the mines, and they are almost our only customers in everything we produce in the forests. But the Minister of Finance is cheered by his friends behind him, when he tells this House and the country that those articles that go free into the United States and which were made free by the Finance Minister who preceded him, a gentleman who had had large parliamentary experience, and who was imbued with the idea that greater freedom of trade should prevail, should no longer be free. The late Minister of Finance, after members on that side of the House had risen in their places and declared that those articles men-

tioned in that list should not go free, the then Finance Minister came down the next day and issued a proclamation to place them on the free list. He had the courage to do that which was in the best interests of the country at that time. To-day we have the statement of the Finance Minister. He says Canada is going on regardless of what is proceeding in the world around us; and the hon. gentleman appears to fold his arms and close his eyes, and not take cognisance of the great events transpiring, and he says, that is the manner in which the country should be governed. We desire enlightened statesmanship, action which will keep us abreast of the times and in harmony with the trade of the world. The hon. gentleman says that what they do in the United States or any other country is a matter of no consequence to us; we are going to govern Canada for the Canadians. And it appears we are going to limit the trade of Canada if we can, for that would be almost the only result of the tariff, and the further fact that it would impose more taxes on the people. If the hon. gentleman had been in Parliament some years ago, he would have known that the policy at that time was a different one. In 1879 there was placed a statutory offer on the Statute-book, and in that offer the Government pledged themselves that, so soon as the United States should remove the duty from certain articles mentioned, the Dominion Government would do the same. The Finance Minister came down and redeemed the honor of Canada and maintained its statutory offer; for, although the change was long delayed, and it was said the Americans had taken the duty off three years before our action was taken, yet by the strenuous efforts of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the Finance Minister rose in his place, issued a proclamation and had the duties removed. In view of the policy enunciated by the Minister of Finance to-day he should take this statutory offer from the Statute-book, for the standing offer is a standing falsehood, and for the honor of Canada it should be blotted out this Session. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, not take as deep an interest in Canada as some other hon. members, for perhaps it is not his birthplace and home, and perhaps he does not feel that we regard the statutory offer as a bond of honor and good faith; but, at all events, if it is not taken off, it should be adhered to in so far as the Americans have adhered to it.

An hon. MEMBER. You did not accept it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You accept whatever the Government tell you to accept. That is one of the difficulties that surround this matter; it is one of the difficulties of partyism. The hon. gentlemen on the back benches will accept anything, whether it is against this country or not, so long as it tends to keep the party in power. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House, or any man in this country, who believes that if it was only in the interest of trade that such a tariff should see the light of day, it would have been submitted, if it was not that it would tend to perpetuate the reign of the present party in power? The country was never considered when this tariff was conceived. This is not a policy which should be adopted in this stage of the world. We should have freedom politically and freedom in commerce; we should be free in trade, so far as it is possible in keeping with the revenue for the government of this country. We should possess all those privileges that are desirable in the interests of trade and commerce. Any other policy is calculated to be detrimental to the best interests of the country and should not be tolerated by this House. This policy of tying the hands of the people, of limiting trade, and, of going back to old exploded theories to govern this country, is something in this enlightened age which should not receive the support of the majority of members of this House. It is a standing menace to the progress of this age to think that we keep on the Statute-book a tariff in itself oppressive, cruel and disastrous to the trade and commerce of the country, and it is high time that this Government should awaken to the necessity of removing a tariff so objectionable in nearly all its features. We want in this country—we on this side of the House at least want—to see this country freed from the shackles imposed upon it by this Government. We believe that with our great resources this country is destined to take its place among the nations of the earth, if we only have freedom and liberty to work out our own destiny. The other day when I was travelling up to Toronto, I was studying a map of this country, and I was as convinced, as I am convinced I am standing here, that if we had a more enlightened system of government, if we had a tariff framed in the interest of this Dominion, we would have before long the greatest country on this continent. There is no gentleman who studies the map of Canada but who will see at once, that if we had freedom of trade, Montreal and Toronto are bound to become the most important cities on this continent. It is only this system of restriction of trade which will prevent these cities attaining the growth and dimensions we would like to see them attain. The policy of this Government has had the effect of damming the grain trade back to Chicago, and the distribution of grain which we used to have at Montreal and Toronto has gone from them now. The Minister of Finance knows that the Board of Trade of Montreal does not now publish the report of the business done in the grain business there, as they did for years formerly. I studied these reports from year to year, as I was interested in the trade done by that city, but, recently, when I sent to the library, I found there was no report published after the year 1884. I asked why this was the case? and I was answered that the secretary had died, and they apparently have not had a secretary since, so there is no report of the distribution of grain and supplies from Montreal now. Montreal used to be a great distributing point, but the tariff wall has dammed back that distribution to Chicago, and Chicago is now growing at the expense of both Montreal and Toronto. Now, Sir, about retaliation. The Minister of Finance, and some others, may consider it statesmanship to quarrel with our best customers, to whom we sell more natural products and other produce of our country than we do to any other. The Minister of Finance may have discovered—but I do not know that the country has yet discovered it—that if we have a good customer we should strike him in the face, or offend him in some such way. If the hon. Minister of Finance, with that intuition with which he seems to be eminently

endowed, has discovered that this is a way to "foster" trade, and to develop the resources of the country, he has made a very extraordinary discovery indeed. The United States are our best customers generally and it should be the policy of the Government to keep them as such. Let us consider our imports and exports in cattle, horses, sheep and swine to the United States and to England. We imported from England these animals to the value of $21,698, and from the United States we imported to the value of $286,861. We exported to England to the value of $5,226,508, and to the United States $3,531,230. Does the hon. Minister of Finance imagine that he is going to increase that trade by increasing the duties; or does he imagine, as he says he does, that this increase of duty will not invite retaliation? He seems to think that, if he raises the tariff against the United States, the Government of that country will not meet him on his own ground. It may be possible that they will not, but if they do, it would be just what would be expected by any man who holds a correct idea of the existing relations between the two countries. If this Government raised the duty, it is but natural to suppose that the United States will follow the same course, and after the warning the hon. Minister of Finance has received, it will be useless for him to say: "When I raised this tariff, nobody in this country conceived that it was done through a spirit of retaliation." The hon. Minister of Finance is not so young in politics as not to know that retaliation from us will provoke retaliation by the United States. He could not delude the youngest child of intelligence in this country with such sophistry as that, for he knows very well that if we raise the tariff, the United States, in all human probability, will retaliate. We are not depending on the United States; we have grand resources of our own; but from a business standpoint, or from a national standpoint either, we do not wish that any policy should be adopted which will provoke a feeling of irritation in the United States. If the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs beside him—who, since he got into power, has been rather mild in his temper, rather courteous in his demeanor, and rather statesmanlike to some extent—if they have the idea that the people of this country, or that the business men of this country, believe that it is to the best interest of Canada to have quarrels and irritation existing between us and the United States, I say to both hon. gentlemen that they are very much mistaken, and that I, for one, have no sympathy with any such policy. I believe it is best for us, as Canadians, that we should maintain our rights and stand firm for our country, but, at the same time, that we should give no unnecessary offence. I believe it is a mistake for the Government to pursue this policy which they are pursuing, and pursuing it, as I am told, because they are forced to do so by hon. gentlemen who sit behind them, from a monetary consideration. I do not wish that the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Customs should become craven to the United States. I do not want that, and no gentleman on this side of the House wants it; but we have seen the time when some of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs became craven enough to the United States and ate humble pie—when the late Finance Minister, Sir Charles Tupper, brought in this enactment. With regard to this tariff, I am under the impression that the best interests of Canada demand that we shall have no tariff except for revenue purposes. I believe the people of this country at present are convinced that this high protective tariff is against the best interests of this country. I believe the most matured minds of this country—always excepting the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs—believe that it is detrimental to the best interests of this country to keep up this protective system any longer, and I believe it is the duty of the members of this House to remove the tariff which is pressing so heavily on the people. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), last night spoke of the Reciprocity Treaty under which this country had such good times, and he then uttered something which almost all the people of this country know. The late Minister of Finance was one of those who believed that reciprocity was the best thing for this country; so was the hon. First Minister. My hon. friend the President of the Council, was, at one time, in favor of it also. My hon. friend at one time said that protection was legalised robbery, and uttered some other truths in reference to this system—that the country should understand that the days of protection in this country were doomed, and the members of this House should unite in opposing a system which has done nothing but injure this country ever since it was initiated. Of course, it is a little difficult to convince all our friends of the soundness of our views. One hon. gentleman got up the other night, and if I tell you what he said, it will, perhaps, show you the difficulty we labor under in trying to convert some of them. It was the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). If I remember aright, that hon. gentleman was one of those who last year, to a certain extent, relinquished party. He was led to believe that under the guise of party a great deal of evil was perpetrated in this country, and he thought the time had come when he should withdraw his allegiance from the party with which he had formerly acted. Well, he was a very respectable man, and I did not wonder at that; I gave him credit for high motives. But, the other day, when he was speaking, the old Adam appeared pretty strongly in him again. He was speaking about something my hon. friend from North Norfolk had said in regard to those grangers who had believed the National Policy would give them better prices, and who were so green down below that they had to be hung up awhile to dry. The hon. member for Muskoka, speaking of them, told us a story of a Norseman who was ill, and who sent for his missionary and asked him where his ancesters were; the missionary told him that they must be in hell burning, when the Norseman answered, "Well, I prefer to remain and burn with my ancestors, to accepting your doctrine." So the hon. member for Muskoka said, "I prefer to remain with Pluto in his dark dominions with the Tories and protection, rather than enjoy the glory of heaven with the Grits and reciprocity." Well, when we have such material as that to work upon, you can understand what a formidable task we have in trying to convert hon. gentlemen opposite. When they prefer to rule in hell, to serving in heaven on this side, the task

may well appear hopeless. But we have done it before ; we have converted some hard shells before, and we are not going to relinquish the task until we do it again. We believe there is hope for this country, and its brightest hope is in reducing the tariff to a revenue tariff, when these antiques who govern this country will have to give place to enlightened, liberal and progressive statesmen.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is quite clear, from the remarks that fell from the hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon, that the Government are disposed to act in a stand-off manner towards the Government of the United States. With regard to the statement he made that there is no indication on the part of the United States Government of a desire to enter into closer trade relations with Canada, I think the history of this country, and the facts which have come before this House, abundantly show that that statement is not correct. I think it is quite clear that the Government feel that they are so closely and absolutely committed to the maintenance of the National Policy in this country, that they are ready to sink or swim as a Government on that policy. If they fancy that they are going to catch the farmer's vote by imposing a restrictive duty on the cattle coming into this country, I think the farmers of this country will see through the hollowness and the mockery of any such proposition. The statement presented to the House by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) shows clearly that the importation of cattle at the present time is very slight, and the importation of sheep into the older Provinces is virtually nothing. In the face of that fact, the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance that the Government do not wish to be understood as making this change in the tariff in any spirit of retaliation, but simply for the purpose of protecting the interests of this Dominion, is mere mockery. It shows nothing less than a disposition on the part of this country to retaliate, and our Government take this course because they do not desire that a friendly spirit should grow up between this country and the United States, lest they might be placed in the awkward dilemma of having to refuse a proposition from the Government of that country for unrestricted reciprocity. They are exceedingly anxious not to encourage the making any overtures by that country. In every little incident which has transpired in connection with their readjustments of the tariff as regards articles coming from the United States, they have shown the most contemptible desire to act meanly and do all in their power to prevent the United States from being disposed to hold out to us any reasonable offer of trade. The statutory offer which has been referred to by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), remained on our Statute-books for over two years after the United States had removed from their dutiable list certain articles which we produce. Yet, until the attention of this Government was drawn to the fact by Lord Sackville, the British Minister at Washington, that they had not complied with their statutory offer, they never made a single move to meet the United States in the direction of freer interchange of trade ; and it was only when they were placed in such a tight position that they had, either by their own act to rescind that statutory offer or meet the Americans by the removal

of the duties, that they consented to take the latter course. Every step these hon. gentlemen have taken has been in the direction of propping up as much as possible their so-called National Policy. Why, Sir, two years ago the Minister of Finance moved an amendment to a motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which amendment clearly indicated that this Government were not willing to have an interchange of trade with the Americans, should it in any wise interfere with the operation of the National Policy. The following is the amendment :—

"That Canada, in the future as in the past, is desirous of cultivating extended trade relations with the United States, in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries of this Dominion, which was adopted in 1879, and which has since received in so marked a manner the approval of the Canadian people."

It is clear, therefore, that the existence of the National Policy is, in their view, a consideration supreme over all others. If they could by any possibility maintain that policy, and secure at the same time some little concessions from the Americans which would benefit our farming community, they would be willing to accept these concessions, but the National Policy must be maintained at all hazards and at all cost, whether the farmers suffer by it or not, and it has been clearly proved that they do suffer, and are continually becoming poorer under its baneful influence. Every change made in the tariff has been in the direction of assisting the manufacturer and of making worse the condition of the farmer. But the Government became alive this Session to their danger ; they began to scent defeat, and to realise that unless they did something to please the farming community, if possible, they might, when they next sought the suffrages of the people, not meet with those successes which they have met with in the past, and on which they so often pride themselves. In order, therefore, to persuade the farmers that they are at last going to make them rich, they have taken the same course which has been adopted by the protectionists in the United States. The Republican party in the United States gained office, and have been maintained in office, by the American manufacturers and combines ; and though, in the last elections, the vote of the people, taken as a whole, went against them, the majority against them was set at naught by manipulations of one kind or another. Warned by this vote, however, and feeling certain that, unless they can make some pretence of showing sympathy with the farming community, the probability is they will not be successful, even by their manipulations, in being returned to office for another term, they are endeavoring to make their tariff in some degree appear to benefit the farmers. I believe the course they have taken is not dictated by any opposition to freer trade relations with Canada, but simply by the fact, that they find themselves in the same position as hon. gentlemen opposite, and feel that, although they owe their office to the combines, they must make some strenuous endeavor to conciliate the farming community. In this view they have adopted a policy which is calculated to have injurious effects on this country, and in the same view hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed a duty on cattle coming into Canada, but the farmers of this country will see through the hollowness of their efforts. They

have been too long deluded and deceived to be any longer led astray. They are intelligent enough to see for themselves that such a policy cannot be of the slightest benefit so far as their interests are concerned, for if they take up the returns, they will find that there are virtually no cattle imported into this country at all. If the Government are really disposed to assist the farmer, let them admit corn free, and thus give our farmers a chance to feed cattle for export to the British market. But they do not want to do that. They pretend to want to keep out American cattle, when in reality none come in. They have put a duty on American sheep, when only one sheep was imported from the United States into Ontario last year. I hold that the Government are acting purposely with the object of hoodwinking the farmer, but they will realise when the time comes for the people to make their voice heard, that the farmers have been hoodwinked too long and are now alive to the situation. I must express my regret that the Government show this determination to act in no reasonable spirit towards the United States. I do not say for a moment that the United States have acted in that generous, high-spirited, honorable manner towards us which would be consistent with the position they occupy, but I hold that a people like ourselves, composed of only 5,000,000, and doing a large business with the Americans, who furnish us with our principal markets for our commodities, cannot afford to do anything which will restrict our trade in these markets. We are driven through necessity to trade with the United States, and in place of taking a course which tends to prevent closer trade relations being had with that country, and which is calculated to strain the kindly feeling that ought to exist between the two peoples, we ought to adopt the opposite course, and in this way help the straitened agriculturists of this country by securing to them free access to the American markets.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I cannot see the reason for the proposed increase in the duties. We have a large surplus, and I cannot see the reason why the Finance Minister thinks proper to increase the taxation which is already weighing upon the country. The other day the Finance Minister rejoiced at the large surplus, and offered it to us as a subject of congratulation, almost as a blessing for which we should thank Divine Providence, as if that money had fallen from Heaven like the manna which fed the Israelites in the desert. But we know the surplus is only the result of the moneys which have been extracted uselessly from the pockets of the people. With that surplus in hand, why is this increase in taxation demanded? Certainly the necessities of the public service do not require it. Does the Minister fear that the receipts from the Customs during the next year will not be sufficient to fill the public exchequer as they have in the past? Does he fear a deficit? That would be evidence that he is not so confident of the prosperity of the country as he professed to be; but the hon. gentleman has told the House this afternoon that the reason for this new increase of duty was to protect the different classes of this country. I can understand that a large portion of this increased duty is intended to foster the interests of the manufacturers who seem to have been, for a series of years, the pets of the Government, as if the prosperity of the country depended principally upon the prosperity of a certain class of manufacturers: but we might infer from the imposition of duties upon cattle and sheep imported in this country, that the Finance Minister pretends to give to the farmers a compensation for the heavy duties which have been imposed upon them in favor of the manufacturers. I regret to say, for the success of the scheme of the hon. gentleman, that the duties he proposes to impose on the importation of cattle and sheep, will do nothing to foster the interests of the farmer. It has already been shown, that we import a very small number of sheep and horned cattle. British Columbia, Manitoba and the North-West Territories are the only parts of the Dominion that import sheep and cattle, and they do so on account of the great distance which lies between them and the Province of Ontario. I venture to say that, notwithstanding the increase in the duty, they will prefer still to import from the States lying along their frontier, than to obtain their cattle and sheep from Ontario. But the other Provinces do not import these animals, and, while these new Provinces import a comparatively small number of them, the other Provinces export a large quantity to the United States. In fact the United States are our only foreign market for horses, sheep, wool, potatoes, poultry, eggs and hay. For the Province of Quebec especially, the exportation of hay is very important. In fact it is the main article of farm produce for the largest portion of that Province. During the Easter recess, like other members, I was at home. I met some farmers, and I find they are very anxious in regard to this matter. In that part of the country, as in most parts of the country, the farmers are in an impecunious condition, because of the small crop which they have raised and the low prices offered for what they have to sell. The only large crop they had was hay. In the southern part of the Province of Quebec, the farmers for many years have adopted the habit of producing as much hay as they can, and the only foreign market in which they can sell it is the New England States. This last year we had an abundance of hay, and very low prices are offered for it, and if this duty of $4 a ton which is proposed in the American Congress is carried, I tell the House, in all sincerity, that it will be very disastrous to our farmers for several years. I have said that the American market is the only market for a large quantity of our farm produce. By the Returns of Trade and Navigation, I see that our whole importation last year, under the head of animals and their products, and of farm produce was for the sum of $37,308,818, of which there was paid by the United States $16,262,713, or nearly 50 per cent. of the value of the whole export. I think that, with these facts before us, we cannot ignore the truth that the American market is the best market we have for the sale of a large quantity of our farm produce. If the Finance Minister persists in imposing these duties, I am afraid it will be taken advantage of by those in the American Congress who are in favor of an increased duty on the produce of the farm; I am afraid it may be used to justify the policy which they advocate, involving a duty of $4 a ton on hay, 30 per cent. on horses, cattle and sheep, 5 cents a dozen upon eggs, 25 cents a bushel upon potatoes, 30 cents a bushel on barley. This would be disastrous to the whole

of this country. I believe that the policy of this Government should be conciliatory, and not such as could be quoted by the advocates of increased duties in the States as justifiable ground for retaliation. The duty proposed to be placed on sheep and cattle will produce no revenue. It will afford no protection to the farmers of this country. If we imported sheep and cattle largely from the United States for home consumption, the duty might afford some protection, but these animals are imported in so small a quantity, comparatively, that the duty can have no effect in affording protection to the farmers of this country. Sir, I repeat that I fear that the policy adopted by this Government will provoke retaliatory measures on the other side of the line. I think our policy, on the contrary, should be one of conciliation, and that this Government should already have taken means to prevent the hostile legislation which has been initiated in the American Congress against this country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I must express my regret at the course the Government seems to think it necessary to pursue in reference to the tariff now before the House, and more especially do I regret the very harsh manner in which the Finance Minister closed his remarks previous to recess. We know full well that the Government of the day have entirely changed the views they entertained at the time they were in Opposition, when it was their avowed policy to obtain what was termed reciprocity of trade, or reciprocity of tariffs, and when they avowed their policy to be that, failing in obtaining from the American people a reciprocity of trade, that would be fair and just to the people of Canada, they would raise our tariff in such a manner as to put pressure or coercion upon the American people, and compel them to concede reciprocal trade between the two nations. When the Finance Minister charged upon this side of the House, that he held the members almost criminal who would refer to this matter, I say he made a charge that was not justified by anything said on this side of the House. A remark of that kind, falling from a Minister holding the prominent position in the Cabinet, next to that of the First Minister in the Government of this country, and in respect to the tariff before the House, was unjustifiable, and cannot fail to have a bad effect. And if there be no other reason, if the tariff would not have the effect that, perhaps, he desires it to have, the remark that he made, going broadcast to the American people, will have the effect of inducing that hostility towards the people of Canada which, no doubt, his remark was intended to provoke. When the hon. gentlemen were in Opposition they held very different views from those which they entertain now, but still we have heard from them no repudiation of the views they formerly entertained when they moved their famous resolution upon which the tariff has been founded. That resolution was couched in the following terms :—

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion, that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, would greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

That was the resolution upon which the First Minister went to the country at the time that he succeeded in misleading the majority of the electors of Canada, and there is no doubt they will sincerely regret to the latest day that they were misled. This was the principle adopted at that time, these were the views entertained, not only by the First Minister, but by all his followers, and no doubt the Minister of Finance at that time entertained very similar views to the First Minister, when we found the First Minister stating that the object of the tariff was, so far as possible, to induce the American people to grant us reciprocity in trade. Well, the First Minister made other speeches, and let us see how far they were consistent with the views entertained by the Finance Minister to-night. We find him stating, in a famous speech made at Park Hill, where he developed a great deal of the future policy that he was going to carry out when he came into power :

"The feeling in 1865, however, was very strong in favor of doing everything in our power in order to induce the Americans to renew the treaty. The Government did everything it could, and while its members were exerting themselves in that direction it would have been a suicidal course—it would have been thwarting the very purpose in view—if they had increased the taxes at that time, even to inaugurate a national policy. Because the Americans could have said: 'How can we give you a reciprocity treaty when you are increasing the duties on our goods?' Therefore, from year to year, so long as there was any hope of a renewal of the treaty, Canada declined to raise a larger revenue than was absolutely necessary to carry on the government."

Is that a correct principle now? Is it necessary to raise a larger amount of revenue at the present time than is required for expenditure? During that time the Opposition contended, and contended, I suppose, correctly, that it was the duty of the Government to raise no more revenue from the people than was absolutely required to defray the expenses of the Government. Yet we find to-day the Finance Minister stating that if we advocate anything like the principle that they advocated at that time, or if we criticise the course that the Government are pursuing, and contend that it is not in the best interest of Canada, we find him saying that we are criminally to blame, that we are inducing a feeling antagonistic to the best interest of Canada, and creating ill-feeling on the part of the people of the United States. I say, if the principle they advocated then was correct, that principle must be correct to-day. I blame the Government that they boast in glowing terms that they have a surplus of nearly two million dollars. With a surplus in the treasury, I would ask: Is there any necessity of placing upon the Statute-book legislation that may possibly have a very injurious effect upon the relations between Canada and the United States, and that at the very time when there is before the American Congress a Bill threatening to increase the duties against the people of Canada? As it has been stated to-night, let there be 5 cents a dozen placed, for instance, upon eggs ; let there be 30 cents a bushel put upon barley ; let there be an increased duty placed upon every hog that goes from Canada into the United States, upon cattle and upon everything going into that part of the country—I say it will have one of the most in-

jurious effects upon the people of Canada that any action on the part of this Government has ever had. We will be placed in a position that our best customer will be unable to further trade with us. I, therefore, feel that the course that is being pursued, and the remarks that have been made, will all tend to injuriously affect the position of Canada, so far as regards our relations with the people of the United States, and I believe that even now it would be in the interests of this country that the Government should recede from the course they have taken, and allow these resolutions to be so amended as to make the tariff a fair one in the interests of both nations. We do not need the revenue. And why should we place legislation on the Statute-book to irritate the people on the other side? There can be no other object; hon. gentlemen opposite must desire to create hostile feelings with the United States. There can be no other motive on the part of the Government than to seek to prevent that reciprocal trade which we desire to see brought about; no better course can be pursued than the one they are now following. They, no doubt, have been stimulated in this course by the resolution of Mr. Hitt, showing that the American people are holding out to us the olive branch and are ready to give us fair terms in any reciprocal arrangement. In to-night's *Globe* there is a statement of the means by which Mr. Blaine is arranging that any nation on the American continent can have reciprocal trade with the people of the United States without going to Congress for it; and with that offer held out to us, it is in our interest to so legislate as to maintain friendly feelings between these two nations, and I am, therefore, strongly opposed to the resolutions submitted to this Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. Just before six o'clock I ventured to ask the Finance Minister why he proposed to place an increased duty on sheep, and I was more than surprised at the spirit he manifested in his reply, and I was infinitely disappointed also at the tenor of his remarks. I asked a question that was entirely pertinent to his proposal, and the reply we received was a torrent of words, a torrent of abuse upon the party on this side of the House, because I proposed a question, and I did not expect that in endeavoring to discharge what I conceived to be my duty to my constituents, I would be classed among criminals by the Minister of Finance. However, I do not wonder at his having brought forward that argument on that occasion, because it is probably the only reply he was capable of furnishing. He had no meritorious answer, and he fell back on the only remaining one. I ask the hon. gentleman again, as the Finance Minister of Canada, if it is possible for him to turn from the old reply and tell us why he is imposing that duty? There can be but one or two possible reasons. It must be either for protective or for revenue purposes or for both. He has told us before that it is not necessary for revenue purposes. He has told us he has a large surplus this year and anticipates a large one next year, and therefore it is not for revenue purposes. We have shown him that, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the increased duty is not required for protective purposes. Perhaps he has not studied his own Trade and Navigation Returns. I have gone through them since six o'clock in regard to this question, and I will give him the figures both of the imports and exports of sheep, and he will see that an increased duty is not at all necessary for protective purposes or for what is called the maintenance of the National Policy. During the fiscal year closing in June, 1888, the total importations of sheep into Canada were 43,255, of the value of $81,863. The total exports of sheep for the same period from Canada to the United States were 307,775, of the value of $918,334; and dividing the trade into Provinces it was as follows:—Ontario imported one sheep; Manitoba, 6,742; British Columbia 33,816; North-West Territories, 2,696. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) asks, what in regard to New Brunswick? Neither New Brunswick, Quebec, Nova Scotia nor Prince Edward Island imported any sheep last year. So that the Provinces of Canada from Port Arthur to the Atlantic did not import any sheep, with the exception of one into Ontario. The exports during the same period by Provinces was as follows:—Ontario, 218,136, of the value of $686,865.

An hon. MEMBER. Black sheep.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman for East Durham (Mr. Ward) says "black sheep." If so, there would have been a very great many vacant seats in this House on the Government side.

Mr. BOWELL. On that side.

Mr MULOCK. Manitoba, 9, of the value of $40; Quebec, 56,965, of the value of $164,354; Nova Scotia, 249, of the value of $425; New Brunswick, 12,886, of the value of $36.239; Prince Edward Island, 16,527, of the value of $33,413. Take mutton, for the Minister of Finance suggests that there must be a tax on live sheep, otherwise the principle of protection will be evaded by the importation of the carcasses. The figures respecting mutton are as follows: Total importations from the United States during that year to the value of $13,555, exports to the value of $6,064. If we add the value of the mutton imported to the value of the sheep imported, we get $95,418, and by adding the value of the mutton exported to the United States to the value of the sheep exported we get $924,398, or a sum ten times the amount of the imports. So the Minister of Finance cannot defend this measure as one necessary in the interests of protection. Then for what purpose is it intended? It is not intended for protection, and it is not justified and required for purposes of revenue. There is only one other alternative, and it is the alternative that has been suggested; it is for the purpose apparently of preventing the United States doing what they did do a year ago, knock down one bar of the tariff wall and invite us to do the same. A couple of years ago the United States placed a certain number of articles, such as green fruits and trees, upon the free list and we followed suit in consequence of the good example set by the United States. This year, however, we find that that policy of taking down one bar when the United States took down another bar has been repudiated by our Government, and that instead of taking down they have erected a bar, of course expecting the United States to do the same. It is now proposed to increase the Canadian tariff on live stock 10 per cent. over the present tariff of 20

per cent., and of course you must expect the United States to follow suit, which, if they do, $10 will be placed on our exports for every one we place on theirs. This policy of the Government is inviting the States to retaliation, as plainly as if you said it in so many words on the Statute-book. It is well that the supporters of the Government, and the country generally should know, that this policy is bound to plunge our country into financial disaster. I have listened here for some days to hon. gentlemen professing to speak about the trade of the country, and I suppose the Minister of Finance is bound to consider the views of the House in every tariff change he proposes. There can be no doubt whatever that no more inopportune time has occurred for many a year than the present time, for making this change, disturbing our trade and entailing the country in great risks. The Minister of Finance in his Budget speech asserted that this country was reasonably prosperous. Where does he get that information? Is it from the comfortable office he occupies that he bases his opinion, or is it from an accurate knowledge of the trade of the country? It may be from an accurate knowledge of a portion of the trade of this country; but has he thought of the great consuming classes and of the agriculturists of this Dominion? Did he consider their position, when he made before this House a statement which I have ventured to think nine-tenths of the people of this country will say is incorrect. That statement of the Finance Minister has convinced me that he has failed to appreciate the true state of affairs existing in Canada and that he is unable to grasp the situation. Several hon. members who backed him up asserted the same thing. We had the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) telling us that happiness and prosperity reigned in every family in Canada; and he would not omit a single family. I wish it were so. I took up a paper to-day, *The Canadian Manufacturer*, and I found the following:—

"Canada is on the boom. Those who don't love Canada ought to emigrate. The glorious brightness of the sunshine or protection radiates Canada, and her future looks as bright and hopeful as her recent past has been under our glorious National Policy."

Such utterances as these are given forth by the Government as a reason for increasing the burdens of the people. I venture to say that the hon. Minister of Finance is entirely in error in basing—if he does base—his justification for increasing the burdens of the people on any assumption that the condition of the country is such as he and his friends think. I would infinitely prefer to think with them that the country is prosperous if I could conscientiously do so; but, knowing the contrary and deploring the condition of the country, I feel I have a painful and unpleasant duty to perform in order to prevent greater disaster to us. The Government have now full warning of the consequences of the policy they are adopting. They know that their course will, in all probability, provoke retaliation, and that the products of our farmers will be excluded from the United States' markets. The Administration, it is true, may be turned out of power on account of their foolish policy, but that will be slight compensation to the country as a whole for the loss it will sustain. The Government have been told time and again that their policy will isolate the Canadian people from their customers in the United States, but the hon. Minister of Finance says: "I have discovered a new principle of political economy; instead of trading with the nearest and most profitable markets I will revolutionise the whole principle upon which trade has heretofore been carried on; I propose that we shall not trade with any of our neighbors within three thousand miles of us, but that we shall pay tribute to the common carriers on land and sea before our produce reaches the consumer." That may be a heaven-born policy, and it may be a wise one, but nobody except the Finance Minister has yet discovered that the best trade is that by which a large portion of the wealth of the people should be expended in transferring their products to remote markets. I would infinitely prefer myself to see the Administration remain in office, if their doing so would only secure the welfare of this country. As I said before, their policy does not tend to this happy result, and although they may be turned out of power, it will be but little consolation, if, before that time arrives, they have sacrificed the best interest of the country. Before it is too late, then, the Government should cry halt, and take a broader view of the situation. The issue is: whether we should have retaliation and trade isolation or friendly feeling and profitable trade with the rest of North America. I do not intend to go into the other items, and I have merely made these remarks in consequence of the manner in which the Finance Minister has answered his question. His whole answer was, that it is criminal for us to point out the dangers he is incurring, instead of what we might have expected, a promise that he would consider the matter in its proper light, and endeavor to show the necessity or the expediency of the measure. Neither of these things has he shown, except in these wide, vague words, which really contain no argument.

Mr. WALDIE. If the hon. Finance Minister is sincere in the statement he has made to the House, that he is only proposing to increase the duty on live stock in the interest of Canada, I cannot see how he can bring that statement into line with the facts as demonstrated by the statistics which have been read by several members of this House. It is not necessary to protect us against an over-importation of meat and cattle in Ontario; and if it is a fact that sheep and cattle are imported into Manitoba and the North-West Territories and British Columbia, it is to the advantage of those outlying Provinces to obtain that live stock from the near parts of the United States; and as we are spending large sums of money to bring settlers into those Provinces, I think it would be a proper policy for this country to favor them in the importation of such articles as will go to develop their resources. I do not think an increase in the tariff on live stock will promote the interest of this country at all; on the contrary, I think it will be a misfortune. If at some future date more friendly relations should exist between this country and the United States, I would like Canadians to be able to say that we were not the first to raise the tariff wall higher between the two countries: and as it has been shown that we benefit largely from this trade, surely, in increasing the tariff against it, we are only, to use a humble simile, cutting off our nose to spite our

face. I think it is very undesirable legislation. I think the National Policy will not be injured in the least by leaving the duty on sheep and cattle at 20 per cent. I remember that a few years ago I felt called upon to make some remarks in reference to a proposed increase in the duty on printed cloths to 32½ per cent., in order to build up an industry in that line. I pointed out that if the print works would use the cotton cloths manufactured in other manufactories from looms which were then standing idle, it would be much better for the country; and if due weight had been given to my words, it would have been very much better for the print works and for those who put their money in them. This is not to the point, however, except as an illustration that sometimes we may run the National Policy into the ground, and entail a large sacrifice on the people of this country. I think, by raising the duty on live stock, you are doing an injury to the very class you propose to protect, and benefiting no one. I think it is a mistaken policy, and I trust that the Government will yet withdraw the resolution, and permit the duty to remain at 20 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to prolong the discussion; I only wish to call attention to the statement which has been repeatedly made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to the effect that we are adopting a policy which is likely to bring about retaliation on the part of the United States. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) spoke of that more directly than almost any other hon. gentleman; and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, says that it would be much better if Canadians in the future, could say that they were not the first to increase the duty. Now, it seems to me that the whole object of the hon. gentlemen opposite in this discussion, has been to show that we have adopted a policy which is likely to induce the American people to impose heavier duties on goods sent from this country to the United States. That would be well enough if it were not patent to the whole world through published telegrams, and more particularly within the knowledge of the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken, that the Committee on Ways and Means have already laid before Congress and published to the world a proposition to increase the duties on all the articles which have been under discussion in this House to-night. The hon. member for North York dissents from that by shaking his head. I hold in my hand the New York *Tribune* of 21st March just seven days before the Finance Minister made his statement, which contains the whole of the amended tariff as proposed in the United States Congress; and we all know that days and weeks before the particulars were published, announcements were made of the intention of the American people to increase the tariff particularly on agricultural products, and in every way to protect the farmer. I find by this schedule which I hold in my hand that they propose to put a duty of $30 per head on all horses valued at $150, $10 per head on cattle, $1.50 per head on hogs and $1.50 per head on sheep, which on a sheep worth $4 is 30 per cent. or 37½ per cent., on a sheep worth $5, the value given by the hon. member for South Huron. So that we had before us the fact that long before any proposition was made to this House, a proposition was laid before Congress to increase the duties much beyond what we have proposed.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was merely a proposition.

Mr. BOWELL. I know it is a proposition; I know it is not law; but what I desire to point out is that the Americans had made a proposition to do that which hon. gentlemen are alleging our act will induce them to do.

Mr. MITCHELL. A portion of them wish that done—that is the whole extent of it yet.

Mr. BOWELL. If I have any knowledge of the working of American institutions, I think the American people, whether Democratic or Republican, judging from the results of their late elections, have no more idea of reducing their tariff than we have of reducing ours; and I assure you, so far as the Government of this country is concerned, we have no such intention. If hon. gentlemen opposite speak as free traders, one must pay them every respect, if they entertain their opinions honestly, as I hold my opinions on protection honestly; we have a right to differ. It is not only unpatriotic, but it is not likely to accomplish the objects these gentlemen have in view, if they are honest in their intentions, of having these duties not imposed by Congress. The politicians in the United States, the Congress and the House of Representatives, have been induced by the speeches of these hon. gentlemen, made not only in this House, but throughout the country, to take the course they have adopted. We never heard anything about the imposition of a duty of 5 cents a dozen on eggs until we had Mr. Wiman and the commercial unionists and the unrestricted reciprocityists howling—I use that word advisedly—from every stump and platform in the Dominion about what a ruinous thing it would be to us Canadians if a duty were imposed upon eggs. The American people are just as keen and alive to their own interests as are the gentlemen who are constantly announcing this policy and uttering these sentiments. The policy of the Americans has been, from Jefferson's time down to the present, to absorb the whole of this continent, and I firmly believe that the course pursued by the gentlemen who have just spoken and the speeches, such as those we have heard to-night, have, even if not uttered with that object, had the effect of inducing the Americans to do precisely what they indicate by their proposed tariff they will do. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the speech he made to-night, made three or four statements which are not strictly accurate. He stated that the tonnage dues and the tolls imposed upon vessels going through the Welland Canal were refunded if the vessel landed her cargo at a Canadian port, but that if she went to an American port they were not. I do think that the hon. gentleman, when he made that statement, must have known that a vessel passing through the Welland Canal and discharging her cargo in the city of Kingston, pays just as much tonnage dues and tolls as a vessel that goes to Oswego.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not if she goes to Montreal.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman had stated that, his statement might not have been misleading

to the public. What he stated was that if she went to a Canadian port she was refunded the tolls, and I wish to point out that that statement is not correct. If she went to Montreal, that is a different thing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is not Montreal a Canadian port ?

Mr. BOWELL. Are not Toronto, Hamilton, Kingston, Prescott and Brockville Canadian ports, just as much as Montreal ? It is these half truths that mislead the people on the other side of the line and incite them to do that which they never otherwise would think of doing. The hon. gentleman never fails to read us a lesson upon our duty with regard to reciprocity. Well, I suppose if reciprocity is good in one thing, it ought to be in another. Yet almost every session, for the last two or three sessions, the hon. gentleman has thrown the weight of his influence and his ability against reciprocity in wrecking. I approve of the course he took in that respect, but it is not strictly consistent with the principles and the doctrine he has laid down to-night. Some people have been uncharitable enough to say—I would not say so—that he took this course because he is interested in wrecking tugs. That is unfair, and it would be unparliamentary to say so, but I have heard it said. The hon. gentleman spoke of the hardships suffered by the Americans from our regulations under the fishery treaty, which he termed an antiquated treaty, and his statements in this respect were equally inaccurate. He knows that one of the provisions of that treaty permits any vessel to come in and get a puncheon of water if required ; and even if the Canadian Government were so unfeeling as to refuse this, there would be good cause, not only for the American Government, but for the world, to set its face against any such action. But, we never did refuse this privilege, and we had no right to refuse it ; and even if we had the right, we never did. When has there been any case in which a vessel has been reported to the Government as being in distress through lack of food or water, or for the want of repairs, or anything else of the kind, to enable her to sail from port in which all the privileges desired have not been conceded ? There have been violations of the law, it is true, and it was necessary for the Government to see that the provisions of the law were respected and obeyed ; but there is scarcely a week, even at present, in which concessions are not made to American vessels, to which they have no right under the treaty, when it is considered advisable and in the interests of humanity that these concessions should be made. I repeat again that speeches and statements of that kind, emanating from members of this House, have done more to mislead the people of the United States, and to induce them to adopt a policy which may, in some instances, militate against the interests of Canada, than anything else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I confess I am rather astonished at the speech which has been addressed to this House by the Minister of Customs. The hon. Minister declares that the hostile feeling exhibited by the Congress of the United States in their proposed legislation is due to speeches and to observations made by hon. gentlemen on this side.

Mr. BOWELL. I believe they have incited.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I deny that altogether. I maintain that it is the action of the Government which has created that feeling. I maintain that the action of the sub-committee of Congress is entirely due to the course taken by hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches. It is not very long since the Finance Minister informed this House that this country would not suffer even if the United States were to legislate with the view of putting an end to the traffic between Canada and that country, and that the effect of such a measure would be simply to build up our own Atlantic cities ; and hon. gentlemen opposite, over and over again, have declared themselves in favor of a policy which would keep, as they said, Canada for the Canadians. These hon. gentlemen have themselves declared that it is in the interests of this country to adopt a policy of retaliation. The Finance Minister has told us that it would be little short of criminal to say that the action of the Government has for its object the carrying out of a retaliatory policy. But, what has the Minister of Customs just now informed us? What justification does he give this House for the proposed legislation of the Government ? He tells us that the American people, assuming that the sub-committee of the House of Representatives represents the American people, have taken a certain line, and that the line they have taken is a justification of the course adopted by this Government. Why, the hon. gentleman intimated that the Government are adopting, by way of anticipation, a retaliatory policy, and in making this statement he has committed what the Finance Minister says is little short of a crime. It is not the doing of the act, according to the Finance Minister, which is criminal, but it is the confessing that you are doing the act. That is what is criminal. It is the warning spoken from this side, after the consummation of that act, that is offensive. The Government are at liberty to pursue a policy detrimental to the best interests of the country, a policy little short of ruinous to the agricultural population of the country. In carrying out that principle, the hon. gentlemen ought to be allowed to do so without any protest or any criticism from this side of the House. We would suppose that we had no longer parliamentary government in this country, that hon. gentlemen were to be allowed to carry out any policy they pleased, supported, as they are, by the majority at their back, and that it would be almost criminal to criticise their action or the policy they pursue. Does the hon. gentleman forget the resolution which was proposed by the present First Minister in 1878, and supported by the present Minister of Customs ? What was the object of proposing that policy of retaliation ? Was it because they said protection was a policy which should be adopted ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No ; it was simply that retaliation should be adopted as a means to an end. Any one who reads the resolution will see that it was stated in that that a reciprocity of tariffs should be adopted in order to bring about a reciprocity of trade. It was not to establish a system of protection in this country, but it was to obtain free trade with the United States, and in order to obtain that, the hon. gentleman was prepared to

adopt a system of retaliation, in order to bring the American people to terms. At all events, that is what those hon. gentlemen told the people they proposed to accomplish, and it was on that ground that they deluded the country into supporting them. They were going to convert towns into cities, villages into towns, and they were going to furnish a home market for all the products of this country. It is true they have not said much about reciprocity. They have said that the American people would not agree to that; but the true sentiment came out the other night, when the President of the Council told us that it would be ruinous to the agriculturists of this country if they were to secure reciprocity of trade with the people of the United States. That proves that these gentlemen were not candid, that they were not dealing frankly with the people of Canada, or with the agricultural population in particular, when they said they desired a reciprocity of trade with the United States, but could not get it. It is now obvious that they can get it, that reciprocity between the two countries can be secured, but these hon. gentlemen are seeking to prevent the consummation of this reciprocity by the adoption of a tariff which will effectually prevent any intercourse or communication between the two countries. Two years ago, the hon. gentlemen came down to this House and undertook to give effect to their standing offer under a threat which had been made by the United States. They passed an Order in Council and telegraphed in haste that the Order in Council was passed, in order to prevent retaliation on the part of the United States. Was that because they did not approve of the policy they had been following, or that they did not desire to impose a tax on certain products? Not at all. It was simply because they knew that the public sentiment of this country was against them on that question, and so they were obliged to yield, notwithstanding the protest made by many of the hon. gentlemen behind them. The hon. gentleman says it was not their action which has produced this irritation in the United States, but it was the speeches made on this side, that we were inviting the United States to make war on this country. Is that true? No; it was the Minister of Finance, when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who produced this feeling of irritation. When the late Minister of Finance went to Washington he found, as he stated, that a few years before he could not find any one supporting the claims of the New England fishermen, but then he found that their claims were supported by sixty millions of people. What was the cause of that?

Mr. BOWELL. It was your speeches.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it was the arbitrary action of the Minister of Customs, who conducted the business of his office in relation to the United States in a manner as impotent as it was insolent; and the impotence of his action was shown by the course he pursued in several cases. The hon. gentleman did not dare to give effect to the policy which he had adopted. He said that, under the treaty, the American fishermen could come into the ports of the Maritime Provinces for wood and water and necessary repairs. There was no doubt about that; but, in addition to what the treaty allows, the comity of nations allows other things which the Minister of Finance, when Minister of Fisheries, denied. He would not permit an American fishing vessel to purchase a dollar's worth of sugar or a bag of potatoes; and, when we were in a condition of dependency on the United States for communication between the west and the east, he would not allow them to tranship fresh fish to be sent to their own markets. Yet he would try to make out that the ill-feeling or irritation which existed was not produced by him or his colleagues, but by the speeches of members on this side of the House. The Minister of Customs dismissed a man for doing a simple act of humanity in the port of Halifax. The hon. gentleman says we have produced this condition of things. He knows that the fabric which has been erected with so much care and at such an enormous cost to the people of this country, which has done yeoman service to hon. gentlemen opposite, is about to fall about their ears. He hopes now to delude the farmers a little longer. He hopes to make the great agricultural Province of Ontario believe that, by keeping out one sheep, enormous advantages will accrue to the farmers of that Province. It it true that he may keep out thousands of sheep from British Columbia, but is that going to assist Ontario, or is he going to impose upon the people of British Columbia the payment of a large amount for the transportation of these animals from Ontario? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that he is going to do anything at all by this tax on domestic animals? The hon. gentleman, after his leader has declared that the policy of the party is to obtain reciprocity of trade by means of what he calls a reciprocity of tariffs, says it was little short of criminal to accuse his party of having any such intention. I have never before heard any one say that it was little short of a crime to accuse any one of endeavoring to fulfil the promises made to the people of this country. The hon. gentleman had better read what is not ancient history, but what his friends and he himself have promised to the people, before he accuses those who assume that he intends to fulfil his obligations of something little short of a crime. Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance has done another thing, he has informed the House that he expects under the existing tariff to have a very large surplus, and, not content with that, he proposes to increase that surplus. Now, I suppose that no one would seriously maintain that the Government had a right to one dollar more from the people of this country than is required for the purposes of state. The money, the capital, the income of the people of this country, are the products of their own industry. That money belongs to them, it does not belong to the state, and the state is only justified, through the representatives of the people, in taking just so much as is required for state purposes. The hon. gentleman has told us that he has a very much larger sum than is required, and still he proposes to take more. I say he has no right to take more; I say more than that—the hon. gentleman, according to the doctrine laid down by his predecessor in office, and by every Minister of Finance, I believe, in every other country in the world where a financial system is recognised, has no right whatever to a surplus. The hon. gentleman has no justification then, as a matter of revenue, for the increased taxation. What did the Minister of Customs say on a former occasion? If I recollect rightly, the Minister of Customs has

maintained that it is not to the advantage of a Government to have a very large surplus—that it tends to extravagance.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think you can find that statement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman repudiate the doctrine ?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in the witness box.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My impression is that that doctrine was proclaimed on one very important occasion by a very large number, and it was certainly supported by the vote of the hon. gentleman, if it was not supported by his speech.

Mr. BOWELL. I never had an opportunity, while you were in power, to talk of having a surplus.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is thinking of the deficits that existed from 1884 to 1887. I think the hon. gentleman has got the wrong decade in his mind, or he would not have made the observation he has just made. It is perfectly clear that the Finance Minister has given to this House no justification whatever for the proposed increase in the tariff, and the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him and support him would be derelict in their duty if they permitted him to add to the burdens of the people of this country without first clearly establishing the necessity for those burdens. But the hon. gentleman has not done that ; he has simply declared that he is going to give certain classes of people protection, and he proposes to do that without any attempt to reduce the taxation of this country, with the view of keeping the amount of revenue within the requirements of the state.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should not have taken the floor again but for one remark made by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. While on my feet, before referring to that matter, I may say that the hon. gentleman has evidently mistaken the purport and significance of the action of the Committee of Ways and Means at Washington. He evidently supposes that in the United States, as here, when a tariff is introduced into the House, it becomes law. That is the case with our tariff, but, in the United States, the practice and mode of doing the thing is entirely different. The Tariff Bill, if I am correctly informed, has not yet been reported by the Committee of Ways and Means. The report the hon. gentleman read, and which appeared in the New York *Tribune*, was merely information furnished by a correspondent as to what he supposed the features of the tariff were, from the best information he could obtain, but I think the Bill itself is not yet circulated, certainly at the time that report was published in the *Tribune* the details of the tariff were not fixed upon. But when that Bill is reported from the Committee to the House of Representatives, it is then acted upon by the House of Representatives, and it may be, and in all probability will be, very materially changed by that House. The next step in the matter is to send that Bill to the Senate, when it goes to the Finance Committee of the Senate, and there the features of the Bill may be greatly changed. After the action of the Senate upon the Bill, if material changes have been made in it, there is a conference between the two Houses in order that an agreement may be come to, and a settlement arrived at of the differences of opinion that exist between the two with regard to the Bill. This Bill is, in point of fact, in course of formation, and the course of this Government, whatever it may be, has just as much effect upon the character of that Bill and the form it will assume, as if nothing had yet been done with regard to it. So that the action the Government is taking now is a direct invitation to the retaliation, that the American Congress can, and in all probability will, inflict ; and this action is more dangerous at this time than it would be if the tariff measure was not under consideration there, and for that reason the action taken by this Government is in the highest degree injudicious. That Tariff Bill has got to pass through three or four phases; it has got to pass the House of Representatives; it has got to go to the Senate and pass the Senate Finance Committee; then, if there are differences of opinion, they have got to be adjusted by a conference of the two Houses. In the meantime this legislation is producing its natural effect upon the features of that Bill.

But, Sir, what I rose particularly to refer to, was an insinuation made by the Minister of Customs with regard to myself ; and I wish to say that if it is to be the policy of that gentleman—and I desire the attention of the Minister of Customs to this matter—and if it is to be the policy of the other members of the Government and of their supporters, that when a member on this side of the House is so unfortunate as to agree with him upon any line of policy, he is to be insulted with insinuations of base motives for having done so, I think, for one, that I will refrain from agreeing with the hon. gentleman on any matter whatever. With regard to my action upon the Bill for reciprocity in wrecking, the hon. gentleman insinuated that I was actuated by personal motives, and that I was opposed to reciprocity in a matter where my own personal interests were opposed to it, while I was in favor of reciprocity on broad general grounds. Now, I think the hon. gentleman, if he reflects for a moment, will be convinced that the position I took upon that matter was a position in favor of a wider reciprocity than the American Government offered to us. They desired reciprocity purely in wrecking. I represented that mere reciprocity in wrecking, without an addition to the offer, was useless to us, that we could not even engage in the business of wrecking upon the American coasts of the great lakes without we had reciprocity in towing as well, because we could not tow a wreck from any point upon the American coast to any dry dock upon the great lakes, without engaging in the business of coasting, as all the dry docks nearly are on the American side, and for that reason my Bill simply provided for reciprocity in wrecking and reciprocity in towing ; it simply enlarged the scope and provisions of reciprocity as contained in the American Bill. Yet the hon. gentleman, who agreed with me perfectly, makes insinuations to-night, and says : The hon. gentleman is reputed to own tugs, and he would not say, but it had been insinuated, that he had a personal motive in this matter. Now, I think that was unworthy of the Minister of

Customs. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the only regular wrecking job I ever engaged in was to take one of my own vessels off. I am not engaged in wrecking as a business. It was merely with reference to my desire to see an important Canadian interest on the lakes preserved, and not sacrificed, that I took the position I did. I make this statement because I do not wish to allow the insinuation made by the Minister of Customs to go to the country without an answer that I deem it proper to make at this time. I think if the Minister of Customs had reflected for a moment upon the matter, he would not have made the statement that he did make in order to throw discredit upon the position that I had taken with regard to reciprocity.

Mr. SPROULE. You have been wrecking vessels, and now you are trying to wreck the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am trying to wreck a very unworthy Government at the present moment. The Minister of Customs tells us that retaliation has been induced by the speeches on this side of the House. I tell him that he differs widely from his friend the Finance Minister, who told us at an earlier period this evening that the action of this country had nothing whatever to do with the matter, that it was the fixed policy of the American Government to give protection, and that the action of this Government, whatever it might be, would have nothing to do with the action of the American Government. I think the two Ministers had better reconcile their views upon this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to enter into the personal matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If I did, perhaps I could show him that he is still further interested in wrecking than he desires to lead this House to believe he is.

Mr. CHARLTON. What if I were?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not find any fault. If such be the case, you should not deny it; that is the only point I desire to make. I now desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He is accustomed to use very strong language, not only when in Opposition but on all other occasions. I challenge that hon. gentleman to find in any correspondence, in any act of the Customs Department, in any other negotiations that have taken place, in which I had anything whatever to do, in connection with reciprocity or with the violation of what is termed "The Fishery Treaty," either directly or indirectly, any language ever used by me or in any document issued, which can be characterised as impudent or insolent. If I hurled back that language as applicable to the hon. gentleman's speech, perhaps it might not be parliamentary, but it would be strictly correct. In all the negotiations, in all the despatches that have been laid before Parliament, there is nothing to justify the statement made by the hon. gentleman; and more than that, there is not a single case in which the detention of a fishing vessel has taken place, and charges had been made of inhumanity on the part of the Canadian Government, but the parties failed to prove it when an investigation took place. The documents, correspondence and the despatches with the United States, together with evidence which are of official record, are now before Parliament, and that record sustains the position I take; and yet with these facts, read by the hon. gentleman himself, I have no doubt—for he is a careful student, and there are very few matters of this kind that pass his scrutiny—he makes such a statement. I repeat there is not a single case in the record in which he can show, that after thorough investigation had taken place, the Canadian Government, while acting strictly within the law, at the same time acted in a manner that was humane to those who desired help, and that the charges which had been made against them were utterly false and fallacious.

Mr. BARNARD. I desire, before a vote is taken upon this item, to say a few words in reference to the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) to-night, in regard to British Columbia. Both those hon. gentlemen appeared to extend their sympathy to that Province; in fact, sympathy seems to be the order of the day for our poor neglected Province. Sympathy was extended to Victoria last Session by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). That hon. gentleman seemed very much exercised over the fact that the China steamers did not call at the port of Victoria. Again this Session we had further sympathy extended to the miners of British Columbia who were handicapped, as it was contended by the hon. gentleman who introduced a resolution on that occasion, I refer to the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), owing to the serious effects resulting from the fact that mining machinery is not admitted free of duty. I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are beginning to realise that there is such a Province as British Columbia. During their term of office, from 1874 to 1877, those hon. gentlemen did not seem to sympathise with British Columbia, and in fact they were hardly aware that such a Province existed, and they did everything to prevent its development and nothing to further the interests of that Province. After the elections of 1874 the people of British Columbia returned a solid contingent to support hon. gentlemen opposite, but the people of that Province, during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, discovered that their ideas were so contracted and their opinion of the country was so small, and they were so ignorant of our resources, that they were unable to do anything for us. They did nothing for us beyond misleading us, and they showed no disposition whatever, to carry out the terms of union and build the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They did not give gold mines to a Yankee speculator.

Mr. BARNARD. I shall be glad to talk with the hon. gentleman about gold mines at any time he wishes to discuss the matter. The result of the attitude of the Government of that day was that after the elections of 1878 no member was returned to support that party.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They support whichever party is in.

Mr. BARNARD. Now the sympathy of hon. gentlemen opposite is extended to British Columbia in the hope that they may thereby catch a few votes at the next election, but the people of that

Province are not going to be misled by them. I was surprised at the ignorance shown by those hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) referred to the fact that British Columbia did not desire an increase of duty on fresh meats. A portion of British Columbia will, perhaps, be seriously affected by this increase, but there are the ranching and farming interests, and those interests are as great as those of Ontario. We can raise all the sheep and cattle required to feed the people of British Columbia, and of Ontario as well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many do you import?

Mr. BARNARD. The farmers and ranchemen want protection and some encouragement. They desire an assurance that when they raise sheep and cattle they will not be brought into competition with stock from Oregon and Washington Territory, from which large quantities of cattle and sheep are being shipped into Victoria and Vancouver. British Columbia has enjoyed exceeding prosperity, I am glad to say, since 1878, since the return of the Conservative party, and it will continue to be prosperous; and I do not think that the sympathy extended by hon. gentlemen opposite, who are so thoroughly inconsistent and who showed no disposition to assist the Province when they had an opportunity of doing so, will be accepted with good grace.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House protest against the excessive rate of taxation levied on all parts of the country and of the increase proposed. If, however, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barnard) finds it to be highly desirous to have excessive taxation heaped on the people of British Columbia, why, of course, the Government will endeavor to satisfy the hon. gentleman. They have been able in that respect to satisfy most of the Provinces, and I suppose, if the hon. gentleman makes a strong appeal for a little additional taxation that may bear more particularly on his Province, the Government will be able to accommodate him, for they can accomplish a good deal in the way of levying taxation. With respect to the statement of the Minister of Finance, that we had an indication of the feeling of the United States in the introduction of the McKinley Bill prior to the resolutions he submitted, I would ask him if there is not equally as strong reason to say that the feeling in the United States is in favor of reciprocal trade relations? Has there not been a resolution proposed in favor of the appointment of commissioners to confer with commissioners appointed by this Government? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that that is simply a resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and one which has not passed the House. Granting this, is it not also proved that the McKinley Bill is the report of a sub-committee not adopted by the whole committee, and not submitted to the House. It must also be remembered that a tariff measure in the United States is not put through Congress as a tariff measure is put through here. When this Government introduces a set of tariff resolutions, the action is taken by a responsible Government, which takes its stand on those resolutions, and is supported by its friends in the House. With respect to the item

under consideration, I desire to repeat the question asked by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), what is the object of increasing the duty on horned cattle, sheep and swine? The object cannot be to secure revenue. If it were to secure revenue the action would be blamable, because he has told us that he expects a surplus of between two and three million dollars. That, we claim, is taking taxation from the people which is not required, and, therefore, unjustifiable. If it is not on that ground, on what ground is it then? Is it on the ground of protection to the farmers? I am inclined to think that a great many gentlemen opposite intend to plume themselves under that head, and to set this forth as an evidence that this Government is looking after the interests of the farmers and is protecting them. Let us look into that question a little and see if it will bear investigation. Let us see what amount of horned cattle was imported into Canada, and the Provinces into which they were imported, and then we will know whether this duty will have any effect in benefiting the farmer. The total imports of horned cattle for home consumption, last year, were to the value of $21,750. Why were these wanted? Simply because we had not enough horned cattle to supply our own wants? No. We find that our export of horned cattle last year was $5,708,126. If we have that surplus to export and only required to import $21,750, gentlemen opposite will see at once that the imposition of 30 per cent. on horned cattle will fail in any protection to the farmer. Now, where does that little import of $21,750 come in, and how? I find that $3,323 worth came into the Province of Manitoba, and why? Because Manitoba wanted it; $17,907 worth went into the Province of British Columbia, because the people of British Columbia wanted it for food; $520 went into the North-West Territories, and these two Provinces and the Territories monopolise the whole import of foreign cattle into Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Barnard), told us that British Columbia was a great ranching country.

Mr. COLBY. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that horned cattle could not very well be imported largely into the other Provinces, because the quarantine regulations are such that they are not permitted to come into these Provinces without going into quarantine.

Mr. HESSON. He did not know that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I did not know it, I have no doubt that the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) did, and if he did not know it, I believe it is possible that measures might be taken by members on his own side of the House to try and force it into his head. Does the hon. the President of the Council seriously mean to argue that that was the reason why cattle were not imported into the other Provinces?

Mr. COLBY. I was reminding the hon. gentleman of the fact.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not forgotten the fact, but what bearing has it on this question? When you have $5,000,000 more than you want to export, why do you import horned cattle at all? Now the hon. member for British Columbia (Mr. Barnard) has told us that this duty will be a great protection to the farmers and to the ranching men

of British Columbia, because they not only grow enough cattle for their own use, but they can export larger quantities. Well, I have given you the imports to British Columbia, and there are some exports from British Columbia as well.

Mr. BARNARD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will first tell you what was the export of horned cattle from British Columbia. You exported two horned cattle to the value of $30. Now, these facts teach us simply that the cattle that came into British Columbia must of necessity have been imported for the food of the people.

Mr. BARNARD. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. Minister of Finance mean to tell me that he is going to benefit the farmers of Ontario and Quebec, of Nova Scotia or of New Brunswick, to the extent of that $21,750 worth of imports, by the imposition of an extra duty of 10 per cent.? Why are these cattle imported into these Provinces from the United States? Simply because they can import them, and pay the duty, at a cheaper price than they can transport them from this part of the country to those distant Provinces. Therefore, I say the proposition of the hon. Minister, as far as horned cattle is concerned, is but a means to tickle the fancy of the farmers, and to give an opportunity to hon. gentlemen opposite to say to them, on the platform, that they are giving them protection. That statement only needs to be investigated for the farmers to realise that this is but another attempt by hon. gentlemen opposite to pretend to give them a benefit, while in reality they are giving them nothing at all. Now, Sir, let us enquire into the imports and exports of sheep. I find that last year there was a total import of sheep to the extent of $81,863, and there was a total export amounting to $1,263,125. How do the hon. gentlemen propose to protect sheep to the farmer? How will they say that they have benefited the farmer by this extra duty of 10 per cent., when there is a surplus of sheep to export to the amount of $1,263,125, as compared with an import of $81,863. Again let us look at the Provinces into which these sheep were imported, and let us ascertain the reason why they were imported. Ontario imported one sheep, Manitoba imported sheep to the value of $13,355, British Columbia imported to the value of $63,037, and the North-West Territories to the value of $5,456. Why did these Provinces import sheep? Simply because they wanted them?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, British Columbia could not have wanted sheep.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). British Columbia did not want them; but I find that not one single sheep was exported from British Columbia, while the hon. gentleman has told us that it is a great ranching country, growing a surplus of all kinds of cattle, and that the Province will derive benefits from this tariff. Sir, this proposed policy of the Government is on a line with their general dealing with the farmers, and it is as well that the farmers should understand how the matter stands. The farmers have not forgotten that when, and before, the National Policy was introduced, how hon. gentlemen opposite pitied the farmers; how they pointed to the low price of wool in those days, and how they pointed out that it was because the Mackenzie Government would not impose a duty that the price of wool had fallen. These hon. gentlemen then said: Put us in power, we will put a duty on wool and we will raise the price of that article. The country took them on the promises they made and returned them to power. They came back to power and they introduced the National Policy. They put a duty on the articles that the farmer had to buy, but, on the articles he had to sell, and of which he produced a surplus, it was impossible for them to protect him. But, there was the article of wool which they did produce enough of—this article about which there was such a cry that the Mackenzie Government did not put a duty on. Did the present Government protect wool when they came into power? No; wool was left on the free list just as it had been before. The next year, pressure was put on the Government, because a number of their supporters waited upon them, and they found that their constituents at home had told them that the Government had deceived them on this matter of wool. Their supporters said to the Government that something must be done, and then they hit on this device, which declared in fact, if not in words, that, in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, the farmers of this country are so blindly ignorant that they could not see through so transparent a device. What did they do then, and what is their law to-day? It puts a duty of 3 cents a pound on all these kinds of wool that we do not import, while all the kinds that we do import come in free. While we export only $217,600 worth, we import $1,605,385 worth of free wool and only $607 worth of dutiable wool. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to protect the farmers, this is an article on which they can protect them. I think these things only need the ventilation they have had to-night in order to show the farmer that whatever has been the object of this increase of 10 per cent. it will fail in any way to benefit him, and if it is for revenue it is unjustifiable, because the hon. Minister of Finance says that he will have a surplus of $2,000,000. As protection to the farmer it is worthless, because the imports are only for Manitoba, British Columbia and the North-West Territories, and the increase of the duty does not afford a particle of encouragement to the farmers of the older Provinces, because they cannot ship to those Provinces even with the increase of duty. But, as has been remarked by gentlemen on this side of the House, what is objectionable in these resolutions, introduced at this time and in the spirit in which they are introduced, is this: It is idle, and worse than idle, for hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to lay any blame upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for speaking of measures as introduced in a retaliatory spirit, because it has been the boast of the party opposite that Canada could hold her own without the United States; their boast has been that they would bring the United States to terms, and that it was for that very reason that they introduced their National Policy. Sir Charles Tupper, in the Maritime Provinces, called the people to the Conservative banner by the statement that the object of protection was to force the Americans to give them the reciprocity in trade which they desired. Actions speak louder than words. Hon. gentle-

men have spoken of the introduction of the McKinley tariff as an indication of the firm intention of the United States Government. It has been pointed out that that may not indicate the real state of feeling on the part of the American people, for it may not pass through Congress as it is. But if hon. gentlemen assume that actions speak the feeling of the American Government, then their actions speak their feelings—that they intend to go on with their policy as a means of forcing the United States to give us reciprocity; and if the United States do not do that, they will give them tit for tat, as they say, and do it at this time when it is not for the interest of the country that the estrangement which unhappily exists to a limited degree between the two countries, should be strengthened. Sir, the objection to all such legislation as this is, that it gives aid and comfort to that element in the United States whose views find expression in the McKinley tariff. We do not desire that that action on the part of this Government or this Parliament should be taken. Nor do we desire a cringing attitude towards the United States. We do not desire to waive one particle of our rights; but we do desire, when there is to be found in that country a class of men of nobler and broader views, as expressed in the resolution introduced by Mr. Hitt, that the legislation of this House should be actuated by the same broad and liberal spirit.

Mr. BARNARD. The last speaker, I am afraid, displays as much ignorance of British Columbia as those who have preceded him. The hon. gentleman is not aware that British Columbia has increased in population from 25,000 to more than 100,000 in the last five years, and that the sheep and cattle have not increased in proportion. Many of the people have come from the States, where the hon. gentleman is afraid people are going to, and the population is increasing so fast that the stock-raisers are not able to keep up with the demand, and they want protection, in order to prevent cattle and sheep from coming in from the other side, where there is a surplus.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has not, I am afraid, looked after the interests of his constituents as well as he should have done. From what the hon. gentleman says, the Province from which he comes still does need a supply of cattle to meet the demands of the ever-increasing population.

Mr. BARNARD. What about the North-West? Have they not cattle there?

Mr. FISHER. Not by any means enough for their own needs. They are asking for them all the time, and they have even applied to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for a relaxation of the quarantine arrangements for the people of British Columbia and the North-West, so that they may be able to bring in cattle from the United States. While the hon. gentleman is no doubt looking after the interests of his own constituents, who are cattle dealers and drovers, we have not heard from the other members from British Columbia. I suppose the hon. member for Victoria, and hon. gentlemen representing constituencies where they have not enough cattle to supply their wants, are quite willing to throw a little more money into the hands of the ranchemen who wish the rest of the people of British Columbia to be forced to pay them higher prices for cattle than they have been paying in past years. This is the meaning of the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He tells us that the ranchers in British Columbia have now reached the point when they can supply their own market, and they want to have the duty raised, so that they can enjoy the benefits of protection. This is a very fair specimen of the way in which certain interests in the country are asking the Government to protect them and their particular industry, at the expense of the rest of the community. But I did not rise to say anything about this British Columbia matter.

Mr. BOWELL. You have succeeded admirably.

Mr. FISHER. I think I have succeeded admirably in showing the condition of affairs in British Columbia. The hon. the Minister of Customs laid great stress on the McKinley tariff, and throughout his remarks on that question spoke of the position which the American people had taken. But the American people have not spoken on the question at all; not even the representatives of the American people have spoken. It is only a committee of the Congress which has passed the resolution, and even that committee has not actually reported the measure in its final form. But while the Minister of Customs dwelt so long upon this McKinley tariff measure, he entirely ignored another measure, which has advanced a step further before the American Congress than the McKinley Bill. I refer to the Hitt resolution, which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, one of the most, if not the most, important committees of the American Congress, and in this resolution the American Congress declares itself decidedly and distinctly in favor of reciprocity.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Commercial union.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen on that side have a very vague idea apparently of the difference between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FISHER. We have explained it over and over again, and if we cannot make it clear to hon. gentlemen, it is not our fault. There are none so blind as those who will not see. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a deep interest in endeavoring to lead the people of this country astray from a proper consideration of this question, for they are aware that, if it was fairly and squarely put before them, they would endorse the proposition which my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has laid before this House and the people. I was not present when the Finance Minister spoke this afternoon, but I am led to understand that he put his foot down squarely against any action with regard to reciprocity. The President of the Council gave voice to this policy on the part of the Cabinet the other day, and I understand that his pronouncement was endorsed by the Finance Minister this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to revise your information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which of you speak for the Cabinet?

Mr. FISHER. So I understand that the Minister of Finance is not opposed to reciprocity?

Mr. FOSTER. I simply remarked that your information is defective.

Mr. FISHER. I will take occasion to read the hon. gentleman's remarks in *Hansard*, but my information in regard to the President of the Council is not defective, because I read his speech. I am a little surprised at the ground the hon. gentlemen have taken. Formerly they were wont to discourse learnedly about the balance of trade, but the Finance Minister did not refer to it at all this year, because, according to the views of his party and his predecessors, the balance of trade is in a very unfortunate condition as regards this country, it being very much against us. In fact we import more than we export, which, according to the doctrine they formerly enunciated, must be very disastrous to the country, and I fail to understand how it is that the Finance Minister, knowing the balance of trade to be so much against us, should have, in opposition to all the former theories of his party, declared this country to be in the fairly prosperous condition in which he pictured it to be. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the other night gave us a long lecture on this question of the balance of trade, but evidently labored under a strange misconception, since he directed his remarks, not against the leaders on the Government benches, as they should have been from their tenor, but against hon. gentlemen on this side. But really what he said, if not levelled against the Ministers, was applicable solely to them, and not at all to us. With regard to the importation of cattle and sheep and swine, we find a most extraordinary condition of affairs exists, and possibly the Finance Minister thinks that condition is so bad that he must put a stop to it at any risk. I take the trade of the United States, because I believe it is almost entirely that trade which will be affected by this duty, and I find that last year we imported into this country $140,000 worth of horned cattle, sheep and swine from the United States, and exported to the United States exactly ten times that amount. I suppose, under the ordinary definition of the balance of trade theory as propounded by hon. gentlemen opposite, that is a very bad state of affairs, and that to be profitable we ought to have imported more than we exported. I venture, however, to assert that that is a very satisfactory condition of affairs, our being able to sell our products to such an extent, and I think it would be most unfortunate that our Government should put a stop to it. This comes home more to the Province of Quebec than to any other section of the country, for we export from that Province a very large number of cattle to the United States, for which we have no other market, as they are young and store cattle, which it would not be profitable at all to export to England. I believe myself that our farmers would find more profit, if the Government would only allow them to do it, in fattening those cattle in this country and sending them to England in a finished condition, but as long as hon. gentlemen opposite will not allow our farmers of the Province of Quebec to enter into this industry, it is adding insult to injury that they should now take away from us the only market we have for the class of cattle we can ship. Enough has been said here to-night from this side of the House with regard to the effects which will follow the imposition of this duty, and I will not discuss that question, but confine myself to endorsing fully the views of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and others, with regard to the imposition of this duty upon cattle coming in from the United States, a step which is sure to be followed by the imposition of an increased duty of our cattle going into the United States. I am almost tempted sometimes to think that hon. gentlemen opposite do not know anything of political economy, judging from the speeches they make in this House. It seems almost incredible that gentlemen occupying the positions which the members of the Government do, should give vent to the views they have expressed in this House. I remember the well known expression used by the leader of the Government when he talked about jug-handle reciprocity. Well, if he expected the Americans to take our products, we must be prepared to take up theirs, and must not expect to have jug-handled trade. This is a fact which I think is patent to everybody, and which I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite would attempt to deny. Yet, by their actions, they indicate that they are going to try it or to stop the trade altogether. It is folly to attempt to stop the trade; it is worse than folly, because it will entail a great deal of difficulty in this country and especially in the eastern part of the country from which I come, and which will suffer the most. I represent a constituency on the border which sends a large amount of farm produce to the United States, and, if this tariff is carried through, the result will probably be that the McKinley tariff will be adopted in the United States Congress, and that will be disastrous to our interests. Like other hon. gentlemen, I have been home during Easter recess, and I have met many people in Montreal as well as in my constituency, and the universal opinion is, as far as I could gather, that this proposed tariff will be disastrous in regard to our trade with the United States.

Mr. LANDERKIN. As the trade of British Columbia was referred to by an hon. member, I looked into the matter. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the Government which was in power ten years ago had done nothing for British Columbia. I find that British Columbia, in 1878, imported of animals from the United States, 498 cattle, at a value of $8,532.92; horses, 147, of the value of $7,518; sheep, 8,489, of the value of $15,316; swine, 1,676, of the value of $11,124. I find that by the Trade and Navigation Returns of this year that the following were imported during the last year: Horses, 240, of the value of $37,839; sheep, 33,816, of the value of $63,000; swine, 2,819, at a value of $21,000. The exports from British Columbia of animals and their produce in 1878 amounted to a value of $271,796. Last year that Province exported to the United States, 9 horses, at a value of $930. British Columbia has been famed for its ranches and its pastures, and yet last year of horned cattle it exported two of the value of $30.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The increased population eat them all up.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They might eat you up, and that would be no loss. I find that they

exported no swine and no sheep last year. You can easily see that under the former policy the trade of British Columbia was larger than it is now, and it is a matter of great pain to me to see that, in a Province so favored by nature and by its political connection with the Dominion of Canada, its trade should be hampered by our tariff and should be falling off as it has been doing in the last ten years.

Mr. POPE. I am very sorry that more material has not been furnished for such a new beginner and apprentice as I am to make a short address upon in regard to this question. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) states that in British Columbia they must have required these cattle or they would not have imported them. They can get their beef cattle from the North-West into British Columbia, and the cattle that were brought into the North-West have been breeding cattle. It is well known that trainloads of cattle have been shipped from the North-West to the East, a great proportion going to England. Perhaps they do not realise as good prices as they desire for those cattle, and perhaps they could get better prices in British Columbia, and we feel that we have a right to our own markets in preference to any foreign nation. The fact that they do not export the same number of horses and cattle from British Columbia as they did in the past proves the rapid increase of the consuming population of that Province. I believe that it is true that in 1887-88 we did send a large number of small cattle to the United States, and I agree with the member for Brome that these yearlings would be better finished off or made more perfect in our own country than if they were shipped off. But that day has gone by. The Yankee farmer in 1889 cannot afford to buy our cattle. I do not believe an animal went to the United States from the county I represent in 1889. A great many cattle went to the States in 1887, and I have seen those cattle re-sold in 1889 just across the line, and they did not pay for their feed. That was the result of that exportation, and I do not think we will be troubled in the future by any anxiety on their part to get our young cattle. The hon. gentleman speaks about political economy. The knowledge of political economy seems to be confined to the other side of the House. As a farming community, and as representatives of farmers, as we all are on this side of the House, we feel that political economy is a very bad implement to hill up potatoes with, it would be a very poor fork to pitch hay with. As farmers we may be blind to some things, but we believe we do see in the fact that 31 million pounds of meat were imported into this country from the United States last year, that if we can have the privilege of making that ourselves and selling it to our own people, whether that be political economy or any other kind of economy, we fancy we can see flowing from that sale certain practical results which will be appreciated by the farming community. Now, it has often been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House during this debate, that the President of the Council had changed his views; that a few years ago he gave expression to opinions that perhaps he did not entertain to-day. It is another evidence of the progress of this country if such be the fact; it is an evidence that ten years ago we were not in the same independent position that we are in to-day. I do not think, after the election that has just taken place in Stanstead county that any man will stand up in this House and say that the President of the Council does not represent that constituency. He represented that constituency ten years ago, he expressed opinions then that he knew were in accord with those of his constituents, and he has, during this debate, given expressions of opinion which he knows are in accord with the views of his constituents and of the people of the neighboring counties. I quite agree with him. So far as I can see, when our beef, when our pork, when our mutton—not lambs, remember, but mutton—when our cheese and butter, when all these articles are worth more money in Canada than they are in the United States, when there is a large export trade of all these products, amounting to thousands and thousands of dollars made from the United States, were we to open the gates and allow the United States to come into this country where there is a better market than she has got, I cannot see by what means the farming community of this country are going to be benefited by allowing them to come in. Not believing in retaliation myself, I do not believe the statesmen of the United States, men who are elected to Congress to represent a great country, will lower themselves down to these considerations of retaliation. I do not believe it. We do not believe it on this side of the House, and I hardly think hon. gentlemen opposite believe it either. I give them credit for a higher and a more elevated view of public questions than to suppose they would consider, for instance, that a certain resolution that was introduced the other day with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway and its bonding privileges across the State of Maine, was introduced for the purpose of retaliation, because we have, as they say, prohibited the importation of one sheep into Canada. Well, Sir, I began to say that perhaps the President of the Council may, to some extent, have changed his opinions, and I think the circumstances, the times in which we live, warrant a change of those opinions, if there is a change. We have known a certain administration which existed for four or five years in this country, which had for its Finance Minister a man no doubt of remarkable ability, so considered by the party which he to-day, in part, leads. He was Finance Minister for this country for four or five years, and during that time he was interviewed by hundreds of delegations of all kinds, from all sections of this country, asking him to change his views. Well, he did not change his views, but he changed his side of the House. He went over with his party, and he is there to-day, and judging from the arguments they have advanced in this debate, he is likely to stay there for some years to come. They say that we intended in introducing this resolution to flatter the farming community of this country. Gentlemen, that is just exactly what we intended to do. We intend to give them protection, we believe they are worthy of consideration at the hands of this Government, and if there is any means in our power by which we can benefit the farming community of Canada, from one end of the country to the other, we are prepared to do it, we are going to do it on this occasion, and we shall do it on future occasions. If the farming community to-day enjoy any advan-

tages, if they have any future in this country, they owe it to the Conservative party. They have received from that party every particle of protection they ever received from any party. They have received from us the expansion of their home markets by the introduction of the National Policy, and the establishment of manufactures in various parts of the country, a home market which did not exist before that party came into power. If they have the means of transport of their merchandise and the products of their farms to market at reasonable prices, if they have railroads and canals all over this Canada of ours, they owe it to the Conservative party. The farmers now acknowledge, and the people all acknowledge, that the Conservative party have a mortgage upon their hearts, and every four years they pay us the compliment by returning us to power with as substantial majorities as we have received from time to time in the past. An hon. gentleman opposite, in dealing with agricultural products of the Province of Quebec, has referred to the duties that the United States propose to put upon hay. He says that the great market for hay produced in the valley of the St. Lawrence, is on the other side of line 45. Well, if that is the case, it must be a very poor market, because all the barns in that Province are full of hay, that whole valley is stuffed with hay, and the farmers cannot get a sufficient price to warrant them in shipping it to the United States. If the Americans do put on that duty it will be the best thing that ever happened to the valley of the St. Lawrence, for this reason, that from one end of that valley to the other, for many years back, they have been exporting hay to the United States, along with other products of their farms. In exporting these productions every year they have been exporting the fertility of their soil. It is like a man having a bank account and continually drawing out money and never making a deposit. It is only a certain length of time before that soil becomes exhausted, and that time is fast approaching. So, if the United States in their wisdom see fit to impose such a duty as will prohibit the importation of hay from Canada, it will force the people who live in the St. Lawrence valley to direct their attention to the raising of cattle, to the production of butter, cheese and pork, on all of which we are going to give them protection, and I believe that ten years from to-day the people who live in that valley will see that they have been benefited by the hay duty, the same as the manufacturers and other industries of this country were benefited by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, which forced us to be more independent and to rely upon our own resources.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not intend to make a speech, but I was reading, to-day, something that Bill Nye, an American humorist, said to the farmers in the West, and I was reminded of it by hearing what our young friend has said about what protection has done for the farmers. Bill Nye's description of a western farmer may possibly be a little exaggerated, but I think it will be interesting to the House. He says:

"What are the prospects for farmers in your State? Well, they are pore. Never was so pore, in fact, sence I've been there. Folks wonder why boys leaves the farm. My boys left so as to get protected, they said, and so they went into a clothing store one of 'em, and one went into hardware, and one is talkin' protection in the Legislature this winter. They said that farmin' was gettin' like fishin' and huntin'; well enough for a man that has means and leisure, but they couldn't make a livin' at it, they said. Another boy is in a drug store, and the man that hires him says he is a royal feller. Kind of a castor royal feller, I said, with a shriek of laughter. He waited until I had laughed all I wanted to, and then he said: I have always hollered for high tariff in order to hyst the public debt, but now that we've got the national debt coopered, I wish they'd take a little hack at mine. I've put in fifty years farmin'. I never drank licker in any form. I've worked from ten to eighteen hours a day; been economical in cloze, and never went to a show mor'n a dozen times in my life. Raised a family, and learned upwards of two hundred calves to drink out of a tin pail without blowing the milk up my sleeve. My wife worked alongside o'me sewin' new seats on the boys pants, skimmin' milk, and even helpin' me load hay. For forty years we toiled along together, and hardly got time to look into each other's faces, or dared to stop and get acquainted with each other. Then her health failed. Ketched cold in the spring house, prob'ly skimmin' milk and washin' pans and scaldin' pails and spankin' butter. Anyhow she took in a long breth one day while the doctor and me was watchin' her. And she says to me, Henry, says she, I've got a chance to rest, and she put one tired, wornout hand on top of the other tired, wornout hand, and I knew she'd gone where they don't work all day and do chores all night. I took time to kiss her then, I'd been too busy for a good while previous to that, and then I called in the boys. After the funeral, it was too much for them to stay round and eat the kind of cookin' we had to put up with, and nobody spoke up round the house as we used to, the boys quit whistlin' round the barn, and talked kind of low by themselves about goin' to town and gettin' a job. They're all gone now, and the snow is four feet deep on mother's grave up there in the old berryin' ground. Then both of us looked out of the car window quite a long time without saying anything. I don't blame the boys for goin' into something else, long's other things pays better; but I say—and I say what I know—that the man who holds the prosperity of this country in his hands, the man that actually makes money for other people to spend, the man that eats three good, simple, square meals a day, and goes to bed at nine o'clock, so that future generations with good blood and cool brains can go from his farm to the Senate and Congress and the White House. He is the man that gets left at last to run his farm, with nobody to help him but a hired man and a high protective tariff. The farms in our state are mortgaged for over $700,000,000. Ten of our Western States, I see by the papers, have got about three billion and a half mortgages on their farms, and they don't count the chattle mortgages filed with town clerks on farm maehinery, stock, waggon and even crops by gosh! that aint two inches high under the snow. Thats what the prospects is for farms now. The Government is rich but the men that made it, the men that fought perarie fires and perarie wolves, and Ingins and Potato bugs and blizzards, and has paid the war debt and pensions and everything else and hollered for the Union and Republican party and high tariff, and anything else they was told to is left high and dry this cold winter with a mortgage of $7,500,000,000 on the farms they have earned and saved a thousand times over. Yes, but look at the glory of sending from the farm the future President, the future Senator, and the future member of Congress. That looks well on paper, but what does it really amount to? Soon as a farmer boy gets in a place like that, he forgets the soil that produced him, and holds his head as high as a hollyhock. He beellrs for protection to everybody but the farmer, and while he sails round in a hity-tity room with a fire in it night and day, his father on the farm has to kindle his own fire in the morning with elm slivers, and has to wear his son's lawn tennis suit next to him, or freeze to death, and has to milk in an old gray shawl that has held that member of Congress when he was a baby, by gorry! And the old lady has to sojourn through the winter in the flannels that Silas wore at the regatta before he went to Congress. So I say, and I think Congress agrees with me: Damn a farmer, anyhow!"

Mr. FOSTER. After the very vivid description of the state of the American farmers, and the feelings of commiseration which they naturally arouse, I think in consideration of the late hour of adjournment last night, the Committee might rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I move accordingly.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 132) to amend the Indian Advancement Act. He said: The first clause of this Bill gives power to the Indian Council to pass regulations as to the size and style of sleighs, similar to the power given to the adjoining municipalities. The next clause provides for the disqualification of any councillor who does not attend the meetings, and of any one who refrains from voting when assisting at the same. The third clause is to make provision for the day on which the nomination of candidates to the council shall take place. All these have been asked for by the Indians.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) further to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue. He said: The first change proposed in the law is, that we take power to ascertain the quantity of spirits by weight as well as by gauge. We have found that there may be abuses under the provision, that spirits may be bottled in presence of an Excise officer. Spirits are often put up by parties not under the supervision of an officer of the Department, and they are labelled in such a way as to mislead the public.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand, that the Minister intends that any person who wishes to bottle spirits, has to do so under the supervision of an officer of the Inland Revenue?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This has been the law for several years. The intention is to prevent people from putting spirits into bottles and obtaining the apparent assent of the Inland Revenue Department as to the age and purity of the spirits, unless the bottling is done in the presence of an officer of the Department. Another provision has been found necessary in regard to methylated spirits. Under the former system, abuses arose, and it was found necessary to bring the manufacture of methylated spirits under the control of the Department, and to distribute them from this point. We find, however, that some amendment is necessary in reference to this. The next change is a repeal of that section of the excise law which empowers the Department to make a refund of the duty paid on corn which goes into the production of spirits to be exported. There is also a repeal of the clause which gives the Department power to refund the duty on malt used in the production of beer for export. Next, there is a change in the duty on tobacco put up in packages. After consultation with the trade in the different parts of the country, it was thought that packages might be put up as small as to contain five pounds each, and that they would better meet the requirements of the retail trade. But some manufacturers objected to putting it up in these small packages, on account of the increased cost. Others—for instance, Mr. McDonald, of Montreal—believed that it was inconvenient and injurious to the tobacco to put it up in small packages. Hence that gave rise to seizures of tobacco in many parts of the country, where small packages were illegally opened. Under this change, on all packages of four pounds and less, there will be one cent less duty collected. That will be a sort of indemnity for putting up these small-sized packages. There is another provision to remedy abuses that are complained of in every part of the country with reference to cigars, and it provides for the destruction of empty cigar boxes. This is in the interest of the honest trader and the honest consumer. The law does not allow a manufacturer to use empty boxes, because generally empty boxes are filled with cigars of a grade inferior to that of the cigars which it at first contained, and this is to provide for the destruction of empty boxes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there anything in that Bill about stamping leather?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, that does not come under this Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. But I understand you mix up tobacco and cigars with liquor.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is not the General Inspection Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the hon. gentleman withdrawn that Bill which was under discussion the other day, for the stamping of leather?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman will see that Bill on the Order paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. You still intend to prosecute that Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is on the Order paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the question: Do you intend following up that Bill?—because I have understood that it was to be dropped. Parties interested have asked me to ascertain whether it was really dropped or not.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Representations have been made by gentlemen interested in the Bill; both sides have been heard, and we have promised that their recommendations shall be considered before any further action is taken on the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then it is not settled yet?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No further action has been taken on the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. It seems to me that, Session after Session, the Department of Inland Revenue changes and tinkers with the law, when there is no reason for it. We ought to have some settled policy with reference to the legislation of that Department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the object of the Minister in taking power under this Act to weigh liquor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is to provide for greater accuracy in cases like this: For instance, there are tanks in large distilleries with a capacity of from 15,000 to 18,000 gallons. They are constructed of copper and set up on foundations made of brick or stone, and, after these tanks are filled, it is possible that through the great weight in them, they may settle on one side or the other, or in the centre, and thus affect the gauging, as we are accustomed to take the measurement by gauge. We have found by experience that the gauging has been affected in some cases by the settling of the tanks. We all know that weight is an exact way of ascertaining quantity, and so we take power to weigh also.

Mr. JONES (Holifax). How could you weigh a tank of liquor that was on a solid foundation?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The weighing machine is set up near the tank and connected, so that a whole tank can be weighed in three or four drafts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON (for Mr. TUPPER) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 134) respecting fishing vessels of the United States of America. He said: It simply continues the *modus vivendi* in relation to United States fishing vessels for another year, on the same terms.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it simply a repetition of the *modus vivendi* of two years ago?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. How long is it to continue?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do the Government expect in the meantime that something definite will be arrived at?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have hopes and expectations that some arrangement will be arrived at.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COLBY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135) to amend the Seamen's Act, chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes. He said: At present there is no appeal whatever, and no opportunity is afforded to remove by *certiorari* or question in any way a commitment made for offences under the Seamen's Act. This Bill is to make the law less stringent in this respect, and afford an opportunity to remove the case by *certiorari* to the Superior Court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved:

That the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Debates of the present Session, be referred back for further consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman explain the object of this resolution?

Mr. DESJARDINS. When I moved the other day the adoption of the report, a discussion arose on the motion and the committee did not appear to agree on the signification of the report, and so it has been deemed advisable to withdraw it for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. WALDIE asked, Whether the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the Queen's Printer have complied with the provisions of sub-section 6 of section 6 of the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 9, amending the Electoral Franchise Act, in respect to those electoral districts where the lists were completed and returned before the 31st December, 1889? Have the provisions of sub-section 7 of section 6 of above-named Act been complied with, and is it the duty of the revising officer to furnish members of this House with the copy of the voters' lists therein mentioned? Or, if not; what officer?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So far as it is possible to provide, under the provisions of the law, that a copy of the voters' lists shall be sent to each member and defeated candidate at the previous election, I said, the other day, that the Government thought the revising officer was the proper officer to give or send a copy of the list to such person, as he is the first official to complete a list and to receive the list after being finally printed. The copy goes to the Queen's Printer and to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the use of the public, according to law. The revising officer should supply members and defeated candidates with copies of the list.

GREEN COVE BREAKWATER, YARMOUTH COUNTY.

Mr. LOVITT asked, Whether the Government have accepted any tender or made any contract for repairing and rebuilding the destroyed portion of Green Cove Breakwater, County of Yarmouth? If so, what is the name of the contractor, and when is the work to be finished? If not, what is the reason?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To the first part of the question, I reply, no. The lowest tenderer was A. McKinnon, of Cow Bay, N.S. The reason why the contract was not given was that the amount of money voted for the work was not sufficient, and as we are asking for an additional amount in the Supplementary Estimates, I had to wait for that vote. It is our intention to proceed with the work so soon as that vote is obtained. I may take this opportunity of stating that, when I answered the hon. gentleman in regard to this work, I made a mistake. There are two works of a similar name in our books, and I mistook the work in regard to which explanation was asked, and, therefore, I gave an erroneous statement to the hon. gentleman. But as he knew all about it, I do not think I have misled him. At all events, the work will be proceeded with as soon as the small amount of money required for the completion of the work shall be voted.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT GREENLY ISLAND.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Why was Louis Couillard de Beaumont deprived of his situation as lighthouse keeper at Greenly Island?

Mr. COLBY. He was removed on the report of the Acting Inspector of Lighthouses for Quebec, as being almost useless, and could not be depended on to attend to the duties required at that important station.

THE BANKING BILL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to ask the Minister of Public Works, in the absence of the Finance Minister, when the Government are likely to take up the second reading of the Banking Bill? I make this request because several communications have been addressed to me, by parties deeply interested, to know when the Government intend to take up this Bill. I think it desirable that reasonable intimation be given.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not likely that it will come up before Wednesday.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 130) to amend the Interpretation Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object of this Bill?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a very short Bill to prevent inferences arising from the repeal or amendment of statutes. We have had cases in which the contention has been made, that, because an amendment to a statute has been passed to remove a doubt or make the meaning of Parliament clear, the inference has been set up, both in the claims against the Departments, and in litigation otherwise, that the law must have been otherwise, or the statute would not have been so adopted. The last sub-section is likewise a common section in the Interpretation Acts, namely, that we do not, by the adoption of a statute, or the re-enactment of a statute, adopt the construction which may have been put upon the same language in a former Act. It has been held that when Parliament adopts legislation on the same subject as existing legislation, and adopts the same phrases, it adopts likewise the construction which these phrases have received.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the last clause is rather objectionable, and that it is likely to create considerable confusion. When we have rules of construction, which have been adopted for a long time, it appears to me that to change them without some pressing reason, rather creates confusion, and that where judicial constructions have been put on statutory language, it is but reasonable to infer that Parliament, in using that language, should be considered to have adopted the judicial interpretation. Otherwise, different courts would be at liberty to construe the statute in different directions, whereas, if the rule stands as it is now, the courts would all adopt pretty much the same construction. It strikes me, from an examination of the Bill, that it introduces some novel principles.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, if a decision which establishes the meaning of certain phrases in an enactment is a sound decision, its soundness will not be in the least degree affected. But what I object to, and what I seek to remove by this section, is the fiction—and it is a pure fiction—that Parliament means something which it really does not mean, and had in view something which it had not in view. In consequence of the supposition that everyone knows the law, and that members of Parliament know the construction which has been put on the language of Parliament, the courts have adopted the theory that members of Parliament know every decision in the country establishing the meaning of every phrase in every statute which has come under review in the courts. That is not a safe rule to act upon, because it would be necessary that we should know, not only the decision of the highest court in the country, but also the decisions of the Superior Courts in each one of the Provinces, and all members of Parliament should be familiar with these, in order to justify a fiction of that kind.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Justice, I am sure, will agree with me that it is not advisable to disturb the existing laws, especially in general principles, unless some grievance, or some injustice, has been alleged because of the decisions of the bench. I would like to enquire from the Minister of Justice if any case has recently arisen, on account of which he thinks it advisable to bring in such legislation; and if he can tell us any particular case in which the law has been found insufficient as it already exists?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The other day, when introducing the Bill, I cited a recent case in regard to one of these matters. I do not want it to be supposed, however, that this was the reason for the introduction of the Bill. The decision to which I refer is doubtless sound, but it introduces a reasoning in regard to the construction of our law, which, I think, it is not safe to be allowed to be followed. I admit that the decision does not proceed upon new lines at all, and, therefore, the fault rests with those who from time to time have had an opportunity of making the Interpretation Act more clear than it is upon these points. A short time ago there came before the Exchequer Court in the first instance, and the Supreme Court on appeal, litigation with respect to the Customs tariff, on the question of certain tea imported from the United States. The particulars I can hardly relate in detail, as I only speak from memory, but the contention was set up by the claimant against the Customs Department, that the tea which in point of fact, and as regards commercial usage, was clearly imported from the United States and admitted to be so imported, was not to be considered as imported from the United States, because, in order to guard against the abuse and the attempt to defraud, the Customs tariff had been altered so as to make it perfectly clear that an importation of that kind could not be made. Under the provisions of the Customs Act, which says that tea imported from the United States shall be subject to a higher duty than tea imported from the country of growth, certain persons intending to evade the provisions of that section, as their counsel admitted, imported tea into the United States from the country of growth with a view of importing it into Canada and for no other purpose. Having got it into the United States, it was put into the bonding warehouse and there abandoned to the authorities in consequence of non-payment of duty. It was then sold, and bought at a nominal price by the persons who were engaged in the importation, and then sent into Canada as being tea from the country of

growth. Surely one would suppose that those engaged in framing the tariff should consider this an importation of tea from the United States and not from the country of growth. When the contention was made, that this could be done, and that the Customs tariff could be so evaded, the Minister of Customs, to remove the doubt and to make the meaning of Parliament clear, brought in an amendment of the Customs tariff, and, in consequence of his having obtained this enactment, the inference was established that the law must have been otherwise before the amendment was passed. Of course, I do not think that the merits of this Bill should be considered on the merits of this case, or by the mere fact of that being a grievance or not being a grievance. It seems to me a clear principle, which has been adopted in other countries, and also, I think, by all the Provinces in their Interpretation Acts; and it is proper, I think, to meet the convenience of Parliament and to avoid fictitious inferences being drawn, that we should pass this Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I would very much like to know, in fuller detail from the hon. Minister of Justice, how far these proposed alterations are in accord with what he understands to be the present practice of interpreting statutes in the same regard in England, and to what extent they are in accord with what has been adopted in the Provinces; because I cannot conceive anything of greater consequence than that we should not without reason create diversities in the principles of interpretation. Our great difficulty, I might almost say our great scandal, at present, is the uncertainty of the law, and if we change the principle of interpretation, we deprive ourselves of the light given by the great body of judicial construction to statutes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to the rule of interpretation in England, my impression is that no such rule of construction as that which is declared there not to prevail has prevailed by force of any subsequent decisions, although it has been much called in question.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the repeal of an Act necessarily involves the idea that that Act is in force. I cannot understand how an Act of this Parliament can effect anything unless it alters or does away with something that was previously in force. If an Act is *ultra vires*, of course it does not require any repeal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had instances in our legislation of enactments which existed before Confederation, and which have been practically superseded by legislation on the same subject by this Parliament; and after the lapse of years, when the early legislation has been considered to be entirely obsolete, that legislation has been distinctly repealed. It has been in some cases contended that the repeal implied that the legislation had been in force.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me reasonable that we should not repeal any Act which is not in force. If we perform the unnecessary operation of doing that, we expose ourselves to the judicial view that we are doing something that we think necessary, and that we did suppose that it was in force or we should not have repealed it. Of course, we are just now passing a law for all time—not to meet contingencies which we have already got rid of, or the case of obsolete laws; but we are adopting a canon of construction and interpretation which is to apply to Acts of Parliament which have been passed since Confederation, and which will be passed in the future. Taking it as a general proposition, that as law makers we do not undertake to repeal a law that is not in force, it is a fair inference, from the fact of our repealing it, that we assumed that it was then in force. What I dread, from the whole plan of the Bill, is that some of those landmarks of decision, those judicial inferences which have been drawn from time to time, may be got rid of—that everything may be left at large and loose to create fresh uncertainty as to the construction and interpretation of the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not dispute the correctness of the reasoning, that Parliament should not repeal a statute that is not in force; but we sometimes find that doubts exist as to the continuance of early statutes. Cases have actually arisen, in which we have found it necessary, in order to effectually remove all doubts as to the repeal of a statute, that it should be repealed both by the Provincial Legislature and by this Parliament. One of the Provincial Legislatures, at its last Session, passed a statute repealing an Act which had been repealed by this Parliament many years before. The contention will necessarily arise under the present rule of construction, that in that Province, that Act was in force down to the time the Provincial Legislature repealed it. The question is, whether that inference should attach to our legislation, and whether the fair meaning of a statute should not be left for the court to decide.

Mr. BLAKE. That is just the question, whether it is not a fair inference, from the solemn legislative Act of this Parliament repealing a law, that this Parliament conceived there was a law to repeal.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me the illustration given by the Minister of Justice does not apply. He said that a Local Legislature last year repealed a law which had long ago been repealed by this Parliament. I suppose it had been repealed by this Parliament without authority?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, with authority.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the Act of the Local Legislature repealing it was *lex non scripta*, and the inference sought to be drawn from that does not apply.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not aware of the particular case to which the Minister of Justice has alluded, but I presume it was one which the Provincial Legislature thought came within their jurisdiction, and that the repeal by this Parliament was *ultra vires*. I cannot see any other ground on which the Provincial Legislature could interfere at all in the matter. We well know there was a certain class of legislation before Confederation—perhaps more than one class—in respect of which there was a somewhat divided authority after Confederation, which rendered it necessary, in order to effect a complete repeal, that there should be legislation both provincial and federal. But no inference can

be drawn from such cases to apply to cases which arise after Confederation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am well aware of the class of statutes the hon. gentleman refers to, but it is not with that class this section proposes to deal. I will, however, allow the section to stand.

On section 59,

Mr. LAURIER. This section seems to me to be liable to the same objection. It is contrary to all the views hitherto held, that to amend a law is to change it.

Mr. BLAKE. The action of Parliament with reference to a pre-existing law may be said to consist of two divisions—amendment and declaration. There may be cases in which Parliament may think the courts have not fairly interpreted the meaning which Parliament intended to give to an Act, and Parliament may exercise the somewhat delicate power of declaring what it meant by its former Act, and may thus interpret its own legislation. That would be an Act declaring, not that the legislation in itself was ever different from what Parliament declared it to be, but that such was the meaning of the law *ab initio*. That is declaration. The other form is that of amendment, and it is with that this sub-section deals. If you amend, you do change. You may change for the better or worse, but an amendment is, or is intended to be, a change, and when we proceed to say, that in performing an act, the very essence of which is change, the presumption is not to be one of an intent to change, we are performing again what is a very extraordinary operation, and once again getting rid of what, upon the whole, has seemed to me to be not an inconvenient view on the part of the judiciary. It is quite true that the construction may be sometimes, as to this and the other instances, a fiction. But with reference to this sub-section, I think it must be plain that when a body of legislators engage in the process of amending a law, they indicate, by that very act, their view that they are changing the law, or, at any rate, it must be presumed that those in that body who are mainly responsible for the legal and formal portions of the legislation, are engaged in such a process. On the whole, it seems to me that the same objection which applies to the first section applies to this one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the House were engaged in establishing a parliamentary system of government, the hon. gentleman's reasoning would be very difficult to assail. But I do not find it at all difficult to assail in this case, because in our experience, both of Provincial and Dominion Parliaments, we can point to illustrations in every Session of laws being said to be amended without any change being made or intended to be made in them. We have passed such amendments this Session by the score, and by the score in every Session this Parliament has sat. We have passed such amendments oftentimes to make a law clear, oftentimes to remove doubts which the decision of an inferior and oftentimes incompetent tribunal has attached to a statute. In such cases, we have the remedy which the hon. gentleman has suggested, of declaring that the meaning of the original Act was otherwise. That is a pretty bold step for Parliament to take, and a step it very rarely takes, of declaring the meaning of a law, the meaning of which has come into controversy, because in doing this Parliament assumes, to a certain extent, judicial functions, and declares that which is usually left to the courts to declare. For that reason declaratory language is generally avoided, and we prefer to pass an Act, some of the sections of which amend the statute and others of which are intended not to amend the statute and do not amend it; but they all pass under the head of an Act to amend a certain statute, and the inference to be drawn, according to the contention just made, and sometimes made in the courts, is that a section which has not changed the law does change it. I do not find fault with the argument of the hon. gentleman, that when Parliament amends a law it designs to make a change, or with his proposition that Parliament ought not to pass an Act amending another Act unless the amending Act really accomplishes that object; but I object to the inference being drawn by a court, not that Parliament thought the law was different from what it was, but that the law was different because Parliament thought so. I am quite willing to allow the clause to stand.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Act to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice whether this clause, apart from the enlargement which he now makes clear as to the right of appeal in all classes of cases, makes any other difference in the previous law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. The change is simply contained in the first line and the eleventh line, in regard to the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose under this the Crown, as well as the other party, has the right of appeal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. There have been some cases in the hon. gentleman's Department—one with reference, I think, to the construction of some bridge over a canal, in which it was possible that by a limitation of the appeal to a certain point, an objection might be raised by the Crown to the whole case. Suppose a party were suing the Crown, and the Crown were to make an objection to the whole claim, will the same thing be open to the other side?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The present practice is to do that by a cross appeal. In the case referred to the claimant appeals on the ground that the award was too small, and the Crown appealed on the ground that it was too large, and was made under mistake.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the Minister of Justice might give some consideration to another feature in connection with the Exchequer Court. As a rule, the claims brought before that court are of great magnitude. I think it is right that such a court, having to deal with such large claims, should have its judgments liable to be reviewed upon the facts as well as upon the law. At present,

if there is an appeal to the Supreme Court, it is only on the question of law, and we know how appellate judges are circumscribed by rules, and how they refuse to review the findings of the court below in reference to facts. I have heard of some awards made already by the Court of Exchequer, of vast sums, which have somewhat surprised the public, and I think there ought to be a provision made in the law so that the Supreme Court may have original jurisdiction as nearly as may be, considering that the witnesses are not actually examined before the Supreme Court. There is no other court where such large claims come before it for adjudication, as the Exchequer Court. It is unique in that regard, and I think nothing short of the full and unlimited right of appeal, in that way, will meet the interests of the public.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt, what the hon. gentleman says is worthy of consideration. I would remind him, and perhaps he is aware of it, that the claimant is not precluded from asking a review of the decision of the judge on questions of fact. There is now an appeal on questions of fact, and the practice is for the judges above to hear an argument on questions of fact as well as of law, and sometimes to revise the decision of the judge below on questions of fact. All that can be said about it is, that there is an inference in favor of the correctness of the finding of the judge of first instance on the question of fact. It is true, that there is now an appeal of questions of fact as well as of law, but I admit, that it is not as full as if in allowing the appeal we gave the court above the complete revision of the decision of the court below, as is done in some countries.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 65) further to amend the Criminal Law. He said: I will ask the House, when it goes into committee, to take up the latest reprint of this Bill, which has been distributed. It is reprinted as proposed to be amended in Committee of the Whole. The Bill contains a number of amendments to the law, with regard both to the criminal law and the law of procedure. There is a provision in the first section which is slightly more stringent than the existing law, with regard to seduction, in which a criminal assault on a female is punishable. Section 10, which is to be read in connection with section 1, contains a provision and penalties for unlawful and carnal knowledge and abuse of a girl under the age of 13. Sections 1 and 10 together will give us a more stringent rule than is found in our present statutes, and will adopt the English rule on both those subjects. The second section of the Bill is a provision for the punishment of persons who seduce those who are under their protection, or who are in their employment. It punishes a guardian for seducing his ward, and punishes employers and workmen in factories, and foremen in factories, who seduce females who are in their service and in their employment. I have added a sub-section which will enable the defendant to testify in his own behalf, and will require the evidence of the prosecutrix to be corroborated. The third section of the Bill contains a penalty for acts of gross immorality committed in reference to a male person. We have upon that subject very little law, and we have no remedy for offences which are now notorious in another country, and which have made their appearance in this country. It will, therefore, be necessary, I think, that a clause of that kind, which is in the English Act, shall be adopted here. I propose, however, in committee, to enlarge the maximum term of imprisonment from two years. In this class of offences which, as I have said, have obtained some notoriety in the mother country, and which have made their appearance here in one or two places, the maximum penalty of two years' imprisonment, I think, is entirely inadequate. Section 4 is intended to remove doubts as to whether there is an offence when only one person is present where there is an improper exposure. Section 5 is to remove doubt as to the effect of consent of young persons. I will explain that more fully in committee, and give the authority which makes that seem necessary. The sixth section is materially changed in the reprint of the Bill, and is intended to establish a penalty for the crime of incest, as to which there has been no legislation, although some attempted legislation, in the Parliament of Canada. As a matter of fact, most of the small Provinces had, before the Union, penal legislation for that offence, and very severe legislation. That legislation is still in force, and offenders are occasionally being tried before the courts having criminal jurisdiction in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, British Columbia, and, I think, Prince Edward Island, for the crime of incest. We have, in the prisons of those Provinces, now, convicts who are serving long terms for that offence. The anomaly exists that in the two Provinces which formerly constituted the Province of Canada, that which is a highly punishable offence in the other Provinces, is not an offence at all, not involving, even, one hour's imprisonment. The facts go almost without saying that the necessity exists for it in these two Provinces, and that the offence is not an uncommon one. As a matter of fact, some of the prisoners now in the penitentiaries of those two Provinces, who are convicts for the crime of rape, have committed the grosser offence of committing that assault on their own children. In one of those Provinces a case was brought to my notice a few weeks ago, of a person who has cohabited with his own child and had twelve offspring by her, and he continues in that state of cohabitation in spite of any remonstrance either from Church or State. We therefore see the two facts I have represented: First, that this crime is highly punishable in several Provinces of the Dominion and not in others; and second, that in those other Provinces the necessity exists, even to a greater degree. I have restricted the operation of the section very much since the Bill was introduced, in order to remove any possible trouble on the score of interference with the marriage relation, and it is now, therefore, confined to parent and child, brother and sister, grandparent and grandchild. Section 7 is for the punishment of a parent or guardian who procures the defilement of his child or ward. Section 8 is intended to extend the prohibition of bigamy. It is to make a second marriage punishable during the life of wife or husband, whether the marriage took place in Canada or elsewhere, or whether

the marriages takes place simultaneously, or on the same day. In case of marrying more than one person on the same day, or both at the same time, the parties were not punishable under the present law. Section 9 deals with the practice of polygamy, which I am not aware yet exists in Canada, but which we are threatened with ; and I think it will be much more prudent that legislation should be adopted at once in anticipation of the offence, if there is any probability of its introduction, rather than we should wait until it has become established in Canada. Section 10 I have already explained. Section 11 contains a provision which seems to be very necessary with respect to the hearing of a charge in regard to which it may be important to consider the statement made by a person too young to know the nature of an oath. We have seen very gross offenders escape, on the simple plea of not guilty, in clear cases of assault on children, for the simple reason that there was no possibility of taking the child's statement without the sanction of an oath, and the simple taking of that statement would have been sufficient to have put the prisoner on his defence and procure conviction. Section 12 is to remove doubts as to cases in which there is personation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is such a section absolutely necessary ? I do not understand how such an offence can occur. I never heard of such a thing occurring in Canada.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has occurred in England, and it called for a statute of the United Kingdom. Cases of that kind are reported.

Mr. MITCHELL. Such a section seems to me to be unnecessary. If a woman does not know whether her husband or someone else is in bed with her, it is a strange thing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I now come to section 13. This is one which will require very serious consideration, because it proposes to carry the law with respect to false pretences as to future events. Section 18 is a section which has been asked by persons connected with the labor organisations, for the purpose of removing doubt as to their liability to prosecution for conspiracy where they simply desire to refrain from entering the employment of any person, in consequence of the violation of the rules which have been laid down for their guidance as members of the organisation. In one case there was a conviction in consequence of the determination of members of one of the labor organisations, according to their rules, to refrain from working at a certain place ; and they desire to have it enacted that it shall not be a criminal conspiracy to do anything that is not contrary to law. I understand that now to be the law, and the only hesitation I have in asking the Committee to adopt this section, is that I so understand the law at present. The requests of the labor organisations have gone somewhat further, as I must explain in order to state the whole case to the Committee. They desire that persons shall not be punishable unless they enter into a combination to do something punishable by statute. That would leave out of consideration entirely conspiracies to do that which is prohibited by common law. It is true that the criminal code is so extensive that there are but few offences punishable by law, which are not punishable by statute, but there are some, and boycotting in its most malignant phase, is one of these offences. I am not able to acquiesce in the request of the labor organisation, because it would relieve from punishment persons who conspire against the law in some cases, which are not within the purview or knowledge of those who have requested the more extensive changes to be made. There is a provision in section 19 to relax the somewhat ancient law with regard to jurors deliberating on their verdict, and to permit that they may, in the discretion of the judge, be allowed to use a fire while deliberating out of court, and to have reasonable refreshment. The law which makes it necessary that a jury, in order to hasten its deliberations, shall both shiver and starve at the same time, is too obsolete for the modern administration of justice, and we propose to have it amended. A request in this respect came from the Government of Ontario, and since then a Bill has been introduced into the British House of Commons to accomplish the same change there. There are various provisions likewise in the Act with reference to the law of summary convictions. These are somewhat complicated, and refer to matters of practice, and I hope the House will allow me to explain them more fully in committee, when I can present authorities and details. There is likewise a provision, adopted in accordance with legislation in Manitoba, in relation to reformatories for boys. Notwithstanding that this Bill is a somewhat long one, I shall have to ask the House to consider, in addition to the provisions I am offering here, some others which have been requested by the Governments of several Provinces, to amend certain other provisions, notably with reference to juvenile offenders. It is desired by the Governments of three Provinces that provision should be made enlarging the present enactments with reference to industrial schools, and juvenile reformatories, so as to increase the number of these institutions to which offenders may be sentenced. I was unable to draft all these provisions in the Bill, even down to this day, because the preparation of these clauses required, not only conference with the provincial authorities as to the nature of the provisions which would be acceptable to them, but likewise concurrent legislation in these Provinces, and that legislation has only just been consummated. The provisions on that subject, I will be able to show the House, have in every case the concurrent action of the Provincial Legislatures, and will be introduced at the request of the Provincial Governments. The concurrent legislation was necessary in order to establish these industrial schools and reformatories as places of detention where prisoners can lawfully be detained after they are sentenced under our criminal law, and likewise it was necessary that provision should be made by the municipalities, at the instance of the Provincial Legislatures, for the support of persons who, from time to time, may be sentenced to detention in these institutions.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the Minister of Justice if there is any sufficient reason for the limitation of the age to twenty-one years, because, if I have not been misinformed, very painful cases have

occurred where the age was over twenty-one, and where the impoverished condition of the unfortunate woman, and her state of subordination, was the cause of the seduction ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know that there is any reason why the age should be limited, and I would be willing to extend it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that at the age of twenty-one, a girl is quite able to take care of herself, and I do not see any reason for extending the time. It appears to me that the whole Bill has a very great tendency to giving facilities for blackmailing, and that is a thing which should be carefully guarded against by this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That may be said with reference to every enactment. Cases have occurred, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has mentioned, calling for this remedy, and they have been brought formally to the notice of this Government by the Labor Commission, in their report, which gives details of the evidence with reference to these cases in factories. In accordance with that report, the labor organisations have very properly asked that we shall make it an offence for a person who has a female employed in his factory, to seduce her, or to use the power which his position as employer gives him, to destroy her character. Under this Bill, the defendant has a right to be a witness on his own behalf, and the plaintiff's evidence requires corroboration, so that the provisions of the Act will be surrounded by all necessary safeguards. The defendant can have the benefit of his own testimony, and the incriminating evidence must be corroborated, which is rarely required in the criminal law. I move that the age be thirty years instead of twenty-one years.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not object to the principle of the section, but I object to extending the age to thirty years, because I think that a girl at the age of twenty-one is quite able to take care of herself. I think the whole tenor of this Bill is to give facilities for blackmailing individuals, and we should be extremely careful not to extend those facilities. I think the section was all right as it was before, and I object to the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend seems to forget that this legislation has been recommended by a commission which was empowered to investigate the relations between masters and servants in factories. In our civilisation those relations are different from what they are in families, and circumstances have occurred in which the employers of labor have taken advantage of women, who were over twenty-one it is true, but who, in consequence of destitution were, to a great extent, in the power of those men. If a man is base enough to take advantage of any woman who is dependent upon him in his factory, I would not object at all to fixing the age to thirty years.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have never heard of an instance of advantage being taken of a woman who was not pretty willing to accede, and I do not think we should place men in charge of factories at the mercy of the female sex, because that is what this Bill is doing.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not see why a criminal act, committed on a female under twenty-one years, should not be a criminal act if committed on a woman of thirty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Better make it fifty.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see no necessity for a limit at all; but I think the age of thirty is a fair compromise between that and the clause of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a great deal of sympathy with the view taken by the hon. member for West Durham. I think, from what I have read, that the relationship existing between owners or foremen of factories, and their female employees, is liable to great abuse, and I certainly think that any man who abuses that relationship, should be punished. But the question is, after all, not thoroughly grasped when we look at it from that point of view alone. You have to take into account the possibility of the owner or foreman of a factory having in his employ others besides such destitute, poor women as the hon. member for West Durham referred to. There have been heartrending cases of authority having been used to drag down, probably virtuous women, into degradation. I grant all that; but suppose, on the other hand, that there is a designing woman in the employ of a master or a foreman. A limit of thirty years of age is suggested, but we read that Ninon de l'Enclos, at the age of eighty, was one of the most fascinating women in Paris.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is she alive yet ?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think so. If she were, I would not give her address to my hon. friend from Northumberland. I entirely sympathise with the attitude of the Bill, and with the remarks made by the hon. member for West Durham; but you ought not merely to punish the scoundrel who in the position of employer or foreman takes advantage of his authority over the women under him, but you have also to protect the employer, who might possibly be an innocent man. Amongst the women in his employ there might be a designing woman who would throw herself very much in his way, and who would do what has been done again and again in the history of the world, namely, seduce him. Hon. gentlemen sometimes speak as though seduction was only an offence against women; but any man who knows anything of the history of mankind, or who is acquainted with the world, knows that seduction is just as often effected by the woman as by the man. With the sentimental view of pity for a poor girl who means to be virtuous, but who is exposed to the danger of being dragged down by her employer, I have the fullest sympathy; but we know that there are bad women as well as bad men. The right hon. leader of the Government refers me to the case of Potiphar's wife. Of course, we know that such cases have occurred. We could refer to cases where women have been sent to act as diplomats even, and sent to men who were known to be of a certain temperament and easily led to lapse from the direct and straight course, in order to influence the minds of such men, even with regard to political affairs. I say, then, that the twenty-one year limit is a proper limit, because I hold that, after twenty-one years of age, women are very well able to take care of themselves, and before twenty-one a woman is not likely to become possessed of those arts which are developed by experience. We

know very well that many a girl has the reputation of a previously chaste character, and that her chastity is, like the phases of the moon, very changeable. If you do not put the limit at twenty-one, where are you going to stop? There have been women, at thirty-five, more fascinating than many at twenty or twenty-one. I think the clause, as it stands, is a good one. We should protect women, but should not pass a clause implying that all the fault was on the one side and none whatever on the other. One of the dangers we have to guard against is the danger of being swayed too much by mere sentimentality. That sort of legislation, with which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has identified himself, looks so good; but you may by it really open the door to blackmailing, and, in fact, almost put a premium on women falling. Women might even find it profitable to fall, who would otherwise have kept themselves straight.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am obliged to my hon. friends from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) for giving such a generous support to the Bill, notwithstanding it has such a good appearance, for that is what the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia amounted to. He said that when a Bill is introduced which has the appearance of aiding morality, we ought to be exceedingly cautious. Perhaps that may be so, but I am glad the hon. gentleman has overcome that sense of prudence by giving my Bill a fair amount of support after all, and I am very grateful indeed. I grant that some of the opposite sex may have the fascinating ways which the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) attribute to them. I yield to the superior knowledge and experience, in that regard, of my hon. friends; but the woman with the fascinating ways, the distinguished courtesan to whom the hon. member for Assiniboia referred, and Potiphar's wife, were not working in factories.

Mr. MITCHELL. You cannot tell that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nor was Joseph a foreman in a factory. Believing all my hon. friend says, as to the necessity of guarding carefully against abuses under this legislation, I submit to the good judgment of my hon. friends and the House, whether we have not taken exceptional care to protect the person who may be prosecuted? Contrary to the provisions of the criminal law, which have existed from the earliest times in the history of English jurisprudence, we have thrown open the witness-box to the person accused. More than that, we have provided that the judge shall not believe the prosecutrix unless she produces other evidence in support of her story. And in addition to that, before she will be allowed to give evidence at all, she must bring proof to establish her previous good character. We have left no door open, which we have the power to close against blackmailing, and having done that, we have simply to deal with a class of offenders who are not only criminals but oppressors.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has referred to the opinions of the hon. member for Assiniboia and myself, and he has said that he has guarded in every way against improper use being made of the protections he has thrown around the fair sex in connection with factories and workshops. I have taken exception to some of the features of this Bill, and I will tell you why. I believe there is too much sentimentality in legislation of this character. I fear that hon. gentlemen who feel as I do have not always the courage to express their opinions, as I have about this and every other matter, and I may call attention to this fact, that when the moral legislation, of which my worthy friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is the promoter, has to be introduced, to whom is he compelled to appeal to second his motion but myself, for there is scarcely any one else in the House to do it. And have I not done it?

Mr. CHARLTON. Always.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think there are two classes to be protected in this world. There is not only the female class. I will go as far to protect them and make life happy to them as any man, but we have the right to protect ourselves; and it is our duty to see, not for ourselves alone, but as representative men, that legislation is not placed upon our statutes which is unfair or unjust, and likely to lead young men into trouble improperly. It is the duty of every man to discuss this question as freely, openly and squarely as any other question. I know that men are not generally inclined to stand up and discuss questions of this kind. I am in favor of legislation, but I am determined that not the female alone shall be protected, and agree with the opinion of the member for Assiniboia, that the men should also be protected in the clauses of this Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of Justice, I think, misrepresented a little my position. I was not criticising his Bill adversely. I was discussing the proposals to amend this clause, and I say that twenty-one years is a reasonable age. I expressed my sympathy with the object which this Bill has in view, because I have lived in England, and have heard something of the abuses that occur in factories. But I certainly do not want to see legislation of this kind carried so very far as some hon. gentlemen would wish to carry it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why does the Minister limit his Bill to factories, mills and workshops? There are a great many women employed in the public offices of various kinds now.

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the peculiar wording of this clause. It reads:

"Everyone who, being a guardian, seduces or has illicit connection with his ward."

Nobody would object to that in a case of a guardian, but I would like to ask the Committee if it is right to punish not only every employer who seduces, but one who has illicit connection with any woman in his employ? I quite admit that any man who takes advantage of his position to seduce a woman in his employment should be punished, but it seems to me to be a very questionable provision which will put a man in the penitentiary for four years for having illicit connection with a woman in his employment. I suppose any connection with a woman, with her free consent, would be an illicit connection. No doubt, that may be very objectionable, but it is not sufficient to make the man liable to four years' imprisonment. In this case, all that would be necessary to prove would be the fact of employment, and then

the illicit connection would be sufficient to send the man to the penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is objectionable on the same ground, as the connection between guardians and wards, and precisely the same argument could be used, that the ward had consented, and that the illicit connection took place without involving any of the elements of seduction. These persons who are employed in factories are under the control, and, as the leader of the Opposition said, to a great extent under the power of their employers, who are able to influence them in various ways, by fear of dismissal, by fear of disgrace, and in other ways. I think that anyone who has women under his control to that extent, and who abuses his power, should be made liable to this penalty. It does not follow that the term of imprisonment should be four years, as the hon. gentleman has stated. The maximum is two years, and it may be made less in the discretion of the judge.

Mr. DAVIN. It appears to me that this Bill does not go far enough. Take the case of theatres. We know that the young women who are employed in subordinate parts in theatres are frequently seduced by the managers, and we know that they are constantly liable to be affected by the temptation placed in their way, that they will get good parts so that they will be able to show their skill as actresses, if they submit to the advances of the manager. I think that is a very serious matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that, if this Bill is to be extended, it should go still further. There is nothing here to prevent your seducing your servant maid, or your cook, or, as an hon. gentleman near me suggests, your typewriter. The typewriter has the most intimate connection with the person who employs her, and the typewriters are generally very fascinating. I desire to know what the Minister of Justice means when he refers to the elements of seduction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In answering the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), I said that the illicit connection between employers and the employed should be punished, although it was not accompanied by actual seduction.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I should like to know what the hon. gentleman means by the term "seduction?" If it means illicit connection without the consent of the woman, then it means rape; but, if it means connection with the assent of the woman, it may be seduction or it may not, but in that case will the man be punished?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In either case.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was unable to understand the meaning of the hon. gentleman when he spoke of the "elements of seduction."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not object to this Bill. On the contrary, I approve of the Bill; but I cannot see why the line is drawn at factories and workshops. The Ministers know very well that there are many people employed in different positions where they might possibly come under the compelling power of their employers or others associated with them as much as in the case provided for in this Bill. Does the Minister of Justice believe that the female operatives in factories and workshops are subjected to this sort of influence in a way in which others are not? He might take many of those who are employed in offices and departments of trade and commerce, as they now are, and might find it advisable to extend this provision to them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true that the Bill might be extended, and it was originally drafted to meet the views expressed by the hon. gentleman, but, hearing the opinions expressed here and outside, I thought it better for the present to confine the Bill to what is known to be a pressing necessity, which calls for an immediate remedy. We have not had any information that it is necessary to extend it further.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have never heard of the abuses to which the hon. gentleman refers, and I would like him to state on what he bases his measure in that respect. We have all heard of the abuses which exist in the Civil Service, and this Bill will not apply to them. If we are extending a severe criminal law to one portion of Her Majesty's subjects, I do not see why it should not be extended to the rest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have never heard of such abuses as those to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have, and many others too.

Amendment to substitute the word "thirty" for the word "twenty-one" agreed to—Yeas, 48, nays, 29.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move that the word "two" in the last line, be made "five."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I entirely approve of the purport of this Act as regards the offence which, I presume, the Minister has in view, but is it not possible that the words he has used, "gross indecency," are not sufficiently precise, and might lead to consequences that he does not intend? Of course, I am quite aware that the particular crime which he has in mind is one which, I very much fear, has been on the increase in certain sections of society, and can hardly be punished too severely. In my opinion the words are not legal words, and it strikes me that consequences might flow from this phraseology which the hon. gentleman does not contemplate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is impossible to define the offences any better. The provision is the same as the English provision of chapter 69, 48 and 49 Victoria. It is impossible to define them any better, for the reason that the offences which are aimed at are so various. The notorious cases I mentioned a few moments ago are not the same in their characteristics, and the description which would cover them would not apply to these cases which have been brought to my attention, as occurring in Canada within the last few months. I think it is better to leave it in this form. It is not more vague than the English Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister to say that the words he has used are the same as are used in the English Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the Minister, if the offence that is referred to in section 3 is the

same offence that is referred to in section 4, for I see exactly the same words—gross indecency—are used in both sections.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are not the same. Section 3 refers to improprieties between two male persons ; section 4 refers to indecent exposure.

Mr. BLAKE. I doubt very much whether there is any other class of cases in which there is more danger of brutalising people than in the class of cases dealt with in this clause 3, and I would suggest that the penalty of whipping be added.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would remind the Minister of Justice that the offence referred to in clause 3, in many American States, is specifically named.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to add the words "and to be whipped" to clause 3.

Mr. MITCHELL. I still think that in so serious a matter as one involving an imprisonment for five years the specific act characterised as "gross indecency" should be put in the statute. I do not think there ought to be any uncertainty about it. If there is a term to apply to it, the Minister ought to put that term in the Act. Suppose a person is charged with an offence of this kind in one of the country districts before a justice of the peace. There are fifty kinds of gross indecency. The term may mean one thing in one case and a much more serious thing in another. I hold, the Minister ought to put the exact name of the crime in the statute, so that there may be no mistake about it. No false modesty should restrain us from protecting the liberty of the subject in a case like this.

Mr. IVES. I would ask the Minister to what extent he applies these words: "or is a party to."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Any person who is an accessory before the fact, I should say, would come under these words. As to the compulsion to whip, that is left in the discretion of the court.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will amend the section by inserting the words: "every one who commits an indecent exposure of the person in any public place."

On section 6,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I understand this clause aright, women as well as men will be subjected to whipping under it. I have no objection to a man being whipped as soundly as the hon. Minister desires, but I very strongly object to that punishment being inflicted on women, and I hope the section will be amended in this direction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no intention to do so. If the section is open to that construction we can amend it. In all the provisions with respect to whipping, there is no distinction made to sex; but there is a distinct provision in the statute relating to punishments, that no woman shall be whipped. I will alter the section to read: "any male person shall also be liable to be whipped."

Mr. CASEY. Quite apart from the whipping, it is unfair that helpless parties connected with such indecency should be liable to the same punishment as the principal offenders. We have had recently reported several cases of incest, I am ashamed to say, between father and daughter. These outrages are generally upon very young girls, who are absolutely under the power and control of their parents. I think the clause as it stands would amply apply even to cases where incest is committed forcibly. I hope the Minister will explain the clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course whipping of a woman is out of the question. I think, however, we had better leave the provision for punishment in the section. Hon. gentlemen will remember that we are merely providing a maximum of punishment to be awarded, and every circumstance will be taken into consideration by the judge—age, degree of subjection and so forth, and the punishment inflicted on a young girl may be almost nominal. I think discretion should be left with the court.

Mr. CASEY. That provides, however, that there shall be some punishment. Cases may occur in a family where the more powerful members can compel the others to subject themselves to indecency, and in such cases it is clear that no punishment should be inflicted on the girl.

Mr. BLAKE. I regret to say that we sometimes read of cases of such assaults on daughters of very tender years. What opportunity have we to secure the conviction of the guilty party, under these circumstances, and to procure the necessary evidence? The main thing we have to grapple with is the crime of greatest enormity which can be committed: that of a father taking advantage of his almost absolute power over his young child, and will not the liability of the child to a long imprisonment be an additional obstacle to securing the necessary evidence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The experience in the Provinces where a similar provision is in force is, that the charge is made and the facts are testified to by the child, not always by a young child, but by a daughter in after years. There is one prisoner in the Dorchester Penitentiary who was convicted of this crime on very clear evidence, the daughter being a child at the time. The discovery did not take place till years afterwards, but conviction was obtained mainly on the evidence of the daughter, corroborated by other persons. We have not found the law to fail in cases of that kind. I think there is no proof of the law having failed for want of testimony given on the part of children.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

On section 8,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only change this makes in the present law is by the insertion of the words:

"And every male person who in Canada simultaneously, or on the same day, marries more than one woman,"

Mr. MITCHELL. He cannot marry more than one at the same time very conveniently.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the Mormon practice.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that following the American statute?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not. The American statutes on the subject are very numerous, and there is one writer, whose essay I have here, who says that the subject has been dealt with by the various States and by the Federal Government by a great series of enactments for the last twenty-five years. The wording adopted in this Bill was in the Bill introduced, in the earlier part of this Session, by Senator Macdonald, of British Columbia. I have looked through the various statutes on this point, and it seems to me that the Bill drafted by Senator Macdonald was better than any other I could get.

Mr. BLAKE. The question with which we are now dealing is one of considerable importance to-day, and it may be of still more importance in the future. I think it is not unfit that we should have what the attitude of the Government is, with reference to the persons whose existence in our midst has given rise to this legislation. We have noticed from time to time in the public prints, reference, to visits of persons of high consideration and authority in the Dominion, to the settlement of these persons called Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints, in the North-West, and occasionally encouraging words have been used towards them with the suggestion, I believe, that they have got to obey our laws—but still encouraging words which it would seem to me were, perhaps, rather out of place. There are in the Province of Ontario, in various sections, certain small scattered communities of Mormons of the earlier period under the Joseph Smith dipensation, who remain monogamists, who, I believe, separated from the Church of the Latter-Day Saints on the occasion of the change which was effected at the time of Brigham Young, and which change mainly consisted in the matter which we are now engaged in attempting to meet. With reference to such persons, we, of course, have nothing to say, but it is right to observe that the difficulties which the United States has had to contend with in respect to the Mormons of Utah since the Brigham Young dispensation are serious and growing; and that from time to time earnest efforts have been made to overcome what seems to be an almost insuperable difficulty, owing to the extraordinary solidarity of these people and their determination to persist in and to conceal all legal evidence, at any rate, of their practices. As far as one can judge, there is now a disposition on the part of a considerable number of these people—if not on the part of their authorities themselves—to seek some more congenial place, wherein they hope to be able to carry on these practices, for the sake of which they are prepared to give up their position in Utah. It seems to me, as far as I can judge, that it is in the course of an effort to find a resting-place elsewhere than in Utah that the settlement has been made in the North-West Territories; and being made under such circumstances, and as far as I can see, with such intention, I can only highly approve of the effort which the hon. Minister of Justice is making to provide stringent laws against the practices which are condemned by these clauses of the Bill. But I think it well, also, to say that the question is, in more respects than this, a serious one, and that it calls upon us for some very strong expression of sentiment in discouragement of the settlement of Mormons with these peculiar views and notions in our midst. I happen to have before me a copy of the will of Brigham Young, in which he made careful provision—I do not know how ample, because I do not know what his estate was—for his rather numerous family. They are divided into some twenty-three or twenty-four classes, the earlier of which consists each of a wife and the child or children by that wife, and the latter of a batch of wives who seem to have been childless. In the course of this will he uses language which it may be useful for the hon. gentleman to know. After having made provision for these numerous persons, he says in the 34th clause:

"To avoid any question, the words married or marriage, in this will, shall be taken to have become consummate between man and woman, either by ceremony before a lawful magistrate or according to the order of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, or by their cohabitation in conformity to our custom."

Simple cohabitation, therefore, in conformity to the Mormon custom is one of the rules by which Mormon marriage shall be recognised. I find, in the compilation which contains this will, this statement with reference to Mormon marriages:

"Sometimes they have witnesses, sometimes not; if they think any trouble may arise from a marriage, or that a woman is inclined to be a little perverse, they have no witnesses, neither do they give marriage certificates, and if occasion requires it, and it is to shield any of their polygamous brethren from being found out, they will positively swear that they did not perform any marriage at all, so that the women in this church have but a very poor outlook for being considered honorable wives."

The same difficulties with reference to the regulation of the Utah Mormons, as distinguished from those to whom I referred, the old Mormons of the former dispensation, have crept up in another way. In 1889 a judgment of an associate justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Anderson, was delivered, upon an application made by some of these Mormons to be admitted as citizens, upon which application the evidence of a number of persons was taken as to their views and principles. Evidence was given by no less than eleven persons who had been Mormons, some of whom had occupied very high positions in the church or organisation, and a number of details were given, which I will not weary the Committee by reading; I will refer simply to the conclusions of the learned judge, which are sustained by extracts from the evidence and from writings of the people. He says:

"During the ten days this investigation lasted not a word of evidence was introduced or offered showing that any preacher or teacher of the church ever, in a single instance, advised obedience to the laws against polygamy. On the contrary, the evidence in this case, and the whole history of the Mormon church in Utah, shows that it has persistently refused obedience to at least a portion of the laws of the Government, has insulted and driven United States officers from the territory, has denied the authority of the United States to pass laws prohibiting polygamy, as an unwarranted interference with their religion, and, generally, has antagonised and denounced the Government in almost every possible way."

Then the learned judge sums up the evidence brought before him as to the teachings of the church:

"First: That it is the actual and veritable Kingdom of God on earth, not in its fullness, because Christ has not yet come to rule in person, but for the present he rules through the priesthood of the church, who are His vicegerents on earth.

"Second: That this kingdom is both a temporal and spiritual kingdom, and should rightfully control and is entitled to the highest allegiance of men in all their affairs.

"Third: That this kingdom will overthrow the United States and all other Governments, after which Christ will reign in person.

"Fourth: That the doctrine of 'blood atonement' is of God, and that under it certain sins which the blood of Christ cannot atone for may be remitted by shedding the blood of the transgressor.

"Fifth: That polygamy is a command of God, which if a member obeys he will be exalted in the future life above those who do not.

"Sixth: That the Congress of the United States has no right under the constitution to pass any law in any matter interfering with the practices of the Mormon religion, and that the Acts of Congress against polygamy, and disfranchising those who practice it, are unwarrantable interferences with their religion.

"Can men be made true and loyal citizens by such teachings, or are they likely to remain so surrounded by such influences? Will men become attached to the principles of the constitution of the United States when they hear the Government constantly denounced as tyrannical and oppressive? It would be as unreasonable to expect such a result as it would be to expect to gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles.

"It has always been and still is the policy of this Government to encourage aliens, who in good faith come to reside in this country, to become citizens; but when a man of foreign birth comes here and joins an organisation, although professedly religious, which requires of him an allegiance paramount to his allegiance to the Government, an organisation that impiously and blasphemously claims to be the kingdon of God, to control its members under His immediate direction, and yet teaches and practices a system of morals shocking to christian people everywhere, under which the marriage of a man to two or more sisters, or to a mother and daughter, is as a sanction, an organisation that sanctions blood atonement as a means of grace, and murder as a penalty for revealing the secrets of its ceremonies, and which for nearly half a century has refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the United States, or render obedience to its laws, it is time for the courts to pause and enquire whether such an applicant should be admitted to citizenship.

"The evidence in this case establishes unquestionably that the teachings, practices and aims of the Mormon church are antagonistic to the Government of the United States, utterly subversive to good morals and the well-being of society, and that its members are animated by a feeling of hostility towards the Government and its laws, and, therefore, an alien who is a member of said church is not a fit person to be made a citizen of the United States."

And the applications were refused. I observe that it is stated that the Mormons who have settled in Canada are not now practising polygamy, though some authorities, who appear to have investigated the matter, say there is a suspicious disproportion of the sexes among them. I have a letter from a friend who happens to be temporarily a resident of Utah, and who is cognisant of the course of events there transpiring, with regard to some of those who have come to Canada, and he tells me that in some instances the Mormons who have gone into the North-West Territories have for a time left their old wives behind them, but he learns that they have each taken a fresh young one. How long that will last I do not know, but that is their solace at present for their residence in Canada. Notwithstanding the anxiety the hon. members from the North-West have shown during the last few days to promote immigration, I fancy they will not be very anxious to promote immigration of this character, and I do not suppose that any of us feel, under the circumstances, that such immigration is of a useful or wholesome or profitable character. I am not suggesting at this moment that we cannot do more than, by the most careful and comprehensive legislation, provide machinery for the discontinuance or the prevention of these abominable practices which we know these people engage in under pretence of religion No one who peruses the evidence taken in recent years in the effort to establish the fact of that cohabitation which the hon. gentleman is endeavoring to render criminal here can doubt that this is a matter of extreme difficulty, and that longer experience on the part of those who commit these practices, and the greater precautions they will take to escape detection will render it a matter of still greater difficulty to prevent the continuance of those practices. Therefore it seems to me that we are bound, not merely to support the hon. gentleman in any reasonable effort to stamp as a crime and to render as effective as the circumstances of the case will allow the provisions of any law against the crime, but that also it should be indicated at the earliest hour that it is not words of encouragement but words of discouragement which this Parliament, as the representatives of the people, have for the Mormons and their abuses, and practices, and the views they entertain of civil government and allegiance and on this marriage question, with the intention of carrying out which, I fear, they are coming amongst us.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may say that a year ago, or a little more, two or three of the principal leaders of the Mormons, now settled in the southern part of Alberta, visited Ottawa for the purpose of asking concessions of different kinds from the Government, and at that time I had one or two interviews with then. The applications they made were not granted, but at the time they stated most distinctly that those coming into the Territories did not propose to practice polygamy. Since they have been in this country, however, rumors have been circulated that they have not been abiding by the promise they gave the Government, and endeavors have been made by the Goverument to find out whether that is the case or not. But I thought it was proper, in view of these reports, that I should, through my deputy, communicate with the leaders of those people, asking for an explanation. Mr. Card, the leader of the party, was not in the Territories at the time the letter reached them, but another gentleman, whose name I forget, answered the letter, and stated most positively that they were not practising polygamy, but that they were keeping to the solemn promise they had made the Government. On the return of Mr. Card to the colony he wrote a second letter. These letters have only been lately received, and I have not yet placed them before my colleagues, but they are now in the Privy Council Office. Mr. Card stated still more strongly than the gentleman who had written previously, that these people came here for the purpose of obeying our laws, and were not practising polygamy, and he invited the strictest and closest investigation. I only trust the Bill of the hon. the Minister of Justice will be so strict as to prevent these people practising polygamy, if they have any idea of doing so.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the nature of the concessions they asked?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They wished to be allowed to settle in communities, or the hamlet system—that is, that they could build in villages and cultivate their lands at a distance. They also wanted some concessions with regard to water rights. But no concessions were granted, although we stated there was no reason why we should not bring in some legislation with regard to water rights, which they require for the purpose of irrigation and erecting mills.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very well understood that the reason the Mormons left the United States is the difficulty they have with the American Government arising out of this question of polygamy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a most serious question; and when they object to remaining in another country where the laws are practically the same as here, only, perhaps, less strict, it is difficult to understand why they should come here to obey our laws.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the bulk of those leaving are fleeing from justice.

Mr. BLAKE. From this sort of justice?

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a few words in sub-section *b*, of section 9, which are as follows:—

"Any kind of conjugal union with more than one person of the opposite sex at the same time."

I do not see the force of the words "opposite sex." If they are necessary in that connection in section *b* they are also necessary in section *d*, where we have the same words, "conjugal union," but not followed by the words "opposite sex." I think these latter words are a surplusage, and might well be left out. I would just call attention to the penal clause, and ask the Government whether they consider the proposed penalty is sufficient to meet the evil? This is not a case of dealing with the evil of bigamy. If it were, the penalty in that case is much more severe than is provided here. But we are here trying to prevent what may become a serious moral and national ulcer, and, I think, we might very well increase the penalty, and instead of rendering the offender liable to punishment by imprisonment to the extent of two years or by fine, extend it further. The present provision, which leaves it in the option of the judge to merely impose a nominal fine, is an illusory punishment, and will develop the hope in the breasts of the Mormons or others who would seek to evade the law that they may escape with a fine; and we will probably find, when too late, that we have not met the case. Under this law, I presume, if a man is once convicted of having married, say a dozen wives, and has paid the penalty, he will be exempt from further liability as regards the marriage, though he may be reached under the subsequent clause, sub-section *b*, which deals with the crime of continuing to cohabit with two or more women at the same time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to striking out the words the hon. gentleman thinks a surplusage, and I am willing to increase the penalty.

Mr. BLAKE. I think imprisonment ought to be made imperative.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will make it read: "and to a fine."

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to ask the Minister of Interior whether he has received any report from the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, who, I understand, paid a visit, not very long ago, of two days and two nights to the hamlet in which these people live, and who, I am told, expresses the opinion that they are not quite so monogamous now as is represented?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have received no report yet. I have only seen some accounts of interviews published in the newspapers.

Mr. CHARLTON. I doubt very much whether the Government would be justified, in view of the experience of the United States in reference to the Mormons, in offering any encouragement to the immigration of those people. It has been found in the United States, that they form an element which is opposed to all the existing forms of society, it has been found there to be thoroughly disloyal to the institutions of the country, and it has been necessary to refuse to admit the territory of Utah as a State of the Union, or to allow these people to form their own institutions in any way whatever. If that element of the population in the United States was large enough to resist the constituted authorities, no doubt it would do so, and if we were to permit the introduction into the North-West of a large number of Mormons—and there are many in Idaho and in Utah who would be anxious to come here—we would probably find that we had a great deal of trouble on our hands. I do not believe that this is a desirable class of immigration. I must admit that Utah, which I have visited twice, has been converted by them from a wilderness into a cultivated land, but, notwithstanding this, I think it is not the class of population which we desire, and the history of the United States proves that it forms an element which the American people would be glad to be rid of. The American people would, no doubt, be glad to have these Mormons go either to Mexico or to the Canadian North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is to be regretted that any inducement should have been held out to these people to settle in the North-West, and I am glad to see this law so framed that it will reach the pernicious habits practised by these people. I am afraid, however, that if they get a settlement in the North-West, they will continue secretly to practice those abominations which they are guilty of in other parts of the world, and I think it was exceedingly unwise that the slightest inducement should have been held out to them to come into that country. It would have been better, if possible, to prevent any of them from coming in there, but, if they do come in there, they should be made to understand that the law will be strictly applied, and that it will crush out the improprieties which they have been guilty of.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman to state what inducements were offered to these people to come into this country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that there were some communications between the Department of the Interior and these people.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course there was some correspondence. Whenever we receive letters we answer them.

Mr. IVES. I should like to know how it is possible to keep these people out?

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that this Mormon settlement has been visited by high officials, who have received addresses from them. If they are allowed to present addresses to these officials without a word of reprobation being uttered in regard to their practices, that is a tacit encouragement of those practices.

Mr. BLAKE. I have understood that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories received an address from these people, and, I think, specially from Mr. Card, whose wife, I understand, is one of the numerous daughters of Brigham Young.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is not offering inducements to come in there.

Mr. BLAKE. No; but it is inducing them to stay there.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened to the remarks of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and my hon. friend here (Mr. Charlton), who is always an authority on moral questions, and, while I commend the Government for taking care to preserve the morals of this country, I must differ with those hon. gentlemen who say that we should not allow the Mormons to come into this country. We have a free Government, we are a free people, and any man can come here and can demand permission to occupy any unoccupied lands which are set apart for those people who come into this country to settle here. An hon. member says, we must draw the line somewhere. I draw the line at their obeying the laws of the country, and, if these people give their pledge to obey the laws, if they state that they will give up their polygamous practices and will live in the same way as other people do, I think they deserve consideration when they are coming here in consequence of the severe laws which have been passed by our neighbors to the south of us. It is admitted that they are first-rate settlers, that they are industrious and frugal; and all we should do is to see that they obey the laws which compel them to live as other people do in a Christian community, to let them know that they will have to carry out what they have professed, and to conform to the laws of the land in which they are living. If they do that, I do not think any person should take the ground that they should not be allowed to come into this country because they may have been Mormons formerly, and may have Mormon inclinations now, so long as they do not practise them. I quite approve of the provisions of the Bill to prevent the difficulties that have existed among our neighbors, and I would let these persons understand that if they want the privilege of settling in our country, they will have to obey such laws as this Legislature may enact, and as long as they do that, I think we ought not to discourage them from coming in.

Mr. BLAKE The hon. member has misunderstood me a little. My position was not that we should pass a law to prevent them from coming in.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not referring to the hon. member for West Durham in respect to that branch of the subject.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish, at any rate, to have it understood that what I said was, that, looking at the whole circumstances, I could not relieve my mind from the impression that these people were coming here in the hope that they would be able to re-establish in our country a condition of things which they had found it difficult to continue in the United States, and that I thought it was important that words of discouragement should fall from the representatives of the people in this country against their coming here with any such notion or idea as that, and that they should learn in a very marked manner that we would not permit the scheme to grow and assume proportions more difficult and more dangerous to grapple with than it is now; and that if they do come here they must come here not merely under a pretence of obeying the law, but that they must do so in reality.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite correct, that they ought not to get any encouragement as regards the continuance of that peculiar institution of their religion, which is so objectionable. They certainly have received no acquiescence or encouragement with regard to that; they have received no encouragement even to come to this country at all. They came, as I understand it, from Utah because they were, as they alleged, hardly used, not only with respect to an attempt to enforce monogamy, but that they were harshly used generally, and they thought that in that wild West there was a prejudice against them which they could not overcome. They were oppressed, they were not allowed to sit on juries, and all that kind of thing, and, therefore, they removed to Canada, where they could have the protection of our law. They came in of their own accord. I am personally aware of these circumstances, because I have seen them. Mr. Card and some others came to Ottawa. Some of them are British subjects by birth, one or two are Canadians by birth, and others were born in the United States. They said they wished to settle in Canada. They were informed what our law was, and they were told explicitly and distinctly that we were aware that the great cause of the antipathy towards them in the United States was the practice of polygamy, and they must understand that the people of Canada would be as firmly opposed to that practice as the people of the United States were. They said they were aware of that, but they wanted shelter from what they considered oppression. They were told—told by myself—that in any case where the practice was proved they would be prosecuted and punished with the utmost rigor of the law. They said they were quite willing to submit to the law. They attempted, of course, to argue their case, and they discussed the doctrines of Mormonism generally with me. I said to them: You must understand that there must be no mistake about it; there will be no leniency, there will be no looking over this practice, but as regards your general belief, that is a matter between yourselves and your conscience. We are glad to have you in this country so long as you obey the laws, we are glad to have respectable people. Her Majesty has a good many British subjects who are Mohammedans, and if they came here we would be obliged to receive them; but whether they are Mohammedans or Mormons, when they come here they must obey the laws of Canada. I told them this, and they professed a sincere desire—I have no reason to doubt their sincerity—to submit themselves to the laws of Canada for the sake of the rest and equity that they thought they would get, instead of being surrounded by a turbulent crowd who were oppressing them in every way.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems clear from what the First Minister states that these people have no:

abandoned the hope of being able to perpetuate their institutions on Canadian soil.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that is not the case. I said the reverse.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister said they began to argue the merits of their institutions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I said their religion generally.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I think this is one of their cardinal principles. However, if I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, I do not press that point. But I rather suspect, from what fell from the Minister of the Interior as well, that they had that in their minds. They desire to adopt the hamlet system. I can well understand that they prefer that system to the isolated life, which they find on the prairies. But, at the same time, coupling that circumstance with their own peculiar institutions, we cannot be too astute in trying to frame a law that will prevent their carrying out such a plan. Now, we are going to declare what the law is, but what steps are we going to take to see that that law is obeyed? If a few years are allowed to elapse and this class of settlers become numerous, they will enjoy the full rights of British citizenship and will be entitled to sit as jurymen on trials of people of their own pursuasion, they will be entitled to sit on trials of Mormons, and in this way they may be able to defeat the very law we are enacting. In order, therefore, that this measure should be effectual, if would be necessary for the Government to be alert on every occasion to check this evil at its very inception; otherwise it may become large and impossible to cope with, and may cause us as much difficulty as it has caused our neighbors in the neighboring States.

On section 10,

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the Minister the meaning of the words "indecent assault." We have had a good deal of ambiguity already in regard to this Bill, and we have passed some sections the meaning of which I have asked members, but have not received a satisfactory explanation. This is a very serious matter. I want to know if kissing a lady is an indecent assault, because it is very often done. If a young fellow is liable to two years' imprisonment and to be whipped for kissing a girl, it is very serious indeed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is easy to refrain.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope the Minister will give me this explanation privately, if he does not wish to give it publicly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the sections of the Act which are amended, he will find we are not adopting any new phrase, and the phrase which is in use is not only a very old one, but it is one very well defined—it is an assault made in pursuance of an attempt to commit a graver offence.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then kissing is not an indecent assault.

On section 11,

Mr. LAURIER. Under this clause, which covers perjury, it is proposed to admit the evidence of a witness who does not understand the nature of an oath. I quite admit the propriety of taking the evidence of a child under the circumstances, even although she may not be fully aware of the nature of an oath; but after the evidence is given, the witness is liable to indictment and punishment for perjury in all respects as if she had been sworn. It may be necessary to have the evidence of a child, but the judge and jury must weigh the evidence and consider how far they can trust it. Although it is proper to receive the statement of a child, yet, if the child is subjected to punishment for perjury subsequently, that is carrying the matter very far.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We must remember we are not inflicting punishment in this clause, but we are entrusting power to those who are capable of exercising a wise discretion in regard to it. We are leaving the power of punishment in the hands of those who will have full regard for the tender years, for the want of knowledge, for the fear of coercion and other circumstances of that kind tending to feebleness of will; but the persons whose testimony is to be received are quite capable of being made to understand the material penalties which the law imposes. A child may not be capable of understanding in a few moments instructions in the court, all that may be meant by the taking of an oath as being an appeal to the Supreme Being, and all that the consequences of a false oath may involve in this respect, but a child can be easily made understand that the penalty for telling a falsehood will be imprisonment or any other punishment connected with perjury. We have, in drawing this section, adopted the words of the English statute.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the English Act provide for the evidence of a child of tender years, just as in the same way you are providing in section 11?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And the clause in the English statute about corroboration of evidence applies to the support of the testimony of a child?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 12,

Mr. MITCHELL. I took exception to this clause when it was before explained by the Minister, as I could not quite understand the possibility of such a thing taking place. I have since learned that there is at least one case in the English criminal law in which this occurred. I withdraw the objection I made to it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There are several cases.

On section 14,

Mr. McMULLEN. I think a penalty of $5 is too small, and that it should be at least $20.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to make the penalty $20.

On section 16,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section is desirable, because in some of the superior courts doubts have been raised as to whether the provision applies to corporeal rights, such as rights of pasture, fisheries, or rights of way.

Mr. MITCHELL. The penalty of five years' imprisonment seems very high. There may be a very trifling offence covered by this section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the present penalty. It is true, it covers a very small offence, but it likewise covers serious offences, such as the destruction of houses or other property left vacant.

Mr. MITCHELL. It does not give the court any discretion; it is absolute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In another chapter it is provided that when any penalty is named, the penalty imposed may be less than the penalty named.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why there should not be in this case discretion given to the judge of punishing either by fine or by imprisonment, for, if the offence may be most serious, it may also be most trifling.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know why a fine might not be substituted. I will let the clause stand in order to consider that.

On section 22,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is taking away the right of trial by jury and putting the power into the hands of a judge. In some of the Provinces that is following the course adopted with regard to civil cases, but in New Brunswick that course is not followed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask to have that stand also. I would call attention to the words at the close, providing that the testimony of witnesses, whose evidence was reduced to writing in the court below, shall be read on appeal, and have the like force and effect as if the witnesses were there examined. In some of the Provinces, where the distances are great, notably in British Columbia, conviction is obtained before a magistrate, sometimes for an offence against the Indian Act, and before the appeal can be heard the witnesses are scattered all over the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think there is great objection to that. I am glad that, in the case of summary convictions, the hon. gentleman has dispensed with trial by jury and allowed the appeal to be decided by the court, because, under the system of trial by jury, in many cases of summary convictions, notably under the Scott Act, proceedings became a farce, as the accused could generally manage to have someone among the jury who would stand out against a unanimous verdict. With regard to using the written evidence of the witnesses taken before a justice of the peace, I think that would give rise to great abuse, as we all know that the evidence is generally taken by these unpaid magistrates, in a most scanty manner, often consisting of a mere memorandum.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Justice, but I would suggest that a provison should be added, that the written evidence should only be used when the witnesses cannot be obtained. I am not so clear, however, that we will do right in taking away the trial by jury. The objection to that system stated by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island does not apply in our Province, for there five jurymen out of the seven can find a verdict.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. TISDALE. With regard to the written evidence being taken, I do not think we should adopt that amendment as regards the older Provinces, at any rate, for in the older Provinces we have seldom difficulty in getting the witnesses. In other Provinces, a provision of that sort might be made to apply. I cannot agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that we should not abolish the trial by jury in these summary cases. The original jurisdiction in summary cases is with a justice of the peace, and I do not think it is logical that we should give a magistrate summary jurisdiction and yet refuse it to the higher court to which the appeal is made.

On sub-section 2, section 24,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am afraid this will hardly work in the case of unpaid magistrates; it may work, so far as stipendiary magistrates are concerned, in cities. Take an ordinary country magistrate, and ask him to state a case; he won't know what you mean. I think the other mode of appeal enables justice to be obtained in a simple and easy way. I am afraid this will be more expensive, even if it works at all, which I very much doubt.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Among the rural magistrates it may be of very little use, as many of them are probably unfit to state a case accurately. But there are many magistrates in the country to whom it would be a very useful provision. It has been specially asked for in the Province of Ontario, for the purpose of enabling the higher class of magistrates to state cases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would suggest that we might meet the desires of these people in Ontario by limiting the clause to the stipendiary magistrates.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is raising a difficulty that is not likely to occur. Whenever you want a case stated, there will always be solicitors employed, and there will be no difficulty in getting a case stated. In my county, one or two magistrates largely do all the business, and they get fairly well qualified. As a rule, the other magistrates, unless in cases of necessity, will not undertake it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think my hon. friends who come from the Maritime Provinces will agree with me that this section will never work. I would like to hear their opinions.

Mr. DICKEY. I think this provision only gives us another remedy. We are not obliged to have the cases stated. I have seen magistrates whom I would not like to ask to state cases. But we still have the recourse to *certiorari*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You may apply to a magistrate to state a case, and although he may have the best intentions in the world, he will be unable to do so. Then you apply to the court of appeal, which involves a large amount of cost, and the magistrate will have to pay them. Magistrates will simply refuse to act at all rather than run this risk. If you impose another large contingent liability upon them, that is, to pay costs if they do not state a case properly, I am inclined to think they will not act at all. I see no real object in this clause. Can the hon. gentleman state any case where justice has been frustrated by the ordinary mode of appeal?

Mr. TISDALE. The advantage of this is that you can go to a superior court. Now the County

Court is the highest court to which we can go; under this provision we go direct to the Supreme Court. In my experience in my own Province, there is not one case in a hundred where the case will not be properly stated by a magistrate. In all the cases the magistrates get fees; and as to costs, there is a further clause in the Act where the magistrate is protected against paying costs if he does not state the case properly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not like the idea that it should be continued for one Province. In regard to magisterial duties, there are improvements going on in all the Provinces. I know in my own Province that magisterial duties are very largely in the hands of professional men who receive salaries, and are men of very considerable qualifications.

Mr. DALY. In the North-West we find in practice, and, no doubt, it is the same in Ontario, that the greater number of important cases are tried before police magistrates, who have greater knowledge than ordinary justices possess; but there is no trouble in regard to stating cases, because it is well known that if a man has to make an appeal he will have counsel, and his counsel will prepare the case. If the justice is satisfied with the case as stated, he will cite it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These provisions will have this effect: Under the Scott Act as it now exists no appeal lies from the decision of a stipendiary police magistrate. His judgment, when the case is within his jurisdiction, is final. This seems to be a specious mode of obtaining an appeal in Scott Act cases tried by a stipendiary magistrate. You can require a case to be stated whenever you think there has been an error in point of law. The policy of Parliament has been to prevent appeals in Scott Act cases when tried by a stipendiary magistrate. Now you will have every case under the Scott Act appealed, and all manner of objections will be made and points of law raised, and the Scott Act contest, which has been fought out during ten years, will be re-opened.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume it will be decided rightly, though.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the temperance people will be satisfied.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to have this clause passed, but I shall invite the attention of the Committee again to it, as it may be necessary to add something, if the House adopts the view of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). My reason for asking it to be passed is, that I think, as far as it goes, it is unobjectionable.

On section 27,

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to this, I am not familar with the practical operation of the law; but a representation has been made to me by a gentleman of very considerable experience in one of the largest centres of population in the Province of Ontario, that the operation of the process of election, when it takes place before a magistrate, without the presence of some responsible functionary representing public justice, is sometimes very unsatisfactory, and that the prisoner does not obtain that information and opportunity for consideration which he ought to have, before deciding on the course he shall take, the result of which is not infrequently, as stated to me, that election takes place, and a hurried trial proceeds and conviction is obtained under circumstances on which conviction should not take place. The suggestion made to me was that there should be fewer facilities for procuring the election, unless in cases where the Crown was represented by some functionary who should see that justice is done towards the prisoner. I am not myself practically acquainted with this matter, but the gentleman who made the suggestion has a great amount of experience; and I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice whether any suggestions have been made to him in that respect?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not received any, but I should be glad to consider them.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. Minister will allow me, I will transmit to him the communication I have received.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall be glad to have it.

On section 29,

Mr. BLAKE. Has any provision been made for regulating the method by which intermediate sentences shall be terminated, or by what authority they shall end?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are now terminated only by the Executive of the Dominion. I have some additional clauses which I shall ask the Committee to allow me to add to the Bill. One is an enlargement of the provision with regard to industrial schools.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be more convenient if the hon. gentleman would put these additional clauses on the paper, with the notice that he would ask our assent to them at the next sitting of the Committee?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection.

Committee rose and reported progress.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. COLBY moved second reading of Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: The first clause relates to the inspection of safety valves, steam gauges, &c. The provision contained in sections 21 and 22 of the Steamboat Inspection Act are rather cumbrous. Great improvements are being made in boilers and machinery, and it is found inconvenient to have the regulations so rigidly fixed as they are in the Act, and it is thought advisable to give power to the Governor in Council to make regulations in place of those specific and rigid regulations. The second clause adds to the qualifications for the appointment of engineers, that the applicant shall have been a resident in Canada for three years, which is similar to the provision in the law regarding masters and mates. The third clause provides that when the board is not sitting, upon the report of the chairman to the Minister, the Minister may grant a permanent certificate. At present he can only grant a temporary certificate until the next meeting of the board. The fourth section gives the power of suspending a certificate. At present the law gives the power of revoking a certificate for reason of negligence and certain other

offences, but this gives the power to suspend as well as to revoke. The fifth sub-section does away with the requirement with regard to the exact size of steamboats, of which engineers of a certain class may take charge. The reason for the sixth clause is similar to that given for the first. There was too much rigidity in the operation of the law, and power is given to the Governor in Council to make such regulations as may be necessary.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has given us the changes but not the reasons for them. The first alteration is of a somewhat objectionable nature. The hon. gentleman proposes to repeal two sections of the present law, and provides that the Governor in Council shall have the arbitrary power to make such regulations as he deems necessary to replace these sections, and the only reason the hon. gentleman has given for the change is that new inventions are being made which may require alterations in the law. Why not, then, bring the law up to the standard of modern requirements instead of putting the legislative power in the hands of the Government? Then the hon. gentleman provides that engineers who are foreigners shall not be entitled to receive licenses until they have resided for a certain period in the country. What reason has the hon. gentleman to give for that provision?

Mr. COLBY. The reason is this: It is said that an inferior class of engineers come over from the United States. Our citizens have no right to be qualified as engineers in the United States unless they become citizens of that country. It is said that men we know nothing about and of whom we have no opportunity of knowing anything, as they are not residents in our country, are, though unfit for many reasons, entrusted with the custody of the property and the lives of our citizens. We know nothing of their moral character and have no means of knowing anything, and for that reason it may be proper that a certain period of residence in the country should be required of them before they can obtain licenses.

Mr. CHARLTON. Upon what terms do engineers obtain licenses now? Have Americans been allowed to come over here and assume the responsible position of engineers without having any qualifications for the position, or without our having any knowledge of their qualifications?

Mr. COLBY. They have to submit to certain examinations, of course.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is short-sighted policy on the part of the Government to debar from employment here skilful men whose services may be desired, and the adoption of this rule, at this time, may be very inconvenient, as our steam vessels have been fitted out and the engineers engaged. To place, therefore, in the hands of the Governor in Council this power, may cause serious derangement to the marine of this country, and I doubt whether the Governor in Council is entitled to assume the power this Bill grants him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is very extraordinary legislation. We are anxious to secure immigration to this country, and yet we are asked to insist on our right of requiring that a person shall reside several years here before he can engage in the only business he understands. Suppose the hon. gentleman were to apply that policy to every other calling? Would he object to a young man being employed as a bank clerk or bookkeeper, or in any other position, where property might be endangered and fraud committed who had not lived a certain time in the country? How far is this rule to be carried? One would suppose that the proprietors of property would be the best fitted to decide whom they should employ, but the hon. gentleman proposes to exercise a sort of parental oversight, and say to the proprietors of steamboats and other property, which require an engineer, that they are not competent to judge in the matter. You may reside in Toronto, and employ a man from British Columbia or from Halifax, or from Australia, or South Africa, but you cannot employ a man from the United States. You can put your property in charge of a man from any of these districts, and it will not be in jeopardy, but you cannot put it in charge of a man coming from Michigan or New York without running great danger. The hon. gentleman says that not the proprietor but the Government is entitled to have some security that the person is competent to whom lives and property may be entrusted, and that if he is a British subject that is conclusive evidence of his moral qualifications, but if he is a German or a Belgian or an American, you are to put him down as a rascal until he has resided some time in the country without employment, and has in that way established his fitness and shown he is a person of good character. That is a very extraordinary proposition. The fact is, the hon. gentleman proposes a policy of retaliation, and is prepared to say to the Americans: You can come to Canada if you choose and follow the plough or dig with the spade, but if you choose to engage in any skilled labor you are not to come, and the Government will not permit private parties to employ whom they please. Parliament is called on to exercise a certain control, not only over property but over civil rights, and to say that a party who is not a British subject shall not engage in the industrial employments in this country for which alone he is fitted, this is a monstrous kind of legislation, which the House should not allow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the policy of delegating to the Departments the powers of legislation is very objectionable. We have already a Steamboat Inspection Act, and the regulations which Parliament has seen fit to lay down are contained in that Act. Any person can refer to the Act and can see what the law requires, but now it is proposed to delegate the power to the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations which shall have the effect of an Act of Parliament. These are to be published in the *Canada Gazette*, and the result is that anyone who desires to ascertain what the law is on the subject will have to refer to the files of the *Gazette*. If any alteration is required in the Steamboat Inspection Act it should have been introduced in the form of legislation, so that Parliament might pass upon it. I think the other section of this Act is equally objectionable. It provides that a man may come here perfectly qualified, by knowledge, by experience, and with good habits of life, but still, because he may have been born a Norwegian, or a Swede, or in the United States of America, he will not be permitted to exercise his profession. It appears to me to be preposterous that a man of that

kind should be refused a certificate simply because he happens to be born, say, in the State of New York. I do not think that kind of legislation should be endorsed by this House.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in the first place, that we should not delegate our powers to the Government, and allow them at any time to make regulations and change them in a few months. The way in which this Bill is framed is very peculiar. The sections do not agree in principle or in detail. If we are going to prevent anyone who is not a British subject from acting upon a steamboat, I do not see what is the use of expending hundreds of thousands of dollars on immigration. By the third section of this Bill the report will have to be made to the inspectors and then to the chairman, and then it requires the approval of the Minister, and it might occur that this would involve a serious loss of time to any man who was seeking employment. The Act is very carelessly worded. I consider the Bill is objectionable in principle and in form. If the provision for inspection in the present law is insufficient, let the Government bring down a measure to remedy any defect in the working of the Act. This Bill provides that the Government may make regulations from time to time, so that what is right to-day may be wrong to-morrow, and a man may try to qualify himself under the regulations in existence, and may find out that he cannot go on when he is ready to pass his examination. If the provisions of the present law are insufficient in regard to the inspection of boilers and safety-valves, or if they are insufficient in regard to the qualifications of engineers, the amendments should be put on the Statute-book, but I consider that, by adopting this Bill, we are delegating powers to the Government to pass Orders in Council which we should retain in this Parliament, and that we are abrogating our rights in that direction.

Mr. ELLIS. I think it is wrong for this country to shut out skilled labor in any case. Suppose a law of this kind were applied to a person who purchased a steamboat or a tug-boat which he has been running for a number of years. He may know better than any one else how to run that boat, but the provisions of this Act will prevent his running that boat, and that seems an absurdity.

Mr. MITCHELL. This matter is one that affects the whole commerce and trade, not only of our inland waters, but of our foreign going steamships, and I think this legislation ought not to be adopted. I think, moreover, that the proposition giving power to the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations abolishing the statutes, and taking powers into their own hands, is not what it ought to be. I referred, to-day, to the Inland Revenue legislation. They make laws one year, then repeal them the next year, and re-enact something else the following year, and bring in three or four Bills the year after, so that nobody can tell what the law really is. They are doing the same thing with the laws affecting steamboats. If the laws are inefficient, let the hon. gentleman who presides over that Department consolidate the whole statutes relating to steamboats, so that people may understand what the law is upon the subject. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member from the City of St. John (Mr. Ellis), and also of the hon. member from the County of St. John (Mr. Weldon), and I entirely agree with them that it is improper to put in a clause preventing us from employing skilled labor, no matter what the nationality of the individual is. The hon. member for the City of St. John (Mr. Ellis) has correctly stated that if a person buys a tug-boat, or a fishery steamer, or a passenger steamer, or a freight steamer, persons who have been in the habit of running that steamer for two or three years, if they are qualified as engineers, ought not to be debarred from being employed by the purchaser of the boat.

Mr. LOVITT. If we buy a steamboat in the United Kingdom, the builder is obliged to furnish a guaranteed engineer for twelve months. This will do away with the trade of buying boats.

Mr. COLBY. I may say that I have not had the advantage of being put into possession of the views of the Minister of Marine on this subject, and have not before me just now the reasons which induced him to propose the Bill. After hearing the expression of views of hon. gentlemen, I am disposed, under the circumstances, to let the Bill stand over and not ask for the second reading to-night.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think if the Government would consent to withdraw the Bill they will do the sensible thing.

Mr. COLBY. We will not withdraw it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting Agricultural Fertilisers. He said: The third section reads the same as the old section, and these words are added:

"With a statement setting forth the nature of the materials which enter into its composition, and the certificate of analysis of such fertiliser, together with an affidavit setting forth that such jar contains a fair average sample of such fertiliser so manufactured or imported by him."

Sub-section 2 is new, and is put in in order to meet the expenses of the administration of that branch of the service. In the third sub-section, the words in the last line are new. They provide that when the manufacture of a fertiliser is carried on in a foreign country they may forward a sample from that country, and make affidavit before a British Consul. Section 4 is the same, except that we add the words "Adulteration Act." That clause gives authority to officers in the different branches of the Department to act under this Act. The old Act did not so empower officers employed under the Adulteration Act. In section 5, this is new:

"With a statement showing the relative value of each fertiliser calculated from its contents in fertilising ingredients at their current market value."

Section 6 is re-enacted, except that we omit the word "tags." We provide that the mark shall be branded on the bag or barrel, instead of attaching a tag to them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For what are the tags to be used?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They are placed on packages by the inspector, and are proof of inspection, which, however, is not compulsory. If a manufacturer or vendor calls for an inspection of fertilisers, and wishes to sell under inspection, he must have the tag attached, because it is the tag of the inspecting officer, and gives a value to the goods. But it is not compulsory. A sample of the fertilisers inspected must be placed in the Department, and the dealer must sell according to that sample for twelve months. An inspection may also be asked by the purchaser, who may say that the fertiliser is not up to the standard which it professes to reach. An inspection would then take place of samples as compared with the sample in the Department, and if the samples were found below the standard they would be condemned. We have no reason to believe that the manufacturer will fail to sell according to sample, but if a farmer or dealer doubts it, and desires an inspection, his wishes are complied with. Besides, a manufacturer or vendor has the opportunity, if he wishes it, of calling in an inspector and having a tag placed on every package he sends out. The 18th, of course, is a new clause, and it provides fees and penalties.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are the fees provided under this Act new, or were they in the old Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They are new. The $3 fee was imposed for the reason I have already given, that, as we expend a considerable sum of money, it was only right that we should get some revenue if that could be reasonably done. At the first glance it was considered that this $3 fee would be a heavy tax, but when it is considered that the manufacturer has only to put in the sample, at the beginning of each year, and pay only $3 upon it, and that he sells all the material he can manufacture during the year according to the sample, the fee is not very unreasonable.

Mr. FISHER. Has he to pay the fee on each brand of the article he manufactures?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not pretend to be very familiar with this question, but I will read, for the information of the hon. Minister, a letter which I received from parties in the business, who take exception to the provisions of the Act, and who say:

"The copy of the proposed 'Fertilisers Act,' came duly to hand this morning, for which please accept our thanks. There are two provisions in the Act which we consider do not in any way protect consumers and are very objectionable to the manufacturers. Sections three and six stipulate, among other conditions, that the statement to be forwarded to the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the certificate to be attached to the packages, shall contain a statement of the nature of the materials entering into the composition of the fertilisers. This condition is not necessary for the protection of the purchaser, because the analysis which is required to accompany all packages covers the same ground, and ample provision is made in the Act for the reliability of such analysis. It is very objectionable to the manufacturer, because it compels him to furnish information which it may have cost him much to obtain, and which is thus made available to rival manufacturers. For instance, we may be obtaining our phosphoric acid or ammonia from some source to which we have access at a much cheaper price than a competing firm are obtaining theirs. Now, why should the law step in and compel us to furnish such competitor with such information as shall enable him to procure his ingredients at an equally low price with ourselves. The other condition to which we object is, that in section thirteen, which stipulates that every person who sells fertilisers shall register his name and address each year, with an officer to be named by the Minister, and shall at the same time pay a registration fee of one dollar. We object to this condition, because under it every agent appointed by a manufacturer, even supposing that he sells but two or three barrels in a season, has to so register and pay the fee. Fertilisers are largely sold through agents, who, having to pay this fee, will look to the manufacturers to reimburse them, and thus this provision will be a very costly one to the manufacturer. One having a hundred agents will have to pay one hundred dollars, and thus this condition, apparently insignificant, proves to be quite a serious one. We cannot see for what reason the business in fertilisers should be hampered with useless and arbitrary conditions, though we are heartily in sympathy with the main principle of this Act, which we take to be the protection of the farmers against worthless articles, by a system of Government analysis and inspection."

There seems to be considerable force in these objections, and I hope the Minister will consider the points to which my correspondents refer. I think he will see that a manufacturer, who has, perhaps, a hundred agents or more, all over the country, will have a heavy tax imposed upon him if he has to pay $1 for each. There seems to be force also in the objection that the manufacturer who has spent his time, energy and knowledge in the business, will be obliged to expose his details to the public. I think the fee on the sample each year is one that might well be dispensed with. The Government might at least do that in the interest of the farming community; for it will, of course, be a tax on the farmers in the end. I hope the hon. gentleman will give due consideration to these representations in the letter I have read, which are made by very reliable and respectable merchants.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that the statement made by the hon. gentleman has been made from several quarters before. With regard to the provision requiring that the nature of the ingredients should be named, exception has been taken to that by some of the dealers in fertilisers. Not being familiar with this, I confess I had to make enquiries to know why the provisions should be insisted upon. The reasons given by the officers in my Department, and by the chief analyst, are: that there is a very great difference in the phosphoric acid and ammonia that is taken from the different elements. One is more soluble and more serviceable than the other. It is not required, however, that a detail should be given, but only the nature of the materials. It is just a question whether we should impose these fees or not, and I think that if a merchant is doing a sufficiently large business to have a hundred agencies, he will be all the better able to pay the fees, because the more agencies he has got the more business he will do. The registration is as much in the interest of the dealer in fertilisers as for the sake of revenue, and most of the dealers agree that there should be a registration, so that all the dealers in the country will be known, and it will be much easier to keep the run of this branch of business.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If a manufacturer has a hundred agents, he may naturally be supposed to be doing a large business, but some of these agents may sell only one or two barrels of fertilisers in a year, and on these persons the registration fee would be a pretty heavy tax. Therefore, I hope the Minister will decide to withdraw that provision.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the section with regard to registration would apply to a country storekeeper who, as is frequently the case, obtains for a farmer a few packages of artificial fertilisers in the course of his business. I think it would be a hardship to compel him to register. I do not see myself how this registration can be a protection to the buyer, because the importer or the manufacturer is the person who is responsible for the purity of the fertiliser, not the man who distributes it retail. I can also fully appreciate the force of the objection made by the hon. member for Halifax, that this registration might be a hardship to a great many agents who frequently only act as agents out of accommodation to the people in the neighborhood where they live, because, being in trade, they can obtain the fertilisers with greater facility, and, perhaps, at lower rates than the farmers themselves. Of course, the hon. gentleman must understand that this fee, in the end, comes out of the purchaser, because the business men who deal in fertilisers are quite sure to charge enough for them to cover the fees.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not like to say that it would not apply to the case the hon. gentleman mentions, although I would prefer that it should not. I think it would be hard if a merchant should be required to register in such a case. I do not think it is the intention that the Act should go that far.

Mr. FISHER. I think the section had better be re-written, to avoid such a possibility.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be an additional security if the people allowed to sell these things were restricted to British subjects or persons domiciled in the country for three years, corresponding with the Bill of the President of the Council?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman would move an amendment to that effect, I would, perhaps, accept it.

Mr. COLBY. I think the Bill of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) the other day regarding civil servants required five years' residence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You voted that down.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a very much more striking instance than that. On the celebrated Ship Railway which they are building in Nova Scotia, I believe that they have at work a thousand Italians imported for the very purpose of building it. There is not much National Policy in that. As soon as they earn their money they will be out of the country again.

Mr. FISHER. Returning to this section, I do not think there is any doubt that it would apply to any country storekeeper or dealer who sold fertilisers, and before the Bill passes I would like it to be provided that he will be protected from the necessity of registering.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When this subject was under consideration before, in connection with the hon. Minister's former Bill, I expressed the opinion that it was a matter that more appropriately fell within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature than the jurisdiction of this House, and I see no reason to entertain a different opinion now. I do not know on what ground the hon. gentleman assumes to have jurisdiction over this subject. What right have we to say what ingredients manufacturers shall employ in the production of a particular article? Why not make regulations with regard to the dyeing of goods, or provide that the manufacturers of agricultural implements shall employ steel and not iron for certain purposes? We have the same right in the one case as in the other. The matter of the adulteration of food is somewhat different, because in that case we are dealing with a *quasi* criminal matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Trade and commerce.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is not a matter of trade; it is a matter of property. You might as well say that the sale of groceries is a matter of trade and commerce, and under the jurisdiction of this House. This is a question not merely of the importation, but of the production of a particular article, and you undertake to say that it is under your jurisdiction, although it may only be manufactured in a particular place and sold only to the people in that neighborhood. Why, Sir, if I choose to produce an article that may be utterly worthless, it is not any of the business of this House or the hon. gentleman's Department. That is a matter which concerns me as a member of the Province. It is a matter of property; it is my right to do it unless the Province chooses to take away from me that right; and I say that, whether the hon. gentleman's legislation on this subject be good or bad, it is not the kind of legislation with which this House ought to undertake to deal, and we cannot deal with it except by usurpation. I was of that opinion when the hon. gentleman's Bill was introduced before, and still entertain that view; and, holding that view, I would not support the Bill of the hon. gentleman, whatever might be its merits.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I know that the hon. gentleman when, not this Bill, but a Bill which he evidently thought the same — the Adulteration Act—was up before the House, he took the same ground as he takes now, that this Parliament has no right to deal with this question, although it deals with subjects very similar. The Adulteration Act was passed by his Government, and the legislation I refer to was in amendment of that Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to know what the Minister of Justice thinks of the question raised by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It appears to me we have on a great many occasions gone very near the line which divides our powers from those of the Local Legislatures, and we ought to know what the legal authority in the Government thinks about it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should have very cheerfully answered the hon. member for Bothwell, out of consideration for the weight of his authority, had it not been for the fact that he and I have been differing on this question ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and I thought we had discussed it so fully, and know each other's views so well, that there was no further need for discussion. I consider that this measure relates to trade and commerce purely and simply, and we have the right, when dealing in good faith with trade and commerce, of prohibit-

ing even the production of an article the production of which may be detrimental to trade and commerce. I need not go into an elaborate argument, not because the hon. gentleman's authority is not worthy of consideration, but because the House has adopted legislation on this subject in this line ever since it has been established.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee on resolution (p. 1402) to make certain provisions in respect of the Bill intitutled : An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilisers.

Resolution reported and concurred in, and referred to Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MITCHELL. I understood that affidavits were abolished, and that statutory declarations now took their place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statute under which declarations are taken instead of affidavits is one in reference to extra-judicial oaths, but that does not refer to this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Some years ago I think it was agreed that the statutory declaration was to be substituted for the affidavit as far as possible, because it was considered that the multiplication of these affidavits was not calculated to advance the cause of morality and the obligation of telling the truth. I remember a Bill which was promoted by the Government of the day some years ago in regard to the Civil Service, in which statutory declarations were substituted for affidavits on this view. My opinion is that the morality of the country is deteriorated by insisting upon such numbers of sworn statements on the ground that the declaration of a man is not sufficient to assure us of its truth unless he makes it under oath.

On section 11,

Mr. FISHER. What fee is to be charged ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No fee is fixed yet. It will be as moderate as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is the fee put on for revenue purposes, or is it a kind of regulator ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is to raise a revenue to pay a portion of the cost of administering that branch of the service.

On section 13,

Mr. COSTIGAN. After consulting the Minister of Justice, I will propose a change to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first line, instead of "every person" it shall read "every manufacturer or importer."

On section 14,

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the reason for limiting the price to $10 a ton ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The reason is that we do not interfere with fertilisers under $10 a ton.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Friday).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said : The Bill does not contain any very important clauses. It is a recasting of the amendments of last year, with a view to curtail the expense in the manner of printing the lists for the revising officer, in the manner of posting them, and in the manner of distributing them to parties who are authorised to receive them, and there is a clause to allow the appointment of a deputy to the revising officer in the case of sudden illness or temporary inability to perform the duties of the office. At present the revising officer can only be replaced upon his own demand in case of illness, absence or temporary inability. The Act appears to be long, but I have taken all the clauses of the Act of last year for purposes of convenience.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, there are other provisions besides those two. Would the hon. gentleman state what they are ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There are some other provisions. For instance, in regard to posting. It has been represented by the revising officers that the posting, which in the aggregate represents a large sum of money, could be well dispensed with, the copies being distributed to a large number of different officers indicated by the law. As I said before, these provisions are only matters of detail in the execution of the Act as it stands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) About six weeks ago I introduced a short Bill (No. 108) to amend the Electoral Franchise Law. It is now on the Public Bills and Orders, and so far I have been unable to have it read the second time. I think if the hon. Secretary of State would look at that Bill he might possibly incorporate its provisions in the Bill which he has introduced ; because I am perfectly satisfied, from the way that business is going now, that unless the Government accept my Bill, we will not be able to get it through at all this Session. It is important not only with respect to one district, but with respect to all districts. I will explain why it was introduced. At the last revision of the lists in my district, the judge, at the final revision, struck off the names of two or three hundred voters. It was not objected that these men were not good voters ; as a matter of fact, the majority of them had been voters for many years, and, I think, with the exception, perhaps, of a dozen or less, all the rest of the three hundred were unquestionably good voters. The only objection taken to them was that they were in the wrong polling district, and that they had not given notice to put themselves in the other polling district. The hon. gentleman knows that the revising officer has the arbitrary power, in cities, to divide and subdivide cities into as many polling districts as he likes, and the bulk of the voters do not know what the subdivisions are. Those who are tenants move in the spring of the year from one part of the city to the other, and they cross from one district

to the other. The decision given by the revising officer in my district was that unless each elector who changes his residence or qualification from one polling district to another, applies to have the necessary change made in the list, his name will, on an objection, be struck off the list altogether; in other words, that the Act does not entitle the revising officer to transfer an elector's name from one polling district to another unless special application has been made to have it done. No matter, therefore, what qualification a man possesses, if he happens to change his qualification he runs the risk of being absolutely disqualified. I assume that both sides of the House agree that those names should not be struck off. I ask the hon. Minister if, in view of the fact that it will be hardly possible to reach my Bill in the ordinary course of events, it will not be possible for him to embody it as a clause in his Bill?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have read the hon. gentleman's short Bill, and it appears to exempt certain persons from the notice provided by the Act in certain cases only, and I think the case made out has been represented to me by one of the returning officers. Between now and the second reading I will take the opportunity of ascertaining where I can incorporate it in my Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

General LAURIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, and will read a paragraph appearing in a newspaper and will then make a statement. I have here a copy of the Toronto *Globe* of yesterday. I would say I have been given to understand that a paragraph to the same effect appeared in the Montreal *Herald* of yesterday. I was informed of that fact in the lobbies of the House early yesterday, and I went to the reading-room in the hope of being able to obtain it, in order, that I might, if I thought it necessary, bring it before the House. Unfortunately, the files of the *Herald* had been removed and were out the whole of the afternoon, and I was unable to bring the matter up.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will give you a copy of the *Herald* now.

General LAURIE. I will read the paragraph, and then I will make my statement. The paragraph is as follows:—

"There is a good deal of talk in the lobbies over the case of General Laurie and his sessional mileage. Each member is allowed 10 cents per mile for the round trip by the shortest mail route from his home to Ottawa and back. General Laurie was for years a resident of Oakland, N.S., and is so entered in the official list of members issued this year. For this Session, however, it would appear that he has claimed, and has been paid, mileage allowance from London, England, a total sum of over $600. To get this he would have to make a declaration that his residence is in England. Some months ago General Laurie went to England, but his friends understood that he was only on a visit simply. If the General has taken up his residence in London he will naturally expect to drop out of the representation of Shelburne after next election, and if there is *primâ facie* evidence of the truth of the statements made, the matter should be brought up in the House, that the hon. and gallant member may have an opportunity to explain."

I have taken the earliest opportunity in my power to bring this matter before the House. I would say, that owing to certain matters, which I do not think it is necessary to go into before the House, for I do not think family matters are of interest to the House, I found it necessary to move my family to England immediately after last Session, or at least as soon as it was possible to leave. I made every possible effort to get paired, in order that I need not attend this Session, because the requirements of my return to England were of such a nature that it was almost impossible for me to leave. I was unable to obtain a pair for this Session, and I came out late, as you, Mr. Speaker, are aware, to discharge my parliamentary duties, but desiring to return as early as possible. My home is in England, and I must for the present stay there. When I arrived here I went to the accountant of the House, and asked him for some money on account. He told me it was necessary to sign a declaration stating where I resided. I told him I resided in England, and I asked him how that would affect my travelling expenses. He replied, that such a case had not occurred, and he would rather that the matter should lie over for a few days in order that he might make enquiries. I did not call again for about a fortnight. When I called again he said: It is all right; the law provides that if you sign a declaration as to where you reside you shall receive mileage from that point. I accordingly signed the declaration last Wednesday, and I received the mileage allowance. I wish to say that distinctly. As to whether I propose retaining the representation of Shelburne County, that I need not enter into. I have simply further to say, that I have nothing to find fault with in the tone of the comments, either in this paper or in the Montreal *Herald*. Both are framed in courteous terms and in a way I do not think any man need find fault with; but I thought it proper to make this statement to the House, in explanation of the matter as laid before the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to add a word to what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no debate on an explanation.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is only a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman does not appear to be mixed up in it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I gave the hon. member notice that I would bring it before the House, and that is the reason he has brought it up.

General LAURIE. I intended to bring it up yesterday, but the files of the paper had been taken away. My word should be taken, and no one has a right to make such a statement as has been made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he got the notice.

TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, the Territories Real Property Act. He said: This Bill is intended to obviate some slight inconveniences, and to remove some doubts in regard to the administration of the Torrens system in the North-West Territories. I will state briefly what the different sections of the Bill refer to, and hon. members will see, that while

some are important, some of them are mere matters of detail and administration. The first section changes the designation of real estate in the North-West Territories. It was designated in the original Act as being of the nature of chattels real. We think "personal estate" should be substituted, in order to remove doubts that have arisen as to the scope of the first expression. Two of the judges have held that, in consequence of the expression "chattel real" being used, real estate and personal descend differently, whereas, the intention of Parliament was, that real estate should be administered as a personalty for all purposes. The second section declares that the various officers, the inspectors, registrars, deputies and clerks shall be under the control of the Department of the Interior. At present the Department is not designated as the Department through which these offices are to be administered. And difficulties have arisen, and slight inconveniences have arisen, in consequence of the officers asking instructions from the Department of Justice, and, in some cases, the Department of the Interior. I think I will have to discontinue, Mr. Speaker, in consequence of the noise in the Chamber.

Mr. BLAKE. It really is impossible to hear what is going on. I cannot hear the hon. gentleman, although I am sitting so near to him. There is a general buzz of conversation all over the House, participated in by hon. gentlemen opposite as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and it really ought to stop.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As I was saying, inconvenience has arisen on account of some of the officers who are administering the Act in the Territories asking instructions, from time to time, from the Department of Justice, and others from the Department of the Interior; and to prevent any errors of administration, and conflicting instructions being given, we have thought it better to place the Act under the immediate administration of the Department of the Interior, so that enquiries may be focussed, as it were, in that Department, and transmitted, if necessary, to the Department of Justice for advice. By section 3 the definition of the word "surveyor" is restricted. The words "Dominion Lands Surveyor" are substituted for "License Surveyors." The object of section 4 is to make the adoption of the Torrens system compulsory in the North-West Territories—that is, that all lands, when once they are patented, shall be subject to the Torrens system, and that there shall be only one land system in the North-West, instead of leaving it voluntary for the patentees to bring their lands under the system or not. I think there cannot be the slightest doubt that that was the intention of Parliament. The old registry system was abolished, and we have transmitted the patents to the registry offices, thereby bringing newly patented lands under the operation of the Torrens system; but in consequence of that not having been expressly declared as the meaning of Parliament, two of the judges have decided that the system is not compulsory there, and there has been an attempt to create two systems of registry. By section 6 some slight inconvenience is avoided by removing the necessity for the production of a sheriff's certificate, on application to bring lands under the Act. The sheriff's certificate is not required to be produced, but it is considered sufficient, that under section 94 of the Act it is made compulsory on the sheriff to record his lien, and, therefore, if the lien is recorded, it is considered sufficient for a person to have a certificate from the sheriff that he has a claim. The object of section 7 is to make the reference in questions arising before the registrar to an inspector instead of a judge. I think that is a provision which requires some consideration, and I will not ask the House to adopt it this afternoon. I should like to have the views of those familiar with the working of the Act on this point. In section 8, the new words are intended to have the effect of making the registrar issue a new certificate with each transfer of land. There is no doubt that it is the true Torrens system, that all previous certificates shall be replaced by a new certificate on each transfer, and that the transferee shall hold the certificate relating to the whole title, and having no connection with other transactions on the record. Notwithstanding this, it has been held by Mr. Justice Rouleau that the registrar should not do this, and the result has been that the certificate of title is not of the character that the Torrens system contemplates; it is involved in connection with previous transactions in the land, and a new transferee escapes payment of the registry fees and the contribution to the insurance fund, although the transfer has created a liability in respect to which the insurance fund may be called upon. Section 9 makes merely a verbal change. In section 10 the word "caveat" is omitted, as being unnecessary and giving a meaning to the Act not intended. The section is not, however, otherwise changed. In section 11, "three months" are substituted for "one month," in relation to the period of delay after the receipt of the caveat, unless within that time proceedings have been commenced in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. Minister will allow me to ask him to make a statement upon one point which seems to be not generally understood. I refer to what the meaning of the Torrens system is. I am told that it is an Australian system, and that it reduces real estate to the character of a chattel. More than that, that it simply requires, in case of litigated claims, the production of the last deed of registry as complete proof. I would like to know if there are any other points in connection with it? I believe there are a great many people who do not understand it, and there seems to be a very great uncertainty as to what it means.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I can put the explanation in a brief way, which will make it familiar to the hon. gentleman, by using the illustration, that it puts real estate as nearly as possible in the condition of a ship. The transactions in respect to a ship are all briefly recorded, but the certificate of registry is all that is used for sailing the ship and is evidence of the title, and that is issued by the registrar. The record is in the registry office; the deeds are deposited there, and the registrar finding that the person claiming the property has a good title, gives a short certificate of title—which is shorter, in fact, than the certificate of registry relating to a ship—and that certificate of title is a good title for every purpose. Any person who holds it has the right under it to

sell the property, and the person who purchases the property under that certificate of title goes to the registrar, delivers it up to be examined, and gets a new certificate of title declaring that he is the holder of the property. If any defect has occurred by reason of which the title of the property has been affected——

Mr. MITCHELL. By the act of the officer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It must be by the fault of the officer, because he is charged with the investigation of the title before he gives the certificate. If any defect occurs, the State pays the damages, and in order to make a fund out of which any damages of that kind shall be payable, we charge an insurance fee at every transfer. That creates an insurance fund out of which any damages may be paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know the hon. Minister will excuse me, as I make these remarks for the purpose of eliciting a clear understanding about this system. In the illustration which the hon. gentleman gives I understand that all land is placed, as nearly as possible, in the condition of a ship. The register of this ship being not always evidence of title, because there may be subsequent mortgages against it. I presume nothing like that can occur under the present system ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. The mortgagee must get the certificate of title, and if he delivers that to the registrar, he gets a certificate that he is the mortgagee.

Mr. MITCHELL. In other words, you cannot mortgage the land.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You can mortgage it, but the mortgagee holds the title and the certificate. Of course, that could not be done in the case of a vessel, because the certificate is wanted for the sailing of the vessel, and must be in the hands of the owner. Section 12 restores the section as originally passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume, then, that all lawyers' fees and lawyers engaged in the transfer of land will be done away with; their occupation will be gone. That will be one great improvement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are great improvements, but I cannot say that is one of them. It is still necessary that there should be a due conveyance of land, but the expense under the Torrens system should be very much less than it is under the other system. This system has been adopted in Toronto, and I believe that there, as well as in the North-West, it has been found to work well; and in Australia it has been found by experience to be a very great success, both reducing expense and rendering titles certain. I think the other changes in the Act are merely verbal.

Mr. DAVIN. This Act contemplates a very sweeping change. The proposals in regard to the examination of titles, may fairly be described as extraordinary. I am not saying that they are proposals which are unwise or which should be rejected, but it is a very great change to give to the inspector of registry offices the position of a judge, although there is an appeal from his decision to the Supreme Court in the Territories, and from the Supreme Court in the Territories to the Supreme Court of Canada. This is the kernel of the Act, and the hon. and learned Minister of Justice has shown no cause why it should pass its second reading; if you pass the second reading you adopt that principle. If this is done, what will happen? One may have an appeal to an inspector in Regina or in Calgary, and he may be away in Battleford. I should like very much to have the Bill postponed until we can hear from lawyers in the Territories interested in this matter, and also from the judiciary. I am not aware that any member of Parliament representing the Territories, or any lawyer or judge in the Territories has made any suggestion of this measure or has been consulted in reference to it; but I know that it has come upon us like thunder from a blue sky. In reading it, I do not understand how this arrangement in regard to the inspector is going to work, and, I think, it would be a very improper thing for the House to go into Committee on the Bill now, and, therefore, there can be no object in reading it a second time to-day. The moment the Bill came out I sent it to some of the lawyers in the Territories to ascertain their opinion of it. My friend, Mr. Lougheed, is one of those whom I wished to consult, but he has been in Toronto, and we have not been able to go into it. Therefore, I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice to postpone the second reading until we have time to consider the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot agree that if the section with reference to the inspector were not adopted, there would be no occasion for this Bill, for if that were left out, there would still be several sections which it would be necessary for me to press. I think my hon. friend approves of the Torrens system being made compulsory, and in some other respects, I think he will find that the Bill is in the direction of economy. I shall be glad, however, to have, even at this early stage, a discussion of the question whether the appeal from the registrar should be to the inspector or to a judge, and I have no intention, in moving the second reading to-day, to ask for a final decision of the House on that point. There are two sides to the question, I admit. The argument of those who have suggested this clause is that the judges of the North-West Territories live in districts widely apart from each other, and never assemble except for the purpose of hearing appeals from each other; that when an appeal is taken from the registrar to one judge, the judge of the district, a decision, it is true, is promptly given, but that the effect has been that the decisions of the judges in the Territories have been widely different from each other, and those conflicting decisions are exceedingly inconvenient when they relate to the titles of real property. The advantage, therefore, of having the appeal to the inspector is this, that all the cases will go through the inspector at least as a channel of communication, which will render the decisions uniform; and it is proposed that there shall be an appeal from him, not to one judge, because that would result in the same diversity of decisions as exists at present, but to all the judges of the Territories, so that uniformity of decision will be maintained. The other side of the case has been presented by my hon. friend, and I will only repeat it in these few words: that the present system, while it admits of diversity of decisions, has promptness and economy in settling the questions of title. I will ask the House to take the

second reading to-day, but I will not ask it to go to-day into committee on the Bill, in consequence of the objection of my hon. friend that the members from the North-West have not considered it, and desire to hear from their constituents.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that under this Bill any person may take exception to the passage of a title, and if exception is taken under affidavit—we know there are some very queer affidavits made sometimes—a delay of three or four months is involved before the matter can be settled.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of the delay is to permit the question to be settled by judicial decision, if possible, before the registrar acts. In most cases where a protest will be filed, it will be in consequence of some pending action based on disputes in relation to which the title will likely be questioned, and the intention of the delay is to allow a decision to be arrived at, if possible, before the transfer is made.

Mr. MULOCK. It is understood that the Minister does not decide either one way or the other with regard to the proposal for an appeal to the inspector, by taking the second reading to-day?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Because I have received communications from parties in the North-West, setting forth reasons in favor of the proposal to transfer the right of appeal to the inspector. I have not had opportunity to study out the proposed amendment, and suppose the whole matter will be discussed in committee.

Mr. WATSON. The Torrens system has been in force in Manitoba for some time and gives general satisfaction. The transfer under it is made much easier and cheaper, and a property is placed under the Torrens system on notice being given in the *Gazette*, so that any person who wishes to appeal against the property being so placed shall have ample opportunity to do so, and the appeal is heard by the registrar general. I would just say that if the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) refers to the lawyers, I believe the system is not at all satisfactory to the lawyers, because it does away with a good deal of fees, as a transfer can be made under this system for $2.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DISCLOSURE OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved second reading of Bill (No. 122) to prevent the disclosure of official documents and information. He said: This Bill was introduced at the request of the Imperial Government and is practically the English Act, the only difference being that in the English statute, the maximum penalty is left to the court, whereas it is here fixed by the Bill itself. The object is to prevent the disclosure of official documents and information, and is for the protection of the Empire.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a most arbitrary Bill. While I have great respect for the legislation of Great Britain, I have a great deal more respect for the legislation of this Parliament, which understands the wants of our community. The hon. gentleman has stated that he introduced this Bill at the special request of the Imperial Government. I think it would be only right and proper that the instructions or request of the British Government should be laid on the Table, so that the House may understand what necessity there may be for such legislation. The Imperial Government may require such legislation; but I would like to know what interest we can have in placing such an arbitrary Act on our statutes. Therefore, before going further with this Bill, I think the hon. gentleman should bring down these despatches and let us see what the British Government want. If the British Government want what is right and proper and in the interest of the State, I should be in favor of giving it to them, but that does not warrant us in extending to our own officers the same rules which the British Government require in regard to their own naval and other officials.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. I see nothing very arbitrary in this measure. It simply provides, as is provided in every other country in the world, that in any fortress, or arsenal, or factory, what is stored away for the defence of the country shall be under the protection of the Government. In that case, the Government would naturally take the precautions provided in this Bill. I cannot see that the hon. gentleman or any one else should object to our preventing strangers from entering into our dockyards, or fortresses, or any department of the Government, and obtaining information for the purpose of conveying it outside, and in such a way that the information might be very injurious to the State. The question, as I understand it, is merely one of penalties. The hon. gentleman has asked whether, within my experience, I have ever been able to find out a case where the clauses of this Act might be applied. I am happy to say that, as far as Canada is concerned, it has not been within my experience to find any such case.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope that will long continue.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I hope the necessity will never present itself, but it is necessary to be prepared beforehand for such cases. I cannot see anything very arbitrary about this Bill, which I think is a measure for the protection of the whole Empire. The despatches which have been referred to merely contain a request on the part of the Imperial Government to introduce this Bill, which is an exact copy of the Imperial Act except in the particular clause to which I have referred.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has not touched the point to which I called attention. He says that he was asked or ordered—I do not know which—by the Imperial Government to introduce this Bill, and I think he should lay the communication he received from the Imperial Government upon the Table of the House. If the Imperial Government requires provisions of this kind in regard to their forts and their ships and their coaling stations and so on, I have no objection to that. But I have a very strong objection to some features of this Bill, and yet the hon. gentleman does not see anything arbitrary about it. I think it is arbitrary to grant the powers mentioned in this Bill. Take, for instance, this provision:

"Every person, who having possession of any document, sketch, plan, model, or information relating to any fortress, arsenal, factory, dockyard, camp, ship, office or other like place belonging to Her Majesty, or to the naval or military affairs of Her Majesty, in whatever manner the same has been obtained or taken, at any time wilfully

communicates the same to any person to whom he knows the same ought not, in the interests of the State, to be communicated at that time, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to the same punishment as if he committed an offence under the foregoing provisions of this section."

To that portion I have no objection, but I have a strong objection to the provision introducing the actions of the civil servants of this country. No information has been given to the detriment of the State, as far as I am aware, by an officer of the Civil Service, and yet we have this second section in this Bill :

"Every person who, by means of his holding, or having held an office under Her Majesty, has lawfully or unlawfully, either obtained possession of or control over any document, sketch, plan or model, or acquired any information, and at any time corruptly or contrary to his official duty, communicates or attempts to communicate such document, sketch, plan, model, or information to any person to whom the same ought not, in the interests of the State, or otherwise in the public interest, to be communicated at that time, is guilty of a breach of official trust ; etc."

If my hon. friend knows of any case since Confederation in which a civil servant has been guilty of communicating informatiom which has been detrimental to the State, he should let us know that. We should not be asked to enact these arbitrary laws, casting reflections and aspersions upon the character of our civil servants, unless some case has arisen to justify their enactment. I do not think that the fact of the British Government requiring certain provisions in regard to their army and navy, makes it necessary for us to carry those provisions into our Civil Service. The Civil Service of this country has been always conducted in a very creditable manner, with a few exceptions, and those have not been in the direction of giving information to outsiders, but rather in the way of retaining information from the public. We remember that one high official of the Government committed a very arbitrary and illegal act in refusing to comply with the election laws, but, if that case is what the hon. Minister of Militia is aiming at, he should say so. That, however, is not affected by this clause. Still, it is within the knowledge of several of us that we were kept under the harrow for a month extra, simply because hon. gentlemen opposite thought they could incite certain people to take action against us. I would like to hear of any civil servant who has given information detrimental to the public service. If the hon. gentleman cannot show that, he has no right to ask for an enactment of this kind simply because the British Government has asked for an enactment in reference to their own service. I think there is something behind this which I cannot see. I want to see these despatches. I want to see what the British Government asks for. We are the judges, and not the Government, as to whether or not we should pass laws of the character contained in this Bill. It is not because the Minister of Militia has distinguished himself in warlike operations that we should pass this law because he asks us to do so. As to the Civil Service part of this Bill, I think we should put a stopper on that. The Civil Service have conducted the business of the country well, and, if the hon. gentleman can bring any case to warrant this provision, we would be able to judge whether it is desirable to pass such a law or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am extremely obliged to my hon. friend for the confidence which he seems to repose in me. He is quite certain, he says, that I would distinguish myself in times of trouble and war. Well, Sir, I must tell the hon. gentleman that this measure is not at all a warlike measure. It is quite impossible to comprehend how the argument of the hon. gentleman applies to this Act. The hon. gentleman wishes to know, before he assents to this Act being read the second time, if any case has occurred where any secret was divulged by any person, that is to say, any secret that might be injurious to the public interest. Sir, we know that prevention is very much better than cure. The question of whether any case has presented itself is not an argument as to the necessity of passing such an Act as this. The hon. gentleman takes advantage of this Act to go into a defence of the Civil Service, when the Civil Service is in no way attacked by this Act. The Act does not apply to the civil servants alone, but to everybody else. It does not discriminate against the Civil Service ; it in no way indicates that we do not have the confidence in the Civil Service which we should have ; but the Act simply states clearly and positively the circumstances under which a person belonging to the Civil Service or to any other service, shall be punished if that person divulges or makes known certain secrets which, in the interest of the public, and of the Government, and of the State, should not be divulged. I agree fully with the hon. gentleman as to the merits of our Civil Service, but it is in no way attacked by this Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Read section 2, and then say if the Civil Service is not attacked.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have read section 2, and it applies to any employé, whether belonging to the Civil Service or any other service ; it applies to the Militia Service, and to every other service ; it applies to people living in the country, and to people outside who may come into this country for the purpose of obtaining a knowledge of facts and of divulging those facts afterwards, the cognisance of which outside may be injurious to the State. Now, if any dispatch has been sent over from England, I am sure it is merely a request. A Bill was transmitted to us, with a suggestion that we should introduce it into the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman says there is some terrible thing behind this Act. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is nothing in the Act which does not appear on the face of it. I have stated to the House what I know about it, and I think the measure is not open to the charges which have been made against it by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has not answered my point. I have asked him to read section 2 :

"Every person who, by means of his holding, or having held an office under Her Majesty, has lawfully or unlawfully, either obtained possession of, or control over, any document, sketch, plan, or model, or acquired any information, and, at any time, corruptly, or contrary to his official duty, communicates, or attempts to communicate, such document, sketch, plan, model, or information, to any person to whom the same ought not, in the interests of the State, or otherwise in the public interest, to be communicated at that time, is guilty of a breach of official trust."

Now, I do not object to what the British Government may have asked, if they have asked anything, and I do not doubt the hon. gentleman's statement that they have ; but I want to see what

that request is, and I want to know whether that request covers the points contained in this Bill, because I hold that section 2 goes far beyond what the British Government can have requested. It affects the Civil Service of this country, it casts an insinuation and a slur upon the Civil Service; and before this House is asked to pass this legislation, the hon. gentleman should state whether any occasion has arisen which calls for such an arbitrary measure as this, reflecting upon the Civil Service of this country. If such an occasion has occurred it should be stated to this House, in order that we may judge of the necessity for this Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The section to which the hon. member for Northumberland has called attention has probably less application to the Civil Service than to any other branch of employment in Canada, because it is less likely that an officer of the Civil Service would be in possession of information and have the means of betraying that information, than almost any other class of persons who might be in any way connected with the fortifications of the country. Sub-section 2 is simply directed against breaches of trust by public officers and by persons who have had employment from the Government, and the possibilities of betrayal of trust of that kind are much more likely in connection with persons outside the Civil Service, who may occasionally have had employment in or about the fortifications of the country, than with persons who are connected with the Civil Service. But it is not considered derogatory to any branch of employment to legislate against breaches of trust by persons engaged in that employment. We know that breaches of trust occasionally occur in every employment, public or private, and no stigma is attached to any branch of service, public or private, by declaring that a breach of trust committed in connection with that employment is a crime. The whole gist of the Bill is this: that it is necessary for the purposes of the whole Empire—and no less and no more for any other part of the Empire than Canada—that similar legislation should exist for the preservation of the defences of the country. With that view this legislation has been adopted in England, and she has sent it to her dependency here, in which she has great fortifications, and in which she is erecting other fortifications for our defence, and she judges it expedient that legislation which she has found necessary there, should be placed on our Statute-book. It is more to the interest of this country that this legislation should be adopted than it is to the interest of the mother country. When we are asked what necessity can possibly exist for legislation of this description, I submit that better evidence cannot possibly exist than the fact that this legislation has been thought necessary in the Imperial Parliament and has been adopted there; that is better evidence of its necessity than the production of any solitary instance which has occurred in this country, of the betrayal of an official secret. This country has never been so menaced by any foreign foe as to make it worth while that the defences of the country should be betrayed, or its secrets betrayed, to a foreign power. I do not know myself of an instance in the history of Canada as now constituted, or in the history of British North America, since its fortifications and defences have been constructed, in which an offence of this kind has occurred; but our conditions are changing all the time. It has been deemed necessary that the fortifications of Great Britain in Canada should be strengthened, from time to time, on the Atlantic coast and on the Pacific coast, and we hear to-day of these fortifications being strengthened in the Maritime Provinces, and, in all probability, in British Columbia; and with the enormous treasure which Great Britain is willing to spend upon these fortifications, it seems to me the least this Parliament can do is to say that the secrets which involve the defence of those fortifications, shall not be betrayed without the betrayer suffering punishment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know that it is trespassing upon the time of the House, but I think it necessary to put myself right after the remarks of the Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman has omitted to recognise the point I stated at the outset of my remarks, that if the British Government has called for an Act of this kind, in order to protect her arsenals and fortifications in Canada in respect to improper information being furnished to outsiders, then I say, let this Government bring down the document and take the House into their confidence, and we will pass the measure at once. But the hon. gentleman has steadily avoided dealing with the one point which is seriously objectionable. The hon. gentleman says that section 2 applies less to the Civil Service than to any other branch of the Government, and asks why should we refuse the British Government the right to punish men employed at arsenals or on board ship, and who give information to the enemy? No one wants to refuse them; everyone is willing to give them that power. No attempt of the Minister of Justice to place me on a false trail will succeed. What I object to in this Bill is, chiefly, that under section 2 it brings in the whole Civil Service, and, if we are seeking to legislate in this way, we ought to know whether any cases have occurred in the Civil Service where information has been furnished. I have very great respect for the Civil Service of this country, and before the Government adopt such legislation, they should state if any necessity exists for it. The hon. Minister states that it is no slur on the Civil Service to pass legislation of this character; but I say it is a reflection on the service, and unless some necessity is pointed out for it, and unless there are grounds for securing it on account of past occurrences, it should not be granted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Animals living, namely, cattle, sheep and hogs, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. MULOCK. When we were in Committee of Ways and Means before, I called the attention of the Minister of Finance to some rather indiscreet or extreme language he had made use of in the course of his remarks, and I expressed the hope that he would see fit to withdraw the remarks he made in regard to members on this side of the House. He hesitated to do so on that occasion,

but I trust, having thought the matter over and having slept on it, he has now returned to his equanimity and good judgment, and is prepared to do so. This side of the House has invariably treated the hon. gentleman with marked courtesy, and he has only received that treatment which he properly earned for himself by his treatment of this side of the House. But in connection with debate the other night he, for the time being, forgot himself, and a plain duty now devolves upon him, that of withdrawing the remarks he made and the insinuations he cast out against the *bonâ fides* of the criticisms of members of the Opposition, or, at all events, of those who spoke on that particular occasion. His observations followed immediately some remarks I offered, and, therefore, so far as I am concerned, I call on him to withdraw those observations, and if he does not do so, I shall feel quite free on all occasions, if such is parliamentary practice, to suggest that the words and statements of the Finance Minister contain a meaning which is not ordinarily or, perhaps, in a parliamentary sense attributed to them. No doubt the hon. gentleman remembers quite clearly what he said, and knows exactly to what I refer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is perfectly justified in the course he has taken. There is no evidence that the statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would lead to the result which the hon. Minister suggested, and it is only fair on his part, having made use of words imputing serious motives to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, he should withdraw them. I certainly feel, having immediately followed the hon. member for North York, that the Finance Minister having insinuated that it was a crime for the Opposition to speak as they had spoken, he thereby imputed to that hon. gentleman that he was a criminal for having made the remarks he offered. I do not think the Minister of Finance desires the imputation to go abroad that because the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) made use of certain remarks, he is guilty of any wrong or committed a criminal remark.

Mr. MULOCK. He applied it to the whole party.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am well aware of that fact, and I am included in it. The slur was cast upon us that we were not only criminals, but we were pursuing a course injurious to the country at large, and one that was liable to be followed by serious consequences. Unless the Minister can furnish proof, he should withdraw the expressions.

Mr. CURRAN. The observations that have fallen from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cannot have been made in seriousness. The Minister of Finance stated that it was criminal, in his estimation, to pursue a certain course, and no doubt in using that expression he meant to say that, whatever the intentions of the party might be, the effect would be injurious, and seriously injurious, to the people of Canada. The fact of the matter is, that the more we consider the course pursued by certain hon. gentlemen opposite, and the speeches delivered by them, the more we are convinced, even they do not see it themselves, that they are inflicting very serious injury on the people of the country; and the more we listen to those speeches and see them reported abroad, the more we must be convinced that the people of the United States, reading the reports of the speeches delivered here by hon. gentlemen in high positions, must come to the conclusion that there is something in the charge made that the policy of the Minister of Finance, and those associated with him in the conduct of the Government, is inimical to the people of the neighboring republic. We all know that such is not the case, that there is no such intention.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is inimical to our own interests.

Mr. CURRAN. I will allow the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to speak all the afternoon when I have finished, and I do not intend to occupy more than a few moments. It is most unfortunate that the expressions should have been used that have been used by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is not one single vulnerable point in Canadian affairs that has not been pointed out. We have heard, time and again, statements uttered that, on certain points, it was competent for the people on the other side of the line to strike a blow at our interests; and all those points have been so often indicated that really it looks as though it was an invitation to do so. On the other hand, there had been repeated, the other night, a statement which was refuted on a former occasion in this House. It was stated by one of those hon. gentlemen who spoke that night, that a feeling of antipathy and hostility to the American Union was manifested by the Canadian people during the civil war. That was stated by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition last year, and replied to by the leader of the Government, who pointed out not only the number of young men from Canada who had been enrolled under the banner of the North in that great war, but who pointed out, moreover, that this Government had received from Secretary Seward the thanks of the American Government for the course they had pursued. But there is something more than that. We have evidence, not merely in official documents, but we have evidence of utterances of public men in Canada during the time that great war was being waged; we have words which, I think, are worthy of being repeated here to-day, showing exactly what were the sentiments of the Canadian people at that time. I shall take the liberty of quoting a brief passage from a speech delivered by a gentleman who occupied a position as Minister of the Crown in Canada, and delivered upon the subject of Canadian interests in the American civil war. I refer to the lamented Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee. He said:

"We can afford to speak of the American system in this hour of its agony, in the glowing language of their finest poet:

> 'Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
> Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all the hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
> We know what Master laid the keel,
> What Workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
> Who made each mast, and sail, and rope;
> What anvils rang, what hammers beat
> Where shaped the anchors of thy hope.'

"We do not—to continue the poet's image—while the ship is driving on the rocks, her signal gun pealing for aid above the din of the tempest, we do not lurk along the shore, gloating over her danger, in hope of enriching our-

selves by the wreck. No, God forbid! Such is not the feeling of the people in Canada. On the contrary, so far the public opinion can be heard throughout the British Empire or the United States, their wish would be that the republic, as it was twelve months ago, might live to celebrate in concord, in 1876, the centenary of its independence. We prefer our own institutions to theirs: but our preference is rational, not rancorous; we may think, and we do think, it would have been well for them to have retained more than they did retain of the long-tried wisdom of their ancestors; we may think, and we do think, that their overthrow of ancient precedents and venerable safeguards was too sweeping in 1776; but as between continental peace and chronic civil war, as between natural right and oligarchical oppression; as between the constitutional majority and the lawless minority; as between free intercourse and armed frontiers; as between negro emancipation and a revival of the slave trade; as between the golden rule and the cotton crop of 1861; as between the revealed unity of the race and the heartless heresy of African bestiality; as between the North and South in this deplorable contest, I rest firmly in the belief, that all that is most liberal, most intelligent, and most magnanimous in Canada and the Empire, is for the continental peace, for constitutional arbitrament, for universal, if gradual emancipation, for free intercourse, for justice, mercy, civilisation and the North."

Those were the expressions of that gentleman who represented so worthily so large a section of the Canadian people in the councils of the nation of that time. He spoke the sentiments not only of that section of the people, but he spoke the sentiments of all those who felt that popular institutions were on trial there, and who desired to see the triumph, as he said, "of justice, mercy, civilisation and the North," in that dreadful contest. But, Sir, whilst we have that evidence, whilst we have these words received with ringing cheers in one of the great centres of Canada, we have gentlemen upon the floor of this House, during the present debate, attempting to irritate the people of the United States, and to make them feel that there was a malignant sentiment in Canada towards them at that time, and that we were inimical to their institutions and to their consolidation as a nation. Is it supposed that this course can be pursued, that people can be wounded in their tenderest sensibilities, that these things can be hurled broadcast all over the land, and be repeated, and reiterated, and printed and reprinted, and that such utterances will be considered as being made in a friendly spirit towards Canada, while we know that we are dealing with a people who are a great commercial nation, a people who are the most sensitive nation in the world; and if these sensibilities are to be offended in this manner, and if it is to be pointed out that we are unfriendly to them, what can we expect but retaliation at their hands. Yet that is the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite; it is the course they announced on the floor of this House the other night and as is recorded in *Hansard*. We feel, and I believe the people of Canada feel, that we have just one policy to pursue in connection with the present state of affairs. We know that it has been in the past, that it is now, and that it will likely be in the future, the desire of the great majority of the American people to annex this country to the United States. It has been their policy all along. Their poets have sung it, their orators have spoken it, and their statesmen are shaping their policy for it, and all this talk of unrestricted reciprocity has merely the one tendency in that direction. If we wish to be a great people; if we wish to be a nation; if we wish our people to continue on in the path they are treading, and to arrive at their national destiny, and not to be engulfed in the neighboring republic, nor to lose their self-governing power, we must carry on a truly national policy for ourselves. The policy adopted on the other side is not one likely to conciliate the people of Canada. The United States have been threatening all kinds of things, not merely on the stump, but in Presidential Messages, as we saw during the last Presidential election, when, through no fault of Canada, Mr. President Cleveland having failed to carry out his object—for mere electioneering purposes, I presume—sought to have retaliation inflicted upon Canada. We have read the recent proposition in the United States, in the resolution introduced a few days ago in Congress, and which has been sought to be explained by my hon. friends on the other side. Now, what is the expression of the *Irish Canadian* newspaper of Toronto, with regard to that proposed tariff:

"Is it intended, by this latest tariff shuffle, to 'starve Canadians into annexation?' If that be the object, it will fail, as did the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, which was to have brought Canada as a suitor for admission into the Union. That attempt at national bulldozing had a contrary effect; it proved, indeed, a blessing in disguise, for it put Canadians on their mettle, and demonstrated what a people could do when thrown upon their own resources. The attempt made now will inevitably end with the same result."

I am glad to be able to quote these sentiments from a paper such as the *Irish Canadian*. It shows that not merely among one section of the people, but in the entire people of Canada, there is a determination that Canada shall exist as a nation, and a determination to develop it to its greatest extent. While I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, especially the hon. gentleman who some time ago proposed a resolution of which we all approved, expressive of our loyalty to the Sovereign of this Empire, are truly and genuinely patriotic, the course they have been pursuing for the purpose of upsetting this Government is one that is doing us vast and incalculable injury, in the minds of those with whom they say we ought to have more extensive commercial relations. They tell us that the people of the United States will not give us any other treaty than one which is likely to wipe out our industries, and place our farming population in the depressed condition in which the farming population of the United States have been shown on both sides of the House to be at the present time, and in the humorous speech of Bill Nye read the other night by the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick, we had a confirmation of the statement that the condition of the farmers of the United States is infinitely worse than the condition of the farmers of Canada. That has been superabundantly proved. And these hon. gentlemen wish us to go into partnership with people in that condition. But if such would be the condition of our farmers, what would be the condition of the manufacturers of this country? It would be what it was in the days where hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches of this country: Canada would again become a slaughter market for the United States, and every sensible man knows that not one of our industries could exist for twelve months against the flooding of this country with the manufactures of the United States; and after our manufacturing industries would be destroyed and our farmers

would be reduced to the condition of the farmers on the other side of the line—after ruin and desolation would be brought to every home in the Dominion—then what would we do? We might then turn to annexation, or if the Americans should lose their hope of bringing us to that, they might say to us, "Now that you have been dragged through this crisis, we will put an end to this treaty and let you shift for yourselves;" and then we would have to begin again and build up those industries which an insane policy of unrestricted reciprocity had destroyed. If hon. gentlemen opposite entertain a desire for annexation, for my part I would like to see them come out boldly and ask for it; if they think that annexation would be for the material and moral benefit of this country, let them come out openly and say so. But I believe there is no desire among the people of Canada to involve themselves in the problems which are staring the American people in the face, and which will not trouble this country for fifty years to come. I believe there is no desire on the part of the people of Canada to change their present position. They only desire to be left to develop their resources in their own way, whether it benefits one country or the other, or reacts even against the mother country. But it is only just and fair, that those who feel that greater advantages are to be derived from throwing in our lot with the people on the other side of the line, should not attempt to bring that about in any roundabout, sneaking way, but should come out boldly and say just what they mean. But I think I speak the minds of those who have sent me here, when I say that we are satisfied with Canada as it has been governed in the past, believing that there is a great and glorious future for our country, which we may all labor to bring about, but which will be retarded if the enemy is to be placed in possession of every arm that can be used against us, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by gentlemen who pretend to speak here in a patriotic spirit for the people of Canada. I believe that no man who is a patriot should show where the blow can be struck against his country, either agriculturally or industrially; I think the greatest mistake any public man can make is to point out the weaknesses of his own country to those with whom that country may have to deal; and I am satisfied that the patriotic words used by the hon. Finance Minister the other night, expressed the true sentiments of the Canadian people, and struck a cord that reverberated throughout the length and breadth of the land, and found its expression in the cheers that were heard in this House; I believe that he spoke the true feelings of the Canadian people as a whole, when he said that they would stand by Canadian institutions, and stand by the policy that has made those institutions flourish.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the amount of oil that his supporter has poured on the troubled waters, and it is evident that such speeches as the one we have just listened to are calculated to facilitate the progress of a resolution imposing an increased tax of 10 per cent. on cattle, sheep and hogs. I have one or two words to say to my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I know something of the history of this country as well as the hon. gentleman. I recollect who were the public men in Canada of any note who ever avowed annexation proclivities, and I can inform the hon. gentleman that he will find one of them to be not the least eminent of the members of the present Government. In fact, although he has not a seat in this House, and therefore was not exposed to the hon. gentleman's criticisms, I think the hon. gentleman would add him to the others who do possess a little brains. From first to last the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there were no men in Canada who avowed annexation proclivities more than those whom hon. gentlemen opposite delighted to honor; and it ill becomes them to throw such a taunt across the floor of this House, when we know that those who were each and all colleagues of the present Premier were dyed to the heart in annexation sentiment. If they wish to find annexation tendencies, they can find them among their friends without going outside of the walls of this Chamber. But I am surprised to hear a gentleman who represents a great manufacturing city rising and telling us that if the Canadian manufacturers got a fair field and no favor, they would be threshed out of the field in twelve months. If there is an unpatriotic or a degrading sentiment or one which shows, in the opinion of one of the most prominent supporters of the National Policy, what the National Policy has done for Canadian manufactures, it is the statement that after ten or eleven years of the most oppressive taxation for robbing the people of this country by tens and hundreds of millions for the purpose of fostering those manufactures, they are not to-day able to stand for twelve months on their own basis. On behalf of every honest manufacturer in Canada, on behalf of every manufacturer who is not a member of a combine, who is not a subsidiser of the present Government as well as a subsidised agent of it, I wholly repudiate such a statement as an unwarranted attack on the manufacturers of this country. What is this policy from first to last? It is a subservient imitation of the American policy in contradiction to the British policy which my hon. friend and I fought and fell for. We fought and fell for the policy of the British Empire, the policy of a revenue tariff, a policy of just taxation which would take no more out of the poor man than out of the rich. What is the policy of these hon. gentlemen? A servile imitation of the American policy for the classes against the masses, for creating a host of plutocrats to help them through election times, for the impoverishment of 500,000 farmers for the benefit of 500 millionaires. That is the American policy, the policy which the Americans are getting tired of, and which in a few years, I hope to see them utterly repudiate. It is the policy we have good reasons for believing the majority of the American people are prepared to repudiate to-day, in order to return to a common sense, intelligent policy such as we advocate—the policy of not imposing one single tax on the people which the necessities of the country and the revenue do not require. What are we asked to do now? The Minister of Finance tells us that we have a surplus of $2,750,000. What did his predecessor, Sir Charles Tupper, tell me when I had a surplus of half a million? He told me that I had no right to have a surplus; that if a surplus existed, it was the bounden duty of the Government to take immediate steps to restore that surplus to the people by reducing taxation.

That was the policy of Sir Charles Tupper, our present High Commissioner, and the hon. the Minister of Finance, who was not then in the House, will find that recorded *in extenso* in Sir Charles Tupper's speech in 1875, when he attacked me, from the identical seat I now occupy, because I presumed to think it desirable under the circumstances, to make a surplus of $500,000. Times indeed have changed with a vengeance. But there is one good thing to which I want to call the attention of this House and country. We have had the most extraordinary difficulty in getting from these hon. gentlemen the admission, and in explaining to the people, that each and every profession by which they got power, not merely at the last general election, but at the first election which restored them to office, was utterly and entirely at variance with their real sentiments. What was the language used by the Finance Minister in reply to a motion of mine made two years ago, advising that an attempt be made to negotiate with the United States ? Did he venture to tell us then, that he was opposed to all reciprocity ? Not a bit of it. Let the House look at the hon. gentleman's resolution, and they will find there a declaration that the policy of the Government was to obtain reciprocity, if they could obtain it on reasonable terms. But what did the hon. gentleman tell us the other evening ? He told us, following humbly in the wake of the President of the Council, that he was utterly opposed to that policy which he said we had been seeking to obtain for twenty-five years, and that he was now going to discard it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has made a strong assertion. Will he be kind enough to look up the *Hansard*, which is before him, and substantiate that statement ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will. What the hon. gentleman said was this :

> "We have been looking for the last twenty-five years in vain for an offer of a reciprocity treaty between us and the country to the south of us, and when at last the trend of events has gone to show that we will not obtain such a treaty, we may as well tread our independent path."

That is to say, that this Government, having been three times over-entreated to make the first, ordinary, common overture, which common sense dictates, to the people of the United States, to commence negotiations with them, with the view of laying the foundation for obtaining a proper treaty of reciprocity, and having each time deliberately refused that proposition and voted it down by their mechanical majority in this House.

An hon. MEMBER. And the country as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. After they have thrice made it as clear to the people of the United States as they could, that they had not the slightest disposition or intention, in any shape or form, to negotiate a treaty with the United States, they now turn round and tell us, forsooth, that they are going to tread their own independent path. That is to say, they utterly refuse the proposal made at our instance, to negotiate with the United States, and when they find that the natural, the inevitable result of their insane policy is that the people of the United States—judging in this respect, I believe, unfairly, or at least incorrectly, of the real wish of the great majority of the people of Canada, but judging correctly according to ordinary usage, and accepting the declaration of the hon. gentleman and his supporters as fairly representing the minds of the people of Canada—when the United States are proposing a measure like this, then the hon. gentleman turns round and says: We could not obtain reciprocity. How did the Government expect to obtain it ? Did they expect to obtain it by proclaiming to the whole world, and notably to the people of the United States, that they would not entertain a proposition looking to negotiations with the United States at any price ? For that is what they did And now we have the President of the Council declaring that even the most partial and modified interchange of natural products would be a calamity to the people of Canada. I say again, I thank the hon. gentlemen for having dropped the mask and shown to the farmers of Canada how hollow and false were their pretensions, how completely they are in the hands of the combines, their paymasters, how utterly indifferent they are to the great interests of the great bulk of the people, and notably to the interests of the great bulk of the agricultural class, when it comes in contact with any of these pampered manufacturers for whose benefit, and whose benefit alone, this whole tariff is devised. What good are our farmers going to get out of your paltry increase of duty of 10 per cent. on animals or 1½ cents a pound on pork ? These are not worth one farthing. The whole duty will not do the farmers a tenth part as much good as would the abolition of the duty on corn, which would go to feed the pork. And, in the same way, this step which the hon. gentleman is taking, and which I tell him is retaliation, and retaliation of a most absurd and suicidal kind, is a direct invitation and incentive to the United States Congress to pass in its entirety the Bill now under their consideration. Sir, it was most impolitic and most unstatesmanlike for the Government of Canada, while that Bill was just in its initiatory stages, to put in the hands of its supporters such a weapon as was done by these resolutions. I say it was a most absurd act, if you look at the enormous volume of trade affected on the one side, and the utterly insignificant results to be attained on the other. It is the most insane act I have ever known the Government to commit. It has but one parallel, and that is the parallel known to this House, when we endangered a lumber trade of some twenty millions of dollars a year for the sake of a paltry export duty, which the Government were obliged to remove some six or twelve months after. But to revert for one momont to the question of annexation. There happen to be a very few men, who were formerly in Canada, and who are fanatic annexationists, and I commend to the attention of this House a fact that has been noticed here before, that the most pronounced annexationist—the gentleman who of all others has made himself most conspicuous of late as an annexationist—declared he would infinitely prefer to support the policy of the First Minister than our policy on this side. Here we have true annexationists at heart, who believe that the policy of the Government is doing more to create annexation sentiments in the country than anything else which has ever occurred.

Mr. CURRAN. When the hon. gentleman stood up and made some observations with regard to the slight applicability of my speech to the item

under consideration, I thought he was going to come back to the subject of discussion, but whilst he has devoted a considerable amount of time to a speech which has so little relation to the subject, I notice that the salient points brought out, or sought to be brought out by me he entirely avoided. He started out with a not very good-humored onslaught upon certain gentlemen, one of whom, he says, is still living, while the others have disappeared from the scene, and he says they were annexationists. I think, if any man deserves respect, it is the man who comes out and says what he means ; but, if any one deserves contempt, it is the man who shows to another country the points in which his country can be attacked, and, whenever he opens his lips, gives aid and comfort to the enemy. Will the hon. gentleman deny that he has stated what I have pointed out and have proved to be false, what this country knows to be false—that the people of Canada were unfriendly to the people of the United States during their great civil war ; will he deny that that statement was injurious to Canada and that it was likely to injure our relations with them ? Can he controvert my authority ? Did he not admit that Secretary Seward had congratulated the Canadian Government ? Can he deny the words used on the floor of this Parliament by the late Hon. D'Arcy McGee ? Can he deny that every suggestion injurious to Canada has been made by his friends in this Parliament, even to suggesting the placing a duty on hens' eggs ? Yet he cannot see that in the statements which he and his friends have made they are playing into the hands of the commercial rivals of Canada. He goes on to tell us that I am not a true Canadian and am not patriotic, because, coming from a great manufacturing constituency, I point out that in twelve months of reciprocity the greater part of our manufacturing industries would be wiped out. That is no criterion of their present status. That has nothing to do with the fact of their being on a good basis now ; but we can quite understand that, with reciprocity, the Americans would turn in their goods here by the carload and would slaughter them in this country, as we have had experience before. We know what took place in the past, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that, so long as this generation lives, they will not forget the soup kitchen policy which was inaugurated by him at that time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are running down your country.

Mr. CURRAN. I know you cannot stand it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I cannot stand humbug.

Mr. CURRAN. We, who saw these soup kitchens in existence——

Mr. LANDERKIN. And, no doubt, you missed them.

Mr. CURRAN. We who saw these soup kitchens, when Joe Beef was giving bread free, and when deputations from every branch of industry were coming here for relief, know that the hon. gentleman opposite turned his back on them, because, as he said, he knew what political economy was and they did not even understand their own business. Now the people of Canada are not likely to accept the political gospel of hon. gentlemen opposite after the comparative prosperity which they have experienced for some years past. They know that, through the instrumentality of the National Policy, they have no such degrading positions to go through as they had when the hon. gentleman was in power. We find the people contending now against adverse interests, it is true, but hoping and believing that, under the enlightened policy of the present Government, there are good days for them in the future. The hon. gentleman may say that the people are wasting under the present tariff hundreds and hundreds of millions. This only shows how careful the hon. gentleman is in his statements to the fraction of a cent. The people may not pay very much attention to his statement, and certainly they will not when they remember the results of his management of finances in the past. He wound up by stating that a certain gentleman on the other side of the border, who had declared himself an annexationist, stated that he would prefer to support the policy of this Government to the policy of the Opposition. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the gentleman to whom he refers was in this House as a supporter of the party now in Opposition ? Does he forget that he was so strong a supporter of the hon. gentleman that they were like brothers, that they walked arm in arm and agreed upon everything. I believe that gentleman left his country for his country's good, and I would wish that all annexationists would leave this country as he did, and allow true and loyal Canadians to manage their country in their best interests.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am sorry to say that the general opinion is that the present Cabinet is rather weak in its composition, and especially in regard to matters of trade and commerce. They have not many men in their ranks who understand much of that matter. My hon. friend from South Oxford has pointed out that our manufacturing interests could hold their own with those of the United States if they had a fair field and no favor, but the hon. gentleman opposite says that the Americans would send their goods into Canada and slaughter them here under cost price.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). "Hear, hear," says a gentleman on the back benches, who appears to have as much commercial knowledge as the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). Suppose that, under reciprocal trade relations, these gentlemen were engaged in the foundry business, and that their stoves were sent in here at 10 per cent. below the price for which they could be made there, and below the price for which they could be sold in the United States. I do not think, if I were in that business, it would ruin me if these stoves were sent in in that way, because if it would close my foundry I would buy those stoves and sell them in the United States where the high price was maintained. Then how long would they continue that business ? One transaction would show them their folly, and terminate such a course on their part. But why should it close my foundry ? I could do better than allow it to lie idle, for not only could I sell their own make at a profit in their own country, but I could work my own manufactory here harder than ever and sell the products of it in their high market as well. The contention of the hon. gentleman is the grossest absurdity in regard to trade and commerce that I

ever heard used in this House. If they do not take that ground, they are forced upon the other ground, which is denounced by the hon. member for South Oxford as unworthy ground, that of publishing in trumpet tones, as he did in this House and to the people of the country, that the people of Canada are unable to hold their own with the United States in a free, fair market, with equal competition, no advantage being given to them. Sir, I repudiate it on behalf of the manufacturers, as I believe the manufacturers themselves will repudiate it. Nothing more need be said to a gathering of men who are supposed to be acquainted with the first ordinary principles of trade and commerce, in refutation of what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has evidently been overflowing for some days, and he has been trying to keep down the safety-valve of his political steam, and now that he has let it off, it is to be hoped he will feel better. I would just say that the remarks that have dropped from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), with regard to the remarks of the Finance Minister, were very proper, and I think my hon. friend has very properly taken exception to the language of the Finance Minister. I think it is unfair that the hon. gentleman opposite should have used the language he did towards hon. members on this side of the House. We are discussing a great and important question. The House will remember that when the member for North York drew the attention of the Finance Minister to this question, he reminded the Minister that the latter had previously stated that it is not for the purpose of revenue that he was proposing this duty—at least he led the House to understand that. Now, if it is not for the purpose of revenue that he is imposing this additional duty of 10 per cent. upon cattle and sheep coming into this country from the United States, we would like to know what the purpose is? If he says it is for the purpose of protection, the Trade and Navigation Returns show clearly that cannot be the object, because it was clearly shown upon that occasion that no animals of that kind are imported into the older Provinces of this Dominion. They have been imported into the North-West, but not into the older Provinces. He puts an additional duty of 10 per cent. upon sheep, when it has been shown that only one sheep was brought into the Province of Ontario. Does the hon. gentleman want to convince the Ontario farmers that he is aiding them by putting a duty upon sheep coming from the United States, when, during the last year, they only brought in one? It cannot be for the purpose of procuring a revenue that he is doing it; he is, therefore, thrown upon the other horn of the dilemma, that it is for the purpose of retaliation, and it is evident that such is his purpose. Now, there is another important matter that, I think, should be pointed out. The Committee of Ways and Means of the United States Congress have, undoubtedly, been deliberating upon a Bill to increase the duty upon products coming from Canada to the United States. That Bill has not yet become law, although it has been before that committee, and although they have, to some extent, adopted some of its provisions. But, after all, it has got to pass through several more stages before it becomes the law of the United States. Now, our Government here has taken a step in advance of what has been done in the United States in the direction of retaliation, because they are coming before this House with a Bill, backed by their supporters, declaring retaliation in regard to cattle and sheep. It is exceedingly imprudent on the part of the Government to ask the consent of this House to a measure of that kind, until such time as it is clearly proved by the action of the United States Congress that they are legislating in the direction of retaliation. I say that their action shows, on the face of it, that hon. gentlemen opposite are determined, by every item of legislation that they can pass, to show the Americans that they do not want any closer trade relations with them. The President of the Council has said so, the Finance Minister has virtually sanctioned that statement by the language that has been read by the hon. member for South Oxford, and the Government are evidently committed to that course. They have made up their minds that whatever may become of the farming community of this country, however much they may require closer trade relations with the United States, however hampered their financial condition may be, the Government are determined that, sink or swim, they will stick to the National Policy and the manufacturers of the country. That is the decision they have come to, that is the course they are bound to carry out. I contend that, in the discussion of this question, the Finance Minister used language that was not at all courteous to this side of the House, and I say that the hon. member for North York, in demanding a retraction of that language, is doing what is just to every member of this House, in a parliamentary sense. Let me read what the hon. gentleman said. He will find it on page 3193 of the *Hansard*:

"We have been looking for the last 25 years in vain for an offer of a reciprocity treaty between us and the country to the south of us, and when at last the trend of events has gone to show that we will not obtain such a treaty, we may as well tread our independent path; we may as well be a country now, and do what we honestly consider to be best for the country through and through, and if we meet difficulties we will meet them like men, but not act the part of cravens, and simply fall down and do nothing."

Now these are the words we take exception to:

"I will go one step further. I hold it to be criminal almost—I may say without that restriction 'almost,' that I hold it to be criminal for any party to endeavor to create the idea in this country, and in the country to the south of us, that we are animated with a malicious motive of retaliating against them."

Now, I hold that the hon. Finance Minister had no right to use these words as regard the hon. members on this side of the House. We have simply been saying that the Government, by the course they are taking, have proved that they are adopting a policy of retaliation. If they have not said so in words, they have said so by the Acts which they have been prompted to bring before this House, and by forcing them through before the Americans have given effect to their retaliation policy, if they have any. I say this Government are taking a step in advance of the American Government; they are going one better. It shows clearly that they are not disposed to conciliation; they are disposed to irritate, provoke and encourage retaliation on the other side, by acts of retaliation on this side. That is the long and short of it, and the hon. Finance Minister, in

applying those words to hon. members on this side of the House, committed an injustice; had he applied them to his own acts, and to the course he has taken, the application would have been entirely proper.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) should have been a little more moderate in his assertions as to the ignorance of members on this side of the House. He has accused one hon. member after another of the grossest ignorance, of want of knowledge of commercial business. Well, Sir, I suppose that his knowledge of commercial business is in the line of joining combines in trade in order to rob the people of this country. That is one of his conceptions of the proper method of conducting commercial business in this country. His solution of the difficulty is this: He tells us that if a stove can be imported 10 per cent. cheaper, he, as a stove dealer, would be glad to buy those stoves at 10 per cent. under cost and sell them to the people of this country. In that case, what becomes of the laborers of this country? What becomes of the foundries of this country? Their employment would be gone, they would be forced to seek for occupation in some other country outside of Canada. I think we, as Canadians, prefer the policy we have adopted, of protecting our own industry, and of giving employment to our own people, as the one best adapted for making the people of this country prosperous and contented at home. With regard to the statements made and reiterated by hon. gentlemen opposite, they have asked us, why put this duty on live stock? Why impose this duty, when the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and another hon. member told us that only one sheep came into Ontario last year, and yet it is proposed to impose an additional 10 per cent. to keep that one sheep out. Is that a fair statement to place before the country? Do not hon. gentlemen know that 43,225 sheep were imported into Canada during last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Into what part?

Mr. WALLACE. Into every part of Canada. We are here legislating for the great Dominion of Canada, not for one Province exclusively. But, if they had been imported into only one Province, the case stands on precisely the same footing. For this reason: If the people of one particular Province required 43,000 sheep and could not get them from the other Provinces, they must import them. Why should not the surplus in the other Provinces have been sent to them——

Mr. LANDERKIN. The freight would have eaten them up before they reached there.

Mr. WALLACE—and thus have encouraged the farmers of the other Provinces? Hon. gentlemen opposite also lose sight of the fact that not only 43,000 sheep were imported last year, but also 4,000 horses, 3,900 swine and 748 horned cattle. If a single live animal had not been imported into Canada the argument for increasing the duty still remains, for, in order to be consistent, the duties on live stock must be made equal with the duties on dead meat. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year, what do we find? Of butter and cheese, we imported last year more than half a million pounds; of bacon, ham, beef, mutton and pork and canned meats over thirty-two million pounds. These are products of the farm which our Canadian farmers can as well raise and produce as can the farmers of other countries. And what does that mean? It means occupation, profitable employment to thousands of our farmers and our people.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point of order. Are we discussing the item of pork?

Mr. WALLACE. We are discussing it in this way: duties on dead meats have a close relation to live stock, one depending on the other.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is an axiom no one will deny.

Mr. WALLACE. The increase in the imports of dead meats and in beef alone is most astonishing. A few years ago scarcely any of these products were imported from the United States; but now they are increasing steadily yearly, and no doubt if the increased duty had not been imposed there would have been an enormously increased importation of beef next year. The Government are to be congratulated on increasing the duties on farm products, in order to meet the wishes of the people, and I hold that we should go forward and make a tariff to suit the Canadian people and the interests of Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. After the oratorical effort of the patriot for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), I may, perhaps, be allowed to say a few words. That hon. gentleman told us he would not say anything to decry the country, neither in its present nor in its past history. He told us how the policy that prevailed previous to protection had depreciated and destroyed our industries. From the Trade and Navigation Returns I have prepared a statement which shows our exportation of manufactured goods for several years, and if the hon. gentleman had been present I should like to have shown it to him and pointed out that at the very time when he says our industries were standing still we were exporting more manufactured goods than we are exporting now. In 1876 we exported manufactured goods to the value of $5,972,913, in 1877 to the value of $4,105,422, or a total for the two years of $10,078,335. The hon. member for Montreal Centre said that our industries had all gone to the dogs at that time, that our people had left the country and that everything was standiag still. We will take three years under the policy instituted by this Government. In 1886, when this beneficent policy was in all its glory, we exported manufactures to the value of $2,834,137; in 1887, to the value of $3,079,972; in 1888, $4,616,282; making in the three years exports to the value of $10,529,381.

Mr. WALLACE. I rise to a question of order, and I raise the same point as was brought forward by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right to ask the question as to whether I am in order; but I will speak to the hon. gentleman in a moment. I want to show the House and the country that during the three years our manufactories were in full headway under the National Policy, we did not export so many manufactured goods as we did in two years before protection. A few words now with respect to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). The hon. gentleman has reason to rejoice in this policy, because it has

given him a stand in this country which he would not otherwise have attained. We would never have required an anti-Combines Bill but for this policy; and if this Bill had not been required, the hon. gentleman would never have been heard of. One of the reasons, therefore, why the hon. gentleman favors this policy is because it has served as a little stepping-stone for him, and enabled him to move against the combines system, which we predicted years ago must result from a policy of protection. The system throughout is simply one of combines and monopolies. No one who ever gave any attention to political economy will believe that it is anything except a system of combines. Protection is a system ruinous to this country and opposed to its best interests. I will now address a few remarks to the President of the Council, who is a gentleman possessing a great deal of skill and ability; but it appears that he is not gifted with a spirit of prophecy, because he told us, at the time of the introduction of this policy, that it would be impossible for combines to be formed here. He said:

"I know something about the Americans. I have lived among them a good deal. I was educated among them."

That is where the great trouble is with members of this Government. Nearly all of them have got their education from the United States. That is where the trouble is with the whole thing. They are trying to introduce Yankee systems and Yankee customs into this British country of ours. That is what the matter is with the Government. They have got their education and training in the United States, and they try to introduce those Yankee customs. We, on this side of the House, stand for glorious old England; we stand for her system of trade and her system of commerce, we are British to the backbone. The gentlemen on the other side of the House have got their education and their tariff in the United States, and they have got to try to show that they are loyal, but their loyalty don't materialise; it scarcely ever does, and they cannot make the people believe they are loyal unless they get up and declare in everything against the United States. It is not necessary for us on this side of the House to tell the people that we are loyal. We received our education in Canada and in Great Britain, and everybody knows that it is not necessary for us to boast of our loyalty every time we speak in this House or in the country, because the people know well that we are. Now, the hon. the President of the Council says:

"I know something about the Americans; have lived among them a good deal; was educated among them, and have always lived near them. I, at that time, expressed my settled belief, though it had not then the weight with the leader of the Government that I hoped it would have, that just so long as we were prepared to permit this unequal system, by which we were excluded from the American markets, while the Americans had access to ours, they would consider it better than reciprocity, and would not give us reciprocity. That was the view I then took and still hold, and I then made use of the expression which had been so much lauded, and so much abused—'reciprocity of tariffs, if not reciprocity in trade.' I believe the reasons I then urged were sound."

Again, the hon. gentleman says:

"We who entertain protectionist principles, hold that the ordinary effect of protection would not ultimately enhance the price of goods to the consumer. And why? Because, when an industry is protected, those engaged in that industry had an opportunity of making money, and the result was, that others finding an industry to be a profitable one, would embark their capital therein; thus, competition would regulate prices. In this way, rings could not be formed."

If "rings" could not be formed, what was the use of the Combine Bill introduced by my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace)? The hon. the President of the Council was educated in the United States, and I have no doubt it was a very good school; but he and his friends have told us about the depressed condition of agriculture in the United States. We tell those hon. gentlemen that it is protection that has depressed agriculture there as well as here. I think, perhaps, we had better come to the item under discussion now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentlemen on the other side will, no doubt, agree with me in that, and I wish to call the attention of the Government to this item for several reasons. The Government say they are going to do a grand thing for the agriculturists of the country by this tariff. It is very gratifying to find they are not allowing those animals to be slaughtered in the country, so as to enter into competition with the products of the farmers. They pretend to be the friends of the farmers, but they have never shown it, and in this very proposition which they now make, I do not think they have gone far enough to benefit the farmers. Now, we did not import, last year, into the Province of Ontario, one single cow from the United States, or from anywhere else, and we imported but one sheep and two hogs. I notice that while the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance are going to protect the farmer from this incursion into the country of one sheep and two swine, they have neglected altogether the breeders of horses in this country. There were actually two horses imported into Ontario last year, yet the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance have not raised the duty on horses. Are they going to discriminate in favor of those who raise cattle, sheep and swine against those who raise horses? While they are doing this great stroke of benefit to the farmers of this country, they should not forget the farmers who raise horses. Now, as I have said, there were only two horses imported into Ontario last year.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. You had better read the blue-books. There were more than two.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Read the blue-books yourself. You have evidently taken your figures from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). There were two horses imported from England, but if you look you will find that there were a great many more imported from the United States.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, I see that I was a little astray, and my hon. friends have discovered a mare's nest. I find there were two horses imported from Great Britain, and that there were 258 imported from the United States, but that only strengthens my argument. Although we have only imported a few pigs and sheep, and although we have only imported two horses from Great Britain and 258 from the United States, the Government have not increased the duty on horses. I am glad the hon. gentleman brought this fact about the import of horses to my notice, for I am very sorry when I make an error on the

floor of this House, and I am always willing to apologise for it, but I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for this information, because it makes my argument stronger.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). If you got a little more information from this side of the House, your argument would be very much stronger.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, it is at least two hundred and fifty times stronger than when I began. The Minister of Customs no doubt feels more than any man in this House for the political condition of the farmers of this country, and if there is any man who feels more for the farmer's vote next to him, it is the Minister of Finance; and, no doubt, both hon. gentlemen did not come into the House yesterday at all, because they were devising ways and means to capture the farmer's vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was not the reason they did not come here yesterday.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, yes, it was.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, no, it was not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, why?

Mr. MITCHELL. It was because we were discussing the Thompson Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I don't think that would keep either of them out of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; both of them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume the hon. gentleman knows more about that than I do; but I think it is the duty of the Minister of Finance to see that something should be done for the horses. I hope the Thompson Bill will not exclude any gentleman from the Government, and I trust they will all be allowed to remain in the House.

Feathers of all kinds, N.E.S., 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand how it is that the Government should admit artificial flowers at 25 per cent., and charge 32½ per cent. upon the cotton goods used by the poor farmers. Artificial flowers are, as a rule, used by the richer classes, and yet you charge less duty on them than you do upon goods which are absolutely necessary for clothing poor people. I would like the hon. Finance Minister to explain that. Is it because he wants a revenue? If he does, he should charge more than 25 per cent. His tariff is arranged to encourage the importation of commodities which are not a necessity, and to compel poor people to pay a high duty on the commodities which they use. I would like him to explain why he makes this change.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change. If my hon. friend would study the items of the tariff more closely, he would not make that mistake. The rate mentioned here is the old rate, but the two kinds are disjoined for obvious reasons.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I think this is a proper time to make a change. I think it is unfair to make such a discrimination.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would ask the hon. Minister if he does not allow any feathers to be imported into Canada free of duty, as was the case a few years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you will find any feathers on the free list in schedule C.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then the hon. Minister must have changed the tariff on feathers, and I will call his attention to the fact that there are feather-bone factories in Canada where various useful articles are manufactured; and on representations being made to Sir Charles Tupper when he was Finance Minister, he granted a concession permitting the importation of certain kinds of feathers free of duty. If I am to understand the hon. Minister correctly, although this industry was established to a certain extent on account of that concession, yet, after it has been in operation for a short time, he comes down without any notification and imposes 25 per cent. duty on those feathers. If he persists in this duty, it will have an injurious effect on that industry.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps I could save a little time if I inform the hon. gentleman that he will find the item to which he refers on page 54 of the Customs Act—quills in their natural state or unplumed. That is the article out of which those things to which the hon. gentleman refers to have been manufactured, and it still remains on the free list.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, it is evident that the hon. Finance Minister is more efficient at hurling epithets at the Opposition than he is in acquainting himself with the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman asked about feathers, and then he gave us a dissertation about manufacturing from goose quills.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, it is a nice playing with words to say that a quill is not a feather. The hon. gentleman will certainly admit that the hon. Finance Minister did not understand the item; but I am now satisfied, if the hon. Minister of Customs states that those articles are to be admitted free, that the industry to which I have referred will continue as it has been in previous years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask if this item includes all kinds of feathers?

Mr. FOSTER. All except those which are not elsewhere enumerated.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the hon. gentleman intends to reduce the duty on ostrich feathers to 15 per cent., while he charges 25 per cent. on all feathers which are used by the poorer classes.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that it would be better to take the discussion on each item as it comes. It is not intended to change this item. When we come to the item of ostrich feathers, if my hon. friend thinks it is wrong, he can move to change it.

Mr. McMULLEN. All I want to do is, to impress on the hon. gentleman the propriety of arranging his tariff to bear on the poorer classes fairly and honestly, and I ask him why he allows a duty of 25 per cent. to remain on common feathers, and reduces the duty on ostrich feathers to 15 per cent?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be well for the Committee to confine their attention to the items as they are reached. We cannot avoid

going back to items sometimes; but I think the Committee will agree with me that we ought not to anticipate the discussion of any item in advance.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order to properly discuss the items, we must compare them with each other, and we cannot do that if we are confined to discuss each item by itself.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 98) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith; and the motion of Mr. Wallace in amendment.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The preamble states the circumstances which necessitate the passage of this measure. I would move to amend it by striking out, in the ninth line, the word "accident," and substituting the word "circumstances," and to add the following words :—

"And whereas, it has been made to appear that the expiration of the patent was due to fraud on the part of persons who were not under the control of the patentee and his agents."

This should be adopted in order to prevent a precedent being created with regard to the renewal of patents by statute. I substitute the word "circumstances" for "accident" because the expiration of the patent was not quite accidental, though not due to any circumstances under the control of the patentee or his solicitor.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Would it not be better to prevent the establishment of a precedent by not allowing the Bill to pass? From its tenor, the Minister of Justice has not evidently fully established that the lapsing of the patent was owing to fraud. If it were, there ought to be action taken against the guilty parties. Although the evidence before the Committee was in the direction stated in the Bill, that ought not to justify this House in allowing a patent to be revived after it is virtually dead, and after people have obtained a right from the neglect, either accidental or otherwise, of the patentee. I think the principle of this Bill is a dangerous one, and that the Minister of Justice will regret the action he is taking. The whole responsibility will be on the Government for this legislation, and I, for my part, protest against it.

Bill reported and amendments concurred in.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the National Construction Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. Hudspeth.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the York County Bank.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Home Benefit Life Association.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 128) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 125) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Mr. CURRAN. The Railway Committee altered the eighth clause from what it previously was, to make it correspond with the sixth clause of a Bill passed in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, making the terms of this section agree with the Bill already passed with respect to the other company. The words were :

"The company may enter into working arrangements with, or may lease or acquire running powers over, or the right to work the line of any other company in Canada which has been duly empowered to make or grant the same."

This alteration was satisfactory to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which merely required to lease lines that are under the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada. But the Grand Trunk Railway Company are desirous of leasing roads that have been chartered by the Provincial Government of the Province of Quebec, amongst others, and the ground on which objection to this clause was raised, was that the Bill, as it stood, might empower the Grand Trunk Railway Company to lease, hire or amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company gave the views of the company as follows :—

"In looking over clause 8 again, I am a little surprised at the position taken against it. You will notice it could not by any possibility include the Canadian Pacific Railway, because there are express enactments put on the Statute-book by Sir Charles Tupper. You will remember the discussion at the time which prohibits any agreement, or lease or amalgamation between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and any of its branches. The clause in our Bill simply enables the Grand Trunk Railway to enter into working arrangements with, to lease or acquire running power over, or the right to work the line of any other company that has been duly empowered to make or grant the same to the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway are not so duly empowered, but, on the contrary, are expressly prohibited by the statutes I have mentioned from making any such arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway. The clause, as we put it, is to enable us to complete arrangements with our little side lines and small roads, and that is all that is aimed at. The clause would prevent us from having anything to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other line that is not duly empowered, as I have stated, and there can be no other construction put upon it."

I want to add a few words in section 8, after the

word "Canada." I will read the clause and state where the words come in :

"The company may enter into working arrangements with, or may lease or acquire running powers over, or the right to work the line of, any other company in Canada under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, which has been empowered to make or grant the same."

Leaving out the words "by the Parliament of Canada."

"Which has been empowered to make or grant the same to or with the Grand Trunk Railway Company."

That is the amendment I would like to suggest.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is departing from what was fully discussed and arranged before the Committee, after due deliberation, because, if he does, we shall have to enquire into and discuss the matter very fully. I think it was understood, that exactly the same powers that were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be given to the Grand Trunk, and a paragraph in the Bill was altered to agree with a paragraph in the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, passed this Session. It was done with the approval of the First Minister, who was present, and agreed to by the Committee, and the words were altered to meet the general approval of the Committee. It would be very unwise to attempt to reopen that discussion. If it is done, however, I shall feel it necessary in the public interest to propose an amendment, which I do not care about doing, unless it is absolutely necessary, and I think the hon. gentleman who is moving this measure will best consult the interests of his clients if he does not seek to depart from what the Committee solemnly agreed upon after due deliberation and consideration of the different interests involved. I do not desire to oppose the Bill; I think we should give the Grand Trunk exactly the same powers as the Canadian Pacific Railway. But this country has to dread, and we look forward with a good deal of fear to the time when these two great corporations might unite, for, if they did unite, they would control this Legislature and control this country from one end to the other. We ought to have a section inserted in the Bill, and I intended to move such a paragraph if there had not been such a unanimous feeling in the Committee that under no consideration should those two great companies, which control an enormous power politically, amalgamate; and if they did amalgamate, there would be no more use for Parliament, for these companies would elect the members, they would dictate who should form the Government, they would make a recommendation as to who should be Governor General, and they would practically rule this country, and it is of the utmost interest to the public to see that no such amalgamating powers shall be given to them. The hon. gentleman says there is a small corporation chartered by the Province of Quebec which has not the authority to unite with the Grand Trunk. Why did he not mention that company by name in the Bill, and if this had been done I do think any one would have raised an objection, but I object to the words in the eighth paragraph being altered as the hon. gentleman suggests. If he wants a discussion he can have one, but he had better take the Bill as the Committee decided it, and not raise a discussion under the circumstances.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, in so far as my memory serves me, the extract which the hon. gentleman read, correctly states the effect of the law, and there is on the Statute-book a provision, inserted during a somewhat animated discussion which took place here, which would prevent amalgamation or working arrangements between the two great corporations of which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has spoken. It is not, therefore, with respect to that difficulty that anything I have to say is brought forward. If that question were raised, I agree with the hon. member that it would be a vital question, a question which certainly could not be disposed of, under any proper reading of our rules, without a proper notice and without a reference back to the Committee. But a suggestion which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has made, may, perhaps, solve the immediate difficulty, and enable us to deal with this measure upon what I conceive to be sound principles. I feel, perhaps, a special responsibility with respect to the present position of this Bill, because it happens that, upon looking over the earlier measure to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, it appeared to me, as then framed, objectionable. It seemed to me that the Parliament of Canada ought to lay down this rule: that it would not grant the power of amalgamation or working arrangements without having passed once, at all events, upon the proposition that it was expedient that such powers should be given. And, therefore, I suggested to those who were promoting the other Bill, that they should alter the Bill and limit their powers to cases in which the Parliament of Canada had once spoken affirmatively. I said, if Parliament has given to any railway company either a general authority to make working arrangements with any other company, or a special authority to make working arrangements with a particular railway company, then there is no objection to Parliament saying to another company: You can make working arrangements with any company so authorised; because Parliament in that case has already said there is no objection to such an amalgamation being effected. And it was upon that suggestion as to the expediency, on general principles, of retaining the power to the Parliament of Canada to that extent, that the other Bill was altered, with, I believe, the unanimous consent of the Railway Committee. It seems to me the principle is as good and sound to-day, and with respect to this Bill, as it was with respect to the other Bill, and, therefore, I object, upon the same grounds on which I objected to the other Bill comprehending that wide authority, to this Bill comprehending as wide an authority as the hon. gentleman proposes. If there be, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said, some specific case, which it is wanted to meet in a hurry this Session, for the amalgamation or the making of working arrangements with some particular railway, we can still preserve the general principle, which I deem to be of importance, by allowing the general clause to be retained in its revised form, and by inserting a clause giving special authority to deal with the specified company, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, and thus we shall have met the case fully.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is the solution of the difficulty. One can quite understand that the Grand Trunk is in a different position to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Grand

Trunk has connections in the settled parts of the Dominion, and has running arrangements and leases with smaller railways. I quite agree with the line of argument pursued by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that we should adhere to the principle settled and to the clause as decided on by the Railway Committee to-day, but that in order to meet this special case of the Grand Trunk, there should be a separate clause added to this Bill, setting out the railways over which they desire to make running arrangements. If that suggestion meets the views of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), he might postpone the Bill until next Monday, by which time he could have procured the list of railways and inserted them in the Bill.

Mr. CURRAN. I feel that the suggestion having come from both sides of the House, the best policy is to acquiesce in it as gracefully as possible. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has spoken of this company as my clients.

Mr. MITCHELL. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. CURRAN. They are constituents of mine, but not clients, unfortunately.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I said clients, it must have been that they were your clients as one of the representatives of a city where they possess great power and influence; and, no doubt, in order to have them in that position, the hon. gentleman is willing to attend to their official business here. I wish to say, in addition, that I am not opposed to this Bill; I supported it in Committee, and I shall be glad to see the Grand Trunk obtain exactly the same powers as the Canadian Pacific Railway possess, and nothing more; but the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Durham, and approved by the Premier, entirely meets my approval as a fair and reasonable arrangement.

Committee rose and reported progress.

H. H. VIVIAN & CO.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 124) respecting H. H. Vivian & Co., Limited. —(Mr. Dawson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I think the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill should explain to the Committee what the object is in coming here for the incorporation of a company to work mines and carry on mining operations. I could understand why that should be done if the mining operations were to be in the North-West Territories, but that is not proposed; they are only to be carried on in the Provinces of Canada, and I think the hon. gentleman should tell us why he comes here, and not to the Legislature of the Province in which those operations are to be carried on.

Mr. DAWSON. The company is an English company, which is said to be possessed of a good deal of capital. It has acquired lands in Algoma, especially at Sudbury, where it proposes to carry on operations. There can be no clashing of interests with other companies, because its work will be simply to sink shafts in the ground, and every additional mining company is an assistance to the others. This company is already incorporated under an English Act, and it comes here to ask power to work mines in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty is, that the object of the company is to acquire and work properties in the Province of Ontario, and is, therefore, a Provincial object; and it would certainly seem more appropriate to apply to the Provincial Legislature for any corporate power that might be desired. It seems to me that it is a very great stretch of our jurisdiction and an evasion of the limitation of our rights, to incorporate a company here simply for Ontario operations.

Mr. DAWSON. The company asks power to work mines and establish smelting works in any part of Canada. Though it proposes in the meantime to begin operations at Sudbury, it does not wish its operations to be confined to the Province of Ontario, otherwise it would have gone to the Provincial Government. I may say, from information which I have, that the company is possessed of sufficient capital to carry out its objects. I believe it is one of the largest mining companies in the world, having mines in every part of the world, and it now proposes to come into Canada with its great capital to carry on mining operations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the observations of the hon. gentleman at all remove the objection. We have to consider, not merely where their operations are to be carried on, but the nature of the franchises which the company seek. They are franchises which this Parliament has not power to bestow, except in the North-West Territories. Once the company is incorporated it is an artificial person, and has the same rights to carry on its operations within the powers conferred on it as any other person. It proposes to establish smelting works not in any part of Canada, not in the North-West Territories, which are under our jurisdiction for all legislative purposes, but in the Provinces of Canada. The power of a company to carry on mining operations must depend on the good-will and authority of each Province where those operations are to be carried on. It is true, if this company were incorporated in Ontario it could not carry on mining operations in Quebec, but it cannot carry on mining operations in either Ontario or Quebec if is incorporated here. The fact is that our incorporation confers on it in this respect no power, and the hon. gentleman purposes to create a corporation without in reality giving it any franchise. The Legislature of Ontario might refuse to recognise any corporation incorporated by the Parliament of Canada for such a purpose, and it does seems to me that it is altogether an abuse of our power to create a corporation on which we are bestowing no franchise at all in any proper sense.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not prepared to assent to the proposition that this Parliament might not confer these powers on a company, but, I think, we ought not to do so unless sufficient reasons are given why we should. As the time for private Bills is up, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman allow the Bill to stand until Monday.

Mr. DAWSON moved that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Axle grease, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the same duty as before. The only change is that the words "similar compounds" are omitted, and the reason of the omission is that all sorts of things were attempted to be brought in as "a similar compound," and thus a great deal of trouble was caused.

Barrels containing petroleum or its products, or any mixtures of which petroleum forms a part, when such contents is chargeable with a specific duty, 40 cents each.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the same duty. The only change is, that, whereas formerly every barrel containing petroleum was taxed 40 cents, whether the contents were chargeable with a specific or *ad valorem* duty, now the barrel is taxed 40 cents only, when the contents are charged a specific duty.

Surgical belts or trusses and suspensory bandages of all kinds, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The change in this consists in adding the words, "and suspensory bandages."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that both the duty on trusses and the duty on suspensory bandages are equally objectionable. It does appear to me that a community of Hottentots would know better than to legislate for the purpose of increasing the cost of articles required for the use of persons suffering from injury. Of all the vicious practices that have crept in under this tariff, that of taxing surgical appliances or medicines of genuine value, appears to me the most utterly barbarous that ever entered into the minds, even of protectionists, to conceive. I cannot imagine how any human being, who really considers for one moment the results of a tax of this kind and the fact that these taxes operate directly as a penalty inflicted on any unfortunate individual who may happen to sustain severe injury, requiring the use of a truss or bandage, can defend such a tax as this. I hope the hon. gentleman, who is not responsible for putting this in originally, will make these things free, in the interests of suffering humanity.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I endorse every word the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has uttered. This is a tax on people who are very ill able to bear it. There is a very large profit at present in the manufacture of trusses, belts and bandages. There is no other industry in this country whose product pays better and sells at higher rates. Again, when we consider it is largely the working people who require these articles, we cannot fail to admit that this is another attempt to impose a heavy charge upon those who are unable to bear it. From my own practical experience, I find that nearly nine out of every ten people who require bandages and trusses are found among the working people; and that is only natural, because those troubles are occasioned by hard work and heavy lifting. The cost of these articles is at present high enough. We have to pay $2 to $20 for a truss, although any one who examines a truss will see that $2, $3, or $4 at the outside will cover all the material and workmanship it contains and when a duty of 25 per cent. on that article, is imposed, you are inflicting a heavy tax on the laboring people. Trusses, belts and surgical instruments are too dear altogether in this country; and if we had a little more competition in the Canadian market in these articles it would be much better for the people. I can purchase an article in the city of New York for 60 cents for which I have to pay in this country $2.60, and I can purchase an article in New York at $7 which costs $13 in Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. The duty would not keep that out.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No; but there appears to be an understanding or a combine among these manufacturers to impose these very high prices. If the Government would reduce the duty on these articles, they would be doing an action which would redound to their credit and would benefit the people. The greater number of the people who require these are men and women working on farms and at other heavy labor. This tax does not come out of the pockets of the medical men, who have only to prescribe those helps and supports, but comes out of the pockets of these poor people.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the appeal which has been made to the Minister of Finance has been sufficient to induce him to make up his mind that this is a duty which ought not to be placed upon the unfortunate. It is only the unfortunate who require these articles, and why should the hon. gentleman inflict more misery upon them. They are generally a class of people who are ill able to bear the burdens imposed upon them? The Minister knows that he does not require this revenue; he has a large surplus and is going to have a still larger one. Why, then, should he impose this tax upon those who are already afflicted? If a man loses an arm or a leg, he is often compelled to go to the United States to get an artificial limb. I know a case in which an honest, industrious young man in poor circumstances lost an arm in the discharge of his work, and had to go to New York to get an artificial arm and hand. Being poor, he could not remain in New York while they made the arm and hand for him, and so he came home. The artificial arm was sent to him at St. Thomas, and he was charged a customs duty of $7.50 on it. The collector of Customs there said he thought it was a hardship for this man to have to pay that duty. If he had been in good circumstances, he could have remained in New York until the arm was completed, and then probably no duty would have been collected on it. The collector forwarded an application for the remission of the duty to the Minister of Customs, and the reply came back that it was a dutiable article and must pay the duty. Representations were made that the man was in such circumstances that he was practically unable to pay, but the Department, true to its instincts, compelled him to pay $7.50 for this article. This case shows that there is a wrong being done to these unfortunates in compelling them to pay this extra amount of duty. I think the Minister should allow this item to stand or withdraw it. I think, if he knew the people who require to use such instruments as these, he would

reconsider this. It may be said to doctors that, if we are so anxious that these men should get along, we ought not to charge them for our attendance. Well, we do not charge them in cases of this kind. Professional men who are here may call to mind circumstances which have come under their attention in which these unfortunate men have been injured when doing hard work in lifting or other work in connection with railroads. They know that generally these people have large families to support, and that they cannot be expected to bear these burdens easily. If you go into a drug store, they will charge you for one of these articles $2, $4 or $6, and you will wonder how such an article comes to so high a price. But the Government add 25 per cent. more duty, which will come upon these men who wear these instruments. I hope the Finance Minister will have heart and conscience enough to feel that this is a case in which he should relieve the burden on the afflicted. I do not place very much confidence in the Government of the day, but still I have hope that, in the interest of the suffering, they will allow this item to be struck out, and will lay the tax upon those who can afford it better. Let the hon. gentleman place an additional tax on the silks and satins and the wines of the rich. Some hon. gentleman say the Government do not want champagne taxed extra, but, if the Finance Minister entertains the same views now as he did formerly, he would increase the duties on brandies and champagnes and other articles of that kind ; but sometimes positions change people, and I am afraid that the hon. gentleman has changed. If you must have this additional revenue, impose it in such a way that it will be borne by those persons who are able to pay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Committee should pause before they confirm this duty, and I think the Minister should give us some information of the reason for maintaining such a duty at all. The cases which have been mentioned by my hon. friend are not singular. I know of a case in which an unfortunate child had lost its leg and had an artificial leg. As the child grew, the leg was found to be too short, and it was sent to New York—the only place on the continent, I believe, where this sort of thing can be done—to have it lengthened. When this leg, which had already been worn, but was simply mended and lengthened, came back, this paternal Government charged a considerable amount of duty upon it. I think it is not only unfair but degrading that such a course should be pursued. I do not think there is any nation in the world so barbarous, except perhaps our neighbors, the United States, as to put a duty on such articles as trusses and bandages. However, if Ministers are not disposed to strike out this item, we can only divide upon it on concurrence.

Mr. MULOCK. I see that the Minister is surrounded by three or four, or perhaps five or six medical advisers. These instruments may be very necessary to them to lift themselves over the next election with, and I think they should give the Minister some advice.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the professional gentlemen opposite who display their intelligence, or rather want of intelligence, with reference to this line of goods, have been talking in a way that is not consistent. I understand the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) stated that he bought an instrument on the other side for 60 cents, that he would have had to pay $2 for here. There is only 15 cents duty ; that would make it 75 cents. Why should he pay $2 ? I can say with reference to this particular item, that it only applies to trusses and bandages, not to surgical instruments or artificial limbs ; and in this particular line we have makers in Canada that, I think, are quite equal to any on the other side. In my experience I find that Canadian-made instruments or appliances are quite as effective for what they are intended, as any that can be got on the other side, and I think at as reasonable a price. The member for North York (Mr. Mulock) knows that Cluthe's establishment in Toronto is one of the best on the continent, and supplies the finest instruments in the world. When we have them made so plentifully at home there is no great hardship in putting on a duty. In this case there is no increase of duty, it is only making the item a little plainer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman says that instruments manufactured in Toronto are superior to those manufactured in other places.

Mr. SPROULE. Of this class they are quite equal.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I have had a good opportunity of ascertaining the character of the instruments manufactured in Toronto, and I have compared them with those manufactured in the old country. Surgical instruments and all other instruments manufactured in the old country are far superior to those manufactured in Toronto. Very few instruments at all are manufactured in Toronto. The hon. gentleman says it is only to make the item plainer, but that has nothing to do with imposing heavy burdens upon these unfortunate people. Am I to understand that the Government have sought out these unfortunate afflicted people and are going to increase their burdens and afflict them still more? Is the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) going to let the people understand, that, although they are already afflicted, he is going, for the sake of the Government, to impose extra burdens upon them ? I, for one, would not feel justified in imposing heavier burdens upon these unfortunate people. We cannot get much revenue from these instruments, and it must fall upon a class of people who are least able to bear it.

Mr. SPROULE. It falls upon the wealthy as well as the poor.

Mr. MITCHELL. For one wealthy person afflicted there are twenty poor people, for the reason that it is by hard labor, by straining and toiling, and lifting, that these accidents occur. Wealthy people do not do that kind of labor.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the usual experience of medical men.

Mr. MITCHELL. The poorer classes are not able to pay the exorbitant fees that medical men charge, therefore you do not know how many poor people are suffering.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My professional brother, the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), must know that all these articles are sold at prices three times greater than it costs to produce them. I appeal to all the medical men on the other side of

the House if that is not a fact; therefore this industry should not be protected so as to exclude from our market a reasonable competition, in order to reduce the expense of these articles to parties who need them. Now, the 25 per cent. duty has succeeded in keeping these articles out, with the exception of $22,164 worth of trusses and belts. Would it not be better if there were larger competition from other countries, so as to reduce the price for those individuals who use them? I am astonished that the hon. member for Grey should get up and attempt to justify the imposition of a duty upon that particular article, when he knows very well that a truss which costs $5 never cost $1.50 to produce it. It only lasts about one year, and then the party, who is usually a workingman, has to get another. It is usually a laborer in the woods or on the railways who suffers an injury through bending and twisting his body; also the wives of farmers and of artisans, who are seeking to help their husbands to make a living, frequently have to perform labor which should be performed by the men themselves, and suffer such injury as to necessitate the use of belts and trusses. The hon. member for Grey knows that is the case, yet he stands up and supports the Finance Minister in imposing a duty upon these poor individuals. How is it that the Government succeed so well in picking out the classes who are the least able to bear these heavy duties? The laborers have been sought out and duties have been put upon articles they require; farmers have been selected to bear heavier burdens, and now the Government has found a class of invalids on which they are determined to impose a burden by putting a duty upon articles which they require in order to enable them to labor at all, and to earn sufficient money, as an hon. gentleman beside me says, to pay the rest of the taxes. Now, I would appeal to the hon. gentleman with the big heart inside that coat—I mean the hon. gentleman who wears the fine silk hat—and I would ask him, in the interest of that class of people, either to remove or reduce the duty, and I am sure he will have their gratitude for all time to come.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, the duty on these articles has not been raised; it is exactly the same as it has been for two years. In the second place, it is not the most expensive of surgical appliances that pay this duty; the item does not include any surgical instrument; it is the cheapest and least expensive class—belts, trusses and bandages. Again, as has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), who has had medical and surgical experience, these articles are made in Toronto and Montreal, and other cities, and, as I am informed, are made just as cheaply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you do not want protection for them?

Mr. FOSTER. The duty is not large. If the duty were 35 per cent., or a higher specific duty, there might be something in what the hon. gentlemen say. The hon. gentleman opposite is profuse in his sympathy for the poor and afflicted upon whom the duty is placed; if he will carry out the same line of argument, he will see there is scarcely anything that pays a duty at all that is not used by the poor and afflicted. The sugar which they use in their tea, for example; all the articles that are taxed in this country for purposes of revenue, are used by the poor as well as by the rich. The line of articles upon which this duty is placed are used by the rich as well as by the poor, though it may be quite true that they are more generally used by people who have to labor with their hands.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance said that the Canadian manufacturers manufactured these articles just as cheaply as they are manufactured abroad. If that is the case, why enhance the value to the consumer, by imposing a tariff which enables the manufacturer to raise the price. The Finance Minister told us that the Canadian manufacturer does not require protection in order to carry out this particular industry.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said they could manufacture as cheaply as foreign manufacturers. If he did state that, he said what I say he said, namely, that the Canadian manufacturers do not require for the purpose of what is called the National Policy, namely, the development of that industry, this particular protection. This, then, is a sample of the infant industries the Government are always protecting, and which never arrive at maturity. If it is the case that the Canadian manufacturer can manufacture as cheaply and manufacture as good an instrument as is manufactured abroad, how comes it that the Trade and Navigation Returns show a very considerable importation of these particular articles every year? Last year the duty collected on belts and trusses was $5,542, which, at 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, would give a value of over $21,000. Here we have seen, as is usual, doctors differing. I regret that an hon. member, who is so well informed on the question, and who comes in daily contact with suffering, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) must do, should be the one to stand up in Parliament and ask to have additional burdens imposed upon those unfortunate members of society. Why, the Government are boasting that they are doing their best for the poor man, for the benefit of society generally, and yet here they have been unmasked by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who has shown that, for the sake of protecting one or two manufacturers in Toronto or other parts of the Dominion, it is proposed to tax the halt and the lame throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is an inhuman proposition. It is a disgraceful proposition. I cannot find language sufficiently strong to express my abhorrence of this proposition. It is a bit of downright cruelty, and I suppose it could only be proposed by the Government on the well-founded theory that they are not free agents. They are simply instruments in the hands of the manufacturers of those instruments, and I trust that those instruments which they are taxing will become instruments of torture to the Government when they come to give an account of their administration to the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Men of wealth, who can afford to go to Boston and New York, or Buffalo, are treated in those cities, and the necessary appliances are put on, and they come back to this country without paying duty on those appliances. But the poor man has to be treated at home, and has to pay the duty on the appliances.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Minister of Finance must remember that the price on which the duty is paid is double or treble what the article is really worth. Add to that 25 per cent. and the result is a very heavy duty indeed. It is said by the Finance Minister that all duties must bear more or less heavily on poor people. I do not think that is an argument to offer in the present case, and the hon. gentleman should consent to the item being struck out. It is well known that a much larger number of the poor, in proportion to population, are afflicted with these troubles, than the rich ; and these cases are principally confined to those who perform heavy work. These people are, moreover, compelled almost every year to supply themselves with new articles of this kind, and a sufferer will have to pay an extra duty almost every year or cease working altogether and go to the poorhouse. In the interests of humanity the Finance Minister should strike out this item. The hon. gentleman said that this is not an increase of duty. Even if it is not, it is no argument that it should be retained if it imposes hardship and is wrong in principle. There are other items that are nearly as unjust as this. Take, for example, oranges, which are necessary to the sick room. The Government impose burdens on every class, and yet they say they are a paternal Government; but, if so, they are cruel, harsh and unjust.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I submit that the Finance Minister has not touched the merits of the question. He has stated that this duty is only on the cheaper kinds of appliances used, and that the costly instruments used by a surgeon are not included. We have no objection to the more costly instruments being highly taxed, because we know that medical men, although they are compelled to work hard, are about as well paid as any class in the community, and are well able to pay the duty on the high-priced instruments they use. He says the poor people must pay a share of the taxes as well as the rich. We do not object to that principle, for the Government cannot levy taxation without including the poor as well as the rich, but unfortunately the Government has so arranged the tariff that in the articles of consumption the poor man uses he has to pay the heavy share of the burden. As regards this item, what we complain of, is not so much that the poor have to bear the heavy share of the tax, but that the Government have singled out for taxation a class that is not only generally poor, but which is also afflicted and unfortunate. I submit that the Minister of Finance has given no satisfactory reason for continuing this tax, and that it is a duty we owe to these afflicted people that this extra tax should be struck out.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Minister of Finance has said that we were paying a duty now on surgical instruments, but I do not complain of that, as the surgeons themselves pay that particular tax. This is a different thing altogether. Surgeons have nothing whatever to do with paying the expense of trusses and belts, and other articles included in this particular item. The expenses entirely fall upon the party purchasing, and I believe it is largely in the interests of those invalids to have these articles placed on the free list. I, therefore, move, seconded by the member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), "that trusses, surgical belts and suspensory bandages be placed upon the free list."

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I think the hon. gentlemen on the other side entirely magnify the importance of a duty on these articles. Trusses and such appliances are largely in the hands of patentees ; their sale is limited, and the price is comparatively high or the manufacturers could not keep in the business. In speaking about bandages, I venture to say that nine-tenths of those in use are worn by the wealthy people of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I know something about this as well as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I know that these articles are largely used in this country by wealthy people and that they are sold and peddled all over the country by women. The poorer people have very little to do with paying the duty on these articles.

Mr. PLATT. The remarks made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) would tend to show that the duty on these articles is entirely unnecessary. He has said that these instruments are generally in the hands of patentees, and the sale being limited, it was necessary that the articles should be placed at a very high price. Nobody will dispute that the prices of these surgical appliances, no matter how simple their construction, are far beyond their intrinsic value and the cost of their production. That, I think, is a sufficient reason why their price should not be increased by a duty. If we have to pay the present high prices, it is due to the fact that these articles are in the hands of specialists or patentees, and that they are distributed to druggists or other vendors who generally expect pretty high profit on their wares. That is a very good reason why no duty should be placed on these articles. I have listened to this debate to ascertain the reason why the Government propose to continue this duty. They have not told us whether it is for revenue purposes or for the sake of protecting the manufacturers of the country. It must be for the one or the other, or for both. The Government has told us, time and again, since this debate commenced, that these duties were not for the sake of revenue, and I can tell them that the placing of duties on these articles does not protect the manufacturers in this country in the least. The manufacturers need no protection. The high-priced articles which they produce are used by them to advertise their professional standing—for many of them are professed surgeons—and they use the trusses they manufacture to advertise themselves before the country, so that when they advertise their wares they are advertising their professional skill. They pretend in their advertising to advise their patients free of charge, and to charge moderate prices for their trusses. Aside entirely from the representations from this side of the House regarding the condition of the people who mostly suffer from these accidents which require such appliances, there is a very good reason why no duty should be imposed, or rather why the duty should be removed, because of the high prices which are charged upon these articles. If the people already have to pay three times the cost of an article, it seems to me that it should not be enhanced in price by imposing a duty. Unless the Government are really in need of

revenue, I do not see what reason they can have for continuing these articles on the dutiable list, and I trust they will not wait for a division of the House to place them on the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. Before you put that motion to the House, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I scarcely think the hon. gentleman who proposed it understands what the effect would be. Does not the hon. gentleman know that, even though the article be struck off the list, it still remains the law?

Mr. PLATT. He moved to have these articles placed on the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. I have to inform the hon. gentleman that the striking out of this item would not affect the duty now imposed upon the articles mentioned. The only reason for asking the consideration of the House upon this item, was simply to declare by statute that which we have had to rule in the Customs Department as being dutiable at 25 per cent.; and in order to avoid the trouble and annoyance which occurs at the different ports of the Dominion. For instance, some officials would interpret the word "belts" to include everything—even a belt for a saw-mill—and as the word "surgical" was not in the old law, nor the words "suspensory bandages," they are inserted here now to make the matter clear. This is a mere explanatory clause, inserted to enable the different officers to administer the law as it stands upon the Statute-book. If you strike this out, you leave the law precisely as it was, and under which so many difficulties have arisen. If the House deems it advisable that there should be no duty imposed on trusses and belts, then it would be necessary to introduce a Bill to repeal that clause of the tariff as it now stands on the Statute-book. I may mention that a majority of the resolutions now before the House are of the same character; they are rather explanatory than an interference with the duty as it exists to-day; so that the House will understand that if it is desirable to repeal this clause, some other procedure must be followed than merely to strike it out. The manufacture of these articles is an industry that exists in different parts of the Dominion, and if it is worthy of a protection of 25 per cent., then, like all other industries, it should be protected. That is the only reason why this duty is on the Statute-book at all. It is not for purpose of revenue. The arguments used, as my hon. friend the Finance Minister very aptly said for striking out this item, will apply to every single item in the tariff, with the exception of those which refer to what may be termed luxuries. I hope the House will not strike the item out, but will allow the amendment to be made in order to enable the Department to nnforce the law as it ought to be administered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that it is trifling with the intelligence of this House to say that a tax of this kind stands on the same footing as all others except taxes on luxuries. Here you have a tax on an article known to be required by people suffering from a particular disease, and I can conceive of no possible article on which common humanity should more induce the Government to require that there should be no tax, than trusses and suspensory bandages. The hon. gentleman knows that it is the sheerest folly to talk to us of these articles being made here as cheaply and as well as they are made elsewhere. If they are, of what earthly use is a protective duty on them at all? Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that $21,000 worth of trusses would be imported into this country and a duty of 25 per cent. paid on them if they could be manufactured here as cheaply as they are in the United States, England or elsewhere? The thing is absurd on the face of it. This is an article that every principle of humanity requires you should make free. With the solitary exception of a tax on quinine, which, to the everlasting disgrace of the United States and to our own disgrace, was maintained for a considerable time, I know of none so utterly indefensible, so inhuman or so repugnant to every sense of political morality, as a tax on articles of this description. I remember on one occasion, when my hon. friend from North Brant and myself called attention to a similar enormity, the hon. First Minister had it struck off. In conformity with, I was going to say, the barbarous instinct of the protectionist mind, Sir Leonard Tilley, when Finance Minister, had actually imposed a duty on books printed for the use of the blind, and it was not until the hon. member for North Brant and myself appealed to the hon. First Minister that we got that duty struck off. I will appeal to him again, as a man of sense and humanity, whatever else he may be, to throw off this duty on trusses.

Mr. PLATT. I think we may as well know now as at any time what our powers are. If we can, by no action we take here, remove any of these duties, I do not see the use of discussing them any further. The hon. Minister of Customs has told us that it is impossible, by anything that this Committee can do, to affect the duty on this particular class of articles, and it will certainly tend to shorten the discussion, if it is true what he tells us, that in the case of a majority of these resolutions, we are here only for the sake of discussing them, without the possibility of preventing their effect. It seems to me we have before us the very clauses, by carrying one of which and voting down the other, we can repeal the duty on these articles. If the Committee fail to pass the section now before us and repeal section 2, this article will be placed on the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. It is scarcely fair for the hon. gentleman to say that I attempted to mislead the Committee, for I pointed out a mode in which the repeal of any of these duties could be effected. I did not expect to convince the hon. member for South Oxford. I expected him to meet the question exactly in the manner in which he has met it, for he hardly ever rises to address the House without using such adjectives as absurd, barbarous, heinous, with regard to propositions from this side of the House. He is very desirous of annexing this country, commercially, to the United States, and he wants us to adopt the American tariff, which imposes on these very articles, the moderate duty of 45 per cent. If we are barbarous in imposing 25 per cent., I leave it to the hon. gentleman, with his power over the English language, and particularly his knowledge of adjectives, to properly designate this conduct on the part of the friends with whom he so much desires to be allied commercially. I am really inclined to think that the hon. gentleman must be politically ruptured, or he would not attempt to impose on this country such

a barbarous and outrageous tax as 45 per cent. on trusses and articles of a similar character.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I regard the American tariff as a degree more barbarous than our own, which is saying a good deal. As to the introduction of the American tariff, I and my friends here always maintained the English system; it was the hon. gentleman and his friends who introduced the cast-off relics of American protection here. They are the parties who are responsible for discarding the English system, under which we had lived practically until 1878, and who introduced the American system, which has worked its legitimate fruits. But I recall the hon. gentleman to the question before the Chair. I say no friend of humanity can read this item which proposes to inflict a duty of 25 per cent. on surgical belts, trusses and suspensory bandages, which are largely used by the poorer classes, without feeling ashamed of the Parliament of his country, which allows such things to remain on the Statute-book.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Blacking, shoe and shoemakers' ink, and shoe, harness and leather dressing, and harness soap, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change in the duty. Shoe, harness and leather dressing had formerly been ruled under this clause.

Advertising pamphlets, pictures and pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price lists, advertising calendars, advertising almanacs, tailors' and mantle-makers' fashion plates, and all chromos, chromotypes, oleographs, photographs and other cards, pictures or artistic work of similar kinds, produced by any process other than hand-painting or drawing, whether for business or advertising purposes or not, printed or stamped on paper, cardboard or other material, N.E.S., 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. Advertising pamphlets, not illustrated, were formerly charged at the rate of 1 cent each, and these are now included under this item.

Geographical, topographical and astronomical maps, charts and globes, N.E.S., 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. Formerly the item read, "Maps and charts, 20 per cent." Globes have been added. They were ruled here formerly.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Have we any establishment for the manufacture of globes in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand they are manufactured in Toronto.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Toronto *Globe?*

Newspapers or supplemental editions or parts thereof, partly printed, and intended to be completed and published in Canada, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The words, "Newspapers or parts thereof," appeared formerly, and now the item reads: "Newspapers or supplemental editions or parts thereof." If the newspaper should be rated at this rate, supplemental editions should come under the same rate. They were formerly ruled under this.

Bank notes, bonds, bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, drafts, and all similar work unsigned, and bill-heads, envelopes, receipts, cards, and other commercial blank forms printed, or lithographed, or printed from steel or copper or other plates, and other printed matter, N.E.S., 35 per cent., *ad valorem.*

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new item. These articles were not before enumerated, but were ruled generally, I think, under the item of manufactured paper, at 35 per cent., and some of them were rated under the still higher duty of 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent. It was thought best to make a new item, and put them at 35 per cent., which would be less than the average before.

Bookbinders' tools and implements, including ruling machines and bookbinders' cloth, 10 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The only change in this item is adding "book" before "binders." Bookbinders' cloth is a special cloth used for the binding of books. This will prevent every kind of cloth alleged to be for the binding of books, but not actually bookbinders' cloth, being attempted to be brought in under this item.

Mr. MULOCK. This brings up the question of our copyright. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the proclamation is issued yet bringing our Copyright Act into force?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has not. The despatch in relation to the Order in Council which was sent by the Imperial Government is on its way to the Privy Council, and has not reached that body yet.

Fancy work boxes, writing desks, glove boxes, handkerchief boxes, manicure cases, perfume cases, toilet cases and fancy cases for smokers' sets, and all similar fancy articles made of bone, shell, horn, ivory, wood, leather, plush, satin, silk, satinette or paper; dolls and toys of all kinds including sewing machines when of not more than two dollars in value, and toy whips: ornaments of alabaster, spar, terra-cotta or composition; and statuettes, beads and bead ornaments N.E.S., 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the permission of the House to insert the word "amber" after the word "spar" in the line next to the last. I propose also to strike out the word "beads," and to make a separate item for beads at 20 per cent. This is in consequence of representations made, especially from some bands of Indians, who use these beads largely for their ornamental work.

Brass in strips, for printers' rules, not finished, and brass in strips or sheets of less than four inches in width, 15 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. Formerly brass in sheets, not finished, was on the free list, but it was found that an attempt was made to bring in the brass in narrow strips almost ready for manufacture, and it was found necessary to make a definition as to what a strip should be. Consequently, the arbitrary limit of four inches has been made here. Anything less than four inches is still on the free list.

Braces or suspenders, and parts thereof, 35 per cent *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The only addition is the words "and parts thereof".

Mr. McMULLEN. It seems to me that this is a very large increase on the article of suspenders.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no increase.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, it is a very large duty to continue on such an article.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the rate is so very high, considering the competition. Very strong pressure has been brought upon us to make the duty higher, but I have withstood that, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be satisfied.

Mr. MITCHELL. You did not withstand it very much.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty is not increased.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am surprised at the assurance of the hon. gentlemen when they say that the duty is not increased, as if it was not twice too much before. The duty which they imposed before has left them a surplus of two million dollars, as they claim; but, whenever a high rate of duty is complained of, the answer is that they have not increased it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) objected to the high duty on braces and suspenders, and my hon. friend said the duty was not increased, and that he had resisted the attempts which were made to induce the Government to increase it. Then the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said: "You did not resist it much," and I said the duty was not increased, showing that we had resisted the appeal which was made to us to increase the duty. I will be very cautious in future to suggest anything to the hon. gentleman which may ruffle his sweet temper, which is very much like my own.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish the hon. gentleman had shown as much caution during the last fifteen years, and then we would not have had such large duties imposed. These are due very much to the accumulating tendencies of the Minister of Customs. It is not due to the Finance Minister, but to the grasping tendency of the Department over which the Minister of Customs presides, and his desire always to draw blood out of the poor people. Time and again the hon. gentleman has said, as the Minister of Finance said just now, we have not increased the duties, as if they were not too high before.

Mr. ELLIS. I understand that there is quite a large industry in bringing parts of suspenders into this country and putting them together here. Will not this added provision crush that industry out altogether?

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister says the duty is not increased. It is 35 per cent. What industry is there, I should like to know, that should have a duty of more than 35 per cent. The maximum duty should be 25 per cent., and, if an industry cannot exist with a protection of 25 per cent., the money should be devoted to something that can exist under that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that pressed goods are admitted on a duty of 25 per cent., nickel and other goods of that kind at 25 per cent., jewelry at 25 per cent., gold and silver articles at 25 per cent., silk hats at 25 per cent., diamonds, set, at 20 per cent., and yet 35 per cent. is charged on braces and suspenders. Is there any necessity to make the poor man pay 35 per cent. on a pair of braces, while the rich man only pays 20 per cent. on diamonds?

Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, 17½ per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The only change here is leaving out the words "when imported direct from the country of production."

Mr. MULOCK. Why is the Minister imposing a duty on rice?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not imposing it.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, does the Minister approve of imposing a duty on rice?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, or it would not be here.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the Minister imposes these duties either for the purposes of revenue or for the purpose of protection. In which respect does he suppose this duty will operate?

Mr. BOWELL. This is not to protect the rice, but the change is made for the purpose of enabling parties to bring into this country uncleaned, unhulled or paddy rice from any part of the world at the rate of 17½ per cent. The old tariff reads as follows:—

"Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, when imported direct from the country of growth, 17½ per cent."

Rice, cleaned, bears a duty of 1½ per cent. The object in making this change, as I said a moment ago, was this: A line of steamers is running in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Vancouver and Hong Kong. If that rice is bought at Hong Kong, although it has been brought there from some other part of the world, if imported in that way, it would pay a duty of 1½ per cent. a pound, not being a direct importation. This enables a large quantity of uncleaned rice to be brought into the country and cleaned in Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. If the duty is excessive, let it be repealed or reduced. Here you are imposing a tax of 17½ per cent. *ad valorem* on a food used by a large portion of our people. Last year we imported 18,000,000 lbs. of unhulled rice, which paid a duty of some $30,000. Everybody knows that rice is one of the staple foods, and not only of the wealthier classes, but of the poor, and it can never be protected sufficiently, to be grown in this country. It is certainly not necessary to impose this tax for revenue purposes. I would ask the Finance Minister why this tax is imposed. On what principle is it that you tax rice, an article that can never be grown in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. There are many things that are not grown in Canada, that are taxed. Rice must have been originally taxed for revenue purposes. I suppose we need a revenue yet.

Mr. MULOCK. But it is not required for revenue purposes, because the Minister told us a month ago, that he had a surplus of last year and was going to have a larger one this year, and he says he is shortly going to commence to reduce the national debt. It is quite clear he has made out no case for taxing rice, a staple article, that enters into the consumption of all classes of the people, more particularly that class which the Government loves so much on election days, the poorer classes. Why is it that now, in this quiet nook of the Dominion, they tax this food?

Mr. FOSTER. I have given the only reason.

Mr. MULOCK. The only reason is no reason at all. He supposes it is for revenue purposes, and he tells us that he has a surplus. So it is a burden wantonly placed upon the shoulders of those friends of the Administration, the poor people.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend would not, of course, argue that because we had a surplus last year of $1,800,000, and because we expect a surplus of over two millions next year, therefore we must repeal all the items from which a revenue is col-

lected. We have a surplus, and we need a revenue still. It is my opinion we need both.

Mr. MULOCK. If you will collect more than is necessary, you should reduce the taxation. Look through the items that are taxed and see which ones can be best dispensed with, and you will find that rice is an article upon which there is no justification for imposing a tax for revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we need all the surplus we have over and above consolidated revenue, to meet the capital expenditure of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad my hon. friend has raised this question, because it brings us down to the food of the people. It is a question that will have to be threshed out thoroughly before hon. gentlemen get through all these items of increase. The answer these gentlemen always give is: We have not increased the duty on rice. The Finance Minister says that by fixing the rice tariff on uncleaned rice as it was before, at 17½ per cent., it increases the traffic between Japan and China and Vancouver, and leads to the importation of large quantities of unhulled rice, for the purpose of giving employment, I presume, to a single rice mill over there. The hon. gentleman admits that he had $1,800,000 of a surplus last year, and he expects two millions this year. My impression is that there will be a good deal more than two millions, with the tariff we are now dealing with. The hon. gentleman says that he does not think that because the tariff has brought him in a surplus, therefore he should take the duty off. Sir, I recollect that when one of the hon. gentleman's predecessors had a surplus, he felt it necessary to give relief to the poor people, and he took the duty off tea altogether, and it was to the credit of that hon. gentleman that he did so. It would be well for the present Finance Minister to follow his example, and according as his surplus grows, and he finds there is more revenue collected than he needs, let him commence by taking the duties off the food of the people, off the staple articles upon which the people live, and there is none of them that, while not a luxury, is a more desirable article of food than rice. Let him commence by taking the tax off the food of the poor people, take it off rice, take it off flour, take it off pork, take it off molasses, take it off everything that enters into the daily food of the working classes of this community. If he and his Government would pursue that policy, they would earn the gratitude of the country more than they do by heaping up surpluses and trying wherever they can to put on heavier duties. I think the hon. gentleman should take that duty off rice altogether. He will lose $30,000 of revenue, it is true, but that money would remain in the pockets of the people, particularly of the poorer classes. Hon. gentlemen say they may require it. Yes; they will require it, and a good deal more. You will require it for subsidising and purchasing constituencies, in making useless railways and useless public works, in spending three-quarters of a million pounds, for instance, upon the Chignecto Ship Railway, which is as well as thrown into the sea. It was done for what purpose? To please Sir Charles Tupper and his constituents, and for no other reason under Heaven. He held you by the throat and made you vote the money. And how are you building it? You are carrying out that part of the National Policy in what way—how are the contractors building it? They have imported a thousand Italians, who dig holes in the sides of the banks, put in a few poles as for Indian wigwams, put on a covering of brush, and live in them like hogs. Let the Finance Minister ask the member for that section of the country, and he will get the information that I have got from him in regard to this condition of affairs. These laborers do not spend the money in the country. The Government has squandered three and a quarter millions to bring a thousand Italians into the country.

Mr. FOSTER. We did not bring them in.

Mr. MITCHELL. Your tools have brought them in, men for whom the money for this useless work is voted; this work which, when it is finished, will be a standing disgrace and ridicule in this country to the whole world. Then it is completed at a useless expenditure of three and a quarter millions. Hon. gentlemen go on accumulating taxation when it is useless and unnecessary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in regard to duty on rice, I most cheerfully endorse them. I cannot see on what ground the hon. Minister continues the duty on this article. If it was absolutely necessary to raise money to carry on the business of the country, he might possibly include such an article of food as rice, which is a cheap and nutritious article used by the poor people, on the same ground as he would include other breadstuffs; but, I think, it should be one of the last of the articles placed upon the taxable list. But when the hon. gentleman concedes that last year he had a respectable surplus, that this year he has a very large surplus, and that he expects a large surplus next year, every possible ground on which he could demand an exaction of from seventy to eighty thousand dollars a year in the shape of a tax on rice is gone from him. My hon. friend mentioned $30,000 as the amount collected in duty, and he was perfectly correct if he confined his remarks to uncleaned and unhulled rice. We imported last year a very large quantity, 19,951,897 pounds, of the value of $193,000, on which a duty was paid of $30,289. But we also imported rice, on which a duty was paid of $43,683, making a total of about $74,000. This is an article not consumed by the rich but by the poor, and the duty strikes at a class which the Finance Minister should seek to relieve. Moreover, he does not require $70,000 more revenue. This is one of a class of articles which should be first removed from the taxable list. Further, this is an article not raised in the country, the duty is not required for protection purposes, and, therefore, the tax is totally indefensible.

Mr. GILLMOR. The Finance Minister, in reply to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), said they did not bring in the Italians to work on the Chignecto Ship Railway, and they had nothing to do with it. They had a great deal to do with it. On one thousand dollars worth of the products of labor which come in, our workingmen have to pay $300 taxes before they can use them; but the Government allow the Italians to come in without paying any taxes, and they come in to compete with our own laborers. In order to make your protective system consistent,

when you tax the product of labor, you should tax the foreign laborer coming in to compete with our own workingman.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that your policy ?

Mr. GILLMOR. If I were a protectionist, and wanted to do the fair thing, I would do that. If I wanted to protect all classes alike, I would do that; and I would say that a workingman, twenty-one years of age, had cost somebody $1,000 to raise him to that condition, and I would tax the $1,000 in labor $300, just as I would tax $1,000 in products of labor. Then manufacturers would understand what protection means all round. When the workingmen are taxed to support railway works, manufacturing and other interests, the Government should impose taxes on foreign workingmen who come in to compete with our home laborers. That would be a consistent policy. It is an imposition on the workingmen of this country that taxes are imposed on everything they eat, drink and wear, and yet they are compelled to contribute towards the annual subsidy of $150,000 to build that marine railway in order to make work, as you say, for the people; and yet you let Italians come in to do that work, and to build that nuisance and swindle the Chignecto Ship Railway. I say the workingmen ought to awaken to their position. I saw how the workingmen were protected in Albert street in this city. I remember this Session a banquet was given to the Premier by the Conservative Workingmen's Association of Ottawa. No doubt the workingmen thought the Government were promoting their interests. I talked with some of those workingmen on Albert street. I there saw men digging through a foot of frozen ground and throwing up frozen earth from a sewer—if any of you want to know what work is, go and try it. These men received for this work a dollar a day of ten hours. Now, you are protecting all the industries of the country and all the monopolies and all the wealthy concerns; but when that workingman with his dollar a day expended it on sugar, he had to pay 65 per cent. additional for duty. Let that workingman take his dollar and spend it in a retail store, and he would have to give 30 cents of it for duties, and so he would receive only 70 cents for ten hours' toil. I hope the workingmen will see they, as a class, are not protected, and I think they are awakening to the fact that they have been humbugged by this so-called National Policy. The Government have tried this National Policy for eleven years, and what has it done for Canada ? Look at the question fairly and honestly. You have got a lot of interested parties to combine to cheat the people. But you found that there was a large class that bore the public burdens, the farming class, and they saw they were not being treated rightly, and you had, therefore, to come to their assistance. Why did you not do that eleven years ago ? If your system was a sound and correct one, why did you leave that large class to struggle with the evils of protection until they have become pauperised in this country ? Hon. gentlemen opposite were very much pleased when I read, the other night, an extract from Bill Nye's description of the western farmers. They thought that supported their view and showed that the Western farmers were in distressed circumstances, and mortgaged for millions and billions of dollars. Why, it is just what you have done here. Across the lines they have had protection for 25 years, and that was an honest description of the condition of the farmers of the United States to-day. Protection is having the same result in Canada, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it, and the Government are now coming to the relief of our farmers. They would not do it if they were not compelled in order to maintain themselves in power. That is the secret. There is no other reason. The farmers have been carrying the load and bearing the burden. I once read a story of an Irishman and a few of his associates who took a contract to clean out a well. As they had no ladder to get down, it was proposed that one should take hold of the spindle, and the next should hold on to the feet of the first, and so on with the rest of them, and that they should get down to the bottom of the well in that way. After they had got into position, the first man said he could not hold on longer just then, and exclaimed: "Hold on below till I spit on my hands." And he suited the action to the word, and down they went to the bottom of the well. And if the farmers who are now holding on, have to rest to spit on their hands, down they go, and down the Government goes with them, and down the manufacturers go—down where you ought to go, and down where you will go, if you hold on to the National Policy. I am delighted that now we are beginning to understand that question in Canada, and I am as sure that your National Policy and your protective system will come to naught, as I am sure I am standing here. I know that that system is based upon injustice, I know that it is a false policy, I know that it will fail eventually; but it will hold on a good while no doubt, because the fallacies which you can bring to bear upon it will succeed as long as you can warp somebody into these unholy combinations to cheat somebody else by entering into this reciprocal rascality. Who are you going to rob when you get through with the farmers? The workingmen and the industrial classes are the only ones left for you to prey upon. The statements in regard to farm mortgages may be exaggerated, but there is no doubt that the National Policy has depressed Canada in later years to an enormous extent. You cannot point to one industry, you cannot point to a locality in the Dominion, which has benefited by your policy, with the exception of a few monopolies in Montreal and Toronto, or one or two other places. Your protective system is calculated to make paupers of the many and millionaires of a few. That is what it has done in Canada, and it can never do anything else. When I was a boy in England forty years ago, I never dreamt that I would have to stand up in Canada, to oppose a tax upon bread and food. I saw the workingmen in England, and I saw the anti-corn law bazaars going on, and I became a convert then to free trade. Thirty years ago, when I embarked in public life, and when I started out as a representative of the people, my principles were free education, manhood suffrage and free trade, and in all these years I have never given a vote, or expressed a sentiment contrary to these principles. I have lived to see two of them adopted, and I hope to live to see free trade. I am ashamed that Canada should have adopted this exploded system of protection.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are ashamed of her politicians.

Mr. GILLMOR. I saw workingmen in England, I talked with them, and I asked them about the wages they received and their habits generally, and scores of them told me that they were able to buy meat, and that only of the poorest kind, once a week for their families. Yet they were working just as your workingmen are working, digging these sewers on Albert street to-day. I gave my mite to uphold the anti-corn law movement in England then, and we have got this question fairly before us in Canada now. The Government has thrown off the mask, and we want the right kind of people to fight them in this policy. All I want to know is that we have got men of the right stamp here to oppose the Government and I am sure we will succeed. I don't want any half protection, I want free trade. I do not want any half-hearted men to fight the battle of free trade for the people, I want whole-soul men like John Bright and Cobden, who will go into this work honestly and sincerely, and attack this protective system root and branch. I have great faith that the people of this country will overthrow the protective system when they understand the question. What have you, gentlemen on the Treasury benches, done in Canada for eleven years with your protective policy? Where is your prosperity? You say that the railroads of the country are evidences of prosperity. Is the Intercolonial Railway an evidence of prosperity? Is the Canadian Pacific Railway an evidence of prosperity? Are your canals an evidence of prosperity?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. GILLMOR. I say they are not. They are of course facilities for trade, but they are not evidences of prosperity, because you are in debt for every dollar you put into those enterprises. It is no evidence of prosperity that you have borrowed money and that you owe that money, and that you have to pay your annual interest on these $237,000,000 of Government debt. In addition to that Canada has to pay every year the interest on about $650,000,000 of British capital. England before the corn laws were repealed was not in a position to make money or to lend money, but England has made her money since she repealed the corn laws. England has astonished the world by her increased wealth under free trade. Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid of the United States. I am not afraid of anything that any nation can do against Canada, if Canada is true to herself. Let them put on their tax of 5 cents a dozen on eggs, or 25 cents a dozen if they wish; we do not want any favor from them. Of course, I believe it is better that these two nations should be amicable, friendly, and brotherly, and that there should be free trade between them, but I appeal to this country and this Government, not to follow the pernicious practices the United States have followed. If we want to be a great nation, let us throw down our tariff walls and let them build theirs as high as they like. Let them build a Chinese wall if they wish, and let them receive what China has received from her policy. Two thousand years before your ancestors had emerged from barbarism, China was civilised; but China had a wall which kept all the rest of the world out, and there she is to-day far behind other civilised countries. Let the United States have their tariff wall if they will. I am sorry for it, because to some extent it injures us, but it injures them ten times more than we are injured. I would make Canada a place so cheap to live in that the Americans would be glad to get over that wall and to come into our fertile fields in the North-West. I would make Canada so cheap a place to mine in that their wealthy men would come here where they would get their mining machinery cheaper than any where else. I am proud of Canada. Everything that Almighty God has done for us is good. He has given us broad fields and fertile lands, and rivers, and water powers and a climate that is good. All that He has done for us is good, for which we thank Him, but all that you the Government have done for us, for twenty-two years, is a curse to Canada. I did not intend when I rose, to speak at such length, but now the issue is properly before us, and, I tell you my friends of the Liberal party, that we do not want any half-hearted protectionists here. We want free traders, if we are going to fight out successfully this battle for the people. We want free traders here if we are going to fight on this platform, and I am satisfied that my hon. friends here have had experience enough in twelve years to know that the policy of protection is a bad one. Nothing now escapes taxation. The coal men of Nova Scotia howl for protection, the agricultural implement makers and the millers of Ontario howl for protection on their machinery and their flour, the manufacturers of Quebec howl for protection on boots, and in Sherbrooke or Stanstead they are howling for protection on knickerbockers and corsets. Why, one would think that the tender associations which linger about such articles would spare them from the piracies of the tariff. But nothing escapes. Talk about these instruments and bandages for the sick and poor. Why, it would be a mercy to let them die and get out of the toil, and oppression, and hardship which come upon them from protection. I can see the picture of the people in England, in the days of protection, without meat, or food, or clothing; I remember the riots for bread. But those things happen no longer. Look at England to-day, spending a million dollars a week in the United States. The people of England, with their superabundant wealth, will buy up all the paying industries in the United States and Canada in twenty years if they keep up their protection. They are teeming in wealth. We have to export $25,000,000 yearly to pay the interest on the money which the English people have invested in Canada, I mean the obligations of railway companies, loan companies and the Government; all combined we owe to the English people $650,000,000, and all the exports of lumber from this country are required to pay the interest every year. You talk about prosperity in Canada. Point to anything that is prosperous in Canada. We have not poverty, it is true; it is hard to bring people down to starvation in Canada; it is a broad country, and there are many means of keeping the body and soul together; but anything like prosperity does not exist; you cannot find it anywhere, except in the favored monopolies which are making millions a year out of the poor people of this country. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry for Canada; but we know now what we have to do. There is no use of bothering with this cheeseparing process of getting a few cents off this and a few cents off that. Attack the system squarely and boldly, and if you find ten men who are free traders, let them stand together and they will

succeed eventually, because free trade is right, and you need not be afraid when you are right. Protection is a child of the Devil, and it never can succeed. It is always a matter of humbug and deception. You have only to look at the way in which this tariff is made up. Here are the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs; they are both friends of mine; but they begin with *ad valorem* and specific—how can we deceive the people most; here is a little specific thing, so much, two or three cents a pound, or a little *ad valorem*, and when you come to figure it out it will amount to about 60 per cent. That is the way you are trying to deceive the people; and the Devil is never so well pleased as when he sees the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs sitting down and putting their heads together to see how they can fix up their specific and their *ad valorem*. Now, I will tell you what I think of specific and *ad valorem*: I think they are two thieves that you are licensing to go out to plunder everybody right and left. At the introduction of this policy hon. gentlemen did not know how to manage it. Sir Leonard Tilley, though always as cunning as a fox, could not do it, much as he had to do with his Satanic Majesty, and he had to send down to Washington for an expert to show him how to suck the blood out of the people without letting them know it. Now, I am really sincere. I am satisfied that the Devil dresses up in his Sunday best when these two gentlemen sit down to fix up their taxes. Mr. Chairman, Canada has just come to the condition to which I thought she would come when we went into Confederation. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and I, perhaps, do not agree. He got deceived, but I did not. I never wanted to come into Confederation. Not that I did not regard kindly my fellow British subjects in all the colonies, but we in New Brunswick were afraid of a protective tariff, we were afraid of excessive taxation. We knew that our trade was with England and the United States, we were afraid of a high tariff, and we fought it out on that line. But we were assured by Sir Leonard Tilley and others that for twenty years we would not spend over $13,000,000 a year. We ran an election on that question and the anti-confederates carried the day; but down came their emissaries, and they met at Charlottetown; I was member of the Government, and the late George Brown talked to me. I said: "We were elected in opposition to Confederation." He said: "Greater men than you have changed their principles when necessary." "Well," I said, "you may get other members to deceive their constituents, but you will not get me; I have no desire to go into Confederation." He said: "We will put the tariff down to 15 per cent., and it will never be any higher." But now where is it? How have we been deceived? In the second session after Confederation you began your National Policy by putting 50 cents a barrel on flour and something on corn; but when the representatives of the people came down to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, there was such a howl of indignation from all parties that they hurried back as fast as the Lord would let them, and the next spring took it off. But protection has done its work, and in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick they will bow their necks now and take the load without a murmur. Party has cursed Canada. It has robbed us of our manhood, and independence, and self-reliance, and convictions, and we will sit here, and swallow, and vote things we know we ought to oppose. I speak of party, not particularly with regard to one side or the other; but I say that party has cursed Canada, and that political morality and honesty have become a reproach and a by-word, and the best men will tell you: Oh, well, one party is as good or as bad as another. We are robbed by party, and we are being robbed by protection. However, hon. gentlemen opposite are consistent; they have nailed their flag to the mast. They have told us that they are going to protect every industry, and put on taxes without mercy—without regard for the hungry or the poor. They will tax everything, from the swaddling clothes of the infant to the shroud you wrap around the corpse. But I have great faith in the honesty, in the great heart, the great mind and the intelligence of the people of this country, and I have no fear for the result. I do not know if I shall ever live to see it, but events come rapidly in our day. The people have become enlightened; they are beginning to think; and my friends opposite are beginning to tremble. They are beginning now to do what? To try and bring in the farmers. But you cannot help the farmers by protection. You may double the duty on beef and on pork. What will that do for them? The poor laborer, the hardworking people, have to do without beef, for they have no money to buy it. You are trying to keep the good things out of Canada—the beef, the pork, the flour, everything the people desire; and poverty and hunger, instead of plenty to eat and drink, and plenty to wear, and a cheap country to live in, are the rule to-day. You are keeping that which is good out. You are keeping immigrants out; you are keeping prosperity out; you are keeping out of Canada everything you can by your vicious, false legislation. I admit there may be very different ideas about what constitutes prosperity, and, perhaps, we would come nearer together if we could define really what prosperity is; but I would like to see you point out what prosperity you have created. Have you got it in the North-West? You have within fourteen years expended $3,000,000 for the sake of getting immigrants into that splendid country, which, I daresay, is pretty nearly as good as some of you describe it. You have succeeded in getting a few immigrants in there, and they are howling for greater taxation on the older Provinces to help them to get in more settlers. What has been a success in this country except a few industries fostered by the National Policy in the centres of population? The fishermen are distressed. It cannot be otherwise, for you are taxing enormously everything they consume; you are taxing those industries that ought to be fostered, because, when the fishermen and the farmers and the lumbermen are depressed, that class of people are suffering who furnish our exports. There is no better test of prosperity than the exports of a country. Do our exports show any prosperity within the last ten years? Why, we exported $9,000,000 worth more nine years ago than we did last year, and we then had less people. You must have 500,000 or 600,000 more people who can produce in Canada to-day than we had then, and yet we exported $9,000,000 less last year than we did nine years ago, and on an average we have exported less and less from year to

year. The agriculturists and the fishermen produce a good deal more than half our exports, and the lumbermen some $25,000,000 worth besides. Are they prosperous? Are you helping them? No; you are helping a few manufacturers in Canada, and I say any manufacturers who are not self-sustaining you might as well have in the poor-house as take from industries that pay to support those which do not pay. I suppose all the people on that side think the duty on flour is not going to increase the price, and no doubt some on this side would say so too, I am afraid; but it takes 5,000,000 barrels of flour to feed the Canadian people, and 75 cents a barrel on that means $3,750,000 tax, which must come out of their pockets. If we did not make any Canadian flour, that certainly would go into the Treasury. I say that the tariff means taxation, and that the millers would not ask for that increase of 25 cents a barrel if it did not go into their own pockets, and it will go into their pockets. The men within a mile of the mill will pay it just as much as the people in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This is a tax upon the food of the people which gives somebody $3,750,000. I am astonished that this country should support anything of the kind. That is what we got by joining Confederation, and adopting a protective policy. There is no necessity for such a policy. We can be, and ought to be, united under a free trade policy, and we would then have a national sentiment, which we have not to-day, as we would not be playing off one industry and one Province against another. We would not be warring and jarring as we are now. There is no national sentiment in Canada. I do not mean to say that we are disloyal. I do not think there are many annexationists; but the loyalty I heard to-day from the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), is about as much loyalty as there would be in a bladder blown up with a straw, and the speech was just as harmonious as the wind would be coming out. I had not intended, when I rose, to make a speech on the general condition of the country, but if my friend the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will hand my notes from my desk, I can now proceed to do so; however, I think I will postpone it to another occasion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to hear some statement from the Finance Minister in reference to this. One of his colleagues laughs, but we find that $70,000 has been paid by way of duty upon rice, and this is a matter of serious consideration. If the Minister of Finance cannot defend this, perhaps the hon. gentleman who laughs at it will be able to do so. It appears that this is not required for protection or for revenue, and we want to know for what reason that amount is taken out of the pockets of the people. Perhaps the Finance Minister may have some line of policy on which to defend this tax, but if he has not, he should withdraw it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the request which is made is a reasonable one. Surely the Government must have some motive for imposing this tax, and it cannot be because rice is produced in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends must have been out somewhere, because the explanation has been already given. The question was asked by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and I made the statement in reply to both.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I never heard it, and I have not left the House.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), takes as one premise that the money is not wanted, and as another premise that this is not imposed for the purposes of protection, he can easily arrive at the conclusion that it is not required. I have never stated that the revenue was not required. I said that it did not follow, because the revenue was larger than the expenditure by a million or a million and a half, that this revenue was not necessary. On the contrary, I have stated that although we may have a surplus of a million and a half or two millions of dollars, as I have shown in my financial statement, all will be needed for Canada in the succeeding year. I have never stated that revenue was not required, and this is one of many things which are not produced in this country which are taxed for revenue purposes.

Mr. LAURIER. Than we are to understand that this country is so reduced in regard to its revenue that a tax must be levied on rice to add to the revenue of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman says: that revenue is required. In that case, why does he allow catgut strings for musical instruments to come in free, or bamboo reeds to come in free? If revenue is required, why does he not put the tax on these articles, and take it off rice? Why should he take $70,000 in duties out of the people in order to keep one rice mill going, while he allows diamonds and other luxuries to come in under so small a taxation?

Mr. FOSTER. What taxation would you put on diamonds?

Mr. McMULLEN. Why do you not put more on those articles? Why do you allow raw silk to come into this country free and tax rice?

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a pity if my hon. friend did not understand the answer which has already been made to the question which he has asked, and I should be sorry to insult his intelligence, or that of any other hon. member, by repeating my answer to the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose it simply means that the hon. gentleman wants to encourage the manufacture of silk in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. You are getting pretty close to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. But you can do better for the revenue by taxing raw silk than by taxing the rice, which is used by the operatives who manufacture the silk.

Mr. MULOCK. Is not this unhulled rice the raw material from which the ordinary rice of commerce is produced?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the reason why it comes in cheaper.

Mr. MULOCK. If you admit the raw material for the manufacture of silk, why do you not apply the same principle and admit the unhulled rice free, as it is an unfinished article, from which the article of rice which is commonly used is produced? Will the Minister answer the question?

Mr. FOSTER. I think you have already received the answer.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister refuses to rise to the occasion. The explanation which he gave of allowing raw silk to come in free would be also a proper reason for allowing unhulled rice to come in free, but he is willing to tax the food of the poor and to allow the clothing of the rich to go untaxed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For the information of the Finance Minister, I may state that a former Minister of Finance once said this:

"The Minister of Finance says we have a surplus of half a million. I say the Government have no right to have a surplus. If they have, they should endeavor to get rid of it, and the best way to do so is that pursued by us and by the Government of Great Britain,—by lightening the taxes on the people."

Mr. FOSTER. He must have been in Opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That statement was made by Sir Charles Tupper when he was expounding the policy which has been adopted by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Public Works and the President of the Council. That was the doctrine which he preached at that time, when we expected a surplus of half a million in that year, and when, owing to the mismanagement of my predecessors, I had to raise between thirty and forty millions to meet the engagements they had entered into. Even then, Sir Charles Tupper begrudged me a surplus of half a million, and said we were bound to reduce the taxes on articles of food, which, he said, would be received as a boon by the poorer classes of the country. That was the doctrine preached at that time by Sir Charles Tupper, now the High Commissioner, and that is a fair sample of the way in which those hon. gentlemen acted at that time.

Mr. HICKEY. Did you take the advice?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; because, I had ample occasion to use the money then raised in order to meet the extravagant engagements entered into by Ministers, before I came into office.

Mr. BOWELL. That is why you raised the tariff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the tariff was raised before that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I find that the duty on rice, when reduced to its specific value, amounts to 62½ per cent., which is a very excessive rate of taxation.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Government were to abolish that useless institution, the Franchise Act, they could save ten times as much as is levied on unhulled rice.

Mr. TISDALE. Don't you think you have gone over the "hull" question?

Mr. MULOCK. It may be, but I am helping the Minister out of his difficulty. He said, he may require this money for the purposes of revenue to carry on the affairs of the country. Now, I am showing him how he can reduce the expenditure by ten times the amount collected on rice, and, at the same time, remove from the Statute-book that which is of no mortal use to the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says he does not require this tax for the purpose of revenue, he has more than is sufficient, he has a surplus. Supposing this to form part of the surplus, he requires it for expenditure on capital account, so that it is for that purpose the public will pay the tax of $75,000 a year upon rice. They want the money to build canals with, to expend in the construction of the Chignecto Railway, and other capital expenditures of that kind. It is well we understand at last. He does not require this for the purpose of revenue or for carrying on the Government of the country, but he proposes to expend it on capital account.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is still a pitiful sight to see gentlemen representing the people in this Parliament sitting upon their benches dumb as ducks—when they begin to cackle a little, and unable to give to the people's representatives a reason for the increased tax put upon this article. I think it is much to be regretted, both from the brute force of the majority vote which they possess, and the unvarying support which their devoted supporters give to them. They will put it on, no matter how it may affect any or all the classes of Canada. Sir, we are at the commencement of this tariff, which is going to increase, in all probability, the taxes upon the people, to the extent of some two million dollars a year. I hold it to be the duty of every member of this House who possesses freedom of thought, and freedom of action, to resist, stage by stage, that increase of the tariff, from the first to the last of the book. I tell the hon. gentlemen that they will best secure and promote the termination of this debate, which has commenced, but which is far from being terminated, by answering the questions which are put to them from this side of the House, and giving sufficient reasons for the increases they put upon food, upon clothing, and upon the necessaries of life which are included in that list. I refer now to the Finance Minister, and to the hon. gentleman who aided him in inspiring this tariff, whom I look upon as the chief Mogul in connection with it—I mean the Minister of Customs. I say it is not to their credit that they sit there and refuse to give any satisfactory reason for the increase of taxation which they ask this House to impose upon the people who sent them here. The argument they use in almost every case is: "Oh, we have not increased that item of tariff, it was there before." With the surplus they have this year, with the two millions that they expect next year, and with this additional two millions a year they are going to get by reason of this increase, they tell us they may need the money. Now, is it possible that gentlemen occupying their position refuse to tell the Parliament of Canada what they are going to do with that money? The information the hon. gentleman has given increases the implication that it is going either to consolidate the debt of the country, or to the fixed charges of the country for improvements. Now, what is there in this country that warrants them in spending money and raising an increased revenue by taxation? Is it such a scheme as the Chignecto Ship Railway? Is it such a scheme as that New Glasgow Railway, under which, I am informed, an award of over one hundred thousand dollars for damages has been given within a few days? Is it for subsidies for such

a railway as the Caraquet Railway, for the Sorel Railway? Is it some of those other railways that have created such discredit to the name of Canada in England, of late years? Is it to subsidise the Meat Company at Three Rivers?—for that is what is coming next. Is it for any one of these schemes that they will require the money next year, or the year after? Do they propose to tell the people: "We are taxing you, but we will give you a railway that will never be run; we will build you a ship canal that will be the laughing stock and the disgrace of the country and bring upon us the contumely of the world at large?" Hon. gentlemen may, if they like, continue the duty of 17½ per cent. upon a raw article of food which ought to be one of the first items to be put into the free list. If they take off the duty, would not that cheapen the article to the people, and would not there be more imports? What reason can they give for taxing an article of food that cannot be raised in this country because of climatic difficulties? It is outrageous that such a course should be pursued. Can they justify themselves to the people of the country by going on and increasing the debt by millions, while the people are suffering and starving? Look at the condition of the laboring classes throughout this country. Look at the exodus that has taken place. I venture to predict that, when the census is taken next year, as it must be under the Constitution, it will be found that, in place of having a legitimate ratio of increase of the population, we will have very few people more than we had ten years ago. Notwithstanding all the money that has been spent on immigration; notwithstanding the natural increase of a people living in a healthy climate, and notwithstanding that we have a population of a million and a-half of the most prolific race in the world—the French Canadians—in face of all these facts, I venture to predict that the population of our country will not show a very considerable ratio of increase over what it was ten years ago. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has feelingly described the condition of Canada. I have known him for years, and I know him to be a man who would not express an opinion that he did not honestly believe. I believe his views are founded upon a sound judgment, and that he is honest in his expressions, in his intentions, and in his acts. I think the warning that has been given to this House ought to be taken to heart by the gentlemen who are responsible for the administration of public affairs, and I ask hon. members sitting behind the Government this question: Whatever course you may take in endeavoring to impose on the people of the Maritime Provinces duties on the flour which they do not grow, in order to place an amount in the pockets of the west, whatever course you may take in regard to duties imposed on pork, which the lumbermen requires, and which is imported largely from Chicago and Kansas, this imposition being to put money in the pockets of the farmers; whatever justification you may have for the imposition of duties on lard and beef, I ask every hon. member if he can find the slightest justification for imposing a duty of 17½ per cent. on rice, one of the articles of food which is most desired, which is most useful and nutritious for the poorer classes of the community? I do not believe any hon. member will say there is any justification. This is not the first time I have expressed my opinion on public acts. I remember when three and a quarter million dollars, which capitalised means an annual grant of $180,000 a year for twenty years, was given to that infamous Chignecto Marine Railway; I stood up almost alone in opposing it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not alone.

Mr. MITCHELL. I said "almost alone." For, unfortunately, very few of my hon. friends behind me understood the question; they did not know the locality or understand the nature of the work proposed, or know the iniquity involved in it. I am proud to say this, that after the vote was over everything that followed justified my opposition to it, and I found more than a dozen hon. gentlemen opposite, who said: "Mitchell, I am proud of you, although I could not sustain you in your opposition to the Government." I have no doubt some of these hon. gentlemen will recollect that even to-day. I have no doubt, moreover, there are many hon. gentlemen opposite who in their hearts endorse everything I have said in regard to this duty on rice, and everything that has been said by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), and others, that if there is an item in the whole list which should be wiped off, it is the duty of 17½ per cent. on rice, an article which we cannot grow in this country, upon which a tax was imposed in the first instance for revenue only, and to-day is retained for no other purpose. If that be so, surely there is sufficient honesty and independence among hon. gentlemen opposite to tell the Government that they are not able to vote for that tax, and if they are not able to tell the Government that openly, lest they should lose improvements in their counties, let them wait on the Ministers at their offices, and say to them: Whatever we may do in the way of voting bindly for you, for God's sake give us some ground on which to go before the people and justify this vote, for we have no justification in this case.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). Hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to agree as to the amount that will be furnished by this duty. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said there would be half a million dollars additional, the hon. member for Richmond gave the amount of one million, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us it would be two millions. I find, on looking over the tariff of 1878, that rice was taxed one cent per pound, and that under what we were told was a liberal policy and a free trade tariff. I find also that a large number of articles under that tariff were taxed at about the same rate as now. For instance, take the duty on kerosene oil. The duty per wine gallon was 6 cents, now it is 7½ cents per Imperial gallon. If it was necessary under a free tariff for hon. members opposite to tax rice 1 cent per pound, the difference is not very much between that and 17½ per cent. It appears to be almost impossible to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to any portion of the tariff. When it is proposed to tax anything that is not grown in this country, they tell us we are taxing the food of the people, and the poor man's food in particular, and that we are taxing the farmer. Every year a large number of resolutions are brought forward to assist the farmers, and the

way it is proposed to assist them is by taking the duty off such articles as they grow and which are largely imported from the United States. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) made reference to the duty on flour. I think he should take the statement of his own leader, delivered in 1878, just on the eve of going to the people, particularly when that statement was made in a Province where it would most affect the people.

Mr. MITCHELL. To whom do you refer as my leader? I was not aware that I had any leader in 1878, and certainly I have not any one now--I never had a leader since 1873.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I would say the leader of the party with whom the hon. gentleman is very closely associated, and with whom he has worked very smoothly since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. That genteman declared in Halifax that a duty on flour would not affect the price to the extent of 1 cent a bushel.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you say that was my declaration?

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I say it was the declaration of the leader of the Government in 1878, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and it would have been to his interest to have made a different statement then, but I believe he stated what was correct at the time. The hon. gentleman who had charge of the Government in 1876 and 1877 largely increased the duty on kerosene oil.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We reduced it enormously.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I think it had reached its highest rate in 1876 or 1877.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen opposite had increased it, and we reduced it.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). Next, I take the item of molasses. The duty at that time was 25 per cent., whereas now it is only 7 or 8 per cent. The people of Nova Scotia demanded at that time that there should be an increased duty imposed on coal. The members of the Government, even those from the Province of Nova Scotia, opposed it, and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said the proposition was so iniquitous, he would not even ask the Government to impose the duty. If that duty had not been imposed on the coal of Nova Scotia, that Province would not to-day have sufficient revenue to carry on the Government, within $160,000 or thereabouts. In 1879 the revenue received from coal royalties amounted to $49,132, whereas in 1889 it reached $166,846, or an increase of $117,700. In addition to giving employment to a large number of people, it would have been impossible to carry on the Government of Nova Scotia without increased royalties, which altogether arose from the duty on coal. Again, when a duty is proposed to be imposed on articles which it is not necessary to import, and of which we have plenty, then we are told we are taking this action to annoy the people of the United States. The people of the United States, however, pay very little attention to what we do here. The McKinley tariff was brought in before the resolutions of this Government were introduced, and it would be better if the members of the Opposition devoted themselves to assisting this country, rather than to crying it down, and making very unfair comparisons between it and the United States. There is nothing at which I was more surprised than the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other evening, that all they require in the United States was 65 cents per capita to meet the interest on the debt. He forgot to tell the House that in 1887 $71,000,000 were raised directly upon real and personal property to carry on the State Governments, instead of raising it by indirect taxation. I have the figures here to show that the taxes in the United States are levied directly upon the real and personal property. We find that in the State of Alabama, the amount was 1,468,727, or 55 cents upon every dollar of real and personal property. In the State of New York they raised the sum of $9,075,046 directly on real and personal property, and we find that the debt of all the States in the American Union is more than that of the United States itself, and that the debts of the cities of the United States is over $1,500,000,000. I think what when making comparisons of this kind hon. gentlemen on the other side should at least be honest in giving us the facts. I may say that I was surprised, and so were a large number of members on this side of the House, to hear that the tax was so small in the United States, and on enquiry we discovered that instead of the Federal Government giving large grants to public works, as we do in Canada, these were altogether left in the hands of the State Governments. I think it will be a long time before the people of this country will be willing to be governed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who seem to have no policy except to oppose every measure that is brought forward by the Government in the interest of the farmers and all other classes of the community.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Finance is so fond of following American precedent, that I would recommend him to imitate them with regard to the duty on rice. The evident tendency of American legislation at the present time is to reduce the duty upon all articles that cannot be raised in the country. Following out that policy, the duty on tea and coffee was abolished, and it was now proposed to reduce the duty on sugar by one-half. I would recommend that policy from a protectionist standpoint, and if I were a protectionist I should follow the policy the American Government have adopted, that is, I would reduce the duty, or abolish it in fact, upon all articles which cannot be raised in my own country, and keep up the duties on other classes of goods which I desired to protect. This is the policy which the Americans have pursued, and which the latest proposals before Congress indicate they intend to pursue in future. The Minister of Finance will, I think, admit that we cannot raise rice in this country, and there are no indications that we require a duty on rice for revenue purposes. The Minister told us that he had a surplus for last year, and that he anticipated a larger surplus for the current year, which would indicate that the time is opportune to remove the duty on this article which enters so largely into consumption among all classes. The hon. Minister of Finance has an answer from his own predecessor in office, who told the hon. gentleman

in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright) when, as Minister of Finance, he had a small surplus, that it was almost a crime to have a surplus, and that the duty should be reduced upon all articles the people consumed, mentioning at the same time the article of sugar especially. While the duty on sugar at that time was about 45 per cent., it is 65 per cent. to-day. The hon. gentleman may call this statesmanship to levy duties on articles of general consumption when revenue is not required. He and the Minister of Customs may meet together and discuss those tariff changes, which I do not think they understand themselves. I believe that half of those changes are made up for them in their Departments, and that whenever a question comes up that they think a few cents more can be screwed out of the taxpayers of the country, they make a note of it, and discuss whether or not they can take more taxes out of the people at the end of the year.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that the way you used to do ?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That may by called statesmanship, but it is about the kind of statesmanship that would qualify a man to run a peanut shop at a corner. These resolutions as brought down to the House indicate that the Government has given no thought to the matter at all. They indicate that the Government has just the one purpose of getting more money out of the people and that they can show no ground for this increased taxation. From a hasty observation I calculated that these taxations would give half a million more to the Government, but those who had time to make a more deliberate investigation find that three-quarters of a million at least will be added to the taxes of the people, which already are very onerous. If the Minister of Finance could show that there was any necessity in the public interest for this, I would be willing to discuss the question on that basis, but, as he said himself, he merely wants to pour out this money like water for useless enterprises, such as were mentioned by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), namely, for such a huge folly as the Chignecto Ship Railway, in which three and a half million dollars are buried, and which never will be of any use to mortal man, either now or in future time. There never has been in this House a man with any knowledge of business, or with any idea of the working of such an undertaking, who would venture to offer an opinion that that money was profitably expended. We know very well, and everyone knows, that the idea of carrying a ship fourteen or fifteen miles across a belt of land like that, and then disbarking it, is an expenditure which is of no value whatever to the country. Still, as the hon. Minister of Finance says, we poured out our treasure like water for that and other enterprises ; and now in order to meet these expenses he asks us to continue this duty on rice. It is no excuse for the hon. gentleman to say that he is not increasing the duty. He has reached the point when the country expects him to reduce every tax he can reduce, and this is one above all others which in my judgment he should deal with. Now, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) was good enough to refer to the action of the Mackenzie Administration, and he quoted Mr. Mackenzie's speech in Halifax as going to show that the increased duty on flour would not affect the price. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House the other day when I read what Mr. Mackenzie did say, he would not have made the statement which he has made, I believe, in ignorance, because what Mr. Mackenzie did say was entirely different, when his remarks are read together, from what the hon. gentleman desired the House to understand. Mr. Mackenzie stated distinctly that the increase of the duty on flour was disturbing the trade we had with the United States, where we could procure our flour at a very much lower price. The hon. gentleman says that we would not put a duty on coal for the benefit of the coal owners of Cape Breton. That is quite true, because it involved a duty on flour, and I never could and cannot now understand why the whole people of the Maritime Provinces should pay a duty of 50 to 75 cents a barrel on flour simply to obtain a duty on coal for the benefit of a few coal owners in the Island of Cape Breton, who, by their own showing at that very time, were making fair returns on their capital ; and if required, I would to-day repeat the vote I gave on that occasion. The Government of which I was a member, attempted to carry out a British policy, a policy which we believed was in the interest of the great masses of the people. The country was experiencing a time of extreme depression ; we had expended large sums of money ; the American war was just over, and the huge expenditure of money on that war had been followed as a natural result by extreme depression which extended to Canada. The articles which we had to sell, our lumber, our fish, and our agricultural produce, were of very little value, comparatively speaking, and owing to that depression the Government labored under the difficulty of being unable to meet the public expectations with regard to what was considered the policy that should be pursued. Some people thought that if we kept our own manufactures, it would give this country better times at once ; but the policy the Government pursued was to tell the people that it was much better for them to wait quietly for a year or two, when the United States were sure to recover naturally from their extreme depression, and when their returning prosperity would react on Canada ; and our predictions were verified to the letter. 1879 or 1880 had not passed when we saw a great revulsion of trade in that country, and it reached within a few years perhaps as great a height of prosperity as it had ever reached before. It was then that the products of Canada found a market across the border and the condition of affairs in this country improved. Since then the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has for a time built up a certain amount of fictitious prosperity, which is already beginning to show signs of decay. They find themselves in this position, that when they protect one thing they must protect another. Every day they find some hungry manufacturer or combinist coming into their offices, and saying that the hat, or bonnet, or corset, or some other twopenny-halfpenny article that he manufactures is not sufficiently protected ; they are driven from one position to another ; and the result is the tariff we have before us, which I think will be regarded very unfavorably by the business men of this country. But the whole tenor of it is in the line of the policy hon. gentlemen opposite

have announced their determination to carry out. If we wanted a different condition of affairs it is within our grasp. If we wanted to trade with our natural customers across the border, it is in prospect. We have an offer which although not a legal offer as yet, is an indication of the public mind in the United States, and we know that whether that offer is adopted by Congress or not, there are a large number of people across the border who are anxious for closer trade relations with this country; and it is of the highest possible importance that this Parliament should not at this moment show such a feeling of hostility towards the American people and towards closer trade relations with them, as is indicated by this tariff. Several hon. gentlemen have spoken of members on this side of the House as uttering sentiments likely to create hostile feelings among Americans towards this country. The hon. Minister of Finance was not in this Parliament in 1879, at the time of the inception of the National Policy; had he been there, he would remember that his leader, his predecessor, the present High Commissioner, the Minister of Customs, the President of the Council and the Minister of Public Works, and all who led the Conservative party at that time, advocated the National Policy from the standpoint of opposition to the United States. Their whole doctrine, then, was that we were going to teach the United States that we could be independent of them, that Canada could stand alone and that we would build a wall against their products. On every hustings throughout the Dominion they proclaimed this doctrine of hostility to the United States, and it is owing to the stand they took, more than to anything else, that the Americans conceived the idea that our people were hostile to them. What did we see in regard to their fishing operations? We saw that the Minister of Customs, by his petty enactments and annoyances, drove us almost to the verge of actual war; and it is to the credit of the United States that they did not take stronger measures in resisting the petty insults and inconveniences to which their vessels were subjected by us. When the Minister of Customs dismissed the collector at Halifax for having done an act of courtesy to an American fisherman, by allowing him to transship his cargo, the news was telegraphed to every newspaper in the United States, and the action of the Minister was looked upon as an act of hostility towards the American people. Every act of administration from 1878 to the present has tended to create a feeling of hostility in the United States against us, and it is no wonder that the American people, annoyed as they have been by the attempts of 5,000,000 people to dictate to them, have at last come forward with a tariff which, if passed, is going to be very injurious to us. The hon. gentleman knows there is a large quantity of the agricultural products of this country which can only find a market in the United States, no matter how high the duty must be. We had a discussion over the duty on cattle last night, and the effect of that proposition was shown by the fact that members of Parliament and the Senate to-day waited on the leader of the Government to ask that cattle be allowed to come in in bond from Chicago, to be slaughtered at the dead meat establishment at Three Rivers, of which the Minister of Public Works is one of the directors. I do not know if he was one of the deputation that waited on his leader to urge this concession.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I rise to a point of order. The question of rice has nothing to do with the dead meat establishment.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite do not care to hear about the dead meat establishment, or the Chignecto canal, but the discussion took such a wide range that I thought I might discuss the whole question at once. The reduction on rice is defensible on other grounds, apart from the policy the hon. gentleman supports. I do not say that the protectionist grounds are sound; they are very unsound; but if the hon. gentleman draws his inspiration from American sources, when he has an opportunity of taking the duty off an article of food, he should take it off on this rice. If he does not, that will prove that the hon. gentleman is not actuated by a desire to meet the wants of the country, but by a desire to procure a surplus next year that he may have more money to pour out like water for purposes not consistent with the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. We have been talking for a large portion of two or three hours upon this rice question. Hon. gentlemen opposite endeavor to prove to the people that they are very heavily burdened, but in this item we have made a large reduction.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Take it all off.

Mr. FOSTER. The former item was that rice unhulled, which came direct from the place of production, should pay 17½ per cent.; if not, it paid 1½ cents per pound. This item has been framed for the express purpose of allowing the unhulled rice, which is produced in Siam, and carried from there to Hong Kong, and is transshipped there upon steamers and brought to Vancouver, to come as a direct shipment. Formerly that was not considered direct shipment. Rice was food in 1878 as it is now, and at that time and before, when hon. gentlemen held the reins of power, not only was the duty 1 cent per pound on rice, but it was 1 cent per pound, whether hulled or unhulled, while now it will be on unhulled rice 1¾ mills per pound. What does this crushing burden come to upon the poor man? One would imagine that every farmer was so borne down under the burden, like the old Scripture personage, that he is unable to live or to crawl under this burden. Last year twenty million pounds of rice were imported. We have, I suppose, about five million people in Canada, which would give a consumption of four pounds of rice on an average for each person, and the result of this taxation would be that each person would have to pay 7 mills towards the cost of this importation. That certainly is a terrible burden on the people of this country, and the attack is made by those gentlemen who taxed this same article 1 cent a pound, in comparison with my rate of 1¾ mills per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is aware that the tax was imposed by our predecessors, and it is very disingenuous, to say the least, for him to try to make it appear that the tax was imposed by us and reduced by him. He well knows that what we are contending for is that, when there is a surplus of two and a half millions, these petty taxes affecting the food of

the people, and therefore being very objectionable, should not be imposed.

Mr. BOWELL. Did you not re-enact that tax in 1874 ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No more than we did the whole tariff, and if we had not been so hampered and burdened down by the degrading extravagance to which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken was a party, by the infamous bribery to which he and his party were accessories in order to corrupt the people of Canada, if we had not been so burdened after the people kicked them out of office for accepting the bribes of Sir Hugh Allan, we would have had a better opportunity to reduce the taxation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It seems to me that this discussion has gone far enough. We have travelled from the Chignecto Canal to the Dead Meat Company, and now we have reached the Pacific Scandal. If, for my sins, I were to occupy the position of Finance Minister, according to the principle of the National Policy, of which I am a strong supporter, I should strike this tax off altogether. I am glad to hear from the Finance Minister that the burden is to be so light, because it seems to me that this tax upon rice is one which, according to the principles of the National Policy, ought to be taken off our Statute-book. It is not a tax for revenue purposes, and rice is almost as prime a necessity of life as tea and sugar. It is very proper that the duty should be taken off, and I should be glad if the Finance Minister could see his way to do that, strictly in accordance with the principles of the National Policy, which admits raw material and articles of prime necessity which this country does not produce free. I think rice should belong to that category, and on these principles of the National Policy, I think the Minister would be more than justified in taking off the small duty now placed upon this article.

Mr. HESSON. It is well that the fact in regard to this matter should be properly understood. I find that, in the year 1878, 8,366,903 lbs. of rice were imported, on which a duty was paid of $83,669, or 1 cent per pound. In 1887, 23,000,000 lbs. were imported, and the duty paid was $113,729. In 1889, the amount of the import was 21,500,000 lbs. and the duty paid was $73,973. Either the people in the former period were too poor to have rice in their soup, or the article was taxed too high.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are slandering your country.

Mr. HESSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite have wasted two hours of the time of this House in discussing a matter which they do not understand. I think that some of those gentlemen have not looked into this question. About 3,000,000 lbs. of this rice has come into this country cleaned for use and had to pay a duty of 1¼ cents per lb. What has been the effect of the policy of the Government? We have now 21,500,000 lbs. imported at $10,000 less duty than 8,000,000 lbs. were imported for in 1878. I defy hon. gentlemen to contradict those figures. The duty is very small. In fact it is reduced from 1 cent a pound to less than half a cent, and we are giving employment to men and machinery to clean that rice here, and it is supplied to the consumers at a very much reduced rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have to explain, if it is possible to explain to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Hesson), the effect of this tariff. The Government have not reduced the price of rice at all, but, for the benefit no doubt of some friend of theirs who desired to make a dishonest profit, they have reduced the duty on uncleaned rice, but have kept the duty on the clean rice the same as it was before, so that the consumer all over the country has to pay the duty of 1½ cents a pound while some friend of the Government, probably some subscriber to their election funds, is enabled to get the unhulled rice at the small rate referred to. Thus, the difference is paid by the consumer and it does not go into the Treasury. That is the result of the policy. Some parties, some friend of the hon. gentleman, succeeds in getting the benefit of it. I say that twenty million pounds uncleaned would yield something like a duty of $250,000, of which $220,000 is taken out of the pockets of the people under this system.

Mr. BOWELL. You can beat Bill Nye all "holler."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you import 20,000,000 lbs. of rice with a duty of 1¼ cents a lb. you have a tax of $250,000, of which $30,000 goes into the Treasury and the balance is taken out of the pockets of the people. $170,000 is abstracted fraudulently from the pockets of the people for the benefit of some of those Philistines who are cleaning that rice—a sevenfold loss to the consumer for the sake of about $30,000 that goes into the Treasury ; $170,000 wasted for maintaining one or two miserable factories to hull rice—that appears to be the result of the policy. I suppose of that $170,000, when these gentlemen, with their colleagues similarly circumstanced, meet together in the Red Parlor to be assessed for funds for the purpose of defrauding the public, $10,000 or $15,000 will find its way into the pockets of the Finance Minister, or the Minister of Customs, or the Minister of Public Works, or whoever devised the robbery, for the development of the election fund.

Mr. BOWELL. You don't mean that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mean every word of it. I know how you do it.

Mr. BOWELL. If it is necessary to deny the insinuation made by the hon. gentleman, I have no hesitation in doing so in the most emphatic terms. If he means to insinuate that either directly or indirectly I ever received any of that money, he is stating what is positively and utterly false.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What?—that the Prime Minister called together eighty or ninety manufacturers and assessed them for election purposes ?

Mr. BOWELL. You said the money went into the pockets of my colleagues and myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said it went into the corruption fund by means of which the hon. gentlemen keep their places.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman made a statement which was unworthy of any man, either in this House or anywhere else.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that this whole business of protection is robbery, legalised robbery ; that you subsidise the manufac-

turers, and that the manufacturers in return subsidise you. That is what I say.

Mr. BOWELL. It is untrue.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you explain it away by saying that we do not profit by it personally.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He obtains it for corrupt purposes. Through the medium of these protected manufacturers he obtains the means of corrupting the people of this country, and of succeeding in carrying the elections.

Mr. FOSTER. That is circumlocution.

Mr. BOWELL. You are judging now from your own personal experience.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am judging from what I have seen and know of you.

Wheat flour, 75 cents per barrel.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If we have had a long discussion on such an important article as rice, we are going, I suppose, to have a longer discussion on breadstuffs. The increase of duty on flour is 50 per cent. Now, it appears to me that if the Government had desired to benefit the farming interest, they might have accomplishd it in another way, without putting the duty on the consumers in the Maritime Provinces. They might have reduced or abolished the duty on wheat, and in that way they would have enabled the millers to produce flour at a cheaper rate. The Minister of Finance should be aware that this duty on flour will bear especially upon the people of his Province, and he had better take that fact into account. The hon. gentleman's position, he must know, is precarious. He does not know how soon some other gentleman may occupy that position. He may be cast adrift again, and be compelled to rely upon the good-will of his fellow-countrymen in New Bruuswick. When he goes to them and says: "It is true that I put a duty of 50 cents on flour, and that increased it by 50 per cent., but you have had to pay that much more for flour every year,"—what will be the answer? Now, it is utter nonsense for any man to say that the price of flour will not be increased. Flour has already advanced about that difference.

Mr. BOWELL. Where?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the Maritime Provinces, and here as well. I have that statement from one of the largest shippers of flour in the Maritime Provinces, and he told me yesterday that flour had advanced 20 cents per barrel. Naturally enough they say that the Maritime Provinces are to be entirely dependent upon them, and they are going to take a million or a million and a quarter barrels down there, and by arrangement among themselves, they will put up the price so much. They send it down and hold it. The Government sent flour down there and they held it in their cars for 20 days, and they took advantage of the market. Now, this duty may not all be paid direct. There is something in the contention that where a country produces a surplus of an article, the price will be regulated by their markets. But we could bring our flour from the States at the difference between 60 cents and 15 cents, that is to say, that we can get our flour from Boston for 10 cents and from New York for 15 cents. Therefore, whether you put it that way or on the basis of the duty, they will pay at least 45 to 50 cents in consequence of the imposition of this duty. If the Government want to benefit the farmers, let them reduce the duty on wheat. That, I believe, would have been acceptable to the millers, and would have put them in as good a position as they will be under this tariff. The people of the Maritime Provinces will not regard with any favor this last attempt to take more money out of them. We cannot raise our breadstuffs there, as the hon. gentleman is aware. From our climate, and the habits of our people, for some reason or other, in the Maritime Provinces we do not raise wheat, we do not raise flour, and we must go to the United States or to Western Canada for it. Even if this duty were out of the way, we would not come to Canada; we are only driven here by the imposition of this duty. If we did not come to Canada when the duty was on, we would not come here again if the duty was off. Under these circumstances it is nonsense for any hon. member to try to impose on the consumers of this country the idea that this increase of duty does not increase the price. Our people understand that very well, and no matter what the views of the Government may be, I can assure them that this increase will be regarded very unfavorably by their own friends, as well as by their political opponents.

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot imagine why the duty was imposed if it was not for the purpose of increasing the price. The market is controlled already by Canadian flour, and very little American flour is imported into Canada. As I understand the question, this duty was imposed especially for the relief of the millers, who are not doing a profitable business in this country. As a matter of fact, I was assured by a flour dealer in the Maritime Provinces when I was there the other day, that the price of flour had already increased about twenty cents a barrel. I have here a report of a meeting of the millers of Ontario held recently at Toronto, and in that report I find the following:

"The question of railway discrimination was then taken up. Vice-President J. Brown then read a paper on the subject of railway discriminations which was very well received.

"Mr. Charles Macdonell said that if Mr. Brown had quoted the prices at the different points in the United States the question would have been even more apparent.

"Mr. Brown said that he did not know exactly the figures, but there was one thing he was sure of, viz., that he could buy flour in the United States, ship it through Canada, pay the duty of 75 cents per barrel, and then make more money than by manufacturing flour himself. The only remedy he could suggest would be to appoint a strong Government commission."

If that statement be correct, it is clear that the duty was imposed expressly for the purpose of increasing the price of flour. Look at the state of things in Newfoundland. Where do the people of that Island purchase their flour, having the markets of the world open to them? No less than 220,000 barrels of flour were purchased last year from the United States, while about 10,000 were purchased from Canada. I think no more conclusive argument can be used to show that American flour is cheaper than Canadian flour, and that this duty is being imposed for the purpose of forcing the consumers, particularly those in the Maritime Provinces, to pay more for their flour by keeping them from going to the American market, the natural market to which they would look if

this duty were not imposed. This is a most unjust tax. It is well known that, at least, 1,000,000 barrels are consumed every year in the Maritime Provinces, where wheat is not grown, and where, consequently, those people who are largely interested in agriculture are directly taxed in order to support an industry in another section of this Dominion. But I contend that this tax does not really add anything to the prices which the farmers of Ontario receive for their wheat, for the duty on wheat has not been changed. I repeat that this duty on flour is imposed simply for the purpose of giving to the millers of Ontario 25 cents a barrel more for their flour.

Mr. FREEMAN. The bread tax or the duty on flour is a very unpopular one all the world over, and it is an unpopular one in the part of the Dominion from which I come. I would certainly oppose it if I thought it would increase the price of the loaf of the Nova Scotia fisherman or the laboring man. But even if they were required to pay this 25 cents per barrel, they would have a compensation in the reduction of duties on molasses and the rebate on corn. There is, however, no better evidence of a bad cause than when you find its advocates resort to untruths to support it. I believe that is the doctrine firmly held by every one. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) told us the other day that the people of Nova Scotia paid one dollar more for their flour than they would have to pay if they were permitted to bring it in from the United States, and in order to prove that he read a letter from a mercantile firm in St. Johns, Newfoundland. This is a new mode of proof, which has never heretofore been discovered. The hon. gentleman read the letter from the firm and stated it was a highly respectable firm, and he gave the name, and I do not think they will thank him very much for having given the name. In that letter he told the House and the country, that only 10,000 barrels of Canadian flour were imported into Newfoundland last year. I turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that 48,687 barrels were sent to Newfoundland from Canada. Are Harvey & Co. or the blue-books correct? That is a question that the senior member for Halifax will probably answer. The only proof given that the people of Nova Scotia had to pay one dollar more for their flour than if they obtained it from the United States, is this letter from a St. Johns' merchant. A more ridiculous statement was never uttered. Then the senior member said that he would place Nova Scotia in Newfoundland, and then they would get their flour from New York and save a dollar a barrel. All this is, no doubt, exceedingly interesting. Let us examine the prices of American and Canadian flour. I find the following prices in the Halifax *Critic*, the prices being for the 4th instant:—High grade patents, $5 to $5.15; good 90 per cent. patents, $4.65 to $4.70; straight grades, $4.40 to $4.45. I find by the Boston *Herald* of the 8th April, instant—and I presume that authority will not be contradicted—Spring patents, $5 to $5.50; winter patents, $4.65 to $5.20; clean and straight, $3.50 to $4.75, while Canadian patents were selling at Halifax at $5.15, and you will remember that the Canadian patents had to pay the 60 cents a barrel that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said they would have to pay coming into Halifax. If that hon. gentleman will inform us where the extra dollar a barrel comes in we would be very much interested to ascertain it. We find that while winter patents were selling in Boston at $5.20, and straight flour was selling at $4.75, the straight grades were selling in Halifax for $4.45. These are the quotations, and if they are incorrect, I wish hon. gentlemen to point out where they are incorrect. We find, therefore, that flour in Boston is quoted in the Boston *Herald* at about the same rates as the same qualities of flour are quoted at Halifax, and when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us we are paying a dollar a barrel more for flour in Nova Scotia, than we would have to pay if we were getting it from Boston, they are telling us something in which there is not a scintilla of truth. Let me tell the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), who seemed to have a good laugh when I spoke on this question, that in the town I live in we buy flour at about the same rates they are selling it for in Halifax, and there is not a part of this continent where they can buy flour cheaper, if you will calculate the small sum we pay for freight. The hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) assumes that, in every part of Nova Scotia, we pay the 60 cents he talks about. We get this Canadian flour in bond from Boston, and we pay not 10 cents for freight—for there is very little flour comes at 10 cents, except where some vessels want freight for ballast—but 15 cents is about the ruling freight into Liverpool, and we get as cheap a loaf as you can get in any part of the American continent. Now, Sir, the question may be very properly asked: What is the motive of hon. gentlemen opposite in trying to make the people of the country believe that they are paying more for their flour than they actually are paying? Is it an honest motive? Is there a desire to benefit the people in any way, or to give correct information to the people? There is not, Sir. The desire is to make balls for supporters of gentlemen opposite, with less care for their character than they should have, to throw about during election time. We had these people going around the country during the last election, trying to make the people believe that we paid a duty on Canadian flour in some way. I was met face to face by an intelligent gentleman on the platform, who told me that the flour which came in my own house cost me 60 cents a barrel duty. I said to him: What do you mean? I get my flour in bond from Boston, and I pay no duty at the Customs, and how do you make out where the 60 cents duty comes in? And he replied: "Oh, you don't see it. There is some way in which the Ontario miller gets it into his pocket and you have to pay it." It is for the purpose of deceiving the electors that these false stories are told. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House tell us in Nova Scotia that we are paying $1 a barrel on flour in order to benefit the Canadian farmers, and they tell us at the same time that something ought to be done to relieve the poor Ontario farmer, who is dying for the want of some help from the Government. And yet when the 25 cents duty is put on flour to benefit the Ontario farmer, these gentlemen turn around and say to the Nova Scotians: There are these Ontario farmers down on you again and taking the money out of your pockets. These gentlemen preach

one doctrine in Nova Scotia, and another up here. Is this honest? Is this a consistent course? If you want to help the farmers in Ontario by taxing us in Nova Scotia, say so: but tell the same story down there that you do up here. The style of procedure adopted by these gentlemen opposite is unworthy of a great party, and unworthy of gentlemen who have a regard for themselves. I might quote to the House additional statistics to show that the prices of different grades of flour in Boston, New York, and Halifax differ very little indeed. Canadian flour in Halifax is not dearer than American flour of the same grades in the markets of New York and Boston. I say, Sir, that it is unfair to mislead the people, and it is something which hon. gentlemen opposite should not be guilty of. If I thought that this increased duty gave us a dearer loaf, or taxed the bread of the people, I would oppose it, but I firmly believe that the price of flour will not be increased. As I said before, if the price is in any way increased we have a compensation in the reduction of the duty on molasses which is an article of very general use with us. Then we have also a rebate upon the duty on cornmeal, and if we get any assistance from this rebate on corn it will be so much advantage to us. It is very well for hon. gentlemen to get up a feeling between the different Provinces—to say that one Province is imposed upon, in order to relieve the necessities of some other Province. If the Provinces of the Dominion are to be held together, or if there is to be a kindly feeling between them, the sooner we learn and the sooner hon. gentlemen opposite seek to indoctrinate the people with the idea that we must bear and forbear, the better—that if we are taxed a little in one Province, the other Provinces must be willing to bear a little burden to assist us. In this way the taxation can be regulated, and the people will learn not to weigh one Province against another. Holding these views, which I believe cannot be successfully combatted, I have no opposition to give to this increased duty of 25 cents a barrel on American flour.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The spectacle of a venerable representative of the people making the statement he has done to-night, and telling the House that he makes it conscientiously, fully bears out the remark made by hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) to-night, that party has degraded and disgraced the representatives of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman, coming from Nova Scotia, has stated to-night his honest belief that while the remission of the duties on corn and molasses would decrease the price of these articles just to the extent of the remission, and that he, therefore, accepted those remissions from the Government very gratefully, the advance in the flour duty of 25 cents a barrel would not increase the price of flour at all. If the hon. gentleman were so ignorant that he could not understand it, people might pardon him, but when he states that he conscientiously believes that, I think he will find it very difficult to make the majority of the people of Queen's, N. S., believe it. The hon. gentleman knows that he is playing with his constituents, trying to make them believe that which his conscience tells him is false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think I am perfectly in order. I am delivering a little moral lecture, which I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) may take to himself as well as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman). I am pointing out that the intelligence of the hon. member for Queen's is such that he does know, and cannot help but know, that the increased duty placed on flour will increase the price of flour just by the amount of that duty. He stated further that the increased duty on flour was very unpopular in his own district and throughout the Maritime Provinces, because the people believed it would increase the price of their bread, so that I cannot acquit the hon. gentleman of political dishonesty, I am sorry to say it. In times past he declared that the imposition of a duty on flour would increase the price of that article, and he was opposed to it, but now he gets up and states as his honest opinion that doing the same thing to-day will not increase the price. May I ask him why he thinks the increased duty was put on? May I ask him further if flour has not gone up since this duty was put on?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know that the hon. member for Selkirk is an authority, but I have had that from one of the best authorities in Canada.

Mr. DALY. Who is the authority?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Never mind who. The hon. gentleman can give his authority afterwards if he says it has not.

Mr. CAMERON. It has gone up in the United States a few cents, but not here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not referring to the United States. I am asking why the duty is put on—if it is not to increase the price to the consumer, and if it must not have that effect? The hon. member for Queen's said he did not believe it would have that effect, but he showed by his argument that he knew it would.

Mr. FREEMAN. I do not say that the duty of 25 cents a barrel on American flour increased the price of Canadian flour. I said distinctly that it did not, and the hon. member for Prince Edward Island knows that he was misquoting me. But he has the habit of misquoting people, and I forgive him, because I was going to say he does not know any better. He does know better, but his profession does not allow him to practice any better. He gets off all his speeches by misquoting and misrepresenting people, and he thinks that passes current. The American flour that comes to Halifax would probably be 25 cents higher, but our Canadian flour, I believe, will remain at the same price; the 25 cents additional duty will not increase the price. When he tells me that I know better, I tell him that I know as well what I am talking about as he does. The hon. senior member for (Halifax) (Mr. Jones), said that it would increase the price of Canadian flour a dollar a barrel. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that. That hon. gentleman opposite told us, on the strength of the letter from St. Johns that the importations to St. Johns were only 10,000 barrels, whereas according to our own returns they were 48,000 barrels. But here is something

about the importation of flour into Newfoundland. In 1887, according to the Newfoundland returns, there were 309,000 barrels imported from Canada, and 131,000 from the United States, and in 1888 the importation from Canada was 111,493. The falling off was due to some local cause which is not given, but I have no idea that it was on account of the cost of the article. Now, I tell the hon. member from Prince Edward Island that he has no proof that flour has increased in price in the markets of Nova Scotia since this duty was imposed, and I challenge him to bring his proofs or to stand convicted of stating what is not correct.

Mr. McKEEN. I do not propose to predict what effect this duty on flour may have in Nova Scotia, but I think some of the hon. gentlemen who have stated that the price has already risen have been misinformed. I may state that last week, I bought some flour from merchants in Halifax at a price as low as it ever has been sold at during the past winter, and I know the price of flour last week was as low as at any time during the last twelve months. There is some misapprehension in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, as to the increase which they allege will take place in the price of flour owing to the additional duty. I am not going to say what effect the duty will have; but I know the flour we use is of the best kind, which does not come in competition with American flour, because we could always buy it at much more favorable prices. The same gentleman who sold me this flour offered me cornmeal at 20 cents a barrel less than before the reduction was made on that article. Cornmeal which sold at $2.50 has been quoted recently at $2.30. This is plain evidence that if we have to pay any increase owing to the duty on flour, it will be more than compensated by the decrease in meal, for last year we paid about $7,000 duty on American flour and some $40,000 on corn meal, and a reduction of 20 cents on 111,000 barrels which we used in 1887, is a reduction of over $20,000. Therefore, though I do not say I am in favor of increasing the duty on flour. I think we are not going to lose as much perhaps as those who are not very well informed may seem to think.

Mr. TISDALE. I can answer the two propositions of the hon. member for Queen's. In the first place he says: Why is the duty put on, if it is not to increase the cost of flour? It is put on to allow so much more Canadian wheat to be ground into flour to supply the Canadian people, and, in my opinion, a year or two will serve to show whether what I am about to state is well founded or not. I do not believe it will increase the cost of flour in the Maritime Provinces one cent. Why? Because we are large exporters of wheat, as we grow more than we consume, and so do the United States. We have a milling capacity more than double what is necessary to grind and supply all the flour needed in the Dominion, and the object of a protective policy is that we should supply as much as possible our own needs which we can well do in this respect as we are large exporters of wheat. If we protect the flour trade here and allow the control of the trade to be taken by our milling industries, which have more than twice the capacity to supply our wants, the result will be that the competition created by the millers in that way and the large-

ness of the trade thus secured will result in our getting flour as cheap as we can get it now, and have it supplied by our own millers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with some little attention to the arguments of those gentlemen who pretend to say that an increase of 50 per cent. to the duty on flour is not going to increase the price of food to the people who are consumers and not purchasers. I have always great respect for the opinions of the last gentleman who spoke, but unfortunately he speaks from an interested standpoint. He comes from a community which is a wheat-growing community, and he tells us that the increased duty of 25 cents per barrel is not going to increase the cost of flour to the consumer, and he gives as a reason that Canada produces more wheat than she can sell, and as the United States is also an exporter it must necessarily follow that the price of flour produced from Canadian wheat cannot possibly be any greater than if the duty were only 25 cents a barrel. Does my hon. friend pretend to tell me that if there were no duty on flour, flour would be as dear to the consumers of the Maritime Provinces as it is? He says it can make no difference, because there is twice the milling capacity that is required for the consumption of the people.

Mr. CAMERON. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; twenty of them.

Mr. CAMERON. There is a duty of $1 a barrel on flour imported into the United States. Does that increase the price of flour in the United States?

Mr. MITCHELL. We are not exporters of flour to the United States.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman knows there is a duty of $1 on flour going into that country. Does that increase its price?

Mr. MITCHELL. They do not import flour from Canada; and I will tell my hon. friend that the value of the flour in the United States is regulated by the markets in Liverpool.

Mr. CAMERON. He cannot answer the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have answered it.

Mr. CAMERON. Does it increase the price of flour?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell you what it does. If we exported Canadian flour into the United States——

Mr. CAMERON. Say yes or no.

Mr. MITCHELL. If we exported flour to the United States——

Mr. CAMERON. That is no answer.

Mr. MITCHELL. And if the United States require to import that flour and there was a dollar duty per barrel on it, that would increase the price, I will not say a dollar a barrel, because the price is regulated by the markets abroad to some extent. If the millers of this country choose to do what the sugar manufacturers have done, if they choose to do as the "combiners," who are fostered by this enormous tariff imposed by this Government, if they choose to combine in order to raise the price of flour, it would make a difference of at least 75 cents a barrel. Does my hon. friend who last spoke pretend to tell me that we will not have a combina-

tion among the millers of this country? Why, there is a combination to-day. What is the reason why this Government has been besieged by the millers for the last twelve months? Is it not that they have combined to force their requirements upon the Government in view of the coming elections? There was an attempt to conciliate the people of the Maritime Provinces who claim that they were discriminated against in regard to this duty, but the millers said that the duty imposed was against flour and in favor of wheat. Does my hon. friend who last spoke—not the person who is interrupting me, for he is not worth answering—does my hon. friend who last addressed this House in a calm and dispassionate manner, speaking in the interests of his constituents, say that I am not right? I do not blame gentlemen from western Ontario for protecting the interests of those who sent them here, except in this respect that they know that, in an assembly representing all parts of this Dominion, representing Provinces which were induced to come into this Dominion to build up a nation, they should give and take. The people of the Province from which I come and from which other hon. gentlemen come—I do not refer to the renegades who speak in this House and elsewhere against the interests of their Province—expect that fair play will be given to every part of the Dominion of Canada. It is well known why this duty has been placed upon the people of the Maritime Provinces, because it is we who pay it. It is not the people of Ontario who pay this tax, but it is the people of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. These are the people who pay this iniquitous increase in the duty on flour, and that is imposed for the benefit of the millers of Ontario. They themselves fixed the relative duty on wheat and flour; but, because the Ontario millers made a mistake at the time the tariff was fixed, they have come again to agitate the country and to compel the Government to put an additional duty on the flour which we consume and which they want to compel us in the Maritime Provinces to obtain from them. The proper thing would be for the Government to take off the duty on wheat as well as on flour, and to allow the people of the Maritime Provinces to buy their goods where they can get them cheapest. That would be the true policy; but, if the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, by the brute force of the majority they possess, commit an act of injustice against the people of the Maritime Provinces, they will find that they are mistaken.

Mr. MACDONALD (Cape Breton). Withdraw.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman who asks me to withdraw any statement I have made has the courage to come down to the front, I will answer him. I say that you cannot carry on the affairs of a country by performing such acts of injustice as these. This is not going to create kindly feeling between one part of the country and another. Legislation here has to be based on principles of justice and fair play. I speak thus freely because, unfortunately for myself and the people I represent, I did a great deal to induce my Province to come into Confederation. Probably there is no one in this House who did more than I did in that regard, because I depended upon the pledges of Canadian statesmen, pledges which have been violated, sentiments and principles which have been thrown to the winds. If there is a man in this country who is more responsible than another for bringing my Province into this Confederation, it is the humble individual who now addresses you. In 1878, how could I go back to my constituents when it was said that the Americans will not give us reciprocity because of the sentiments which we had in favor of the south after the war and the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated; but the leader of the Government then led me to believe that a National Policy was the only means to obtain reciprocity. In order to do that we were to keep Canada for the Canadians, or, in the old Scotch phrase, we were to keep our "ain sea guts for our ain sea maws." I was led to believe that a maximum of duty of 25 per cent. would be sufficient. Unfortunately for myself, and for my country I believed it, but, while the elections were going on, when the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government went to the west of Ontario, he found that the farmers wanted protection and the millers wanted protection, and then it came out that a duty was to be placed on flour; and that lost me my election. If the hon. gentlemen were anxious to carry out the measure which they said they believed was to bring about reciprocity with the people to the south of us, I was willing to take the chances. But now those hon. gentlemen with professions of that kind on their lips and with an outrage of public sentiment in their hearts, have thrown off the mask, and this Session they have declared that they do not desire reciprocity in any shape. Is that just, or honest, or right? It is an outrage upon the people of my Province. What is the position in my county, which is representative of the northern counties bordering upon the Gulf? The resources of that county are almost entirely derived from lumber and fish. The farmers raise nothing to speak of for export, but mainly for their home consumption, and for the consumption of the lumbermen and fishermen, who alone raise the articles which are exported from that country, which constitute the wealth of that part of the Dominion. I might speak of the fishermen. These people are threatened to-day because the Government who control this country with a servile majority at their back——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Take it back.

Mr. MITCHELL. You may call "order" if you like. I refer to the records, to the Votes and Proceedings, to the divisions in this House, as proof of my statement. I say these men care nothing for the question of justice for the people I have the honor to represent; they do not care for the fishermen who risk their lives in earning a subsistence for their family—these fishermen for whom pork, and flour, and beans, and molasses, and rice, form the chief elements of life. Every single thing that I have named is taxed. The Government have raised the price of pork to $6 a barrel upon all kinds except the mess pork. They have prevented the people getting cornmeal at all, except at an enormous duty. They talk about the concession made by allowing corn to be introduced for human food. There is not a mill in one of the five counties that grinds corn. They would have to carry their corn to the one or two isolated mills that exist in Nova Scotia, or to one on the southern shore of New Brunswick, which will cost more in the transport than it will cost

to bring corn from Chicago. Under these circumstances, how can the fishermen of my county live with these increased taxes? How can they live in the face of the outrageous opposition which the Government is arousing in the United State when that McKinley Bill passes, which puts one cent a pound upon fish which used to come in free? If that McKinley Bill passes our people will pay the tax of one cent upon every pound of fish that goes into the American markets, which would practically exclude our fish from that country. Can you suppose these people will be satisfied with the representations which have been made to them, or with the conduct of the Government towards them? It will be ruination to them. I was told the other day, by a gentleman from that section of the country, that it would completely ruin the fishermen of my county. Now, we will come to the lumbermen. I read a telegram the other day from all the leading lumbermen in my county, save one who happened to be out of the county at the time, in which they denounced this tax upon pork, and flour, and cornmeal, and the other items that they named. In the lumber camps the sole food of the lumberman is flour, pork, and beans, lard, molasses, rice and beef. Is it possible that we can justify to these men the increase from $2 to $3 a barrel upon flour, the increase upon mess pork from $2 to $3? Beef, and all other pork but mess, is increased in the same proportion to $6 a barrel. Is it possible that we can justify to these men the fact that all this is done, not because a revenue is wanted, because those gentlemen admit that they do not want a revenue, but it is done for the purpose of protecting some other portion of the Dominion as against the people who have to purchase and live upon these articles. Now, what do these people get from the National Policy? Not one single industry among them is benefited from it. I challenge hon. gentlemen around me to deny that that group of counties derive one cent of benefit from the National Policy. There is not one single manufacturer in them who is protected. Their sole export is lumber and fish, and both these things will be excluded from the markets of the United States by the McKinley Bill if it passes, and I regret to say that I fear it will. I do not appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite in the hope that they will change the policy they have announced. They have sat there to-night, in my opinion, degrading the positions they occupy, unable to justify the means which they are taking to increase the taxation of this country. I feel it to be an outrage. I have extracted some figures from the blue books, of which I have only time to give you the totals. The people in my Province consumed last year, of flour 279,371 barrels, valued at $1,093,718, paying a duty of $129,047. Of lard they consumed 8,295,996 lbs., valued at $636,078, paying a duty of $165,705. They consumed of pork and meats 25,899,805 lbs., valued at $1,634,062, paying a duty of $293,357. They paid in duty on meats and breadstuff, that is flour, lard and pork, $588,109. Now, this is the amount which our people have to pay in taxation upon articles which are of absolute necessity, and it is paid by two industries mainly, that is, lumber and fisheries, both of which are suffering in the heaviest degree. Sir, we have not got in our country the valuable pine lumber that they have in the Ottawa district, and it realises nothing like the same price. Here they have the market of the United States open to them for every thing they cut, every thing that passes through their mills. But we have got to send our cheap spruce, the only wood we have for marketable purposes, to Europe, to find a market in Great Britain or on the continent, as against the cheap labor and the cheap wood of the Baltic, which is of a similar character to our spruce. Our lumber industries have ceased to be profitable, and are suffering severely. Is it possible, then, that you are going to increase flour by 25 cents a barrel, and pork and beef in like manner, articles of prime necessity, which are required in that industry? It is the same with the fishermen. I feel it is useless to appeal to men who have shown so much hardness at heart as the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have shown. I made an appeal to some of the gentlemen who are sitting behind them. I made an appeal a short time ago in relation to rice. Whatever principle you may allege in sustaining your National Policy, there is no principle whatever in sustaining it upon rice. I will say this, that if hon. gentlemen opposite pursue the course they are pursuing they will find themselves, when they come to give an account to the people, minus some of the support they are now receiving from the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. CAMERON. When the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) commenced his speech, I asked him what I supposed to be a civil question, and he condescended to permit me to ask not only one but twenty questions. If I had known that the only one I asked would have so disturbed his equilibrium, I would not have asked it, and the very fact that it did disturb him to such an extent prevented my asking the nineteen other questions he promised to answer. I asked him that question because I knew there was only one answer to it, and if he answered honestly and truthfully, as an hon. gentleman suggests he ought to do, he would have answered that the duty of one dollar a barrel on flour imported into the United States did not increase the price of the flour there to the extent of one cent. But instead of answering my question he wriggled around in a peculiar manner, and he said a great many things which should not have been said in Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am ready to answer for them outside.

Mr. CAMERON. No doubt you are answerable for them; and if the hon. gentleman will only keep cool until I have said the little I intended to say, we may go home and stay outside. The reason I asked the hon. gentleman that question was that I knew that if he reflected a little he would find the reason why the imposition of 75 cents a barrel on flour in Canada will not increase the price of flour here. He argued that the reason why it did not increase the price of flour in the United States was, first, they did not import any breadstuffs. In that statement the hon. gentleman was not correct, because they did import breadstuffs, and they imported breadstuffs from Canada to the value of $8,971,000. The true reason is that the price of flour in the United States, as well as in Canada, is regulated by the foreign markets. Another reason is that the inter-state trade in the United States, enables them to have American flour free of duty in the United States, and the products

of flour being in excess of the demand, they are able to procure it at the lowest possible figure consistent with the markets abroad. The same reasoning applies to Canada. We produce more flour in Canada than is necessary for home consumption. The price of flour is regulated here, as in the United States, by the foreign market, and it does not make any difference what duty was imposed on American flour coming into Canada so long as we produce more flour than is necessary for home consumption. The leader of the party (Mr. Mackenzie), in my presence repeatedly stated that fact, and there is no intelligent person in the Dominion who does not know it, but there are a great many who know it, but refuse to acknowledge it because they appeal to the prejudices of the people and mislead them into the belief that they are paying the tax on flour. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who spoke in very strong language not only against hon. members of this House generally, but against myself particularly, will find on some fine day a foeman worthy of his steel when he arouses a Highlander from the backwoods of Cape Breton. He appeals for the poor fishermen of Northumberland—and I am sorry if they are as poor as he represents them to be—for the poor farmers, and poor mechanics, and poor lumbermen.

An hon. MEMBER. And poor doctors.

Mr. CAMERON. And there may be some poor doctors, because, when all the other people are poor the doctors must be poor also. I want the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) to understand this : that the poor fishermen of Northumberland get their flour free, get their tea free under the National Policy; they get their flour free because Canada produces more flour than she requires for home consumption, and they get their tea free because the National Policy has taken the duty off tea. I do not know whether it was done especially for the poor fishermen of Northumberland or not, but the fishermen all over the Dominion have received the advantage. They receive also their coffee free, their molasses free, except the duty of one cent and a-half a gallon, and that was done in their interest. They have their pork free, the senior member for Queen's will supply them with all the pork they require and of excellent quality, and the hon. gentleman did not stir while the pork duty was under consideration. The members from Prince Edward Island do not have a great deal to say against the tariff on this occasion. They may come to the front by-and-bye, when some articles of minor importance are under consideration, but they are very particular not to touch that which is in their own interests. In addition to all these articles I have enumerated, the fishermen aad other classes obtain cornmeal free of duty. If the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) had kept cool and had answered the simple question I asked, I will not say dishonestly, because that is not a parliamentary term, I would not have addressed the House at this hour of the night, and I have done so only because the hon. member provoked this discussion.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). A statement has been made frequently, in the first instance by the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman), that the duty was imposed in order to relieve the straitened circumstances of the poor farmers of Ontario. It has been repeated by the hon. member for Cumberland, that the farmers of Ontario would derive a benefit. I am one of the farmers, and I deny the proposition, and in doing so I voice the sentiments of the farmers' conventions in Ontario. There were seventy farmers institutes held. Arrangements were made by the millers associations to send their representatives to those institutes and urge the farmers the necessity of giving the millers this protection. What was the result ? At the first institute they carried the resolution to ask the Government to increase the duty on flour. But the farmers are becoming alive to their own interests, and they find that during the last year they did not receive the quantity of flour they had been formerly receiving when they took their wheat to the mills. The statement made by the millers in their own association that they could no longer grind the farmers' wheat, as they had been accustomed to do, and give him his own flour, but now they bought the wheat at the market price, and gave him the flour at the market price. Therefore, the farmer has got to pay the duty on the flour made from his own wheat. I hold that if the millers did not find that the increased duty on flour was going to benefit themselves, they would never have put themselves to the trouble of attending the farmers' institutes in the Province of Ontario, or they would not have waited upon the Government in the large numbers in which they came here. The great complaint of the millers was that in putting 15 cents duty on wheat, it cost them 70 cents duty for sufficient wheat to make a barrel of flour, and they held that it was the duty of the Government to equalise the tariff on wheat and flour. In the second farmers' meeting which the millers attended, a motion was made by the secretary of the millers' association, but an amendment that the duty should be removed upon both wheat and flour was carried unanimously, showing conclusively that the farmers of the Province of Ontario know their own condition and know that under the present circumstances they have got to pay the duty upon flour. I have been astonished at the ignorance of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and also of the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) both of whom stated that we raise a larger amount of flour and wheat than we require. If these gentlemen had examined the records they would have found that up to the year 1888 we were exporters of wheat and flour; but I find that in 1888, we imported of wheat 15,617 bushels and of flour 25,813 barrels, which when turned into wheat at four and three quarter bushels to the barrel, gives 1,229,381 bushels. In that year we only exported of wheat 490,905 bushels and of flour 131,181 barrels which, turned into wheat, makes 623,110, so that when the subtraction is made, we find that Canada, after the harvest of 1888, was short 130,500 bushels of wheat. Therefore the statements made by these hon. gentlemen are not borne out by facts. Now, Sir, let me examine into the question how much wheat Canada really required for consumption during the year and see what amount of taxation is imposed upon the consumer by this 75 cents duty upon flour. There is a statement in a document which has been put into the hands of members which shows that 31,139,981 bushels of wheat were retained for consumption in Canada after the export, and the

amount used for seed was deducted. That would give us 6,610,000 barrels of flour, which at 75 cents a barrel, would amount to the nice little sum of $4,957,600 of taxation imposed upon the people of this country through the duty on flour. When the Minister of Finance made his financial statement last year, he told us that the farmers of this country paid no duty on the goods they consumed, but he need not tell the farmers of Ontario that any longer, because they know that they now have to pay a duty upon the produce of their own farm before they can put it on their table in the shape of flour. Now Sir, how much of this taxation do the farmers pay? Being three-fifths of the population the farmers will pay for the privilege of using their own flour $2,974,000, and I hold that the farmer pays a duty on flour just as well as the workman or any other. I have great sympathy for the laboring men of the Province of Ontario at the present time. I find that the farm laborers who board themselves have an annual income of $38 less than they had in 1882, and this reduction in the wages of the workingmen corresponds to the reduction of the income of the farmer on account of the small crop and reduced prices. I find that the workingmen with five of a family, is taxed for $4.50, because according to this statement, five of a family will consume six barrels of flour, and we find, therefore, that the burdens of the workingmen are increased while their income is being steadily reduced. The artisans of this country will also suffer severely by this taxation. From a report I looked over to-day, I find that out of 1,860 workingmen there were 1,140 who had a small surplus, 302 whose receipts and expenditure just balanced, and that there were 418 out of the 1,860 who had a deficit during the year. I hold that it is a gross injustice to the workingmen of the country to impose such duties upon the articles they require for the use of their families. Their income has been decreasing during the last few years, while their burdens have been largely increased. Is there any wonder why there is a cry among the workmen? I have had communications from one or two workmen to advocate their claims along with those of the farmers, and I believe the one is nearly if not altogether as bad as the other. I hold that the farmers have to bear this duty on flour as well as the people in the Maritime Provinces have, so that the duty is not for the benefit of the Ontario farmers, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they go back for re-election will find that the farmers understand that. I would just say to those who represent farming constituencies in the Province of Ontario that it is well for them to sit dumb and not lift their voices during this discussion on the imposition of taxes on the farmers and workingmen of their ridings. You may depend upon it that if they defend this duty, a day of reckoning will shortly come in a general election, and they will then find what the result will be.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has given us in his concluding remarks the key note of the spirit which seems to animate hon. gentlemen opposite. He has referred to the elections which must take place in this Dominion. I have listened most attentively to this interesting discussion, because all that relates to this tax on flour concerns us in the Maritime Provinces in an especial manner, and I have learned from the discussion that when hon. gentlemen opposite tells us of the terrible taxation which is now to be imposed on the people of the Maritime Provinces by this duty on flour—one hon. gentleman said, that we should be completely ruined by this duty—they are simply preparing for the coming elections in the Maritime Provinces. Let us examine and see exactly what amount of duty the people in the Maritime Provinces have paid on flour during the last twelve months. The Province of Nova Scotia paid $6,961; the Province of New Brunswick, $1,735.25, and the Province of Prince Edward Island, $694.56, making a total of $9,391,31. That duty has been increased 50 per cent., amounting to about $5,000. Now, if I estimate the population of the Maritime Provinces at 1,000,000 for the sake of calculation—the increased tax will amount to about one-half of one cent per capita of the population of the Maritime Provinces. Representing, as I do, a fishing constituency, and representing the working classes of the community in which I reside, whilst I should be very glad to see less taxes on breadstuffs, yet I do say that the increase of the taxation one-half of one cent per capita is not going completely to ruin the people of the Maritime Provinces. I confine myself simply to this item of breadstuffs. I will not follow the example of hon. gentlemen opposite by wandering over all manner of subjects; and I desire to point out that while this increased duty involves an increase of something like $5,000 per annum, assuming that we shall import next year the same quantity as we did last year, there has been a reduction in the duty on cornmeal of from $30,000 to $35,000.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman is ingenious if not ingenuous in the opinion he presents; but he knows very well that the contention in the Maritime Provinces—and I believe it is well founded—is that the tax on flour increases the cost of the flour used. It is not simply the amount of duty paid upon American flour, but the cost of the flour is raised all over the country. I have been in the Maritime Provinces since the duty was increased, and I find everywhere the opinion of the people is that there is to be an additional tax upon trade. If there was to be no additional tax, why did the Government not assent to the proposition of the millers, and make the duty $1 a barrel? But they knew well that they dared not face public opinion with such an addition as that; and so they split the difference, and made it 75 cents. Further than that, this whole tax is a restraint upon trade. It is an endeavor to force trade in a direction in which it will not naturally go. With reference to the whole business of flour in the Maritime Provinces, we could take our goods to Boston or New York, and bring back to our people flour cheaper than they can buy it in Ontario. The hon. gentlemen who support the Government entirely overlook the political effect of such a tax as this. They pay no attention to the fact that in imposing such a tax as this upon the bread of the people, they are doing great injury to the union which now exists among these Provinces, making it more difficult every day to maintain the Union, and making the path more easy for those who believe the best interests of the Maritime Provinces would be served by severance from the Union.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was not surprised at the enquiry of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) relating to the importation of flour by the United States, because that gentlemen has not that familiarity with business which would enable him to deal with that question.

Mr. CAMERON. I have not had so much to do with sugar as you.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If he had, he would know that if the duty in the United States was $5 a barrel on flour, it would not raise the price of Canadian flour if it went there.

Mr. CAMERON. Would it increase the price of American flour?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not one cent.

Mr. CAMERON. That gives up the whole case.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If a son of mine six years old were to ask me a question of that kind, I would give him a spanking and send him to school, and tell him to learn the principles that govern commerce.

Mr. CAMERON. And when he had learned them you would not understand them from him.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman asked whether the price of American flour would be raised. He put us in the position of the United States. But we do not raise any breadstuffs in Nova Scotia at all, and, therefore, the cases are not parallel.

Mr. CAMERON. Why not?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Simply for the reason that we do not raise any breadstuffs in Nova Scotia at all.

Mr. CAMERON. Do they raise breadstuffs in the city of New York? Does a school boy know that?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman does not understand a business argument, there is no use appealing to him. I was surprised to hear my colleague argue that because we only imported a certain quantity of flour from the United States, we do not pay more than the duty on it. The hon. gentleman is too good a business man not to know the contrary. He knows that the duty will apply to every barrel of flour consumed in the Province and not only to the few barrels that come from the United States. The hon. gentleman charged me with having stated that the increase of duty was going to make our flour $1 per barrel dearer. I did not make any statement of the kind. I said that but for this duty, we would import our flour from the United States; and but for the difference in freight, our flour would be a dollar cheaper than it is under the present arrangement. I maintain that still. The hon. members for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and Queen's (Mr. Freeman) and my worthy colleague have given their views about this matter, but we have a good many other members from Nova Scotia, supporters of the Government, who have been dumb dogs on this subject. The hon. members for Shelburne, Digby, Annapolis, Hants, Colchester, Pictou and Cumberland have been very careful not to say a word. No doubt they look on at their more energetic, if not more devoted, members of the party, and say to themselves: Let them go forward into the breach if they like, and be slaughtered, we will stand behind the wall. With regard to the duty on flour, I may give the House the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce in Halifax, for the benefit of my worthy colleage, who was in possession of a copy of the resolution I am about to read when he made his observations. This resolution was first introduced by one of the warm supporters of my hon. colleague, Mr. D. F. Power, who said:

"In reference to the bread tax clause in the report, he hoped the Chamber, in view of the matter soon coming up in Parliament, would emphatically condemn the proposal to increase the duty on flour. He moved to that effect, and Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion."

Then Mr. Curran, another active supporter of my worthy colleague, moved this resolution, seconded by Mr. Chipman, a third Tory:

"Whereas it is learned that the Government of Canada proposes to increase the duties on American flour; and whereas, such proposal is, in the opinion of this Chamber of Commerce, not in the interest of the people of this Province; therefore resolved, that our representatives at Ottawa be advised that should such legislation referring to flour duties be proposed, the chamber would protest against any such increase, but would urge the necessity of having the duties removed on American corn."

My hon. friend had this resolution in his desk when he was speaking, and the House will see how well he has carried out the desires of the merchants of Halifax. Neither of their requests has been complied with. American corn has not been admitted free for all purposes. It has been, or will be practically, when used for human food, but a large portion of it is not used for human food, but for feeding cattle, and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) will find that if he feeds the cornmeal to which he refers to his cattle, the drawback will not apply. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) referred to the great reduction which was going to be made in molasses to compensate the increase in flour. I observe my colleague (Mr. Kenny) made no reference to this subject. Probably he has been in Halifax and found out, what I knew some time ago, that instead of the proposal of the Government reducing the duty on molasses, it actually makes the duty heavier.

Mr. BOWELL. No; it does not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). So that the hon. member for Queen's will not be able to draw the consolation that this change will have the effect he says it will, and will be a gain to the people. It must be evident to any business man that so long as an increased duty exists on flour, so long will our people have to pay more for that article. If not, why increase the duty? Or, if the increase does not add anything to the price, why not have the duty $1, and have met the views of the millers? But the Government knew better than to do this. They thought that by taking only an additional quarter out of the people of the Maritime Provinces, they would find supporters like my worthy colleague, who are more loyal to the party than to the people they represent, but they would not venture to test them to the full extent of $1 per barrel. The people of Halifax will know how to appreciate the regard my hon. colleague has for them, when, in speaking of a subject in which our people take so much interest, he did not deem it worth while to submit to the House the resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, and sent to him in order to have it presented to the House.

Mr. FREEMAN. How do you explain the fact that Canadian flour is as cheap in Halifax as the same brand of American flour in Boston, if there is an increased price put on Canadian flour, because of the duty on American flour ?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that the brand does not indicate the quality of the flour ?

Mr. FREEMAN. I stated the same brand identically.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Their brands are not the same as Canadian brands, and the hon. gentleman is talking nonsense in that respect. The American and Canadian brands do not correspond in quality.

Mr. FREEMAN. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman. He knows what I am talking about, but is misrepresenting the facts. I am speaking of brands that represent the same grades of flour, and the same grades which sell in Halifax at $5.15 are selling in Boston at $5.15.

General LAURIE. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has expressed surprise that several members from the Lower Provinces have not spoken on this resolution, and affirms that they have not done so because they are afraid to endorse the action of the Government. I have already spoken on the subject. I spoke on it at the time the Tariff Bill was introduced, and I then endorsed the action of the Government. I therefore did not conceive it was necessary I should do so again, but as my not having done so has been pointedly referred to, I rose with the intention of saying exactly what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) has pointed out and anticipated me in saying, that flour of the same quality can be bought in Boston, either Canadian or American—the Canadian in bond, and the American of course in the open market—at the same price. It is open to our people to purchase Canadian flour there in bond and take it to our markets, and they buy it at the same price as the American flour. It is, therefore, open to our people to buy Canadian flour at the same price as the Americans do, without paying any duty whatever. I think here we should speak only for the information of the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has told us that he is not a resident of the Dominion, I think he is not interested in this question at all.

General LAURIE. Residence in any particular place has nothing to do with this question. I probably know Boston quite as well as the hon. member for Halifax, and certainly know Shelburne better, and I am speaking from personal knowledge and quoting the experience of Shelburne merchants.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one point to which I take exception in the remarks of my hon. friend. He says we are speaking for the information of the House. I want him to understand that we are not speaking for the information of the House, but we are speaking to empty benches and for the information of the country. We all know what the votes of the House will be.

General LAURIE. I think our arguments should be addressed to our fellow members, and not to the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. MITCHELL. That might be true if the arguments we advanced here had any effect on the votes of members.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think, when the supporters of the Government from Western Ontario go home, and produce the speeches which have been made by my hon. friends from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and Queen's (Mr. Freeman) their constituents will hardly appreciate the statements which have been made by them as to the effects of the National Policy. If their statements are correct, the effect on the duty of wheat and flour amounts to nothing either on the American or the Canadian side. That is what we have maintained on this side of the House all the time, that these duties were of no benefit to the farmer, that they were simply a make-believe all the time, and that the National Policy was a delusion and a snare, as far as the farmers are concerned. I think, when the Conservative farmers read the speeches of the two hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred, they will be inclined to say: deliver us from our friends. I believe these gentlemen are speaking on correct principles ; I believe they are coming over to our view, that the National Policy has been of no use to the farmer, but that he should be allowed to enter the markets of the world and to buy as well as to sell against all comers. But this proposal will be found rather hard to swallow. We know that when a duty on coal was imposed as an offset to the duty imposed upon flour, it was pretended that the people of the Maritime Provinces were by that means to get square, because of the duty imposed on flour in the interest of the Ontario farmer ; and we know that for a long time the Ontario manufacturer paid a duty on anthracite coal as well as upon soft coal for that reason. Now, it appears from the statements of the hon. gentleman, that the Ontario farmer had no benefit from that at all. The Finance Minister did not arrive at the decision to increase this duty on flour without a great deal of fear and trembling. It has been urged upon him and the First Minister, by the millers for three or four years, that our Canadian duties should balance the American duties, on the principles of the National Policy, which were that, if we could not have reciprocity in trade we should have reciprocity in tariffs. The millers urged the Government not to increase the duty to 75 cents only, but to make it the same as the American duty and put on the amount of one dollar. If the argument of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) is correct, why do not the Government make the duty the square dollar in order to balance the American duty ? It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are trembling in their knees as to the result of this when they get home to their constituents and that, like the little boy in the graveyard, they are whistling to keep their courage up. But, if there was one statement required to show the fallacy of the argument, it was the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, that, in consequence of the increase of the duty on flour, he had reduced the duty upon molasses and corn imported for the purpose of being made into cornmeal for human consumption, in order to compensate the Maritime Provinces for the increase in the duty on flour. That proves that the hon. gentleman thought

it was necessary to make some concessions to the Maritime Provinces, and it proves that the increased duty on flour would increase the price of bread. The Government did not yield to the demand of the millers at first, and I believe that, if it were not for the different rates on freight between the North West, which is to be the great wheat-raising area of this continent, and Minneapolis and the western States, this duty would not now have been imposed. Do the millers desire this increased duty on flour in order to pay higher prices to the farmers for their grain. Not a bit of it. Their argument is that the price of grain was too high and they had to get this protection in order to shut out American flour and to enable them to successfully carry on their business. I believe that the Finance Minister, in making this concession to the Maritime Provinces in regard to molasses, was taking the same view as my hon. friend who spoke here a few minutes ago, and who said that the result would be that the millers would be able to charge everybody a little more than before by shutting out American competition and depending on the fact which my hon. friend from Inverness stated, that, as we have a surplus to sell, our farmers could get no increased price for their products. If the millers want to raise the price of flour all around and make it higher than before, no doubt this will have the effect of making them succeed. We have the evidence of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and of the hon. member for Queen's and of the junior member for Halifax, that under existing circumstances the farmers cannot get any better price for their wheat. I say it is cold comfort to western Conservatives when they go home to meet the farmers whom they have been telling ever since the National Policy was inaugurated that this wheat and flour duty was their salvation, and that the prices were better for the farmers in consequence of this duty. I can understand that my hon. friend for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) and others in a similar position, will inwardly bless us for the admonition we have furnished them when they go to their constituents and defend this blessed National Policy from the agricultural standpoint. These gentlemen are getting down to hardpan principles, they begin to realize that it is impossible in the position in which we are placed to protect the farmer under any system of the National Policy. I think we have reason to congratulate our friends from the east when they are called on to do a little hard swallowing, and to come down to hardpan principles.

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend may speak to others, but he cannot apply his reasoning to me. In 1882 I declared to my constituents that as long as Canada would produce more wheat than was necessary for home consumption, so long would I be in favor of imposing $1 a barrel on flour, because it would not affect the price in the Maritime Provinces to the extent of one cent. I had the high authority of the leader of the Government from 1874 to 1878 in making that assertion, and my majority, after making that declaration on every hustings in the county, was only 850. I now ask my hon. friend: Is he in favor of taking the duty off American flour altogether?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I will say my catechism when I get a chance to speak.

Mr. CAMERON. I think you can now go on to the same stool of repentance with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). If you will take my record in the House you will find that I stood by that principle time and again, and you did not dare to do it by your vote.

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend from North Wentworth thinks he has all the wisdom of this House resting upon his own broad shoulders, but it is not true, all the same. My hon. friend may mislead his constituents, and I have a great deal of sympathy for them, because free schools and high education could not have done much for them if they cannot realise that a duty of 75 cents a barrel on flour is an advantage to the farmers of the great Province of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. Who pays it?

Mr. CAMERON. My friend ought to know that the very best market any man can have for his products, is the home market, and if the farmers of Ontario will allow American flour to come into the Canadian market by hundreds of thousands of barrels, instead of having the home market to themselves, which is the most profitable one, they will be driven abroad to participate in whatever prices they can get for their products; and if my hon. friend's constituents are so blindly ignorant, being misled by his sophistry, I am only sorry for the humiliating position which they occupy as electors of this Dominion.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has chosen to go out of his way to make a personal attack on myself.

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. It has been a favorite system of the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government, to set up certain characters, to answer gentlemen who have reasons to put forward to the country. He has done it in this case, although not present himself, and the men who represent him here ought to have been ashamed to do it in this instance.

Mr. CAMERON. That statement is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.50 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GAS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) to amend the Gas Inspection Act, chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The changes are very simple. The first change is to bring under the operation of

the Inspection Act, naturai gas, the utilising of this gas not having been contemplated when the Act was passed. The second change is to provide for more frequent and efficient inspection of gas meters. The third change is a trifling one, it being one more of construction than anything else, and it is to remove doubts with respect to connections between gas manufacturing establishments and the testing houses. These are the three changes proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE AMERICAN TUG *E. K. ROBERTS.*

Mr. TROW (for Mr. COOK) asked, 1. Whether the Government is aware that the American tug *E. K. Roberts*, during the season 1889, was engaged in carrying fish from one Canadian port to another and calling at different Canadian ports, and taking on fish at these various ports, in the Canadian waters of Georgian Bay, during the same voyage *en route* to Detroit, U.S.? 2. If so, has such action been sanctioned by the Government, and why? 3. What entries has said tug made, and what duties has she paid during the year 1889? 4. Have any penalties been imposed by reason of said tug having infringed the provisions of the Act respecting the "Coasting Trade of Canada," chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes of Canada?

Mr. BOWELL. 1st. The Government is not aware that the American tug *E. K. Roberts* has during the season of 1889 violated the provisions of the coasting laws, as indicated in the question asked. Application was made on the 28th March, 1889, for permission for the steamer *E. K. Roberts* to carry supplies for men and outfits from Windsor, Ont., to the Duck Islands during the season of navigation, which application was refused by letter dated 1st April, 1889. 2nd. Subsequently, about the 20th of the same month, on further representations—that no Canadian steamer was available—permission was given for the vessel to make one trip only, to carry Canadian supplies to the Duck Islands. 3rd. The Department has no information as to what entries said tug has made or what duties she has paid. 4th. No penalties have been imposed, as no report has reached the Department of any infringement of the provisions of the coasting regulations or laws.

GRAIN ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) (for Mr. WELDON, St. John) asked, What amount of grain, in each year since its erection, has been passed through the elevator at Halifax, N.S.?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1883-4, 73,387 bushels; 1884-5, 244,933 bushels; 1885-6, 378,739 bushels; 1886-7, 575,880 bushels; 1887-8, 71,373 bushels; 1888-9, 129,725 bushels.

QUEBEC CAVALRY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether the Government intend, according to their promise of last year, to promote the officers of the Quebec Cavalry School? If yes, when? Also, why have the officers of the Quebec Cavalry School not been granted promotion in accordance with the Militia Regulations, as promised last year by the hon. the Minister of Militia?

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the officers of the Quebec Cavalry School have been granted promotion in accordance with the Militia Regulations. I am not aware of any promise made by the Government to any of those officers.

OUTLAY FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES.

Mr. DOYON asked, What sums of money have been paid by the Government, from the 30th of June, 1889, up to date, to Messrs. Charles Darveau, Isidore N. Belleau, Thomas Chase Casgrain, F. H. Drouin and Jean Blanchet, advocates, for professional services? What sums have been paid by the Government, during the same period, to the following law firms: Casgrain, Angers & Lavery; Belleau, Stafford & Belleau; Blanchet, Drouin & Dionne?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to this question and to the following one, I would ask my hon. friend to make a motion, and the accounts will be brought down.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) According to the suggestion of the hon. the First Minister, I move for:

Return showing what sums of money have been paid by the Government, from the 30th June, 1889, to date, to Charles Isaïe Labrie, Notary Public, of St. Joseph de Lévis, for professional or other services, and also what sums have been paid, during the same period, to Messrs. L. N. Asselin, P. V. Taché and J. M. Pouliot, for professional services.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES' RESIDENCES.

Mr. CIMON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to compel the Honorable Jean Alfred Gagné, Judge of the Superior Court for the District of Saguenay, to establish his domicile in that district, in accordance with the terms of the law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no information that the judge has not complied with the law. In the case of any judge not complying with the law as to his place of residence, he will be requested to comply.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. In rising to move:

That it is expedient that the Government should direct earnest attention to the establishment of a system of irrigation in the Territories,

I will speak, not only on this motion, but, unless the House objects, I will speak generally, in order to economise time, on the subsequent motions which I have on the paper, and then move them without further comment. I hold that the Government and the Minister of the Interior are in a very happy position in regard to the North-West, a position that is capable of redounding to the great advantage of the Territories if properly used. The people of the North-West at present are a free community, with great privileges. I have no sympathy whatever with those persons who talk about the North-West as though it was a community in which the people are suffering from any great disability. We are, I say, a free, prosperous

and happy community. Some friends of mine here say that we have not got the ballot. Well, the ballot has never seemed to me to be an evangel of political or other prosperity. I am very glad, however, that my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) and another hon. friend have interrupted me in this jocose manner, because their interruption gives me an opportunity of telling the House that I am about to place considerations before it than which few considerations have been placed before it this Session, or any other Session, to which it ought to give more attention. I should like to remind this Parliament, that it is in a certain sense an Imperial Parliament, governing vast territories; and if it forgets its high functions and the demands these territories make upon it, it forgets the importance of its position and the great duties that devolve upon it. What I wish to place before the Government is this: that in the North-West they can have for the next five or six years—aye, for the next ten years—all the advantages of a centralised government, all the advantages of a paternal government, and at the same time all the advantages of a free government. Now, Sir, for two or three years, I have tried to impress on the mind of this House and on the mind of the Government the necessity of giving the people of the North-West Territories responsible government; but among the motions which I have placed upon the paper this year, carrying out the policy which I have carried out each year, of expressing the opinion of the Territories as evinced in the North-West Council or Assembly, I have omitted to place a motion for responsible government, and I will tell you why. I went through my constituency, and I found that the great mass of opinion among the people there was against having responsible government at the present time; in fact, I only found a single farmer who wished to have responsible government. My duty as a representative is, of course, not merely to express my views as to what is right, but to give expression to the opinion that I find in the territory; and therefore I do not urge on the House what I did in previous years, to grant responsible government, although I am myself still in favor of it. Now, Sir, I hold that the Government is in this happy position: that the money that would be given to the Territories in case they had responsible government, can be used now for the material development of the Territories. The history of Manitoba in this connection weighs upon the minds of our settlers. We have a large number of settlers from Manitoba, who of course to a great extent leaven the settlers around them. These men say: "We have lived in Manitoba, and we have seen no good come from the money which came to Manitoba, because it was organised into an autonomous Province; on the contrary, we see that that money has been spent uselessly;" and everyone knows, that without spending money in a corrupt manner directly, the Provincial Government is tempted to allow leakages to prey upon the fund which it has at command. I do not know anything about it myself, but I know that I have seen in Manitoba a large amount of money placed under the control of the Government there, and now, after some twenty years of responsible government, if you ask what has been the result of all that expenditure, there is very little answer for it; there is no material, tangible evidence of what has been done with the money. Now, the Government of Canada, to-day, can give the Territories—whether you call them the North-West Territories or, as somebody has suggested, the British Canadian Western Territories—you have a vast territory there to-day, immensely rich, valuable, and full of resources, whether you regard them from an agricultural, a mining or any other point of view; there it stands, a country stamped by nature to become one of the richest, most fertile, most abounding countries in the world. You have that country, and what is the Government's opportunity in regard to it? The Government have this opportunity, that they can apply to that country all the advantages of a centralised paternal government, without denuding it of a single valuable element that inheres in a free government. The House will probably have seen, the Government will most certainly have seen, in the petitions which have been sent to the Governor General, to this House, and to the Government, that the Assembly of the North-West Territories states, and states truly, that if you take the same ground as you took in giving the subsidies to the Provinces, our population entitles us to at least $200,000 a year more than we get at present. It would be nearer to say $250,000 a year. What is the opportunity the Government has in respect of that? Let them capitalise that sum, and use the money right off in the material development of the country. If we were to give responsible government to that country and give them $200,000 or $250,000 a year, which is due to them, I am afraid, looking at the characters, all records of all Governments which have ever existed, that much of the $200,000 or $250,000 would be frittered away; and at the end of the ten years, I doubt whether we would find, on looking over the decade, such tangible results as my suggestion would secure. What I would suggest to the Government is that they should capitalise that $200,000 or $250,000 a year, and use it at once, with energy and foresight and a clear grasp of the needs of the country,—and the needs of that country are the needs of the Dominion—in developing that country rapidly. I sometimes hear it said, especially on the Opposition side of the House, and you read it sometimes in the newspapers: Oh, there are sixty millions below the line, and here we are but five million. Suppose you multiply—to talk a little algebraically—five thousand by X, you get one result; if you multiply it by X2 you will get another result; and if you multiply it by X3 you will get another result; so if you add to that 5,000,000 people energy, rapidity of movement, and rapidity of development, and if you multiply that people by a rapid power you will discount the great advantage which the 60,000,000, by their numbers, enjoy. I have put on the paper a motion declaring that it is desirable to attract earnest attention to irrigation in the North-West. I have put that motion in the same words that were used by the Legislative Assembly, but if I had the choice of words myself, I should have talked about the necessity of digging wells in certain places which require them, because there is very little of our North-West—but a mere fraction—which needs irrigation. If you will go below the line and travel, as I have travelled, along the Union Pacific and the Northern Pacific, you will find vast tracts of territory utterly barren, given

up to alkali. It almost blinds you to travel over those plains so alkaline are they, they are stamped by nature with barrenness, but there is not a spot in the North-West similar to those. You can go over any part of the Canadian North-West without finding a single spot where any man who knows anything about agriculture will say: This is a place that cannot be successfully cultivated; but there are parts where it is difficult to find water. For instance, it is a very peculiar thing that north of what is called the Waskooni, or, if you like, Pile o' Bones Creek, we can get water anywhere, at any depth, from forty to eighty feet. But go south of the creek, and for twenty miles there has been no successful well-digging, although we have gone 120 feet below the surface to get water. When a farmer goes 120 feet down, he goes to the utmost that any settler can be expected to go. When he goes that depth, he has exhausted his resources, but I need hardly tell you there may be water at 200 feet, 250 feet, or 300 feet; and you have only to go south and witness experiments made in Dakota and other parts of the United States, to know that water can be obtained at 300 and 400 feet, bubbling up and flowing the whole year. I saw, myself, in the States, an artesian well, which made a great lake and supplied water enough for two or three farms and for a whole lot of cattle. As I approached the farm, I saw what seemed to be a lake, and three hundred of cattle, or more, coming down to drink. I drove up to the farm house and said to the inmates: You have a very fine lake here. They answered: No; that is not a lake, it is a well; and they brought me to an artesian well flowing into a great tank, and this tank overflowing, the water took the trend of the country and flowed down to a little valley, making a lake. The Government might take the country south of Regina or the country north of Pense or the country in the vicinity of Moose Jaw, into which I am happy to say an immense immigration is coming this year, and than which finer land is not to be found in the world. What the Government should do is this: Let them have artesian wells dug in the centre, say of four sections, which would put it within a mile of each farmer on each section, or if the farms were only 160 acres each, you would have sixteen farmers within a mile of it, instead of their having to go, as at present, eight, nine and ten miles to get water. I do not know exactly what the cost would be, but supposing the cost would be $1,000 or $2,000 for sinking a well, you could put the charge upon the farmers contiguous, and I am sure the Canadian Pacific Railway would be ready to fall into line and pay part of the expense of digging those wells, which would add to the value of the sections they possess. I know this, that the farmers coming in will be very glad indeed to pay the amount of tax which would fall upon each one of them in order to pay for the well. I say that there you have an opportunity of doing a great good for the territory. You should spend in one year the whole $200,000 or $250,000, because my idea is that you should strike a hard, strong and effective blow at each spot. My idea is, not that you should distribute your expenditure in little dribblets and let it be lost; but that the money should be concentrated in one year for one purpose, in another year for another purpose—and so something effective will be attained. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, on whose attention this has been pressed for more than a year, has given some attention to me now. I hope that the view I suggest will find favor with him and with the Government. Then comes a question of great importance to the territory, namely, the position of the North-West Half-breeds. I will put the argument in a nutshell, and then leave it to the House to consider. You cannot expect the Half-breeds of the North-West who were no party to the contract which took place between the Government and the Half-breeds in Manitoba, in 1870, to go in on the conditions and within the four walls of that engagement. You cannot expect these men to come in on the conditions and within the four walls of that engagement. It would be irrational, it would be unjust to them. They are in a position to say: We were no party to that arrangement. There is not a man of prominence in the North-West who does not contend for the same thing, that you should deal with the Half-breeds in the North-West precisely on the same conditions as prevailed in 1870. That is to say, do not hark back to 1870. Deal with them on the basis of the date when you make the contract; abolish the Indian title in them there and then. It is such a small and such a contemptible matter in the way of means and scrip, that I am surprised that the Government have failed to see the reason, the justice, the policy of the course which I advocate. Then comes the question, that we should at once mark out and set apart the land for a university for the North-West. I think that is very desirable, although I may say that, for my own part, I am guilty of the heresy of thinking that this country and nearly all modern civilised countries have made a great mistake in taking care of what is called superior education. My own opinion is—whether you call it a Tory opinion or a Radical opinion—that the Government, properly speaking, has nothing whatever to do with the higher education of a people, but should leave that to private individuals and private benevolence, and should only attend to the elementary education of a people. I think, when a Government does that, it has enough to do, and, if it were my cue, I could show some evils which have arisen in Canada, in the United States, and in England, also, in consequence of the facility for higher education, which has been given where there was no capacity, no calling for it, and no proper encouragement in the individual to suggest that that higher education would not be thrown away. However, I think it is desirable that land for a university for the Territories should be set aside. There would be this advantage about it: If land were set aside for such a university, it would probably prevent, when these Territories are separated into Provinces, the erection of a university for each Province. The educational course in Canada has already been such that we have so many universities that we find the universities are competing for the students, instead of the students competing for the universities. I remember a distinguished gentleman in Toronto showing me, at dinner one day, a letter which had been written to him by an "honors" man in one of the universities, in which there were grammatical mistakes for which a sixth-form boy would be degraded. The next point is as to the necessity of guarding against prairie

fires. I have here a resolution in which I move:

That in order to the prevention of prairie fires, the Railway Act be amended to enable railway companies in the Territories to enter upon uncultivated lands 200 feet on each side of their track, and that such railway companies be compelled, at proper times in each year, to plough, as a fire-guard, a continuous strip of not less than 6 feet in width on the outer part of such 200 feet and parallel with the line of railroad, and burn the prairie grass between such ploughing and their tracks; provided such fire-guard need not be constructed within the limits of any town or city, nor along the line of railway running through the mountains or over lands where ploughing would be impossible or unnecessary; and that any railroad corporation operating its line of road, or any part thereof, shall be liable for all damages by fire that is set out or caused by operating any such line of road, or any part thereof, when such railroad company has failed to plough a fire-guard as above provided; and any such damages may be recovered by the party damaged in any court of competent jurisdiction.

If you have directed your attention to the condition of affairs in the North-West, you will have known that last year and in other years we have suffered very largely from fires, and you cannot get it out of the people's mind that the railway is wholly responsible. I know very well that the railway is not wholly responsible for those fires. I have tried to disabuse the minds of the people of that view, but that the railway is in part responsible I have no doubt whatever; and, therefore, if it be responsible, it ought to be made liable. At the present minute, owing to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a railway chartered by this Parliament, we cannot quite get at it. There have been some decisions unfavorable to that view, and neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor any other road, except for a consideration which I will point out by-and-bye, need be afraid of such a clause as this if it is not liable, because the costs of the action, in that case, will fall back upon the party bringing it. It will have to be proved to the satisfaction of a judge and a jury, and I think, under those circumstances, the railway is pretty well protected. I grant you that, where the evidence was doubtful and was not conclusive as to the innocence of the railway company, the company might be imperilled owing to the prejudices of the people, but I think the Government can provide a clause which will be at once just to the railway company, and just to the people of the Territories. I am confident that a great many of the fires have been caused by bone-seekers. They make a fire in order that when it has cleared the ground, they can get up on the mound and see the bones at a great distance. I know also that many of these fires have been caused by eastern men going up there and making a camp fire, and, unaware of the danger, abandoning their fire and allowing it to smoulder. However, I think it is necessary that some clause—I do not say this clause—should be inserted in the Railway Bill which is about to be brought down by the Government in order to provide for these cases and to give confidence to the people of the Territories. It would be hard to exaggerate the language of praise that the Canadian Pacific Railway deserves for its own watchfulness in regard to this very matter, and for the interest it shows in the Territories generally. I have no want of confidence whatever in its interest in the Territories and its desire to do everything possible in the interest of the Territories, but it will be necessary to have some clause such as this adopted in order to meet the legitimate needs of the people, and provide proper safeguards. Then comes a much more important resolution.

SECOND HOMESTEADS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That it is just and expedient that clause 43 of the Dominion Lands Act be amended by extending its provisions from the 2nd day of June, A.D. 1887, to the 2nd day of June, A.D. 1889.

He said: Now, that is a question that I have brought before the House every year since I have had the honor of a seat in this Parliament. The first year, in 1887, I got the Hon. Mr. White, the predecessor of the present Minister of the Interior, to extend the time from the 2nd June, 1886, to the 2nd June, 1887. Of course, he had to bring it before his colleagues, and his colleagues agreed to it, and I hold, that the fact of his colleagues agreeing to extend the time from the 2nd June, 1886, to the 2nd June, 1887—remember they passed an Act in 1886, doing away with the second homestead—shows that they acknowledged the principle for which I contend. In fact, it is not possible that any human being with the least sense of justice could rise up and assail the principle for which I contend. Now, Sir, what are the facts? In 1883, on the 25th May, assent was given to an Act which provided that any person coming here and homesteading, pre-empting if he liked, and who got a patent for his homestead and pre-emption, or for his homestead alone, should have a right to a second homestead. The language is "may," I grant you that; but nobody has ever dared, in this House or elsewhere, to rise up and say, that because that language was permissive, on that ground the Government might hark back from the promise, from the lure, from the temptation, from the advantage held out to people in the old country and elsewhere, who went up to the North-West. Nobody has ever attempted to do it, in fact it would be useless to do it, because, in the Act of 1886, there is a clause which acknowledges it as a right. The clause, by a curious confusion in the language, says that the right of homesteading shall be abolished after a certain time. The right to a homestead, the right given in 1883, a right that only accrued after three years working on the farm, after three years of settlement that right is declared to be non-existent, although during that whole three years the law, the lure, the temptation, the advantage, was held before the intending settlers of Europe. If anybody supposes that it was not held out as a lure, I have in my possession one of those hand-books issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1885, two years after this Act was passed, a hand-book that Mr. Dyke told me was circulated by hundreds and by thousands in England, in which it is stated that one of the advantages the settler in Canada has over the settler in the United States, is that if he homesteads and pre-empts, he can, after having had his patent for the homestead, go and get a second homestead.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the Act.

Mr. DAVIN. Why, everybody knows it. What is the use of tiring the House with that sort of thing? The usual way in this House, if a man wants to bring before you the opinion of Mr.

Wiman or anybody else's opinion, instead of saying what Mr. Wiman said and passing on, he comes to you with a column of stuff and reads it out, and so occupies three hours when he might have said everything in an hour. If anybody disputes what I say, I have got the Act here. As I have said, in 1887 I got Mr. White to extend the time from 1886 to 1887, that is, I got for the people that came in in one year their second homestead, which was not contemplated in the abolition of 1886. But there are a great number of people who came in there, not merely in 1883 and 1884, but in 1885 and 1886, and those people contend that they have as good a right to a second homestead as the people that got it, and can anybody deny it? Will the hon. the Minister of Interior, will the hon. the leader of the Government, will the hon. the Minister of Justice, will either one of them stand up, and with the Act of 1883 in their hand, an Act sanctioned May 25, 1883, and reading the clause—will they say that, on grounds of justice, they can possibly stand by what seems to have been a decision of the Government? Last year the Minister of the Interior came up and visited the North-West, and we were very glad to welcome a member of the Government in that country, and a number of gentlemen and farmers waited on him, some from one quarter and some from another, on this very subject of the second homestead. They told him what they wanted; they told him that they wanted a second homestead; and I think, myself, it was made pretty clear to my hon. friend that what was needed was a change in the law. Well, I sent down some petitions to the Minister of the Interior. I have the petitions here, one was from the Crofters; another was from settlers in the Bluffs, signed by Messrs. Shearer and Holden and a number of others, asking and insisting that they were entitled to a second homestead, seeing that they came in before the law that was passed on the 25th May, 1883. Well, I had some correspondence with my hon. friend, but after seven months of correspondence, and after these petitions went in, it was somewhat amusing to me to get a letter saying that the question had been referred to the Department of Justice, and that the Department of Justice declared that those gentlemen were not entitled to a second homestead. Why, Sir, you might as well refer the question to the author of the differential calculus, whether two and two make four, as to refer to the Department of Justice, the question whether those men were entitled, under the law, to a second homestead, or to tell them under the law they were not entitled to a second homestead. There was not a farmer in the Territories who did not know they were not entitled to a second homestead, except morally, and it seems to me something like a farce—I tell you frankly, it seems to me like a mockery—sending to the Department of Justice to know what was the meaning of the Act that my hon. friend had to administer. Why, a child of seven years of age, who had read the Act of 1887 and had read the claims of these men, would know that, under that law, they were not entitled to a second homestead. The question that we pressed was this: Whether they were not morally entitled to a second homestead, and whether the law should not be changed; and we have the Minister of Justice, I suppose, and his deputy, sitting in incubation on the question whether two and two would make four. An hon. gentleman says, the Minister of Justice is a very poor Minister of Justice. I have seen many Ministers of Justice and Attorneys General, and I will say, that having seen the hon. gentleman in this House, there is no free assembly in which he would not do honor to it, and to the Government he represented. I say this, that we are morally entitled under the law of 1883. Our people who came in between 1883 and 2nd June, 1886, are morally entitled to a second homestead. It is unjust to take it away from them. It is an act that could not possibly be done to any powerful or rich corporation; and I am here to represent the poor and the weak, and I will press the cause of the poor and the weak just as strongly as others will press the cause of rich and strong corporations. I say that those men are entitled to their second homestead, and that they should get it. I expected, and so did the people of the Territories, that when the present incumbent of the office became Minister of the Interior—for he is a North-West man, and he has spent a good many years in the North-West Territories, at all events—we should have more sympathy shown for the people of the Territories than before. I have been having communication with the Department of the Interior with regard to settlers for eight years, and the tendency of the regular officers of that Department, and I suppose it will be the tendency of all bureaucrats, is to decide everything for the Government and against the people. That is the tendency. When this law was passed on 2nd June, 1886, they actually would not give a second homestead to a man who had fulfilled every duty and was simply kept by a flood or by some other cause from getting to the office in time, and was, perhaps, an hour late. I had a long correspondence with the Department of the Interior, first writing to Mr. Smith in Winnipeg. After some time I received a letter from Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister, stating that the Department had come to the conclusion that my reading of the law was the correct one—my reading being that any person, whether he had applied at the time or not, who was entitled to a recommendation of his patent, that person should get a second homestead. An hon. friend near me asks, if the Government decided the question? They decided one or two cases; but the thing was swept away after a month's correspondence. This is my argument, that if the Department in that case was wrong and I was right, why should not the Department in these other cases be wrong and I right? But I appeal to the good sense of the House, to the legal knowledge in the House, to the hon. and learned Minister of Justice, to look into that Act of 1883; and I want him or any one else to stand up here and state an argument, that cannot be torn to shreds, on the policy of depriving those men who claimed the second homestead of their rights. I can speak with some authority on the subject, because I have been attending to these matters for a very long time. At the very moment the second homstead policy was announced by the Department, that very moment I condemned it. I said it was a bad policy. I wrote, that it was a bad policy, and I denounced it in the paper I was editing. The moment they saw that somebody who knew something about the Territories denounced it, why did they not change the policy? If they had done so, they would have had only one

year's settlers to deal with it. It took three years of criticism of the second homestead policy to get the law changed. But, when a change in the law was adopted, the Government should not have adopted that monstrous proposition of depriving those men who came here under the law of 1883, from the rights they acquired under that law. I have the records of a number of cases where men were actually in the country in 1882 and 1881, where they had done everything that could be done, where in some cases they had got permission from Mr. H. H. Smith, the commissioner, to go east for a year to buy cattle; but the result of their going was that, although they had fulfilled up to the handle all the requirements of the law, and although in some cases they had 60 or 70 acres in crop, they were deprived of their right to a second homestead. You can never make those people contented unless you restore to them the rights that belong to them. It will prove an irritating sore in the North-West the whole time. But I do not care about the policy of it; what I look for is justice. What I look to, for them and for the Half-breeds, is justice; and what I want to see in the North-West is a large, just, vigorous, far-seeing and broad policy, and as part of that policy I want to see the people who are entitled to second homesteads, dealt with properly. It is simple justice, the commonest justice, that it should be done. Such questions as these are not interesting questions to this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They are.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad of it, because I remember in 1887, when I first commenced to speak of North-West affairs, the House showed a little impatience. I am glad to see that the House now realises that it is the real government of the North-West Territories. All these questions come home to them; they should also come home to the bosoms of all of us, because you cannot go into a single settlement in the North-West where you do not find sons of Canadians farmers and of Canadian tradesmen among the best settlers, men who have come to us from Ontario and who have all the sense of justice, of fair play, and of freedom that belongs to men born in this great Dominion. I move the first resolution:

That it is expedient that the Government should direct earnest attention to the establishment of a system of irrigation in the Territories.

While I should like to have special attention directed to digging wells in places where it is difficult to procure water, and while the North-West Council have covered that subject in their resolution, I have gone over the Territories and there is no portion of the Territories where, in my opinion, there is not absolute need of irrigation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I shall have to find fault with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for two reasons. In the first place, hon. members will remember that a few nights ago the hon. gentleman pledged his word to this House that he did not propose to piddle brains into the Government of this country; and yet he has proceeded to endeavor to do so during the last two hours. The second grievance I have with the hon. gentleman is this: During the first portion of the Session he placed on the Order paper a large number of very important motions, all referring to the North-West Territories. He really took advantage of his hon. colleagues, who, I know, felt very strongly on the subject; and yet, although the hon. gentleman had placed those motions on the Order paper, he was not in his seat when day after day they were called, and he was obliged to answer to them or to take that action which it was his duty to take.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. The statement made by my hon. friend is not true.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is, that I have been in the House every day during the Session, and I think hon. gentlemen will bear me out in the statement, that on several occasions these questions have been called, and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has not been in his seat to attend to them. I think it is very unfair to members from the North-West in this House, that these matters are brought forward at this late period of the Session.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. There is not a single word of truth in what he states.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. If he makes a misstatement I must rise to correct him.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. member will not interrupt in this way any more.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the interruption is disorderly in its matter and in its manner.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The resolution of the hon. member states that it is

"Expedient that the Government should direct their earnest attention to the establishment of a system of irrigation in the Territories."

That I consider to be a matter of very great importance, and one which might have been debated in this House to great advantage by the hon. gentlemen who are interested in the North-West Territories. We might have had a discussion, not only on the matter of irrigation, but also on the supply of water there generally. Had this motion been made at an earlier stage of the Session, many hon. members would have taken the opportunity of speaking on the question, and it is one which I believe requires the very gravest consideration. The hon. gentleman states that our country does not necessarily require irrigation. I perfectly agree with him in that, because we have only a very small area in the Territories which necessarily requires irrigation, and every year we are improving in that respect. There are sections of the country in which, if we could get water on to some of our prairies, I have no doubt, it would be a great advantage, but we have yet an immense area of unsettled land which does not require irrigation, and, therefore, I think it is premature to go into this question at present. There are sections of the ranche country where water can be brought very easily from the mountains to the plains, and, to some extent, that has already been done by parties engaged in operations there. The time is coming, I am quite sure, when the ranchers of our country will require to utilise the water of these mountains to raise hay for their cattle. That country is now being stocked—not over-stocked—but the time will come when the ranchemen will not be able to allow their cattle to

roam, day after day, and month after month, the year round all over the country, without providing food for them. In the near future these ranges will be eaten down, and then they will be very much in the same state as the people to the south of us. I recollect, some years ago, in talking this matter over with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), he told me that he recollected in days gone by in western Ontario when the vegetation was rank and the country not fenced in, and that cattle and horses then found their own food for the greater part of the winter. I can understand perfectly that this was the case, and it is the same with us now in our western country; but a time will come when that rank vegetation will be consumed, when the country is thickly settled and fences put up, and our ranchemen will have to bring the water down from the mountains in order to grow hay and food for their cattle. There are many questions in regard to this irrigation matter on which I should very much like to have heard the opinions of the gentlemen interested. The time is short, and I shall not detain the House much longer, except to say that in regard to water generally, and to provide water in some of our dry districts, the Government do intend, I believe, to use their endeavors to find out whether we have not some large artesian basins in the Territories which will be able to supply some of those very dry districts. I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was rather selfish when he asked that the boring should be confined to Regina, Pense and Moose Jaw, three points which are in his own district. He might have been a little more liberal and mentioned some other districts which suffer just as much for the want of water. The hon. gentleman spoke of borings being made to a depth of 150 feet and no water being found. He must be aware, I fancy, that at the jail at Regina, we sunk four or five hundred feet, and the man who was drilling struck a substance which he knew would compel him to go several hundred feet further before he was likely to get water if he continued boring in that strata. He moved his boring operations about 300 feet away, and he struck a copious supply of water at 60 feet, which water is now supplying the jail at Regina. The hon. gentleman must know that the Geological Branch propose to deal with this water question, and I am very glad to be able to say, from information I received from the Director of the Geological Survey, that a very important discovery has been made in reference to this matter. Mr. Lowe, who has a very large farm in southern Manitoba, had sunk several wells to a very great depth and he did strike water, but the water is so salt that it was impossible to use it. Dr. Selwyn, who had some experience in Australia, remarked to him that he knew that by filtering salt water through a layer of sand they were able to secure very fair water in that country. Mr. Lowe, when he visited his farm took up with him some five or six iron pipes twelve feet long, and he tried the experiment that had been suggested by Dr. Selwyn and found it to be very successful. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway have also sunk wells and tried the experiment, with the same result. The following is the letter which Mr. Lowe sent me on the subject:—

"I suppose you are aware that almost anywhere on the south-western Canadian Pacific Railway line, in Manitoba, including the whole of the section of country between that line and the American frontier, wherever boring takes place, salt water is found in very great abundance, at a depth of from 200 to probably 800 or even 1,000 feet, and when the water is struck the supply is very great, sometimes overflowing and sometimes rushing very nearly to the surface with great force. I had an analysis of this water made by the chemist of the Experimental Farm some months ago, and the results of this analysis were published in the proceedings of last year of the Experimental Farm.

"The difficulty in procuring fresh water for the greater part of the area I have indicated, during the last few dry years, have been so great that settlers have given up their land right and left, notwithstanding the fact that, so far as relates to the quality and depth of the soil, these lands are of exceptional value, having in view a comparison of the whole of the North-West.

"I contemplated deep boring in the County of Morris, having for object to get below the salt water, but on consulting with Doctor Selwyn in relation to the strata, I obtained from him such information as dissuaded me from any attempt of that kind. The question then came, of alternatives, and I am sure that even condensation would be cheaper than the interest of the cost of very deep boring, even if we were sure by such to obtain fresh water. Doctor Selwyn told me that he was personally aware that fresh water had been obtained in Australia by filtration through sand, and he lent me an English publication, giving an account of a meeting or conference of English Civil Engineers, on the subject of deep borings in France and England. At this meeting, a Mr. Normandy stated, that salt water filtered through fifty feet of sand became fresh. This statement, coupled with personal information Doctor Selwyn had given me, appeared to me to be important. Accordingly, I went to Manitoba, at the beginning of December last, having in view for one reason, to test this information by experiment, as well for my own personal interest as the interest of the area I have described.

"I accordingly procured five iron water pipes, of upwards of twelve feet in length, and I placed in each of these a little over ten feet of sand, procured from the Pembina Mountain. This sand was sharp, but not quite so good and clear as I should have desired. However, by tying a piece of cotton rag at the bottom of each of these pipes and putting them in a perpendicular position, it became very easy to pour water into them and let it percolate throught the sand. The result of my experiment was as follows:

"The water which percolated through the first pipe was evidently less salt than that poured in from the spring.

"The water poured through the second pipe had again a much less salt taste, but there was a very little taste of bitterness.

"The same water put through the third pipe produced the same kind of result, with, however, the effect of there being very little taste of salt at all, only the bitter taste to which I have referred, which I thought at that time might be alkaline, but since I have consulted the analysis made for me by Mr. Shutt, I am convinced that it was owing to the presence of magnesium.

"The same water put through the fourth pipe had no taste of salt at all, but only the taste of bitterness; and

"The same water put through the fifth pipe had no taste of salt whatever, and that taste of bitterness was gone. It was, in fact, fairly fresh water."

I may say that I have two bottles of that water in my office, one containing the original water from the well, and the other containing the water which was subjected to the test and put through this process. This appears to me to be perfectly pure water, and I understand that it can be used in locomotives as well as for household purposes. That is a result, which I consider will be of very great advantage to the country, as there are many sections where the boring has only resulted in the finding of salt water, and, by this simple process of filtration, it can be made pure enough for cattle and for household purposes. Then there is another method which, if made generally known, would, I am sure, be resorted to by many farmers, that is, to impound the waters that come from the melting snows in the coulées and valleys of the mountains in the spring. That was done to some extent when I was Lieutenant Governor of the Terri-

tories, and I encouraged it as much as I could. I know that at several points where formerly the people had to travel miles for water, they have never since been without water. Therefore, so far as the water question is concerned, I think we may hope that the absence of it is not going to be as great in some quarters as we had anticipated.

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has seen fit to bring such a motion as this before the House, for I think it is not advisable to advertise that the North-West is a country where irrigation is necessary. There are large parts of that country which are, no doubt, dry, as is the case south of the boundary line ; but I think it would be a mistake to spend any money on irrigation at the present time, because there are millions of acres in our North-West which are fit for settlement without irrigation. If the people in any part of the far west cannot get water, there are millions of acres in Manitoba which are fit for settlement, and where good water can be got fifteen or twenty feet below the surface. That being the case, I think it would be a great mistake to pass this resolution. I would approve of the Government putting down test wells in the North-West at points where it would be difficult for settlers to dig them to any great extent, Two or three Sessions ago the hon. member for West Assiniboia strongly advocated responsible government for the North-West ; but now, after three years' experience, he thinks he was entirely wrong, as he found only one elector in his whole constituency who was in favor of it. Under these circumstances, I think the measures which the hon. gentleman advocates in this House should hereafter be taken with a grain of salt. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make that admission. What he says with regard to responsible government in Manitoba is entirely incorrect. The people of Manitoba would be very loath to go back to the position which the people of the North-West Territories occupy to-day. It might have been true a few years ago that there was but little benefit derived from the money the Province received from the Federal Government, but of late years we have had a change in the Province, and we are now deriving great benefits from the subsidy. During the last few years we have built some 250 miles of railway in the Province, entirely independent of the lines assisted by this Parliament. I think that is a good evidence that we are satisfied with our present position. We believe that our Local Legislature brings greater benefits to the Province than it would if it were in the position of the North-West Assembly, which is not a responsible body, and which can do nothing except what is permitted by this Parliament. The people of the North-West Territories have had a rather sad experience in that respect. I think at the last session of the Council there was almost a deadlock ; there were practically two Governments defeated during that session. I do not think that is a very satisfactory state of affairs. If the people of the North-West Territories had responsible government, I think they would be in a better position to obtain redress for any grievances they may have than they are to-day. They have their representatives on the floor of this Parliament, but as they number only four in an Assembly of 215, they exercise very little influence on the Government. If they would occasionally make a break, such as was done by the hon. member for West Assiniboia a few evenings ago, and talk plainly to hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches, and threaten what they would do if the Government did not properly attend to the interests of the North-West, their presence here would have some effect; but we find members from the North-West Territories here speaking in one way and voting in another, and the Government always receive their support. So long as the Government are certain of their party allegiance, I have no doubt they will treat the people of the North-West Territories in the same manner as they have done hitherto.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I desire to say a few words on the question before the House. With regard to responsible government in the North-West Territories, I still adhere to the opinion I expressed when that question was first discussed. I believe I represent the feeling of the people of my district, and I believe now, from what my hon. friend from West Assinboia (Mr. Davin) has said, that I also represent the feelings of the people throughout the country. I think it would be unfortunate if we were to be placed in the position in which the people of Manitoba were placed. It would be unfortunate if we were taxed, and the money taken out of the pockets of our people spent in the manner in which it was expended in Manitoba. We have heard a great many stories about the expenditure of money in that Province which ought to warn the people of the North-West, that their public policy is safer in the hands of the Dominion Government at present. When the country is more settled, I hope, and have no doubt, we will obtain responsible government ; but at present, with so few people there, the affairs of that country are perfectly safe where they are. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) says, it would be a good thing if the North-West Territories were to threaten the Government occasionally, but he says they speak one way and vote another. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman. I do not think he can apply that remark to the North-West members generally. They speak one way perhaps, but if they do, he will find their votes go in the same direction. If he will take up the reports of the proceedings in this House during this Session, he will find that on almost every occasion on which the members for the North-West spoke, their utterances were directed towards furthering the development of the North-West, and he will not find a single vote recorded by any of them in the opposite direction. With regard to the first motion brought by the hon. member for Assiniboia, that it is expedient the Government should establish a system of irrigation in the Territories, in the northern district, which I represent, irrigation is unnecessary, because we have the large stream of the Saskatchewan, which is navigable for some fifteen hundred miles, and the country is also well watered by creeks and lakes, but I have no doubt that on the plains along which the Canadian Pacific Railway passes, irrigation would be very advantageous indeed. With regard to the next motion of the hon. gentleman, which refers to the claims of the North-West Half-breeds, I should feel inclined to detain the House a long time on this question, which I consider a most grave

one in the North-West, were it not for the fact that I have not been idle in the interests of the Half-breeds in my constituency. My constituency is the one in the North-West which, above all others, contains a large Half-breed population, and I am happy in being able to state to the House, that the claims of the Half-breed are in such a very satisfactory position before the Government just now that it will not be necessary for me to dwell on this resolution to any great extent. I would simply say to the House that it is absolutely necessary this question should be settled on a permanent basis—not only the Half-breed claims for compensation for losses during the rebellion, but those claims which are, perhaps, more moral than legal, for scrip, and such treatment as will ensure a permanent settlement of the Half-breed question throughout the Territories. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the Half-breeds. I believe we have simply to go back for precedents to the British Parliament in its dealings with Ireland, to find out the good old rule laid down by Lord Palmerston, that in every constitutionally governed country, it is the duty of the Government to satisfy any section of the people which may have become seriously discontented, even though it be at the expenditure of money. I believe this good old rule would apply to the Half-breed question in the North-West, which, if not settled, will become an Irish question for the Dominion House to settle. With regard to the next motion of the hon. gentleman, he may have forgotten that some years ago a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and became law, constituting a university for the North-West under the name of the University of Saskatchewan; and although there has not been much use as yet for that university, it will in time become a very useful institution; and if the Government would give it additional aid by means of a land grant, they would be making a step in the right direction, as, when the Hudson Railway is built, this district will prove the most central in the whole North-West Territories. With regard to the resolution on prairie fires, I think something should be done to restrain the ravages of these fires. But in this connection, there is one matter I would bring more directly to the attention of the Minister of Interior, and that is, that where the Long Lake Railway is being built from Regina to Prince Albert, it passes through a forest of pine trees in the neighborhood of Duck Lake and Willoughby, which are being cut down by the railway contractors to make railway ties, so that this extent of country, fifteen miles long by twenty wide, is covered with the debris of those pines. If the debris is left lying there until the locomotive passes, the ravages by fire will in all probability be immense, as there are good farming settlements on each side, and if fires spread through at the opening of the railway in the month of June they will extend on all sides. I would impress on the hon. Minister the necessity of at once telegraphing to the bush ranger to take measures in order to have the debris off the ground before the snow leaves. With regard to the last resolution of the hon. member, I have always entertained a different opinion to his, and have always been opposed to a second homestead. I believe the principle of the Homestead Act is to give a home at as little cost as possible to every deserving settler, and to this end a hundred and sixty acres are granted him, and one hundred and sixty in reserve, in case he should need it. Many of the most successful farmers have told me that if they did not need to borrow or mortgage on their homesteads, there was no use of their getting out patents so long as they knew they were secure in their homesteads. And if any one desires to keep a settler in the country, it is the worst thing possible to make him become a roving settler. I do not think we should urge upon the Government the adoption of means to scatter settlers when they have once formed settlements. At the same time, I think it is unfortunate, if lands, which have been settled thickly around towns in the North-West, should be allowed to become vacant, as they would, if this policy of giving a second homestead were continued.

Mr. TROW. I do not think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) can be sincere in advocating the expenditure of money in North-West irrigation, because if there is any country under the sun in which irrigation could not be properly conducted, it is the North-West. Where irrigation is requisite is where the waters can be conducted from mountain slopes all over the adjoining lands. I do not know any portion of our North-West where irrigation could possibly be carried on. First of all, we have not the streams necessary; then we have not the elevation. The land is undulating, but there are no mountains. I fancy the hon. gentleman was drawing on his imagination, and was just about as sincere as when he had the presumption to call the Minister of the Interior a liar. I do not think he meant that at the time, nor do I think he intends that the Government should spend money in the North-West for the purposes of irrigation.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. the Minister of the Interior seemed to think it was a very grave matter that at this late period of the Session those important questions should be brought forward, and he stated that the North-West members could now have no opportunity of discussing them. What is there to prevent the North-West members from discussing them? One North-West member has, with great intelligence and clear grasp of the questions, from the point of view of his district, discussed them. As a fact, there are just three days in the early part of the Session, and after that there are two days, and then one day, in which private members can bring forward any subject. On every day when these questions could be brought forward, I was in my place, and on one day I asked to have these questions stand, because, by the time they came up it was five o'clock, and there was no opportunity to have them properly discussed. It seems to me one of the most absurd things I ever heard of—I do not know exactly how to characterise it. My hon. friend the member for North Perth (Mr. Trow) said I was as sincere in moving this resolution as I was in saying that the Minister of the Interior was mistaken. He used a very strong word. I dare say he is under that impression. Subjectively the Minister of the Interior may have been speaking the truth, but objectively he was not speaking the truth. The fact was not what he stated, but I dare say he thought it was; so, subjectively he

was speaking the truth, but objectively he was not. The Minister of the Interior was rather satirical on me, and it is rather hard to have one satirical on me, and he seemed to think I had made an effort to put brains into him. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not undertake an impossibility.

An hon. MEMBER. You have none to spare.

Mr. DAVIN. I dare say I have not, therefore I do not want to give them away. My hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), the Minister of the Interior, the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), and my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) seem to think that there is something inconsistent in my putting this motion on the paper, when I state that, in my constituency, for which I speak principally, what we want is wells and not irrigation; but one of the most trusted officers of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Pearce, a gentleman who has had great control in that Department, has written an elaborate essay advocating the introduction of a system of irrigation in Alberta, and my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) is mistaken if he thinks that irrigation is not required in Alberta. The Minister of the Interior found fault with me because I specified certain places, such as Pense, Moose Jaw and south of Regina, and he thought it was very selfish on my part to specify these places in my own constituency; but I would ask, are not all the other districts in the North-West represented here? Is not the district of Alberta represented here? Is not the Saskatchewan represented here? Is not Eastern Assiniboia represented here in the person of the Minister of the Interior? If they have any places which need irrigation or wells, surely they can advocate them, but I am not to put forward claims of places in my own constituency. My hon. friend the member for the Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) very properly states that in the Saskatchewan they do not need irrigation. From what I know of that district, they do not, but in Assiniboia we do need it, and we are entitled to have consideration granted to us in that way; we are entitled to more money, and, if you have simply a policy of putting in from year to year what is immediately required, we will have those Territories formed into Provinces before we know where we are, and the opportunity of doing what I contend could be done—that is, applying to the Territories all the advantages of a centralised Government, almost a parental Government, while at the same time they have a system of free government—will have passed away. I, therefore, do not see any inconsistency on my part. In putting this motion on the paper, I was guided by the fact that the North-West Assembly, composed of 22 men elected by manhood suffrage, desired to have this placed before the House. I could not talk only for my own constituency, I could not talk only in favor of wells, but I felt bound to bring before the House the view of the North-West Assembly.

Motion negatived on a division.

HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That it is desirable that the claims of the North-West Half-breeds to be dealt with in the same manner as the Manitoba Half-breeds were, should be examined, and, if found just, should be satisfied.

Mr. DEWDNEY. As far as I know, the claims of the Half-breeds of the North-West have been dealt with in exactly the same manner as the claims of the Manitoba Half-breeds were dealt with. Not only so, but, by an Order in Council passed on the 14th June, 1889, all the land agents of the Dominion were empowered to take evidence from any Half-breeds who had claims on the Government, and to report the same to Ottawa, for the reason that the Half-breed Commissioners proper were disbanded, and only one, Mr. Roger Goulet, had taken up his headquarters at Winnipeg. In reference to any of these claims made upon us by the Half-breeds, every attention has been given to them. I know it is a very important question, and there are some claims which some people consider are not settled yet. Appeals have been made to us to pay the Half-breed children who were born between 1870 and 1885, and to give them scrip similar to that given to the children born in Manitoba previous to 1870. Everyone must admit that that is a very important and serious matter for consideration. In the first place, it is a question of policy. I contend that they have no right, and it is really a question whether we should give them any further consideration or not. If we do, I, for one, should object in the strongest way to scrip being given to these children, or to any half-breeds in the future. We know what has been the result of scrip being given to the half-breeds. It has been that the Commissioners have been followed by a lot of harpies, who bought out the scrip of the half-breeds for a mere song. Those who lived in the wilds sold for what they could get; and those who lived in the settlements sold for about 50 cents on the dollar to merchants, and sometimes had sold their scrip simply for whiskey. My deputy, Mr. Burgess, made a visit, last year, to the North-West Territories, and one of his duties was to investigate this matter and to get all the information he could in regard to it. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen have read his report, but it is published in the Report of the Department of this year, and I do not know that it is worth my while to delay the House by reading it. I agree almost entirely with what that gentleman reports. Even in the northern country, where the Half-breeds live, there is a great difference of opinion as to how the Half-breed children should be dealt with in the future, but certainly their best friends, those who know them well and have interested themselves in them, unanimously object to the issue of scrip. As to the other question, the majority of those white people and traders very naturally press upon the Government the necessity of giving scrip. That is the position of the Government with reference to those who have claims. The hon. member from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) says that he found matters in a satisfactory position, having brought the matter before the Government, and he did not propose to enter at length into that. I may state, that some of the claims are still before the Government for consideration, especially in regard to some of those who lost their property during the rebellion. Every consideration will be given to those, or to any other claims of that nature, which may be presented to the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me of the greatest importance, as everybody will admit, that those

claims of the Half-breeds should be settled at the very earliest possible moment. A prompt settlement will contribute to alleviate whatever discontent may still remain amongst the Half-breeds, and there is this further important consideration, that as time goes on and these difficulties are not settled, it is manifest that the pretensions of those people will be increasing all the time. Take, for instance, the resolution that was passed in 1889 by the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories. No doubt we must assume that the Legislative Assembly were giving voice to what were the claims of the Half-breeds in this respect. The first resolution that was adopted by the Assembly reads as follows :—

"That the Assembly recommends that the granting of scrip to the Half-breeds of Manitoba and the North-West Territories be extended to such Half-breeds, heads of families and their children, who, on the 15th day of June, 1870, were residents of non-ceded territory, and who have since moved to either Manitoba or the North-West Territories."

I do not understand exactly what is the precise meaning of this resolution. If my understanding of it is right, it would mean that the Half-breeds were not residents of either Manitoba or the North-West Territories at the time of the acquisition of the Territories in 1870, who did not belong to the ceded territories, but who afterwards removed to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, should be put exactly on the same footing as the Half-breeds who were residents of Manitoba and the Territories at that time. I would be prepared to favor such a construction. The only claim upon which the Half-breeds could rest any pretension to any grant by this Government, was the extinguishment of those titles. The extinguishment of those titles can apply only to the Indians who were residents of Canada at the time the Territories were ceded to Canada. We cannot admit the principle to any Indians who have removed from the other side of the line to our own territory, and the same principle applies equally to the Half-breeds. The Half-breeds' title cannot be extinguished in the same manner as that of the Indians, because they had moved out of the ceded territory. In my judgment, this individual compensation could apply only to such Half-breeds as were residents of our territory at the time it became the possession of Canada, that is to say, in July, 1870. Therefore, for my part, with all due respect to the wishes of the Legislature of the Territories, which certainly are entitled to respect, because those gentlemen are supposed to have a more intimate knowledge of all these questions than we can have ourselves—but with all respect to their opinion—I cannot for my part, endorse the resolution which I have read. In my judgment, justice would be fully met if this question was settled absolutely as it was settled in Manitoba, and if a distribution of scrip was made now just as if it had been made on the 15th July, 1870, no more and no less, to the father of the family and to the minors then living. If that could have been done on the day the Territories came into our possession, a good deal of the bad feeling which has arisen, would have been avoided. But it is not too late now to do it, and if it were done in that manner, and if the agents received instructions all over the Territories to settle still pending claims in that manner, that is to say, to settle them as if they had been settled on the 15th July, 1870, and if this policy be adhered to and well known and proclaimed throughout the Territories, in my judgment, a good deal of this agitation which has arisen, will disappear. I have always been of the opinion that the manner which was adopted to settle the claims of the Half-breeds, has not proved to be the most judicious nor the most beneficial to the Half-breeds. They squander, in most cases, whatever means they have received from Canada. If, at that time we had adopted a policy, such as was recommended by some of those who were consulted, so as to make the gift by Canada to the Half-breeds permanent in its nature, and such as they could not divest themselves of, it is probable that the half-breeds would have been benefited to a greater extent. But, right or wrong, the policy then adopted has been adhered to, and serious complaints have been made by the Half-breeds, that the promises that have been made to them have not been kept. The moment that the promises which have been made to them by the Government have been carried out, that moment any serious cause of complaint will have disappeared. I now pass to the second resolution, which was adopted by the Legislative Assembly :

"That this Assembly would further recommend, that Half-breeds residing in the North-West Territories on the 20th April, 1885, who were otherwise entitled to scrip, but who failed to comply with the conditions of the Order in Council of 20th April, 1885, be granted scrip notwithstanding such Order in Council."

This seems to me a very reasonable demand, and if scrip be granted to all those who did not receive it on the 20th April, 1885, another serious cause of grievance will disappear. Then the third resolution reads as follows :—

"That, as under the Half-breeds' Commission of the 20th March, 1885, the Indian title, in as far as Half-breeds are concerned, only extends to those born prior to the 15th July, 1870, and as a number have been born to parents coming under the said Commission of 1885, who, in the opinion of this Assembly, have equal rights to those already dealt with, this Assembly would therefore draw the attention of the Dominion Government to the fact, and urge that such steps be taken to finally end all Half-breed claims."

Well, that step should be taken also. The inference is that the scrip should be given, yet not in the manner contemplated by the law, that is, to heads of families and to children born before 1870, and also to children born since. Now, I am not quite sure that this would be judicious, because, unless you draw the line somewhere, these claims will continually arise, and the children who are born next year will have the same claim as those that were born last year, and who have been settled with. I think, on the whole, if we adhered to the policy prescribed in 1870, that no cause of discontent would remain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with most, if not all, my hon. friend has just said. The settlement of the Half-breed claims has always been a matter of great difficulty, both in Manitoba and the North-West. The proper way, perhaps, would have been to have considered the Half-breeds as occupying the same position as white people. Most of them are the sons of white parents; but it was found, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the Half-breed retained in his blood and habits and way of life so much of the Indian that it was impossible to deal with him in that way. He looked upon a grant of land as being of no value, for there was plenty of land; he said it

was of no use, I cannot work it and perform settlement duties such as are imposed on settlers obtaining homesteads. And so, in order to settle with the Half-breeds in some way or other, scrip was given to them in lieu of land. That satisfied their claims in Manitoba; but it was most unfortunate for the people, because they sold their scrip for almost nothing, and the money they did receive for the scrip was, in a great measure, spent, if not in intoxicants, at all events wasted foolishly. Still that was done. There was no other way of settling the difficulty, although it proved injurious rather than beneficial to the Half-breeds. Then a question arose in regard to the treatment of the Half-breeds in the North-West, and a Commission was appointed for the purpose of ascertaining the rightful claimants and settling their claims in the same way as Half-breed claims had been settled in Manitoba. That Commission acted with great care, and the vast majority of the claims were settled by that Commission. Some of the Half-breeds, however, did not come before that Commission, for they were in distant parts of the country and their claims stood over. The Commission could not, of course, sit forever, but it sat at various places and it received, as I have said, the vast majority of the claims and settled them. Then it was decided—as it is an expensive matter to keep up a Commission—that the agents of the Minister of the Interior all over the North-West should be instructed to receive the claim of every Half-breed who had not been settled with, and send it to the Department, for the purpose of being satisfied. I do not think there was any other way of dealing with this question. The House must understand that a great many fraudulent claims were set up by the Half-breeds. A good many of those who had received their scrip in Manitoba and moved afterwards to the North-West Territories, set up fresh claims, and no doubt many of those men were paid, the fraud not having been discovered. So the case stands. Every claim is taken up when it is presented, and of course it is in the interest of the Government and the North-West to have these claims presented and settled. But if all honest claims were settled, that fact would not prevent persons setting up dishonest claims. and to a very considerable extent. We must deal with the circumstances as they arise, we must settle all honest claims supported with anything like reasonable evidence, and we must put up with the row, to use a familiar expression, which men will raise who have really no honest claims to present.

Mr. BLAKE. No Riel claims.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the success of the plan in Manitoba was such as to justify the Government in undertaking to deal with the Half-breeds in the North-West in exactly the same way. It did seem to me that the result of the negotiations and the plan of settlement adopted there was such a complete failure, it was not in the public interest that a similar settlement should be made with the Half-breeds in the North-West. We know that so far as lands were granted to the Half-breeds in extinguishment of what the hon. gentleman called, their Indian title in the North-West, it was a failure, and the only effect of the appropriation of lands to them was to lock up a very large extent of territory that was of no advantage whatever to the Half-breed population, against actual settlement by those who would have been willing to take possession of it and cultivate. Lands passed into the hands of speculators, and I believe a very considerable portion of the land is not even filled up at this day, to the very great detriment of the Province of Manitoba. I have no doubt that the long delay which has occurred in the extinguishment of the claims of the Half-breeds of the North-West Territories may render the proceeding of dealing with their case somewhat different from that which might have been adopted if the claims had been dealt with at an earlier period; but it is very clear that the Government ought not to undertake to simply estop the Half-breeds from making further claims by granting scrip to them, or dealing in any way with them, conferring no benefit on them but perhaps imposing a serious obstacle to settlement in different parts of the country, by transferring lands to parties who will make no immediate use of them, but hold them against settlement, thus doing mischief to the progress of colonisation in the Territories without doing any benefit whatever to the Half-breeds. It seemed to me ten years ago—of course I have not followed closely the condition of things since—that if the Government should undertake to confer some substantial advantage upon the Half-breed population for the extinguishment of the Indian title, which the right hon. gentleman recognised in the case of Manitoba, and which seemed to make it impossible to adopt a different policy in the North-West, it would be very much better than conferring on them a very large tract of land for the extinguishment of their individual claims. I think there is no reason why every Half-breed should not be as free to take possession of 160 acres in the North-West as any other settler, and I do not think it would be in the interests of the Half-breeds or of the country, that any attempt should be made to encourage them to locate as a tribal organisation, that individual ownership is of far greater consequence, even though they settle contiguous to each other, rather than make a grant *en bloc* to a considerable number of Half-breeds. If the Government had, at an early day, dealt with the Half-breeds in one respect, as we deal with the Indian population, granted them agricultural implements, a certain number of stock, instead of giving them lands which they could dispose of; if they had established schools among them and given them a large amount of pecuniary aid, they would have done a great deal towards converting Half-breeds into ordinary settlers; and this aid would have gone a long way to benefit the Half-breed population, without in any way placing them at the mercy of speculators. How far the Half-breeds are yet to be dealt with in that country I cannot say, but I do not think the Government is discharging its duty by simply making a grant of land, which they know will pass into the hands of speculators for a mere trifle, within a few months after it is placed at the disposal of the Half-breed, and thus stopping him from making any further claim on the Government. A very great number of the grants made to the Half-breeds of Manitoba were of no material benefit to them whatever. They have left the Province; they have gone to the North-West and settled at Batoche, St. Laurent and other points, and the Government permitted them to take up lands, pre-

cisely the same way as if no grant had been made them in Manitoba. I think that was right and proper under the circumstances; I do not think a different policy in that respect could be adopted, but our experience in Manitoba ought to have prevented us from adopting a similar policy in dealing with the Half-breeds of the North-West. It is a bad policy; it conferred no advantages upon the Half-breeds; it imposed serious impediments on the settlement of the country, and, in my opinion, the Half-breeds might have been largely benefited by a different policy, without any detriment to the public interest and without any very serious burden upon the public treasury.

Motion negatived on a division.

UNIVERSITY FOR THE N. W. T.

Mr. DAVIN moved the following resolution :—

That land for a University for the Territories should be selected and set apart at an early day.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that the hon. member (Mr. Davin) is, in this respect, a little too previous. I do not believe that those who would be disposed to grant an endowment of this kind, think that this is the proper time to discuss that matter. When the grant was given for the University in Manitoba there were some reasons which brought it about. In Manitoba, as in the North-West Territories, as hon. gentlemen know, the school property was one-eighteenth of the whole, and it was found that in the settlement belt in Manitoba, there were some 30,000 acres of land which should have belonged to the school lands, but which had not been provided for out of the settlement belt. At that time the lands in the belt were worth $5 an acre, and those which were outside the belt were valued at $1 an acre. When the Government of Manitoba came to Ottawa for the purpose of asking, amongst other things, an appropriation of land for a university, the situation of these lands in the settlement belt being worth $5 an acre, while these on the outside were worth only $1, it was conceded that they should get 150,000 acres towards endowing the University of Manitoba. In the North-West Territories, on the other hand, wherever land has been taken for any purpose, the appropriation of school lands has been provided for, and consequently the school lands in the Territories are one-eighteenth of all the lands. This, I think, is a very liberal appropriation, and when the time comes that we are formed into Provinces there, I have no doubt but that the several Provinces will be able, out of that liberal appropriation, to endow universities if they think proper.

Motion negatived on a division.

RAILWAYS IN THE N. W. T.

Mr. DAVIN moved the following resolution :—

That in order to the prevention of prairie fires, the Railway Act be amended to enable railway companies in the Territories to enter upon uncultivated lands 200 feet on each side of their track, and that such railway companies be compelled, at proper times in each year, to plough, as a fire-guard, a continuous strip of not less than 6 feet in width on the outer part of such 200 feet and parallel with the line of railroad, and burn the prairie grass between such ploughing and their tracks; provided such fire-guard need not be constructed within the limits of any town or city, nor along the line of railway running through the mountains or over lands where ploughing would be impossible or unnecessary;

And that any railroad corporation operating its line of road, or any part thereof, shall be liable for all damages by fire that is set out or caused by operating any such line of road, or any part thereof, when such railroad company has failed to plough a fire-guard as above provided; and any such damages may be recovered by the party damaged in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I may state that this matter has been brought before the attention of the Government, and they have given it serious consideration. Before the close of the Session I believe it is the intention of the Minister of Railways to propose some amendment to the Railway Act which will provide to some extent for this. I shall not say anything further on the matter, as it will come before the House on a future day.

Mr. DAVIN. I have had a conversation with the Minister of Justice, and I have had some communication also with the head of the Government on this subject, and I understand that the matter is in shape to be placed in a satisfactory condition. Therefore, with the consent of my seconder, I will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved the following resolution :—

That it is just and expedient that clause 43 of the Dominion Lands Act be amended by extending its provisions from the 2nd day of June, A.D. 1887, to the 2nd day of June, A.D. 1889.

He said: I have already described what is required by this motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. Explain the change.

Mr. DAVIN. The 37th clause of the Dominion Lands Act of 1883, reads as follows :—

"Any person who has obtained a homestead patent after three years' residence, or a certificate signed by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, as in the next preceding clause mentioned, with the additional statement that there has been three years' residence, may obtain another homestead and pre-emption entry."

At the end of the three years, within of course which time alone, the condition of that clause could be fulfilled, the Act was repealed. What I want is that the persons who obtained rights under this Act should have their rights acknowledged, and I want the law amended accordingly. I may say in regard to this, that I would not of malice *prepense* have moved that resolution earlier in the Session, because I have been waiting to see if the Minister of Interior would bring down an Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In reference to this matter, it will be within the recollection of the House, that I expressed my opinion very freely in regard to it last Session, when the matter was brought up by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I have not changed my views with regard to that question; I consider it, as I said then, a mistake that the second homestead regulation was granted, and I have not felt inclined to relax in any particular, the position in which I found myself when I took charge of the Department. The few individuals who have brought this matter before the member for West Assiniboia—and they are not, I believe, a very great number—claim, that this change should be made in the law, on account of representations made to them before they left the old country, and although

they were not able to carry out their cultivation conditions, they think, that having come out here with that understanding, they are entitled to have a second homestead. I think that the late Minister of the Interior, after a great deal of pressure, consented to an extension of the time from the 2nd of June, 1887, to the 2nd of June, 1889; and I am not at all sure, if a further extension were given, that we should not still have pressure brought from the hon. member for West Assiniboia for a still further extension. I may tell him that every man who has been entitled to a second homestead, so far as I recollect, has received it, and those who have carried out the conditions are still receiving them. I do not intend to retreat from the position I have taken on this subject, but I will bring the matter before my colleagues again, and if they feel inclined to change the policy and to extend the provisions of this amended Act for another year, I will not stand in the way, although at the same time I will express my opinion in a diametrically opposite sense.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am at a loss to know what the meaning of this extraordinary motion is. Does my hon. friend from West Assiniboia desire that people who have had one homestead granted to them for three years should have another granted?

Mr. DAVIN. It only applies to people who went in between 1883 and 1886.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is still more objectionable, that it should only apply to people going there in certain years. The people of the older Provinces bought and paid for that territory, and we were led to expect, according to the statement of the Ministry of the day, that the proceeds of the land would be used for the purpose of extinguishing the debt created for its purchase and for the improvements made on it; and why we should give away the property of the whole Dominion in the way of second homesteads to people who go in there, I cannot understand. I hope the hon. Minister of Interior will not consent to adopt such a principle. I have heard no reasons whatever given by the hon. member for West Assiniboia in favor of his proposition; perhaps, there are some, but I have not heard any. After we have given a homestead to a man to induce him to go in and settle there, I do not see any reason why we should give him a second one.

Mr. BLAKE. The principle of a second homestead having been very much pressed on the House, it was conceded; but, according to the views of those who have the best knowledge of the subject, it proved unsuccessful and was discontinued. I must say that I think the balance of the evidence indicated that it was discontinued too peremptorily—that a longer day of grace ought to have been given than was given. Although the Minister of the Interior thinks it was a mistake to extend that day, my view was that it was a just and reasonable thing to make that extension—having regard to the position of the existing interests, undefined as they might be—of those who went in on the expectation raised by the adoption of that principle: but I must say, since the House having decided that the experiment was a failure, and having determined to discontinue it, gave that extension out of regard to certain so-called vested interests, I think the extension given was a liberal one and ought to be a final one. I was glad to hear the earlier part of the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior, when he announced such a firm conviction as to what the policy of the Government and the House ought to be, but I was sorry when he declared in the end that he would waive and relinquish his policy if the rest of his colleagues differed from him. I do not think that is the way to win a battle in the Council. If the hon. gentleman, with all the experience he has, with the special qualifications for his office which caused him to be chosen for it, and with his added experience in the office, is quite decided, I would advise him to remain quite decided, and to tell the Council that the proposition shall stay where it is, or that he will not stay where he is.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with the greatest possible interest to the speech of the hon. member for West Durham, because we know what a high authority he is inside and outside of this House; but I confess that, when I sought to gather reason out of that speech, I utterly failed. What is the position of the hon. member? He says it was a right thing to extend the privilege of a second homestead from the 2nd of June, 1886, to the 2nd of June, 1887. Why was it? It must have been solely because the persons who came in between the 25th of May, 1883, and the 2nd of June, 1886, under the law passed in 1883 had a right to a second homestead—a moral right, if you like. These persons had that allurement placed before them in England, Germany, Ireland and Scotland, and they came here with that promise held out to them; and what do you do? You break it in the end. The hon. member says it was right to extend it to 1887. In the name of all that is rational, if it was, why was it not right to extend it to 1888 or 1889? If it was right to give a second homestead to a settler who came in 1884, because the Act of 1883 was in force, why was it not right to give a second homestead to the settler who came in 1885 and up to the 2nd of June, 1886, under the Act which remained unrepealed? The hon. member for West Durham stands up, and with his great authority tells us that it was a liberal arrangement, and he always speaks so solemnly and looks so solemn that, whether he does say anything profound or not, you expect that something profound will drop from him, and occasionally one is not wholly disappointed. But to-day, I came over here in order that I might listen to the honied words that would drop from those eloquent lips; I listened carefully, and I could see no cogency in his argument. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) came in on a sudden, without having, I think, heard the argument. I do not care if the hon. leaders of the Opposition and the whole Government denounce the position, the argument still stands on a rock of justice. If the same position were taken on behalf of a great railway corporation or any great company, what would be the attitude of the hon. membes of this House? You would have them getting up and in the blandest accents and sweetest tones, declaring that the company had the right, and the company would get what it wanted. But in the case of these poor settlers, who are without means of making

their voices felt in the country, when a humble member in this House brings forward their claims, we have a great man using his power against their position. I say you may vote on this how you like, their claim stands rooted in justice ; as it stands there it ought to be strong against the whole world.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have just one word to say in reply to the hon. gentleman, who has referred to me as having just come in and not having heard the argument. I came in when the motion was called, and I must say that I heard no argument whatever. I am glad that my slight introduction of a few remarks, speaking in the interest of the whole Dominion, has elicited such an outburst of enthusiasm and eloquence from the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It always affords me pleasure to listen to the hon. gentleman. Everybody knows he is talented, clever, and able : and when he takes hold of any case, he generally looks to see it through, when he is in the humor. It is much to my surprise and my gratification that for once he has plucked up courage enough to attack the Government, assail their policy, denounce their unjust acts, and endeavor to persuade this House to pursue a course which will lead to a different state of things from that pursued by the Administration which the hon. gentleman has supported in the past, and no doubt will continue to support in the future.

Motion negatived on a division.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the petitions, letters, and the plans and engineers' reports respecting the projected dam at "Hungry Bay," in the County of Beauharnois.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of form 93, North-West Mounted Police returns, in which payments were made L. W. Herchmer, Commissioner North-West Mounted Police, by paymaster at Regina, for contingencies from 1st July, 1887, to 1st July, 1888, and from 1st July, 1888, to 1st July, 1889.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, petitions, and all other documentary writings, which, up to this date, have passed between the Post Office Department and the Post Office Inspector for the District of Montreal, and all other persons whatsoever, respecting the change of name for the post office of Mount Saint Nicholas, in the County of St. John, Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Copies of all agreements made between the Government, or the Minister of Railways, and the Western Union Telegraph Company, respecting the construction and operation of a telegraph line along the Cape Breton Railway.—(Mr. Macdonald, Victoria,)

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Militia and Defence and the officers of the staff of Military District No. 1, regarding the pay and allowances of said officers.—(Mr. Scriver.)

Copies of all papers connected with charges against S. B. Lucas, Indian Agent, North-West Territories, together with the report of investigation of said charges made before Inspector McGibbon in May, 1887.—(Mr. Charlton.)

After Recess.

RELIEF OF GEO. T. SMITH.

Mr. SMALL moved third reading of Bill (No. 98) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. HICKEY. I understand that the effect of this Bill will be to renew the privileges which existed in regard to the old midlings purifier, and that there are other usages among millers which will be mischievously affected by this Bill. Millers who have communicated with me feel that this will create a considerable amount of difficulty, as it has already caused a large lawsuit. I, therefore, move :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. member (Mr. Hickey) is entirely in error. The patent to which he refers expired some time ago. This is a different patent altogether.

Mr. WALLACE. This is really a proposal to renew the old patent. If Parliament gives power to the Commissioner to grant this patent, these people will continue to work under the old patent, and there will be endless litigation in regard to it, and there will be practically, as has before been stated, blackmail brought to bear on every miller in this country. I have no doubt that the millers of this country are a unit in opposing this Bill.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Wallace) is entirely in error. If there is any litigation as a consequence of this Bill, I will guarantee that I will defray all the expenses. The Committee passed the Bill almost unanimously, the Minister of Justice gave his opinion in favor of it, and the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) also gave his opinion in the same direction. It is very unusual at the third reading of a Bill to bring it in question in this way.

Mr. HESSON. I am deeply interested in this matter. It relates to a business which is carried on in the city where I reside, and in the county which I represent. There is not the slightest ground for the statement which has been made by the gentlemen who have spoken. This Bill does not ask for a renewal of the patent which existed some years ago, and has recently expired. That patent was renewed on two occasions. It is true that the millers had a great deal of difficulty with the gentlemen who held that patent, but that patent has expired and has become public property. This is an entirely new patent, and if this Bill is not passed, it will crush out an important industry in my county. The whole Bill has been already explained by the Minister of Justice, and to adopt the amendment would do a great deal of injustice not only to the legal firm in Toronto which should have sent the money on and saved the patent, but also to the gentlemen who are carrying on this industry in the city of Stratford. There is not the slightest ground for the charge made by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that there is any disagreement whatever between the millers and the Smith Purifier Company as to this patent.

Mr. WATSON. I think it is a question for the House whether, after patents lapse, we should renew them in any case. I have a knowledge of some patents, and I think the House should not renew them in this way, but should carry the amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Hickey :

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bowman,
Boyle,
Campbell,
Casey,
Cimon,
Daly,
Eisenhauer,
Geoffrion,
Guillet,
Hale,
Hickey,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McCulla,
McKay,
McMillan (Huron),
Madill,
Masson,
Meigs,
Montague,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Essex),
Perry,
Porter,
Rowand,
Semple,
Smith (Ontario),
Somerville,
Taylor,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Watson,
White, (Cardwell),
White, (Renfrew),
Wilson (Elgin).—37.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Audet,
Béchard,
Bergeron,
Blake,
Boisvert,
Bordon,
Bourassa,
Brien,
Bryson,
Burns,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Curran,
Daoust,
Davies,
Davin,
Dawson,
Denison,
Dessaint,
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dickinson,
Doyon,
Dupont,
Earle
Edgar,
Ferguson (Welland),
Fiset,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Godbout,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hesson,
Hudspeth,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Labrosse,
Lang,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurie (Lieut.-General),
Laurier,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McDonald, (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKeen,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McMullen,
McNeill,
Mara,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Neveu,
Platt,
Purcell,
Putnam,
Rinfret,
Riopel,
Robertson,
Roome,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Shanly,
Small,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Trow,
Ward,
Weldon (Albert),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville).—93.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Order called for House in Committee on Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railway Company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to this, and the following Bill, the Government think they should be re-committed to the Standing Committee on Railways and Canals. Both these Bills involve questions of policy with respect to the general construction of railways in the North-West. There is this further fact, that there are, at least, five railways running in nearly the same region of country, and all running northward, and they will simply kill each other if they are all passed. I will ask my hon. friend the mover of this Bill (Mr. Watson) to allow this to stand over and be referred again to the Committee on Railways, where I will be able to lay before the Committee the considerations I have mentioned, which are of importance, as I can assure the House. As the rush of railway Bills has now ceased, the Committee will have every opportunity to consider them, and the considerations which I shall lay before the Committee. I shall, therefore, move that this Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways and Canals. If it be asked why these considerations were not laid before the Committee, I will mention that it was by accident, if I may use the expression. I intended to be present at the Railway Committee, but just before the hour of meeting of the Committee, I was summoned to Government House in a matter concerning despatches from Washington. I went down, hoping to get back in time, but I did not.

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry the First Minister has seen fit to adopt this course. This Bill was carefully considered, along with the other Bill he mentions, by a sub-committee appointed by the Railway Committee. They were reported on by that sub-committee to the Railway Committee, and reported by the Railway Committee, after careful consideration, to this House. I do not know whether anything new has arisen; it is simply a question as between the companies. The promoters of the Bill, which I have charge of and which is now before the House, were satisfied to take their chances along with the other companies. There might be some objections to the Bill on the part of some of the other companies, but the company which I represent have no objection to any other Bill, because they feel strong enough to go on and construct that road independent of the others. There is another Bill which was sent to the sub-committee, and was reported, and which has passed its third reading, and been assented to by His Excellency, and if there was any objection at all, it should have been raised in connection with that Bill. The promoters of this Bill did not expect there would be any opposition, or any more objections raised after it had been reported by the Railway Committee. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has taken this course, although I do not know what his reasons are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Committee will consider the Bill after the observations I shall make, and I can assure the hon. gentleman there will be every opportunity to have the Bill reported and brought before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. But you do not intend that the Bills shall be reported.

Motion agreed to.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND DUCK MOUNTAIN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Order for House in Committee on Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Railway Company be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Standing

Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

BANKERS' SAFE DEPOSIT WAREHOUSING AND LOAN COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Bankers' Safe Deposit Warehousing and Loan Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to propose an amendment to this section, the object of which is really to make the Bill clearer. Hon. gentlemen will see that by section three the company are authorised to lend money upon property of every kind and description, including stocks and shares in companies, and the last three lines of the section authorises the company to deal by purchase and sale, in all this property, that is to say, it authorises the company to buy and sell shares in companies and stocks of all kinds. I scarcely think that is the object of the promoters of the Bill. I think what is intended is the ordinary power that companies take of buying in their securities when they are foreclosed, and I conceive that to be all that the section means. I do not think it will commend itself to the judgment of the House that we should incorporate a company and give them authority to take other peoples' money with which to speculate in stocks, buy and sell stocks in the market, buy and sell grain on a margin, and all that sort of thing—I do not think that will commend itself to the judgment of the House. With regard to what took place before the Private Bills Committee, I may say that I myself understood this to mean simply the power to buy in their own securities for the purpose of protecting themselves, and I voted for that third section under that supposition, and I think hon. gentlemen in that Committee voted on the same supposition. At the last meeting of the Committee, near the close, it was proposed to test the Committee on this question. But the promoters of the Bill begged that the matter might lie over, because the Committee was so much reduced in numbers, and the Committee decided to leave the matter for the House to deal with. The last three lines of the first sub-section read :

"And may acquire by purchase or otherwise any security upon which the company is authorised to lend or advance money, and may re-sell the same as the company deems advisable."

The amendment I propose to make simply limits the right given to all companies of buying property on which they have advanced money. It is :

They may acquire by purchase or otherwise any of the aforesaid property or assets which may have been pledged, mortgaged or hypothecated to the company as security for any such property, and may re-sell the same.

I think that was really what was meant when the Bill was drawn, and that it was not intended to take the wider power. As the Bill should not leave the hands of the House in its present form, I submit this amendment.

Mr. COCKBURN. I had not the pleasure of being present when the Bill passed the Committee. No doubt the Committee will make the matter clear by carrying out the terms of the amendment.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. COCKBURN. I move that the Bill be now passed, and that the title of the Bill be "An Act to incorporate the Dominion Safe Deposit, and Warehousing, and Loan Company, Limited."

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS—ON DIVISION.

Bill (No. 120) for the relief of Christiana Filman Glover.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 119) for the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I think some order should be maintained in regard to Divorce Bills. I believe the evidence has been taken and printed for some time ; but, so far as I know, it has not been generally distributed, although some hon. members have received the evidence in one case. Bills of this nature should not be taken up until the evidence has been submitted to members, and hon. gentlemen in charge of these Bills should see that this is done, in order that we may be able to discuss the Bills intelligently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The introduction of a Bill is a mere matter of form ; but the evidence must be generally distributed, and should be carefully considered by hon. members before the second reading.

RAILWAY COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. KIRK. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to draw the attention of the First Minister, who is also the Minister of Railways, to the disadvantage under which the people of eastern Nova Scotia are laboring, in consequence of the connections made at Truro by the Quebec express from Quebec going east with the Halifax express at that point going east. If the hon. gentleman will look at the time table he will find that the Quebec express on the Intercolonial is due at Truro at 12 noon. The Halifax express, in the meantime, has gone east by two hours. It is due at Truro at 10 o'clock, and the consequence is that passengers and mails are obliged to lie over at Truro for twenty-two hours before they can proceed on their journey eastward. That, I consider, is a grievance, and it ought to be removed immediately ; I believe it has been in existence all winter, and, I think, it is time that the Minister of Railways should facilitate traffic there. There are seven counties interested in this matter, represented by nine members, two of whom happen to be Ministers of the Crown, and yet the interests of the people they represent are ignored in this way. I think it is only necessary to draw the attention of the Government to this inconvenience to have it removed at once. I also wish to say that when changes are made, the people of the Eastern Extension should be notified of the change. Last fall when a change was made, not even the postmasters or couriers who had to do with the mail knew of it, and in consequence there was a great deal of inconvenience.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree that notice should be given whenever a change in time is made. I would be exceedingly obliged to my hon. friend if he would write me a note, telling me exactly what the difficulty and delay at Truro are, and I shall make enquiries.

SAFETY OF FISHERMEN.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 96) for better securing the safety of certain fishermen.

Mr. COLBY. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would be kind enough to let this Bill stand now. He will have another opportunity of bringing it up.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This Bill has been allowed to stand several times, and as my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) has pointed out, it is rather important, if it should pass this Session, that it become law at an early date, as the "bankers" are about leaving for the season's fishing. I regret the circumstance which has caused the delay which the hon. gentleman could not avoid, but if this Bill is postponed, I trust I will have an opportunity of bringing it up again.

Mr. COLBY. That opportunity will be given.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Although I regret that the Bill is not made law at once, I will allow it to stand over on the understanding that I will have an opportunity to bring it up.

Mr. COLBY. You will have that opportunity.

Bill allowed to stand.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SHANLY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 104) to amend the Railway Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, I move as an amendment :

That the House do not go into Committee on the Bill, but that it go into Committee this day six months.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that in accordance with the recommendation of the Railway Committee ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. This is a very important Bill, and one which is specially in the interests of the farmers of the country. It is a Bill in the interests of all who own farm lands, through which railways pass, and it is to be regretted that the First Minister wishes in this sudden way to terminate the measure. The Bill received the approval of the Senate last year, and also during the present session. Last year's Bill was in somewhat different form, but not materially different in principle from the Bill now before the House, and in view of the fact of its having passed the Senate, I think the First Minister should have given some argument in support of the amendment he has moved. As I understand under the present Railway Act, a private individual, whose lands are affected by the construction of a railway, and which are not capable of being drained by the reason of the railway having obstructed the natural escape of water, is without a remedy. This Bill proposes that a private individual may, under such circumstances, apply to the municipality in which the lands are situate, and if the municipality sees fit to do so, it may set the machinery of this Bill in motion, so that the rights of the individual may be brought before the Privy Council in an inexpensive manner and the grievance, if any, dealt with. We were told before the Railway Committee that the existing law dealt with the case of an individual, but I do not believe that this was seriously argued, or that such is the law. There is certainly sufficient doubt in regard to the law at present to justify the Bill passing in its present form, or in a declaratory form, stating that the law is sufficient to meet the case of an individual. I think it is to be regretted that this amendment is the action of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the action of the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. This amendment now is the action of the Government, because I presume the mover yet occupies the position of Premier and leader of the Government. We may assume that the Government is promoting this motion. It is a question now before this House whether the railway interest is going to override the interest of the farming community, and whether, when these two classes meet, the railway interest is to be predominant. That is the simple issue, because there is no doubt that where the farmer, or any man owning farm lands, finds it impossible to enjoy the full benefit of his land, by reasons of obstruction made by railways ; if this Legislature does not provide him with means whereby he can compel such a corporation under an equitable scheme to have his lands properly drained, to that extent his interests are sacrificed and handed over to the railway company. When the case was before the Committee, I felt, with all respect to the Committee, that the individual farmer was not powerful enough there, and if the hon. First Minister presses this motion, I shall feel that that unfortunate position of the farmer extends beyond the Committee to this House. I hope, however, that he will not press the motion, but will either allow the Bill to pass in its present form, or, if he thinks the present law meets the case, let the Bill be amended to protect the rights of the individual. The hon. First Minister, before the Railway Committee, argued in this way, in his mind, if not with his lips : "I am the First Minister, and as long as I am the First Minister there is a cheap and inexpensive way through me to get justice ; I am sure I render justice to each individual, and, therefore, there is no need of getting legislation." He thinks there will be time enough to amend the Railway Act in this respect when he ceases to be First Minister. In the meantime, however, a certain part of the community suffers. An individual owner of land in a remote part of this Dominion, at present must appear before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in order to have a water-course opened through the lands of a railway company, whilst this scheme provides that instead of the facts being ascertained at Ottawa, they shall be ascertained on the spot itself. To compel the individual to make his application at Ottawa amounts to a denial of justice, for the whole value of his land may not equal the expense of applying to the Government here for redress. Therefore, how can he be said to have equal rights with others ? You are offering him a remedy which he cannot avail himself of, and the very knowledge of the fact that he has to appeal to Ottawa, and have the whole examination made here, where he cannot appear in person and must have some one to act for him, makes him despair of getting relief, and so he suffers. With the principle

of this Bill made law, you will find a vast number of cases brought under it immediately by people who have been suffering for years by reason of circumstances such as those to which I have referred. Therefore, I hope the hon. First Minister will try to look on this Bill as the ordinary public would look on it, and not as one who believes the administration of the law in his own hands is perfect. While I concede to him every desire to administer the law in the interests of all, and with due regard to the interests of the humblest subject, yet I must also look upon the question as the humblest subject would look upon it, who, I think, would say: "If I have to appeal to a court situated a thousand or two thousand miles away from where I live, to have the condition of my farm investigated, it will be wholly impossible to have the case properly and cheaply examined into, and, therefore, I will suffer in silence." The hon. Minister must look at it from all sides.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This measure came before Parliament last year, and was referred to the Railway Committee of the House. There it was discussed fully and was considered carefully, and the Committee by a very large majority rejected the Bill; it was reported to the House, and the House agreed to the report. This year the same measure came again before the House, and was again referred to the Railway Committee, where it was fully considered and by a very large majority rejected the second time, the Committee reporting to the House in these terms:

"The Committee have had under consideration Bill (No. 104) from the Senate, intituled: 'An Act to amend The Railway Act,' and recommend the measure be not passed; because, in the opinion of the Committee, the Bill is unnecessary, as section fourteen of 'The Railway Act' provides fully for drainage through and across the works and lands of railway companies."

The objection was made, in exactly the same terms as the hon. gentleman has used, that a farmer at a distance from Ottawa could hardly be expected to come here and lay his case before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and have it decided here, but that he should have a chance of having his case tried at his own door; in his own town. That argument was well considered by the Committee, and it was shown there that cases of that kind had come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for the last eight or ten years, and that at no time had one man complained of failure of justice, of being inconvenienced, or of having to appear before the Railway Committee, for the reason given by the hon. First Minister, that the party was not bound to come, and did not come, before the Committee. He sends his complaints to the Railway Committee, and whether he is present or not, his case is taken up and is decided, and justice is done to him as well as it would have been if he had been represented by two or three lawyers. I do not think there is any special reason why we should change the law, and adopt the Bill now before us. The Supreme Court sits here; cases are brought and decided here by it, and it is not called on to sit in every parish or in every Province. The hon. gentleman may say that it would be better that the cases should be decided where they arise by this court. That may be, but it is not the law, and if we were to divide the court in that way, we would have as many courts as Provinces.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the cases brought into the Supreme Court first?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course not. The cases are argued in the local courts, and are brought here on appeal. The farmer who has had his case decided in the superior court of his Province is obliged to come here on appeal. Why should he not, in another case, be obliged to come also before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which is by law a court. There is the high court of Parliament also. We do not sit in every Province, and a man from Prince Edward Island or British Columbia is obliged to come here with his petition. He does not come here personally to argue his case, but sends his petition, and his petition is taken up and decided by Parliament. I do not think there is any reason why this Bill should be adopted. On the contrary there are many reasons why it should not be adopted. We have the Railway Act, which provides fully for matters of this kind, and we should be content with that.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated, if I heard him correctly, that for ten years cases of private individuals have been dealt with by the Privy Council. I was present in the Railway Committee, and do not remember hearing it stated that private applications were ever made at the Privy Council.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated that cases come there in large number, and are decided by the Privy Council. Often these cases are brought before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council without the plaintiff or any one appearing for him, but the Committee deal with his case on its merits.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that the cases which have come before the Privy Council have been cases of municipalities and not of individuals. Does the hon. gentleman say that individual cases have been brought before the Council for these ten years?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; not only of municipalities but of private individuals. I cannot remember the names. I remember the case of one farmer who complained of a railway, and he had no one to take his case, but the Railway Committee took it up as if he had been defended by lawyers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The illustration of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat seems to me to be rather unfortunate, and not analogous at all to the question the House is discussing. The suitor who brings his suit to enforce any civil rights in any Province brings his suit before the court in that Province in the first instance, and he has a right to appeal to the Supreme Court at Ottawa. When the Government constituted a court for the trial of claims in the different Provinces which parties have against the Crown, they determined that the Exchequer Court should not sit in Ottawa, and that the suitors in Nova Scotia and British Columbia should not be obliged to travel here with there cases, but that the judge should go to each locality and try the cases there. Let us see what this Bill really does. There is a great deal in it which commends itself to my judgment. Two or three of the leading railway companies opposed the Bill in the Committee, and some very

able arguments were advanced by counsel who took the Committee rather on the jump. They contended chiefly that the Bill should be thrown out because section six made all railways in the Dominion subject to the general municipal regulations of the different municipalities. There doubtless was a good deal in that argument, but the argument only went against section six, and that section could have been very well amended, and the better part of the Bill remains. The Bill simply means this: that when any municipality, either on its own motion or on the application of individual farmers, determines that it is right and proper a drain or ditch should be built across a railway crossing through the municipality, the railway company should construct that ditch, but if when the municipality has submitted a plan of the proposed ditch or drain, the cost is under $800, or if the company does not dispute the estimate or propriety of the proposed work, in that case the company shall construct the work; but if the company dispute the estimate or propriety, and the estimate exceeds $800, the order of the municipality to construct the drains can be appealed from to the Privy Council. In other words the onus which now lies upon the municipality and the individual of appealing in the first instance to the Privy Council to have an order passed for the construction of a drain which may cost only $100 and the propriety of which is not even disputed, is done away with, on the ground that there is no necessity of coming to Ottawa when both parties are agreed, and that being compelled to do so only leads to useless expense. The hon. gentleman argued that any farmer can come before the Privy Council and receive as much fair play as any company. I do not challenge that. No doubt if the farmer or municipality is wealthy enough to provide counsel to present their case, they will get justice; but is it not absurd when a small ditch has to be constructed, which will cost about $100, and neither the propriety of constructing nor the estimate is disputed, the party should be compelled to come to Ottawa before they can obtain an order to compel the company to do the work? It is only the extreme power which the railway companies have in the Railway Committee, that has influenced the Government against this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt there are good grounds for the rejection of a sixth section, but the promoters of the Bill have made out an unanswerable case in support of its main feature.

Mr. MITCHELL. This matter was very fully discussed before the Railway Committee, and every point that could be made for or against the Bill was made. But there is one very important point from a constitutional standpoint which has not been referred to in this House, and it is this: That if the power asked for by this Bill are given to the municipality, the municipality is only answerable to the Provincial Government of the Province in which it is, and we would be consequently delegating powers, which should be exercised in connection with the railways of a county, to municipalities entirely under the control of the Provincial Government. I simply rise to make this statement. It appeared to me that the safety of the public should be considered in this matter as well as the interests of the people through whose properties the railways pass. We know very well that, if municipalities or individuals through municipalities, can get drains made through the country and all over the country, the safety of the travelling public will be seriously impaired, and where railways pass through that country there will be an endless amount of trouble in employing solicitors to attend and conduct and contest these cases before the tribunal provided for by this Bill. I do not know what course the Government may pursue, but, judging from what the First Minister has said, I have no doubt they will oppose its passage, and I think very properly so. The railways of the country should be under the control of the central power, the Parliament of Canada, and should not pass under the control of the Provincial Governments through the municipal authorities. For these reasons, I shall oppose the passage of this Bill.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). This is a very important measure, and I think it ought not to be disposed of without due consideration. I have received two communications in reference to it. I received one from Seaforth asking me to do everything in my power to get the Bill passed, and stating that now it is almost impossible for a private individual to obtain redress in these matters. No farmer will come before the Railway Committee or employ counsel, and, if he does not, he is bound to suffer. Municipalities also find great difficulty in getting their water-courses made across railways, though there may be an actual necessity for that being done. I think some legislation of this kind is necessary, and I hope this Bill will not be thrown aside without due consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course this can only apply to railways which are under the control of the Dominion Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What other railways are there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are the Provincial railways. We must consider the case as it was presented to the Committee on Railways, which is a large Committee and was very fully represented on the day when this Bill was discussed, and the Bill was disapproved of by a very large majority after hearing, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has stated, both sides of the question. We must consider the case of the railways to some extent. The railway companies have a very great responsibility upon them; they have been put to great cost occasionally, and it is their interest to see that the country through which the railway passes is properly drained. It is necessary for their own business, and, as a matter of fact, the different railway companies do settle their matters. The vast majority of applications for drainage are granted by the railway company for their own comfort, or in order to prevent litigation; but this measure provides that, where the claims are not over $800, the municipality, either of its own accord or at the instance of any single individual, can force an arbitration; that the railway must choose one arbitrator, and the individual or the municipality whose interests are effected shall choose another. There is a solemn provision for costs also. At this moment, if any individual or corporation desires to have a drain constructed, an application can be made to the railway company,

and, if the railway refuses to do that, all that is necessary is to apply to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But it is said the Privy Council sits in Ottawa, and that may be a thousand miles away from the residence of the individual who desires the drain, and he must have an agent or a counsel here. That is not the case. All that any individual who has a claim for the construction of a drain or anything else has to do is to write a letter, put a stamp upon it, and send it through the mail. It is not necessary for the party to be present or to have an agent or counsel, and I think the Privy Council is the only tribunal in my knowledge where there is no cost of any kind. The Railway Committee certainly sit judicially, but they look at the cases as they are presented as matters of policy as well as of strict right. It has happened since I have been looking at these matters that parties have applied in this way and their cases have been taken charge of by the Railway Committee. It has all been done by correspondence. The evidence and the correspondence can be sent from British Columbia or from Cape Breton, and it is considered and will be considered, and the party will get a decision without any cost or any trouble beyond that. You will see the enormous inconvenience, amounting to injustice, if every railway were made to suffer from such provisions as these. Every ill conditioned man, every one who thinks he would like to have his land drained at the expense of the railway goes to the municipality. The municipal council in Ontario consists of five men. They say: You want an arbitration, it will cost us nothing, and so we will grant it to you. Consequently, every individual who wants his farm drained at the cost of the railway will apply in that way. If the party has a good case, without any doubt the railway company will grant it, and, in case the railway company should refuse, a simple application by letter to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council will be sufficient to induce them to call upon the company to say why they refuse. If they fight it out, the answer of the company is sent to the individual or to the municipality, and the party can send the reply by post. There need not be any travelling expenses or costs incurred. Last Session, Parliament considered this matter fully, as the Railway Committee has considered it now, and for that reason I ask the House to follow the course adopted last Session and reject the Bill.

House divided on amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald:

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Jones (Digby),
Audet,	Kenny,
Béchard,	Labrosse,
Bergeron,	Lang,
Bergin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Borden,	La Rivière,
Bourassa,	Laurier (Lieut.-Gen.),
Bowell,	Livingston,
Cameron,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Campbell,	Macdowall,
Carling,	McDonald (Victoria),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Chapleau,	McKay,
Cimon,	McKeen,
Cockburn,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Colby,	Mara,
Curran,	Masson,
Daly,	Meigs,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Dawson,	Mitchell,
Denison,	Moncrieff,
Desjardins,	Montague,
Dewdney,	Patterson (Essex),
Dickey,	Perry,
Doyon,	Pope,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Earle,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Riopel,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Robertson.
Ferguson (Welland),	Scriver,
Fiset,	Shanly,
Freeman,	Small,
Gauthier,	Taylor,
Gigault,	Thérien,
Godbout,	Thompson (Sir John),
Grandbois,	Trow,
Guillet,	Vanasse,
Haggart,	Weldon (Albert),
Hale,	Wilmot,
Hall,	Wilson (Elgin),
Hesson,	Wood (Brockville),
Hickey,	Yeo.—85.
Holton,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurier,
Barron,	Macdonald (Huron),
Blake,	McCarthy,
Boisvert,	McCulla,
Bowman,	McMillan (Huron),
Boyle,	McMullen,
Brien,	McNeill,
Cargill,	Mulock,
Carpenter,	Neveu,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	O'Brien,
Casey,	Paterson (Brant),
Charlton,	Platt,
Choquette,	Purcell,
Coughlin,	Roome,
Davies,	Rowand,
De St. Georges,	Ste. Marie,
Dessaint,	Semple,
Dickinson,	Somerville,
Gordon,	Tyrwhitt,
Innes,	Wallace,
Jamieson,	Watson,
Jones (Halifax),	White (Cardwell).—47.
Kirk,	

Amendment agreed to, and motion, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I did not hear the motion put.

COMMISSIONER HERCHMER.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Davin, for the appointment of a Select Commission of Enquiry respecting the management of the North-West Mounted Police, under conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner, and the motion of Mr. Watson in amendment thereto.

Mr. DAVIN. After my motion had been discussed the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) moved an amendment to it. My seconder takes the same view of the amendment that I do, and we quite agree with it. I may say that the construction put upon my motion, that it showed desire to enquire generally into the management of the Department, never entered my head. My desire was to enquire into the management of the police force by Commissioner Herchmer, and as for a desire to enquire into the general management of the force, and still less, as to a desire to attack the Department, as somebody has suggested, such a thing never entered my head. The right hon. Prime Minister replied to me with his usual power, and with a convincing force that never deserts him, whether his case is a strong one or is not so strong. My hon. friend, the member for Frontenac

(Mr. Kirkpatrick), and the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) came into the debate; and I am bound to say that I was somewhat disappointed, because I know what an able man the member for Frontenac is, I know that he has been a long time in Parliament, he has been Speaker of this House, and he is a man of great experience; but he contributed nothing to the argument against my position for the best reason in the world: he knew nothing whatever about the subject on which he spoke. Then came the hon. member for Selkirk, who is an able man, and who, as we know in this House, can make a good speech on any subject about which he knows anything. But it so happened that on this subject he knew nothing whatever; his argument was what I would call a sugar candy argument. He told us that he found Commissioner Herchmer a very nice fellow wherever he met him, that he was all that was admirable in a man. He told us that whenever he asked anything from Commissioner Herchmer, Commissioner Herchmer did it for him, therefore Commissioner Herchmer was exactly what a commander should be. Of course, the force of that reasoning nobody can resist. It is logical, it is strong, it is powerful, nobody can resist a reason of that sort, and the House of Commons ought to be proud that my hon. friend condescends to address arguments of that sort to it. But, Sir, my hon. friend, knowing nothing whatever about the subject, had to invent some sort of argument, and as he had no real arguments to give, he gave us surmises.

Some hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Order! Who calls out order? Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Selkirk said:

"It has been said that the North-West Assembly passed a certain resolution. It may be that nearly every member of the North-West Council has come into contact with Colonel Herchmer, and that probably they have asked him to do what Commissioner Herchmer did not see fit to do."

Why, Sir, was anything more monstrous ever addressed to an assembly like this about another assembly? In order to support the position that he takes up, that Commissioner Herchmer is a fit commander of men, he tells us that the Assembly, any member of which is capable of standing up to any member of any Provincial Assembly you have—I hold that the members of the North-West Council, man for man, will compare with the members of any Assembly in Canada—my hon. friend, in order to support his position, declared that these men asked something from Colonel Herchmer that Colonel Herchmer did not give; therefore, they improperly, according to his construction, solemnly passed a resolution that was sent down to the Government of Canada against this man. Well, Sir, I think myself that my hon. friend from Selkirk was put very hardly to it when he had to resort to such a surmise, and to palm off such a surmise in this House by way of argument. Now, I rather complain of my hon. friend for this reason. After all he is, in a sense, a North-West member. I am here advocating the interest of the North-West Territories, I am here advocating the interest of the people of those Territories. I know what I am talking about, I know all about the police, I know all about the needs of the Territories, and my hon. friend from Selkirk, who is in a sense a North-West man, without knowing at all about it, comes forward to try and discount the efforts of a North-West man who represents the North-West. I do not think it was a very brotherly thing, I do not think it was a very correct thing; it was a thing, certainly, that I would not do to him if he came forward, knowing something about Manitoba, and made a motion about Manitoba, even if I did not know the question, I would come to the conclusion that my colleague knew all about it, and I would stand up to vote shoulder to shoulder with him in this House. Now, the hon. member suggests that these gentlemen asked something from Colonel Herchmer. Why, Sir, what could Colonel Herchmer have to give them?

Some hon. MEMBERS. A permit.

Mr. DAVIN. He has no power to give them a permit.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A canteen.

Mr. DAVIN. We will come to the canteen by-and-bye. He has no power whatever to give a permit. I do not know what he could give these gentlemen that they could be refused. But I do know that these gentlemen are men of the highest respectability, they are representative men, and knowing the opinion of the Territories they came to the conclusion they did. Now, there is only one point in the speech of the right hon. gentleman to which I wish to refer. He thought—I dare say that he had, probably, some reason for thinking so—that I showed some personal feeling; he did not question my motives, but he thought I showed some personal feeling. Now, Sir, I heard afterwards, that some people thought that Commissioner Herchmer and myself have had some personal difference. There has never been an iota of personal difference between Commissioner Herchmer and myself. The whole North-West was attacking Commissioner Herchmer for twelve months before I ever said a word about him. Prominent men came to me again and again and said: "Why, everybody throughout the Territories is attacking this man. Why don't you do something?" I did not lift a hand against him, I did not say a word against him during those twelve months, when the whole North-West Territory was up in arms against him. I did not do it for this reason, that we had been friends, we were friendly, and not one word did I say against him. The very first time anything was said against him in any place where I could control was when he did a most high-handed act. There was a young man in the police force engaged to a young woman, and on the very eve of the marriage he was ordered off because Commissioner Herchmer disapproved of marriages in the force. I at once telegraphed down to the authorities here, and ultimately we had that settled, and the marriage took place. But that was not the only case, for there was another case of the same sort. A sergeant wrote to the Commissioner that he wanted to get married, and the moment he did so the Commissioner said he would take his stripes off if he married. He does not make any bones about the fact that he is opposed to marriages in the force. That is all right, but he has no right to act in such a high-handed manner as he did in these cases. That was the first time in any quarter that I could influence, anything was said against him, and it was last year.

I was rather surprised at the strong attitude taken by the right hon. the First Minister, because there is a member of the Government who could tell him all about the feeling in the North-West. The Minister of the Interior could tell him all about the feeling in the Territories in regard to Commissioner Herchmer. The hon. Minister was up there last summer, and he did not find any difficulty in declaring that he thought Commissioner Herchmer unfit for his position.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If he refers to me, I say I made no such remark.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman made no such remark while he was up there, and if he has made no such remark since he came back here, all I can say is that men, who are prominent men and as truthful men as any men in this House, must have dreamed he said so. Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But according to the word of men, who, up to the present statement of the hon. gentleman, I have believed to be men of veracity, the hon. gentleman had stated that he recommended Commissioner Herchmer for his position, that he was sorry he did so, and that he believed he had made a mistake.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would like the hon. gentleman to name the party who stated that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name ; name.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly that is a very easy thing to say. It would not be desirable that I should name the party. Any one who is acquainted with the debates in this House is aware that it is not the thing to name people

An hon. MEMBER. Then, why did you say so if you will not name him ?

Mr. DAVIN. I will challenge the hon. gentleman to deny it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Give us the name.

Mr. DAVIN. Let us get an enquiry now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name ; name.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not necessary to give the name. Let us get an enquiry, and I will put witnesses in the box that will swear——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name ; name.

Mr. DAVIN,—that the hon. gentleman, when he was up there last summer, suggested that there should be a round-robbin signed by all the officers of the police to the First Minister, to complain of Commissioner Herchmer. I will put a witness in the box that will swear it, and I will swear that since he came back here he said so. I will put the witness in the box.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Then, both the hon. gentleman and his witness will tell a falsehood.

Mr. DAVIN. Let us have an enquiry, and I will put him in the box. I say that it was not to one party, but to more than one that the hon. gentleman, when he was up there last summer, stated his opinion about Commissioner Herchmer's unfitness.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, I will accept the hon. gentleman's denial ; but if there be an enquiry I will prove that. Anyway, it will be very interesting to hear the hon. gentleman rise and express his opinion in this House in regard to Commissioner Herchmer. He can now express his opinion. He can state if he thinks the Commissioner is a proper man for the position, and he can openly, in this House, contradict the statement made to me, not by one but by several parties, as to what he said. Those persons may have invented it, may have dreamed it, I may have been misinformed, but the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of stating the facts. I stated specifically, when I addressed the House before on this subject, the charges against Commissioner Herchmer.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes ; I did. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in the House then ; I think he was away. If he is exercising himself at the catcalling business, he might as well exercise it somewhere else than in this House. The member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) thought that I did not act on strict parliamentary principles in making a motion for an enquiry and not stating in the motion the charges against Commissioner Herchmer. I think that in the annals of the British Parliament he will find that some of the first parliamentarians England ever produced have made motions of this kind, and have stated their charges in the speeches they made to support the motions. If that were not so, there was a reason why it was not necessary on my part to do it. And the reason was this : These charges had been published in the newspapers for months and months before this House met. Commissioner Herchmer was, therefore, familiar with them, and when the motion was put on the paper for an enquiry, he and his friends could have been easily informed as to what the charges would be. It was not, therefore, necessary that I should specify the charges. But I was, of course, very grateful for the powerful support given to the general attitude I took on that occasion by so great a man in Parliament as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and also by the distinguished leader of the Opposition. The distinguished leader of the Opposition dwelt on a point in respect of which I will say a word. I confess that if I showed feeling I do not regret it. I am not so constituted that I can know gross injustice has been done, that gross oppression has been exercised without feeling in regard to it. If I have shown indignation I am not sorry, because the circumstances were calculated to excite indignation in the breast of any man who feels as he ought to feel. There were some matters I did not mention when the subject was up before. One of the subjects I should have dealt with, but I thought I had made a sufficiently strong case, was this, that Commissioner Herchmer has established, in Regina, a boycott. The Board of Trade of Regina sent to the First Minister, within the last few days, a petition in regard to this officer, in which it states what is true, because the leading men in the Board of Trade know well it is so, that the first time I moved in the matter against Commissioner Herchmer I did it at their pressure and at their suggestion ; and the moment the Board of Trade, which embraces all the prominent merchants in Regina, passed a resolution against a certain course that Commissioner Herchmer took,

what did he do? He boycotted every one of them, except one—it will please hon. gentleman of the Opposition to know that the exception is a prominent Reformer, who had not taken any part in the proceedings—and the Commissioner would not allow any of his men or officers to go to any of the stores to buy anything, and a regular boycott was established. Now, Sir, if the House will remember, when that canteen, which my friends are anxious to know so much about, was established, I protested against it. We had a meeting with the gentleman who occupies the position of Deputy Minister in regard to the Mounted Police Force, and I wish to say that he is an able man, and I believe that his management is probably the most effective of the management of any of the Departments. At that meeting there were present leading merchants who are members of this House, and some of whom had been up in Regina, and they proved to the satisfaction of every one of us, that the prices at which things were sold at the canteen, were higher than the prices charged in the stores in Regina, which shows that from the point of view of price or quality, there was no reason for the course taken. I have in my hands the Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army, and one of these regulations in reference to canteens is :

"When canteens are established in barracks it is to be clearly understood that soldiers are in no way to be prevented from resorting to markets and establishments in the neighborhood."

Well, Sir, if you are going to establish a canteen on regimental lines, you ought to have acted upon that principle, but we can prove that the moment that canteen was established, a boycott was placed upon the stores at Regina, and the men and officers were prevented from frequenting it. Another of these regulations for the army is :

"The commanding officer is not to be on the committee if there is one captain available for it. Presidents of canteen committees are, when practical, to be exempt of serving on boards of survey, &c."

It is, of course, very important that the commander of a force should not take a very close interest in the canteen, but we can show that this man has been taking as deep an interest in the canteen as if he had in fact some share in the profits. I do not say he has, because I know nothing about it. Another regulation in this book is :

"No officer of the regimental staff is to be appointed a member of the regimental committee, and the canteen shall be managed by a committee of sergeants."

Now, when this canteen was first established, a man from the outside, in no way connected with the Police Force, was brought in to run the canteen and to make a profit upon it ; whereas in the regimental canteens of the British army, all the profit goes to providing newspapers, books and what not, for the reading room. Again a regulation of the army says :

"The canteen sergeant is to be under the orders of the committee of officers. His position will be that of steward or salesman, not of contractor, and he is not to be permitted to have any interest whatever in the profits of the canteen. The proceeds of the sale will be handed over daily, by the canteen sergeant, to the committee of officers, and a rent for the canteen will also be charged to cover the cost of maintenance of the building."

Now, one of the things mentioned in the memorial that has been sent to the right hon. gentleman, is that the tradesmen of Regina are discounted in their business by reason of this man having a low rent, or having no rent to pay for the premises. That being the case, he is, of course, in a position to fight on velvet, while other traders have to fight as best they may. I object entirely to the system of giving tickets in the canteens. A man, whether he has money or not, gets his beer on giving a ticket, and the result of this is that many of the men, when the end of the month comes, have no money to draw. It is all gone to the canteen. And when the men go to the pay-officer to draw their pay, he brings forward these tickets and deducts their amount, so that the officers of the Government are collectors for the canteen. I entirely object to that system. The right hon. gentleman stated what is perfectly true : that a large percentage of the men whose time is up, wish to rejoin the force, but I know whereof I speak when I say that some of these very men rejoin it because of the fact that when their time has expired they have not a cent to bless themselves with, because this system has drawn every cent from them. They have nothing to go out on the world with, and they are very glad to re-enlist. We know very well that when a man can get beer on credit there is not the check to prudence nor the check to caution which there would be if they had to pay ready money ; and there is a strong temptation for these men to go beyond their income. Now, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman very properly dwelt upon the appearance of the corps ; and it was very hard to have my own strong admission as to the ability of the corps, and as to their fine appearance ; used as a point against the position I take. Of course, if the reasoning is correct, which was also made by some hon. gentleman, that if a corps has a good appearance and has good form, and if that proves that the man is fit to command, why, of course, if the corps was in a bad state you would have to argue that the man was unfit. But, Mr. Speaker, as a fact, I rather think that the right hon. gentleman a little over-stated the condition of the force before the time Colonel Herchmer took charge of it. Certainly we, in the North-West, never saw any evidence of demoralisation in that corps at all. When there were three or four hundred men in the Territories, without a railway ; when the Indians were warriors, when they had not been subjected, and cabbined, cribbed and confined on their reserves, I need hardly say that that force of a few hundred men—not the thousand men we have now—must have been in magnificent condition to do the great work they then did. Of course, I do not contradict the right hon. gentleman, because he is in a position to know, but so far as we have known in the Territories that force has never been in a demoralised condition. If there was any little laxity in 1883, the brother of Commissioner Herchmer, who has really done great things for the force, came down to Regina and very soon set it right. We know, from the example of the British army, that you may have a magnificent force under a very indifferent commander. Take, for instance, the Six Hundred. The man who was torturing the life out of Macaulay to defend him, when Macaulay was Minister of War, the man whom Kinglake, and every writer who has written about war, has utterly condemned as a commander, was the commander of that magnifi-

cent regiment, which made that charge of imperishable memory. Every one now admits that Cardigan, the commander of the men who rushed against death and fate in that charge, was unfit. I cannot certainly think that the reasoning of the right hon. gentleman was conclusive, in the respect that a good force is evidence of a fit commander.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. DAVIN. I will come to the question when it is time. Mr. Speaker, I could reiterate the charges that I made against Colonel Herchmer, and give the names of the persons who are ready to prove them. But I do not think that is desirable; I think it would be unwise to do it; and I do not think it is necessary to add definiteness to the case which I have made. I have made definite charges; I have risked my position before the North-West in making them; but I tell you, Sir, in making these charges I have expressed the opinion of the North-West. There is not a newspaper in the North-West that has not supported me in doing so, and my hon. friend the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has seconded the motion, which was to have been seconded by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Davis), who was not in the House at the time I made it. The fact is, no member from the North-West can vote against the motion, and have a fair chance of re-election. Some hon. gentlemen think they know more about the North-West than I do; but I make these charges with a full sense of the responsibility that attaches to making them. I make them here in a House where these things ought to be dealt with. This House is the supreme inquest in this Dominion, and if it can possibly happen that such oppression, such Russian tyranny, as has taken place in the North-West Mounted Police under Commissioner Herchmer can be maintained in Canada, it is of evil omen for the future of this great Dominion.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As I was the seconder of this motion, I think it is only right that I should say something on this occasion. At the time I seconded it, I explained my position. I did so, as the hon. member has explained, because the seconder was absent. At the same time, I stated the reasons why I advocated the granting of a commission of enquiry into the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer, were that the press of the North-West brought certain charges against him, that the North-West Assembly had reiterated those charges, and that they had been made here by a member of this House on his own responsibility. For my part, I do not know anything about the specific charges which the hon. member brought; but I listened to the debate throughout, and I thought the idea of the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the motion should be cut down, was a good one, because for my part I could not imagine any one desiring to have an enquiry made into the management of the North-West Mounted Police, for every one throughout the North-West, as my hon. friend from Assiniboia has himself said, must acknowledge that the management of that force is most excellent in every way. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) said that in bringing this motion before the House, we were bringing a direct charge against the Prime Minister, as he was the Minister in charge of that force. On that point I take direct issue with him, and there are precedents in the English Parliament to support my view. Some years ago certain charges were brought against one of the responsible permanent officers in the War Office, and an enquiry was made into them. The charges were found proven, but the Minister in charge of the Department was in no way affected; and I do not think that this motion implies any reflection whatever either on the Prime Minister or on his very able Deputy. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in the course of his remarks on this question, said:

"I do not see any cause for enquiry into the management of the North-West Mounted Police at large, but if the resolution had been confined to asking an investigation into the conduct of Colonel Herchmer, I would be disposed to favor it."

I myself thought that the easiest way to secure this object was to strike out of the motion the words "into the management of the North-West Mounted Police;" but later on the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) more fully explained the meaning of the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He suggested that upon the whole the best disposition that could be made of the matter this Session would be to have a departmental enquiry, and I think myself that that would be the best disposition to make of it. For my part, I have no personal charge to bring against Colonel Herchmer; but I do not take back one word which I said in the previous debate. I believe that Commissioner Herchmer, perhaps from his temperament, or for some other reason, is not the best man possible for the command of that force. I believe, if he is continued in the command of that force, it will become demoralised. At the same time, I believe it is one of the finest forces in the world, and one that every man in Canada may be proud of. I do not know of any serious charge to bring against the character of Commissioner Herchmer, further than this, that I think his appointment was not a very good one, and I think the sooner it is changed the better it will be for the force. Therefore, I am inclined to support the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham, that a departmental enquiry be made into these charges, and that the Government deal with the Commissioner as they think right.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should not have made any remarks on this subject had not the hon. member from Western Assiniboia singled me out particularly as a member of the Government who should know something of the circumstances connected with his attacks on Commissioner Herchmer. I may say that Commissioner Herchmer was an old officer of mine, having for several years occupied the position of Indian agent in one of our most important agencies. I found him to be a hard-working, ambitious, reliable and honest official, and I am certain he is not guilty of many of the accusations brought against him by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia. As the hon. gentleman has stated, I was one of those who recommended his appointment to his present position, when I understood that it was to become vacant, and I did it because of the experience I had had of him, and, also, because of the experience I had had of the force for several years, during the time I occupied the positions of Indian Superintendent and Lieutenant Governor. I came to the conclusion that the force required a first-class business man; and, knowing that Commissioner Herchmer had had

considerable military experience, and believing, from what I knew of him, that he would make a satisfactory officer for the position, I recommended him. He had been in charge of the commissariat department on the boundary commission, which I understood he had conducted with great ability. The force, which, when Col. Herchmer took charge, consisted only of 500 men, was as capable and as active, and composed of as good men as it is to-day. The work in the older days was very different from the work to-day. There was more responsibility, then, thrown on the men. They were oftener thrown on their own resources. They had to deal with the Indians as they met them, wild from the plains in very large bodies, and on several occasions I had opportunities of seeing what those men and their officers were made of. At the same time, it was well known that there was a certain amount of looseness and want of discipline in the force, and it was thought that Col. Herchmer would make a good man to remedy that. From my knowledge of the force since he has had charge of it, I believe that not only has the discipline been greatly improved, but the business altogether, of the force, has been carried on in a much more satisfactory state than heretofore. As I stated the other night, the cost per day of the men is a great deal less than it was a few years ago. I know that Col. Herchmer, when he took charge, was in this position, that he had to deal with parties in different parts of the Territories who had been doing business with the different officers in those localities, away from headquarters, and where, as the reports only come in at very long dates, a proper, strict supervision could not be kept, such as is exercised to-day ; and those men, when they had to do business on business principles, felt—a number of them—very much aggrieved at the action taken by the Commissioner. That is one of the principal reasons which has led to the strong feeling against the Commissioner, and which, I own, does exist to a very great extent in the North-West Territories. The hon. member has made some very serious accusations against the Commissioner, not only with regard to tyrannical action, but also against his honesty. I believe he has insinuated that he was interested in a canteen started at Regina. That, I believe, is utterly destitute of foundation. I assert that Colonel Herchmer was never interested one single iota in that canteen, and I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that he was. I know Colonel Herchmer too well to believe for a moment that he could be guilty of anything of the kind. One of the hon. gentleman's charges was that while Col. Herchmer has passes, he charged his railway fares to the Government. Well, I have seen a great number of those officers of the police, travelling from one end of the country to the other, and I have seen them, with passes in their pokets, pay their fares, and they have stated that the passes given to them, were given to them as private individuals, and they did not consider they could be expected to travel on those passes. They paid their fares, and I believe that was the proper system to adopt. I believe any man who has received a pass from a railway company and who is a public officer has no business to use that in his public capacity and then charge his fare. If I am not mistaken, the hon. gentleman himself, who made this accusation, travels on a pass, and I should like to know whether he charges his mileage here and gets paid it every year. He has no more business to do that than has any officer of the Dominion a right to travel on a pass and then charge the amount to the Government. The hon. gentleman has stated that he never had any personal feeling against the Commissioner of police. I am quite sure he ought not to have any personal feeling against him, because I am satisfied that on many occasions the Commissioner of Police has treated him, certainly as a friend, and not as an enemy. If I recollect rightly, when the Governor General was up there, and a review took place in the barracks, it was doubtful whether Colonel Herchmer reviewed those troops or the hon. member for West Assiniboia ; for I understand he not only reviewed those troops, but also the Governor General and his party, in a buckboard driven by a cayuse, a spotted old horse. So much was the hon. gentleman in the way that he had to be led out of the yard with the sergeant at each side of the pony. If the Commissioner had carried out what was requested of him by the sergeants, the hon. gentleman would have found himself in the guard room, and, therefore, I think he has something to be grateful to Colonel Herchmer for. The hon. gentleman has stated that Colonel Herchmer has prevented his officers from buying at some of these stores at Regina, the proprietors of which objected to his keeping a canteen. Does the hon. gentleman want to make this House believe that the Commissioner has power over his officers to prevent their trading wherever they please in Regina ?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Nonsense. Colonel Herchmer has no more power in that respect than the hon. member for West Assiniboia ; and I am sure his officers would snap their fingers at him if he attempted to give such an order. I do not propose to take up the time of the House longer, having given my views in regard to the Commissioner. I believe he is an able man. He may, as some gentlemen say, have a little fault with regard to his temper. I dare say he has. I have reason to know that myself, but at the same time I do not believe the accusations made against him. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has not been very particular as to the way in which he obtained his information, but I do not believe the Commissioner is guilty, and I for one would be very sorry to see an investigation or a commission granted, such as the hon. gentleman asks for.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before this question is put, I wish to say a few words. I do not think that the attack which has been made on the hon. member for Assiniboia was a fair attack. I think he has been endeavoring to discharge his duty, and I am satisfied that the opinion of the North-West is in accord with his in regard to Colonel Herchmer's conduct in the management of the police force. It is not only the Regina *Leader* which has taken Colonel Herchmer to task, but every newspaper published in the North-West has been teeming with criticisms, for more than a year, of Colonel Herchmer's conduct. When the hon. member for Assiniboia brought this matter before the House last Session a great many members were under the impression that it was a personal matter between him and Colonel Herch-

mer; but where there is so much smoke there must be some fire, and every newspaper in the North-West has been criticising adversely and condemning the conduct of this officer for the last year. The charges, therefore, must be in some respect correct, and the Government ought not, therefore, to resist the appointment of a commission to enquire into the conduct of this officer. I have had sent to me extracts from nearly every newspaper in the North-West. This in itself shows that the action of the hon. member for West Assiniboia is not of a personal character, and that he is not actuated by personal motives, and is not endeavoring to persecute this officer. I will read the quotations I have before me, which I think will show that the hon. member for Assiniboia is discharging a public duty in seeking to obtain redress, not only for the police force of the North-West, but for the people who reside there. There is not a single newspaper in the whole of the North-West Territories which supports Col. Herchmer in his conduct towards the force. Here is an extract from the Saskatchewan *Herald:*

"COMMISSIONER HERCHMER.

"For a long time complaints have been made against Commissioner Herchmer and his management of the Mounted Police force under his command. In the North they generally took the form of connection with the management of public contracts, but in the South they embrace charges of wrong-doing and tyranny over his officers and men. So serious are some charges that it seems incredible they should have been allowed to go unchallenged so long. But they are so specific and numerous that they establish his unfitness for the position he occupies, and demand investigation. In fact we cannot see how Mr. Herchmer has allowed them to be so often repeated without taking steps to vindicate his character by asking for a commission of enquiry or in some other way.

"The matter has been taken up by the House of Assembly, and their petition for a court of enquiry will in all probability be granted. Messrs. Ross and Secord, who move and second the resolution, know there are grounds for their action; and it is a serious reflection upon Mr. Herchmer that the resolution was carried unanimously.

"The *Leader* gives the specimen 'justice,' as administered in Regina. In one case, Sergeant Mahony, said to be one of the most efficient men in the force, was fined $30 for saying he would drink no more beer in the canteen; in another, a favored policeman was fined $10 for breaking into the Commissioner's cellar and stealing a quantity of beer; so it would appear that where a man drinks beer he can command immunity for the crime of stealing it. The resolution reads:

"Whereas certain very serious statements have been made on the floor of the House, reflecting on the conduct of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police; be it resolved, that an humble address be presented through His Honor the Lieutenant Governor to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that the matter be enquired into. Carried unanimously."

That is the opinion of the Saskatchewan *Herald.*

Mr. MULOCK. A Government organ?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose all these papers in the North-West are Government organs. Then here is the MacLeod *Gazette*, which is edited by Mr. Wood, a strong supporter of the Government:

"Mr. Commissioner Herchmer cannot look back upon the visit of the Governor General to these Territories, and the part that he played in connection with it throughout, with very much pleasure or satisfaction. Commencing at Regina and ending at Banff, he seems to have behaved more like an irresponsible lunatic, unfit to be at large, than in a manner becoming the dignified and cool-headed commander of a thousand men. On occasions when one might have expected to see a display of cool judgment, Mr. Herchmer seems to have lost all control of himself, and to have raved like an overgrown school boy. Few of his officers, with whom he came in contact during the Governor's visit, seem to have escaped without feeling some of the effects of his ill-temper; and not satisfied with bullying and tyrannising over those who were not in a position to resent it, he even had the impudence to attempt to interfere with civilians. If these absurd outbursts of temper had only occurred during the Governor's visit, we might understand them, but they are of constant recurrence.

"The following account of Mr. Hechmer's unpardonable behavior at Banff, published in the *Leader*, we can vouch for as being absolutely true: 'He (Mr. Herchmer) went up to Banff, and at the ball, behaved as if he was the host. He was insolent to everybody, most insolent to the man he was bound to respect. After the ball, Mr. Mathews (manager of the C.P.R. hotel) had a few friends in a private room, amongst them Mr. Goschen, son of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Pocklington, an English gentleman in the employ of the Government, Capts. Cuthbert, Allen, Burnett and Macpherson, Mr. Baker, General Manager of the North-Western, Mr. Buchanan and one or two others. They heard some furious individual rush at the door, try to open it, then kick violently at it. It was opened. Herchmer enters in a towering passion, and abuses and insults his officers in the presence of civilians, threatens to get Mr. Pocklington dismissed, threatens even his host, Mr. Mathews, and orders the officers out—ordered, it is said, Macpherson to put them under arrest. His orders were not obeyed.'

"The latter part of the story we can slightly correct. When Mr. Herchmer first appeared at the supper which Mr. Mathews gave to a few friends after the ball he complained that the Governor General was being disturbed. Mr. Mathews promptly told him that, if the Governor was disturbed, he would no doubt send down word to that effect. Mr. Herchmer had before this ordered his officers to leave the table. He then went away, and returned later on more furious than ever. This time he ordered his officers to either leave the table or send in their resignations, stating that he did not care a d——n which they did, and that at all events they were under arrest.

"It is difficult to find language in which to express disapproval, not only of Mr. Herchmer's action at Banff, but of his whole management of the police force. Both in and out of the force he is the most thoroughly hated and detested man in the North-West Territories. His men hate him; almost every civilian with whom he has ever come in contact hates and despises him. Where he could have made a friend he seems to have preferred to make an enemy. Men who never speak ill of any one find that they cannot control themselves when Mr. Herchmer is spoken of. He has proved himself capable of the most petty meanness; he will listen to tales about his officers brought to him by a constable, and encourages a sneaking underhand system of spying and reporting among all ranks. He talks about his officers to outsiders, and discusses his future plans regarding the force with nigger Pullman car porters. He is a man as wretchedly unfit to command the Mounted Police force as could be found in the whole Dominion. He has not the necessary military experience; he has not the ability, and he has not the right temperament to occupy so responsible a position. A commander may be severe, and still retain the respect and esteem of his men. Mr. Herchmer's severity amounts to tyranny and brutality, with no redeeming features, and inspire only loathing, hatred and contempt."

This is not an extract from the Regina *Leader*, but from the MacLeod *Gazette*, edited by a gentleman who supports this Government, and who, therefore, ought to have some weight with the First Minister in inducing him to grant this enquiry. Here is another extract from the Calgary *Tribune.*

An hon. MEMBER. Is that a Government paper?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not know what stripe of politics this paper has, but it expresses the opinion of the North-West, and I venture to say that all the papers up there are supporters of the Government of the day, just as the members they send to this House are.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by the allusion which he makes to the representatives of the North-West in this House, when he says they are always supporters of the Governement. The newspapers in the North-West, I believe, are independent, and

the members from the North-West are equally independent.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad to hear that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) is going to turn over a new leaf. I did not know before that he was an independent member of this House. Certainly he has always voted for the Government. Here is the extract from the Calgary *Tribune* to which I was about to refer:

"If the charges brought against Col. Laurence Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, by the Regina *Leader* are true, and if Commissioner Herchmer held a commission in the Imperial Service—were he Commander-in-Chief or subaltern—a court-martial would be held, and he would find himself cashiered forthwith. We do not, however, know what penalty is visited upon an officer in the N. W. M. P. for 'conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman.' The *Leader*, in its issue of Thursday last, makes assertions which, if proved, make this officer no more fit to hold the position he does, than the most pronounced hoodlum. But in that paper's issue of Tuesday the charges are more definite, and assume a far more serious aspect. Nine charges are brought, as follows:—

"1. We say he does not know his business, and cannot put the men through their facings without having a slip of paper prepared for him with the words of command.

"2. We charge him with tyranny to officers and men, and cruelty.

"3. With interfering with the medical men in the treatment of their patients.

"4. With unrighteousness in dealing with defaulters.

"5. With having inaugurated a system by which men drink away their pay before they get it.

"6. With using for himself and family the institution of which he is the head in the Territories as if it was a private matter appertaining to himself.

"7. With yielding to his prejudices against certain nationalities—French Canadians—Irishmen—Scotchmen—English-speaking Canadians—all nationalities except one.

"8. With forcing police officers who are magistrates to act contrary to their consciences.

"9. With illegally awarding punishment on evidence not taken before him, imprisoning men he has never seen contrary to the statute.

"If proved, any of these charges renders Commissioner Herchmer unfit to be in command of any body of men—and if proved several of them are such that Commander Herchmer is not only unfit to hold the position he does, but he is unfit to be an associate of gentlemen. Charges 2, 4, 8 and 9 are too serious to be believed, and yet it appears almost incredible to believe that a respectable newspaper would bring such charges against a public man, knowing the severity of the penalties that would be entailed, were the charges to prove without foundation, whether they are true or whether they are false, these charges should be made the subject of a most searching enquiry, for the present state of things is a crying scandal to the whole of the Dominion.

"If the charges are true, Commissioner Herchmer should be dismissed from the force; if the charges are false and malicious, then should the writer of the articles be punished to the utmost limit of the law. It will be seen that the matter has been brought before the notice of the members of the Legislative Assembly, and one member has made a motion with reference to Com. Herchmer forcing police officers to act contrary to their consciences—a crime of the deepest dye. These charges the member in question, Mr. Haultain, says he is in a position to prove. We sincerely trust he is not. What a state of things to hold up to the world — a commanding officer so base as to force his officers to act against their consciences—subordinates so weak and backboneless that they could allow themselves to be influenced by their superior officer, however blustering or overbearing. The whole affair is very discreditable and requires a strong light to be thrown upon it. We doubt much if Com. Herchmer should continue to hold his position until he has taken steps to clear himself, or the Dominion Government have ordered an investigation to be made. We trust, for the sake of the honor of the force, the charges may prove without foundation, but if true that the Government will dismiss so worthless and faithless a servant."

Here is another extract from the MacLeod *Gazette*. I am sorry to weary the House, but I think it is important that the evidence from the Territories where this man presides over the police force, should be out on record in this House, to show that the Government ought to grant this commission which has been asked for by the hon. member for Assiniboia. I will read what the MacLeod *Gazette* says:

"The feeling that Mr. Commissioner Herchmer must go is practically an unanimous one throughout the North-West. The Government are fully aware that every charge made against him by the Regina *Leader* and the *Gazette* are absolutely true. A strict investigation will prove that such is the case, and it would be a public disgrace to retain him in his present position without such an investigation. It is not altogether improbable that the Government will get rid of him quietly, and so avoid the very unpleasant alternative. An investigation would completely prove the truth of everything that has been charged against him—of interference with police justices of the peace, of overbearing and tyrannical conduct toward both his officers and men, of encouraging a system of underhand spying throughout the force, of incompetency in handling a large parade, of trying and sentencing policemen who have never appeared before him, and upon evidence not taken by himself, of insolence to those with whom he has had business relations, of unfairness and worse in letting contracts, and of generally behaving in a way which shows him to possess an ungovernable temper, and to be entirely unfit to occupy his present responsible position. All these things can be proved, and the Government know it. An investigation before a proper tribunal, or prompt dismissal, is what is demanded, not only in the North-West, but in the east. In this demand eastern newspapers of all shades of opinion have joined."

I may say with regard to this sentence, it is a fact that not only the newspapers of the North-West, but the newspapers in the Province of Ontario and other Provinces, after perusing the evidence which has been furnished by their contemporaries in the North-West, with regard to the conduct of this man, have come to the conclusion, that the charges are well founded, and that an investigation ought to be had in regard to his conduct. Here is what another newspaper says, the Lethbridge *News*:

"THE CHARGE AGAINST COMMISSIONER HERCHMER.

"We have no desire to circulate in the columns of the *News* scandalous stories in regard to persons occupying official positions, nor do we wish to kick a man when he is down; but in regard to Commissioner Herchmer we think we owe a duty to the public to be silent no longer. Very grave and serious charges have been formulated against the Commissioner, which cannot be allowed to rest without the most searching investigation, unless the Government are prepared to see the discipline and efficiency of the Police Force impaired, if not ruined; unless they are willing to allow the administration of justice in the Territories to become a subject of contempt and disgust.

"It has been charged against the Commissioner in the North-West Assembly that he has grossly interfered with the judicial functions of those of his subordinate officers who are justices of the peace, dictating to them the nature of the decisions they were to arrive at, and the sentence to be imposed, and the Assembly has petitioned the Dominion Government to investigate the charge by a Royal Commission.

"Nothing that could be charged against a man in Mr. Herchmer's position could well be more serious than this; the justices of the peace in the Territories are called upon to decide summarily in many cases of great importance, and have power to inflict very large penalties and long terms of imprisonment. It goes without saying that unless the people in the country have the most complete confidence in the integrity and independence of the magistrates, the administration of the criminal law in the Territories must be brought into contempt. With even a suspicion that police officers sitting as J. P.'s are not judging of the merits of the case conscientiously and independently, but are biassed by stringent instructions, or what amounts to nearly the same thing, pressing advice from the Commissioner, how can there be any confidence in the honesty or justice in the tribunal?

"Whether these charges are true or not, there should not be a moment's unnecessary delay in the most strict investigation of them. They must be proved true or false; the people must be satisfied that the fountains of justice are clean and pure, and if the Commissioner is

guilty of the charges laid against him he must be removed.

"Scarcely less serious are the charges made by the MacLeod *Gazette* and Regina *Leader* against the Commissioner of gross misconduct in connection with the late visit of the Governor General to the Territories, and of habitual tyranny and injustice in his administration of the force. The air has been full of rumors and scandals about Mr. Herchmer, but we have not seen fit to notice them before; but now that the public press of the Territories has deliberately accused the Commissioner of gross misconduct, tyranny and injustice, giving instances and details, the matter cannot be allowed to rest without an investigation. It would be a public scandal and disgrace to allow a man to occupy the position of Commissioner of the Police Force with such charges hanging over him. The Commissioner himself should be the first person to demand an investigation. No honorable man should allow such charges to be made without calling upon the authors of them to substantiate them, or without proving their falsity before some competent tribunal.

"We have no wish to prejudge Mr. Herchmer; all we say is that with such serious charges formulated against him, the Government cannot retain him in the position, nor can he, as a man of honor, continue to fill it, without a strict and impartial investigation of their truth or falsity. By all means let us have a Royal Commission, and let it get to work as soon as possible, and we can only hope that Mr. Herchmer can clear himself of the accusations made against him."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what stronger evidence could be placed before this House and before the country, that this man is unfit to hold the position he occupies? The public press of any country is supposed to reflect the opinion of the people, and the opinions of the people are expressed in these extracts which I have read from many of the leading journals of the North-West. I may say that I have scores of other extracts which I could read to this House, giving testimony in the same direction, proving that this man is entirely unfit for the position he occupies, and that the Government ought to grant a commission to enquire into his conduct so as to give confidence to the people of the North-West Territories, that not only the administration of the law will be carried out with justice and with effect, but that the control of this police force will be placed in the hands of a man who is fit to manage a force of men, and who is not carried away by outbursts of passion on every occasion, and who will not allow his personal feelings and spleen to influence him in the administration of his position as head of the police force. Now with regard to the charge made by the member from West Assiniboia with regard to the canteen. I have a letter here written by one of the members of the police force which appeared in one of the papers out there. The Minister of the Interior, I believe, disputes the correctness of the statement made by the member from West Assiniboia with regard to the conduct of this officer in the management of the canteen. This is the letter from one of the members of the force. He says:

"An outrageous case which has occurred shows Herchmer as forcing men to pay liquor bills. The canteen has been a curse. That 4 per cent. beer is poisoned with drugs."

I am not prepared to give evidence with respect to this, but no doubt the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), might give evidence with respect to the 4 per cent. beer. He continues:

"It knocks a man all out as the worst Montana whiskey will not do. It creates a thirst for it as no other liquor will do. No matter how cold, it foams right up, not, I need not say, with the proper head of beer. A man named Henry Vincent Davis joined the force September 26, 1887. He had a staff appointment the whole time. No previous misconduct was against him. Captain Deane once fined him $2 for a little horse play—splashing a brother constable with water. In August he was admonished for an

alleged false statement about a sirloin of meat. It has since turned out his statement was perfectly true. The whole of August this man was boozy, more or less, under the influence of this 4 per cent. beer. He drew his savings out of the bank and must have spent $100. He was drunk on the last day of August and given two months by Major Cotton. As soon as the Commissioner came to Regina it was read out in orders that he was dismissed the force. On the 9th of September he was marched to the orderly room to receive the pay for August. His pay was $21.70. $18.66 was read out for canteen stoppage. Now we have to give orders to the canteen on printed tickets when we go on tick, and the ostensible rule is that the canteen man shall not give more than $5 tick. Davis said he would not pay $18.66 unless his tickets were produced. Captain Gagnon looked for tickets and could find tickets for only $9; so Captain Gagnon closed the book. Next day Herchmer had the man before him and said: 'So you won't pay $18.66? I wouldn't trust you across the room. I'll stop it.' Davis could say nothing. If he said a word he would get extra imprisonment. There was $2.25 stoppage for a pair of overalls by the Quartermaster. So that when this man, whose fault was caused by temptation placed in his way by Herchmer, was turned out of barracks, he had 69 cents. He had to go from man to man begging a few clothes—and this man, if there was any difficulty, would be ready to risk life and limb for Queen and country, for he is a fine strapping young Englishman.

"Another case showing Herchmer's interest in collecting beer money: A. Campbell, regimental shoemaker, always had plenty of money. Gagnon read out to him $1.80 for canteen money. He said he did not owe it. He was brought before Herchmer and asked if he was willing to pay it. He said not. He knew that Herchmer would be down on him and he deserted. He was brought before the Commissioner, who gave him twelve months. At the same time Greenway was brought before him for the same offence, and got only thirty days. Eleven months extra for disputing a beer account with Herchmer. The canteen, Mr. Editor, has been a curse, a temptation and a snare.

"When men are in prison look at the way they are treated. In the summer, when a batch was sent to water the tyrant's garden, he said to them: 'If you don't do it well I will put you on bread and water.' And even on Sunday they are not allowed to rest, but are made to pipe the head ropes."

I might go on reading extracts without number with regard to the conduct of this man and the management of the North-West Mounted Police. When the opinion of the newspapers of the North-West is so decided, when there is an unanimous opinion with respect to the conduct of this man, there should be no hesitation on the part of the Government to grant the enquiry asked by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is in in the interests of Commissioner Herchmer himself, in the interests of the people of the North-West Territories, and in the interests of this House and the country generally that an investigation should be made, and that this man should be proved guilty or innocent of the charges brought against him by almost every newspaper in the North-West. The attempt made by some members of the Government, and by some hon. gentlemen opposite, to impute wrong motives to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) with respect to his conduct in this matter, is not creditable, knowing that the opinion in the North-West is solidly against the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer, and that the people in the North-West Territories and the newspaper press of the country demand at the hands of this Government a proper investigation into his conduct. I cannot see how the Government can refuse to grant the request made to have a proper investigation held. It has been stated that the Government should enquire into the matter. It is all very well for the Government to enquire into the conduct of one of their own officers, but such an investigation would not be as effective and satisfactory as an investigation conducted with open doors by a Committee of this

House or by a Royal Commission, and, therefore, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) should be supported by every member of this House, I do not care what his political opinions may be, who desires to do justice in the premises and see that justice is done to the people residing in the North-West Territories.

Mr. FISHER. There is a phase of this question that has not yet been touched upon, although some of the facts read by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) had a bearing on it. I find a petition from the Board of Trade of Regina in which there are a number of paragraphs relating to the canteen at that place, and in one of those paragraphs I find a statement in regard to a matter which this House has more or less under charge. Paragraph 8 reads as follows :—

"We regret that the canteen is upheld by the authorities on the plea of discipline. It is instead a standing disgrace to say that in a country almost prohibitory our Government should encourage and foster a beer saloon, right in midst of a body of men whose duty it is to confiscate spirituous liquors, to say nothing of the temptation it is to those young men, many of whom are sent to this country by parents thinking they are sending their sons out of the reach of liquor."

This is a petition sent not by a temperance body setting forth the evils of the liquor traffic, but by a body of gentlemen organised as a board of trade and organised to regulate commerce, and this body declares that this is a standing disgrace to the country. Knowing what I know by correspondence and what I have seen in the public press, it is important that a public enquiry should be held into the conduct of the Mounted Police. I know nothing of Commissioner Herchmer, and I know nothing about any personal controversies regarding him or as to his dealings with the force ; but when I find such a statement as this made by the Regina Board of Trade, and which I regret to say is borne out by other statements and letters received from the North-West Territories in regard to the manner in which the liquor traffic is carried on, it is really necessary an enquiry should be made. In this connection it has been suggested that a departmental enquiry would be sufficient to meet the case. It is evident, however, from the statements made by the Minister of the Interior this evening that a departmental enquiry would not be a satisfactory one, for the Minister seems to be quite satisfied with the actions of Commissioner Herchmer, quite satisfied with the conduct of the officers and the management of the force. We can quite understand that a departmental enquiry conducted by gentlemen appointed by the Minister, who is apparently completely satisfied with the position of affairs, would not be one satisfactory to the people of the North-West or the people of Canada at large. But I have confirmation in other ways of the necessity of an enquiry, and it is a confirmation which leads me to believe that the Government are not wholly blameless in regard to the liquor traffic, and, therefore, I would suggest that an enquiry should be conducted either by a Committee of the House or by a Royal Commission. I will read an extract from a letter I have received in regard to this question. The writer says :

"The present state of the liquor laws is most deplorable. Royal (Lieutenant Governor of the Territories) grants permits to all applicants irrespective of what use may be made of same, and hotels are selling right along under the nose of the officials. I enclose a clipping from a correspondence in a Winnipeg paper referring to this point. I can vouch that the report is true not only of this place, but all along the line, and the general impression is that the Government favor the introduction of license, and that Royal is working up the license sentiment for them. As regards 4 per cent. there is none of it sold. There were a few consignments at first, but the wash was a bastard beverage pleasant to no one, and anything further sold has been nearer 40 per cent. than 4 per cent."

This, Sir, is the evidence of a gentleman who was well acquainted with the country, and who was in business, not in Regina, but in a neighboring place, and who knows the position of affairs with regard to the liquor traffic in the North-West Territories. The newspaper clipping which he enclosed to me is the following, and it goes even further than his own words :—

"The prohibitory law supposed to be in force in the Territories is, under the administration of the present Governor, the veriest farce. He has laid down the principle that he has no right to grant a permit to one man and refuse one to another, so he grants them to all applicants. The proprietors of both hotels in this town are now selling liquor with scarcely any attempt at concealment. The *modus operandi* is to get all the boarders and barroom loafers to apply for permits. The proprietor supplies the permit fee and imports the liquor under the permit. Should the police make a search and find liquor (as was done here not long since), he produces enough of these permits to cover the liquor found, and the police, I understand, are instructed to accept such as satisfactory. Such, certainly, was never the intention of the Act, but the officials, allowing the law to be made a farce of, are designedly, some think, working up a feeling among the people that even straight license is better than the present system (as administered)."

Now Sir, that is a pretty state of affairs to be heard of in regard to the administration of what is supposed to be, and what has on various occasions been boasted to be, a prohibitory liquor law in the North-West Territories. It is evident from this statement, and from the statement which my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) read a few minutes ago, that the way in which this law is administered and is enforced by the Mounted Police, is not carrying out the full intention of the law when it was passed. It is true that you can hardly expect the officials there to carry out this law when such encouragement is given them, as that they have a canteen established, as I understand, for selling liquor, right in their barracks at Regina. If a gentleman who controls that force, so far forgets himself as to be concerned in the management of that canteen and the selling of liquor there, as he apparently is, to his own force and to those men who are entrusted with the carrying out of this prohibitory law, it is no wonder that we have the evidence that that law is a farce, and that the carrying out of it is a disgrace to the community, and a disgrace which reflects not only on the people of the Territories, but upon the whole people of Canada, and upon this Parliament, for this Parliament is responsible for the law. I can tell the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, that they are responsible for the fact that this law is evaded in the way it has been.

Mr. DALY. I move the adjournment of the House.

General LAURIE. I cannot conceive what bearing the remarks of the hon. gentleman who spoke last has upon this question which relates to Colonel Herchmer's conduct in the command of his corps.

Mr. DALY. There is a motion before the Chair. I moved the adjournment of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. He is speaking on the motion.

General LAURIE. I would wish to offer one or two remarks on this question. It does appear to me that it is going rather far, that the House should be asked to appoint a committee to enquire into a dispute between a commanding officer and some of his men It is going far beyond the usual practice of the service, and I presume the Mounted Police are dealt with and handled as an ordinary military body. I can quite understand that a complaint of the commanding officer's unfitness to command should be brought up in this House, and that it should be dealt with by the Department. It is right that the head of the Department should make enquiries and report to this House the result of his enquiries ; but to press that a parliamentary committee should be appointed is, I think, going further than is necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a Royal Commission that is asked for.

General LAURIE. I understood that it was a parliamentary committee, but surely this is a matter for departmental enquiry ? That, I think, would be sufficient to deal with the case. I certainly think that Commissioner Herchmer, after the way his name has been bandied about, might justly ask that his conduct be enquired into by the Department, but, certainly, a Royal Commission is beyond the needs of the case.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope that my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly), who takes such a deep interest in this question, will not press his motion for an adjournment of the debate. I think it is not desirable that the question should be evaded in this way, and I would rather see the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) voted down, than evaded in that style. Now, in reference to what the Minister of the Interior said about myself and the visit of the Governor General, I took some interest of the visit of His Excellency. I accompanied him next morning on to the ground, where he shot, and where he made a bull's eye. I had the honor of dining in his company, and I sat by the side of His Excellency. Of course, Sir, I grant that I drove in a buckboard, and I drove a small broncho, which the hon. gentleman describes as a cayuse, with some contempt. I am not at all surprised that he should regard a cayuse and a buckboard with contempt. I cannot afford to flaunt in a carriage and pair as he can ; I did not have his advantages, and if I had had his advantages I might not have made the use of these advantages that he has made. I was not for ten years trying to pick the eyes out of the country ; I was not for ten years occupying a high position, and the whole time, with my eyes open, watching how I could fatten my own purse. I was not doing that, and so I can only afford to keep a cayuse, and I can only afford to drive in a buckboard ; but, Sir, I would rather drive that cayuse and sit in a buck-board than drive in a carriage and pair, and to feel that the money that bought the carriage and pair had been got in an improper way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. gentleman to go unchallenged. I must ask that they be withdrawn. I think they are most uncalled for. I will not allow any man, particularly the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), to make that accusation against me, without asking him to withdraw it. If he does not withdraw it, I will take means to make him withdraw it.

Mr. DAVIN. That part of my remarks which is unparliamentary, I withdraw. I said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; withdraw.

Mr. DAVIN. I will withdraw any part of my remarks that is unparliamentary. I said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentlemen charged the hon. Minister of the Interior with having obtained money to buy a carriage and pair improperly.

Mr. DAVIN. I have not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That was the direct charge.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, if I——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Won't hon. members allow me to withdraw ? Mr. Speaker, I state that I did not make that charge. I withdraw that remark, if it is understood so. What I stated was, that I had not made money in a certain way, but if that is considered in any way as a charge against the Minister of the Interior, I withdraw it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had hoped that after the discussion the other night, on this motion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) might have been satisfied with what I said on the matter, and I am especially sorry to hear that he has followed this up, certainly, in a very hostile spirit towards Commissioner Herchmer. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has quoted a number of newspapers generally adverse to Commissioner Herchmer, and has used very strong language in respect to him. If you read them carefully, however, you will see that they are exceedingly vague in their statements, and that two or three of them apparently are entirely ignorant of the charges themselves, but quote from the Regina *Leader*, and say that it is worthy of all credence. I do not say that the Regina *Leader* is not worthy of credence when it knows the facts which it professes to state ; but I am afraid that all these papers have allowed themselves to be carried away by the unpopularity of an officer who strictly performs his duties, especially when those duties are of an exceedingly unpopular nature. To show the animus which pervades these newspapers, you find the statement made which I refuted the other day, that Commissioner Herchmer was utterly unable to put a body of soldiers through their drill, that he had to get a sergeant to help him to do it, that he could not ride, and all that sort of thing ? I stated that Commissioner Herchmer was a soldier, who had had four years' service in the regular army, that he had been noted as a good drill at once ; that in the first year of his service, when he was hardly more than a recruit, he was employed as an instructor of musketry at the depot of his regiment, and that he had held subsequently positions in the army showing that his soldier-like qualities were recognised by his commanding officer ; therefore, the charge that he could not control a force was absurd in itself. So with the other charges. Now,

the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is a limitation of the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia. His motion was that there should be an enquiry into the management of the force as well as into the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer; the amendment is that there should be an investigation into Commissioner Herchmer's conduct. Well, it is a very serious matter to issue a Royal Commission for the purpose of investigating the character of any officer holding a responsible office. It presupposes that there is a very strong case made out, somewhat in the nature of the finding of a grand jury, before such a commission should be issued. Now, I have the charge of the Mounted Police force in my Department, and I would be unworthy of my position if I allowed an officer in my Department to be run down because he happens to be unpopular, for causes which are not laid before the head of his Department. It has been said that he is such an oppressor that his officers dare not make complaints. Why, that is a charge against the officers as bad as any that could be made against their commanding officer—that they are such a parcel of cravens, such cowards, so unworthy of the name of gentlemen, that they would submit to be treated as no gentleman ought to be treated, and would be afraid to make complaints. They have not made complaints, and, therefore, we must hold that these men, who are holding commissions and worthily performing their duties, have no real complaints to make. So it is said the soldiers and the non-commissioned officers have been afraid to make complaints. Well, a great number of them have left the force, and they have not yet made complaints against Commissioner Herchmer. So that there has not been any real or substantial complaint laid before the Government or the head of the Department from any reliable source whatever. As I stated the other day, I have heard a good deal of Commissioner Herchmer's infirmities of temper. Well, we are not all angels, and his particular failing is, perhaps, an impulsiveness, a too great desire to be a disciplinarian without perhaps the tact of managing and at the same time acting so as not to cause unpopularity. But, with all that, as I stated before, and as my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has stated to-night, he has brought the force into a high state of discipline. They have never been more efficient, I may say have never been so efficient, as they have been since he has been in command. The hon. gentleman says that there was not anything in the statement I made, which I think was a conclusive answer as to the popularity of the force. I stated the other night as a fact that during the last few months out of something like 120 constables and non-commissioned officers, who had served their five years, 75 had re-enlisted for five years more or three years more, I am not sure which, and that a number who had got their discharge and went away had come back after a while and re-enlisted. The hon. gentleman belittled that, and said that it was because they had spent all their money at the canteen. How absurd is that! Those men, while in the force, had looked out for their homesteads and had acquired them; they are not all drunkards; the vast majority of them are respectable, sober men; and even those men who might have been improvident and spent their money during the time they were in the force, every one knows are strong-handed fellows, and that in the North-West they could get employment at once, on the very day they left the force—and my hon. friend behind me says that a great many of them have money in the savings banks, showing that they had been laying up so that after they served their time in the corps they would have a little money to start with on their homesteads. As regards the canteen, and the arrangements about it, Commissioner Herchmer is perfectly free from any charge of impropriety, because the canteen was authorised from headquarters by myself, and I approved of it as the best means of keeping the men sober and regular in their habits, for the same reason that canteens are established in every regiment in Her Majesty's service, for the purpose of keeping the soldiery from straying about and getting into low haunts of dissipation, and destroying their morale. The canteen is strictly managed. It is managed by a committee of staff sergeants, men of approved good character and conduct, and who see that everything sold there is, in the first place, of good quality. It is like a co-operative establishment. There is only beer kept there, and that can be only got on a permit from the Lieutenant Governor. So that the canteen is a means of keeping the men sober and regular, and preventing their straying off to all the shops and inns where forty-rod whiskey and every other abomination are sold. With respect to the Board of Trade at Regina, the petition, though professing to come from the Board of Trade, comes from the Council of the Board of Trade. There were, I think, nine present, of whom five voted for the resolution, and four against; and the object of the petition may be gathered from the letter addressed to myself by the secretary of the Board of Trade, enclosing the petition. He gives the following reasons for it:—

"I have the honor, by direction of the Council of the Regina Board of Trade, to forward you a copy of the petition praying that the canteen at the Regina barracks may be closed up at once, as it is very detrimental to the merchants of this town. Some of them are almost dependent upon the barrack trade for their living."

The merchants want to sell the beer and the whiskey, and object very much to these sales being made in the canteen, managed by the men themselves, and where they obtain goods of good quality at reasonable prices—at wholesale prices, I take it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that the meaning of this petition? Or, rather, does it not mean that the men can spend their money in that way, which otherwise would go in the purchase of other goods?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do they not sell groceries at the canteen?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, they have a right to sell groceries. They have the right to buy as cheaply as they can.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not under the National Policy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to that. I would be quite unworthy of my position were I to allow this investigation into the conduct of Colonel Herchmer who, I believe, to be a good officer and a good man, although he has considerable infirmities of temper. The charge is made against him of dealing improperly with contracts. I do not believe a word of that.

I believe all contracts with respect to the supplies for the Mounted Police are sent to the Comptroller, Mr. Frederick White, by whom they are passed, and without the assent of whom not a contract can be given. I was going to say that I would oppose this motion altogether, although I felt there was a good deal to be said for the suggestion of my hon. friend from the West Riding (Mr. Blake) who said that there should be a departmental enquiry; I would not even consent to that, because there is no *primâ facie* case made out for a departmental enquiry, had it not been that Commissioner Herchmer has asked for such an investigation; and it is my intention to order a departmental enquiry. I consent only because Colonel Herchmer asks for it, otherwise I would not agree, unless ordered by the House, to have even that enquiry. I oppose both the amendment and the original proposition, and I state it is my intention to have a departmental investigation, at the request of the Commissioner, into all the charges made heretofore or which may be presented against him when that departmental enquiry is undertaken.

Mr. FISHER. I was very much surprised——

Mr. DALY. I withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You cannot do it now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He can, for he had no right to make it in the first place.

Mr. FISHER. It is too late now for the leader of the House to make that exception. I must say I was very much surprised at some remarks which fell from the leader of the Government on the subject of the canteen, to which he alluded in such feeling terms. The right hon. gentleman has, on several occasions, spoken about that matter, but has never come out boldly in expressing his views, and those of his Government, on this question of the liquor traffic. A more damaging exposure of mismanagement in the North-West, as regards the liquor traffic, I have never heard. The First Minister told us that he authorised the establishment of the canteen in the barracks at Regina, in order to save the Mounted Police from coming out and getting liquor in the town. But the hon. gentleman must know perfectly well that in the Territories liquor is not allowed to be sold, and these men, to whom he gives this license, are the very men who are the instruments of seeing that liquor is not sold in the Territories. These men are setting the example, by the authority of the hon. gentleman, to the inhabitants, of drinking their beer whenever they think fit to buy it and everything else as much as they like. In that territory in which the hon. gentleman knows it is his duty to Parliament and the country to see that liquor is not sold and to see that the laws of the land are maintained, he gives his authority to have these laws violated, and the very men who ought to see that the law is carried out are encouraged in breaking them.

Mr. LAURIER. It is with some degree of disappointment that I have listened to the remarks of the First Minister on this occasion. I hoped the last time this question was before the House, that, when it came before the House again, the hon. gentleman would be disposed to deal with it in a manner totally different from the spirit he exhibited on this occasion. True, he has consented to a departmental enquiry into the charges made against Commissioner Herchmer, but he has given his consent, not because these charges have been brought up by a member of this House, not because they are supported by the press and Legislature of the North-West Territories, but simply because the Commissioner has agreed to it. This is the very worst of all reasons that could be given. The best and the only reason for granting the enquiry, is that charges have been made, which are not frivolous. I hope that the enquiry will satisfactorily disprove the charge; but when charges of the kind are made by a member of Parliament, speaking on his responsibility and under a sense of his reputation as a member of this House, and when they are supported by the whole press of the North-West Territories, without distinction of politics, and by the unanimous voice of the Local Legislature, he is entitled to better treatment than the hon. gentleman proposes giving him. If the hon. gentleman had stated, on the charges being made, that he would have a departmental enquiry, I, for one, although the investigation would not have altogether satisfied me, would have been disposed to accede to it. But, under the circumstances, I think the hon. member for Marquette ought to stick to his motion, and have a vote taken. What is the only answer given to-night to the charges which have been brought against Commissioner Herchmer? I say now that I have not the slightest prejudice against Commissioner Herchmer; I do not know him; but he is a public officer; he is not privileged, and he cannot be privileged any more than any other public officer. If charges are brought against him, it is the duty of the Government to have them investigated, and it is the right of that officer, as well as it is the right of the country, to have those charges properly investigated. The only answer which has been made is that the hon. member who brought the charges is animated by some prejudice against Mr. Herchmer. It seems to me that as much animus was displayed in the reply as in the attack; it seems to me that there was as much passion displayed in the reply of the Minister of the Interior as there was in anything said by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The Minister of the Interior, in one part of his answer, said that all the charges brought by the member for West Assiniboia were untrue, and he specified one of these charges, and defied the hon. member to prove it; but, at the same time, he refused him the enquiry. At the same time that he made the challenge, he tied the hands of the hon. member. That is not the way for this House to deal with charges which are made against a public officer. These charges may be untrue. I hope they are untrue; but how are we to decide upon that question? If there is no reason to-day for an enquiry into the conduct of this public officer who is charged with these offences, not only by one member of this House, but by the whole voice of the North-West Territories in which he is now serving, if there is no occasion now for enquiry, when shall there be an occasion for enquiry into the conduct of any public officer who is charged with malfeasance of office? I say that, if there is no occasion for such an enquiry now, there never can be any occasion for such an enquiry. The Minister says that no member of the force has complained. That may be a reason more or less good, but if no member of the force has complained, if no officer of the police

force has complained, is not the voice of the people as represented in Parliament and in the Local Legislature as powerful as any complaint of an officer or member of the police force? I hope my hon. friend will persist in his motion and will divide the House upon it.

Mr. WATSON. I have no intention of withdrawing my amendment. I am rather surprised that the Minister of the Interior should try to shield his officer in the way he has done. I supposed he would endeavor to shield him, but I thought that, after these charges had been brought by a supporter of his own, he would be willing to grant a commission. As far as a departmental commission is concerned I am satisfied that it would simply amount to a whitewashing of this officer in regard to these charges, whether they are true or false. I do not believe they would ever be properly investigated. We find now that the Minister under whose direction this man is acting says that everything he does is right. We find that the Minister who says he appointed him to his present office declares that he does everything that is right. He says that since Mr. Herchmer has been appointed, the cost per man of the police force has been much less than it was before. These arguments are most absurd. It was absurd to use such an argument as that, when we know that all the stores are now taken in by rail instead of by cart, as they were previously. As to the efficiency of the force, which the hon. gentleman has increased under Mr. Herchmer, I contend that the North-West Police force never did better work than they did when there were only 300 men there, when the country was practically a wilderness, when there was no railway communication, and when they were commanded by Major Walsh and Colonel Macleod. I do not think that hon. gentlemen will state that the 300 men who were there at that time did not perform as good or better service than the 1,000 men are doing to-day. The fact that Commissioner Herchmer was a soldier before his appointment to this office has very little weight, in view of the evidence we have had produced before committees of this House within the last few weeks in regard to other military officers, and should not be accepted as proving that he has been doing nothing wrong. I think that, as we appointed a commission to investigate the charges against another officer high in the military ranks and not without results, which will probably be reported to this House within a few days, we should also have a commission to investigate the charges against Mr. Herchmer. The First Minister says that Mr. Herchmer has asked for an enquiry, and that, if he had not asked for it, he would not grant it, but Mr. Herchmer has asked for a departmental commission of enquiry, knowing very well that it would prove nothing. I am satisfied that the country will not accept simply a departmental commission. I must say that I was surprised at the course taken by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), who backed up the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) when he made his motion. That hon. gentleman has evidently been consulting some members of the Government since then, and now he is quite satisfied with a departmental commission. We know that it takes a very little to satisfy that hon. gentleman. I hope that the recommendation which has been made by many members of this House, and by the North-West Assembly, who voted unanimously that a commission should be appointed to investigate these charges, will be accepted. I have recently seen men high in position in the North-West Territories who have told me that nearly every one of these charges could be proved if a commission were granted. I, therefore, hope that this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. DALY. It was not my intention to take up any of the time of this House,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. A great deal of this debate has been irregular, but the hon. gentleman has already spoken in moving his amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DALY. It was not my intention to take up the time of the House if the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had not referred to myself. He said I should have stood shoulder to shoulder with him. If I stood shoulder to shoulder with the hon. gentleman, in matters which he brought up in this House appertaining to the North-West Territories, I think I should be like our friend McGinty, down at the bottom of the sea. I think this House, from the exhibition that has been made by the hon. gentleman here to-day, will come to the conclusion that so far as the North-West Territories are concerned, they might well say: "Save us from our friends, if we are to be represented as the hon. gentleman has done to-day." Now, I have no more interest in Colonel Herchmer than any other gentleman in this House. I have told the House upon a former occasion that the only reason I had for saying something on his behalf was to see that justice should be done to him, and that a proper course should be taken in this matter. The right hon. the Premier who is at the head of this Department, in a former debate, stated that he had investigated every one of these charges made against Commissioner Herchmer and found they had not been proven. I would refer to page 2764 of the Debates, where the hon. gentleman spoke as follows, referring to the hon. member for West Assiniboia:—

"All the cases he has mentioned, or almost all, have been enquired into, and in most of them his conduct has been supported; in some of them he has been told that he has been a little too severe, and it would appear that his decisions have been reversed; but on the whole he has proved himself a good officer, his whole soul is in the efficiency of his force, and he has secured that object thoroughly well."

Now, Sir, I, for one, think that was quite sufficient to satisfy me, and at least the majority of this House, that the right hon. gentleman had made an investigation, and when he comes down here to-night and tells this House that he, at the solicitation of Mr. Herchmer, is going to order a departmental investigation, that at least ought to be sufficient to satisfy every hon. gentleman in this House that that investigation will be properly made. I do not think that the insinuation made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who has just sat down, should have the slightest weight. The source from which it comes is sufficient to prevent any person in the North-West Territories or

Manitoba from attaching any weight to it, and when that hon. gentleman says that this investigation will be a farce he is insulting this House, because when the Premier, who is at the head of that Department, says that a departmental investigation will be held, we have a right to believe that, at all events, it will be a thorough investigation, more especially when it is held at the solicitation of Mr. Herchmer himself, who will be called upon to disprove these charges, and I think we may rest satisfied that justice will be done. Now, what are these charges? Is there a single statement that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has made here to-night, or is there a single charge in the paragraphs from newspapers that have been read by one hon. member, that is specific? The charges are general throughout, they are mere assertions. Every paper which has made the charges quotes from the Regina *Leader*, that is edited by the hon. member for Assiniboia. I say that there is an animus running through this whole thing from one end to the other. This is a matter of personal spite and spleen upon the part of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. He has been the sewer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. If I have said anything out of order, I withdraw it. I was going on to say that he has been the conductor gas pipe through which this stuff has been poured throughout the length and breadth of the North-West Territories. He has listened to every little petty charge and has repeated it, to revenge himself against this gentleman, and has spread it broadcast in the Regina *Leader*, and the press throughout the country has taken up the charges that have been reiterated, one after the other, by the hon. gentlemen and by his newspapers, who have been making a mountain out of a mole hill. We know that the hon. gentleman, with the character of his nation, is only too glad to have a sweet morsel to roll under his tongue, and he rolls it until it grows into, you might say, a large mud ball, which he flings at his opponents. So far as these charges are concerned that have been brought against Commissioner Herchmer, I have not the slightest doubt that since the right hon. gentlemen has stated to-night that they will be investigated by the Department, the investigation will take place and that it will be thorough. I am perfectly satisfied, also, that when that report is laid before Parliament, as it will be, we will see that every one of these charges, or at all events, the greater part of them, will melt away into smoke. We will find it made evident, then, that the hon. member for West Assiniboia has merely fanned the flame. There is no doubt in the world, from the manner in which he has addressed the House to-night and from the manner in which he addressed this House on a previous occasion, he has a personal feeling against Commissioner Herchmer. I only ask that hon. gentleman to show towards Commissioner Herchmer the same charity as that gentleman has shown towards him upon several occasions. I am satisfied that if he will extend that liberality to the Commissioner that the Commissioner has extended towards him, and if he will let the Commissioner alone, that gentleman will do his full duty to the satisfaction of the head of his Department. I think that the sole reason for a great many of these charges that have been made against him is that he has done his whole duty only too well. I am not going to take up any more time of the House except to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). He took occasion to refer to His Honor Lieutenant Governor Royal, and to charge him with granting permits indiscriminately, I am not here to defend Mr. Royal, but I know sufficient about the manner in which those permits are granted to say that neither Mr. Royal nor his predecessor ever granted permits indiscriminately. They are only granted on investigation to the party who makes application for them. Possibly a great deal of the ill-feeling that has been created against the present Minister of the Interior, who was then Lieutenant Governor of the Province, was occasioned in connection with the granting of permits. We know that there are numerous cases of men who have gone to that country for the purpose of avoiding the contaminating influences of liquor. They would write to the Lieutenant Governor, who would make an investigation, and, upon finding that these men were respectable people, he would send them a permit. When that permit was given, their wives and their friends would write to the Lieutenant Governor to say that these men had come to that country for the purpose of avoiding the temptation to get liquor, upon which he would refuse to continue them the permits, and every man whom he so refused would become his enemy. There are now a great many instances of men in the North-West Territories who are hostile to the present Lieutenant Governor for that reason. No doubt the gentleman who penned that letter which was read by the hon. member for Brome is one of them. At all events, I was quite amused at the criticism the hon. gentleman made upon the Lieutenant Governor, saying that he was encouraging people to sell liquor in a prohibitory territory. Neither that gentleman nor many more with him could watch every policeman and every individual in the North-West Territories, to keep them from drinking liquor. The hon. gentleman said they were selling this 4 per cent. beer in the canteen for the purpose of giving the men a wholesome beverage. I do not know whether it is some beverage or not.

Mr. WATSON. Did you ever drink it?

Mr. DALY. I do not drink it. I have no doubt you have. I have no doubt the hon. member is more familiar with red ink, Perry Davis' Pain Killer and other drinks of that kind. I may say that so far as the temperance question is concerned in the North-West, liquor is not prohibited there, and it would take five and ten times the present number of Mounted Police to keep liquor out of that country. When the Lieutenant Governor stated that these men were able to get this liquor in Regina, he was stating what the member for West Assiniboia will not deny, he cannot, that liquor can be got in Regina, it can be got anywhere in the North-West Territories, notwithstanding the very great fines that have been inflicted upon men for bringing it in and selling it there. I will say to that hon. gentleman that it will be well for him to go up and see that country and to investigate these matters, before he comes here to take the position of being the only temperance man in this House. We have the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), and the hon. member for Queen's, N. S.

(Mr. Freman) who are probably as great temperance men as he is; they have heard the debate here to-night, but we have not seen them getting up and taking exception to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of the Interior. We know that in times past, in this House, they have taken a position on the temperance question in opposition to that of the right hon. gentleman, but they do not feel called to do so in this instance. In reference to this investigation which the hon. gentleman has promised, I am satisfied that it will be thorough. It is in the interest of the right hon. gentleman himself as the head of the Department, it is in the interest of the Department, it is in the interest of Commissioner Herchmer himself, to have the investigation. As I have said before, my only interest is in seeing justice done to Commissioner Herchmer and justice done to the force. It has been stated by the hon. member for West Assiniboia and by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) and not been denied, that this force is in an efficient condition; that being so, the conduct of Commissioner Herchmer cannot be subversive of discipline, but it is subversive of the discipline of that force that these charges should be published throughout the length and breadth of that country and upon the floor of this House. I say it is in the interest of the force itself and in the interest of Commissioner Herchmer, that an investigation should be held at once, that it should be thorough, and I have no doubt, after the promise made by the right hon. gentleman, that it will be so held, and that it will be thorough.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Before the debate closes I wish to say a few words following the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). He says that both the hon. member for West Assiniboia and myself have spoken of the efficiency of the force, and that the fact of my having spoken of the efficiency of the force was evidence that the charges of the North-West Assembly and of the member for West Assiniboia were untrue. Now, Sir, I think that he was illogical in that statement. What we meant to say was that the material of the Mounted Police force could not be excelled anywhere. I believe at the same time that some of the officers in the Mounted Police are as good officers as can be found anywhere. The right hon. gentleman has promised us a departmental enquiry into the conduct of the Commissioner and into the charges brought against him. For my part, I am perfectly satisfied with that course. I believe it is a proper course to take, and I am perfectly certain that such an enquiry will be carried out in a proper spirit, and that the right hon. gentleman will be guided by the results of that enquiry. I will, therefore, vote for the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. MULOCK. During the course of this debate hon. gentlemen opposite at one time during the speech of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a demand upon him that I think was not a fair one. The hon. gentleman was speaking of certain information he had received, and hon. gentlemen opposite demanded from him that he should give the name. Now, I do not understand a member of Parliament is compelled or expected or under any obligation to give the name of an informer if he choose to rely upon the information, and if he pleases from his place in the House to take the responsibility of giving that explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no such rule as that.

Mr. MULOCK, I say that a communication so given to a member is to this extent privileged, that you have no right to ask him to give the name, or, if he refuses, to comment on his refusal; otherwise, it will be impossible for grievances to be made known by persons who would shrink perhaps from having their names published. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has boasted here of his independence, and I think we have on former occasions within very recent time had an opportunity of judging how far he is independent. I believe we were told by him a short time ago, just as we have been to-night, that, in regard to a certain transaction, there was no foundation for it whatever; and yet when, by force I may say, this House issued a proper tribunal to make an enquiry, it came out that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) was entirely in error.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think the hon. gentleman has made a mistake. What tribunal has been issued, and what decision has been made by that tribunal?

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman desires me to refer to the matter I will do so. When the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) made charges against a certain officer, the hon. gentleman for Saskatchewan stood up and declared there was no foundation for those charges.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think I was perfectly justified in the course I adopted.

Mr. MULOCK. I cite that as an illustration of what an unsafe adviser the hon. gentleman is, when we see him to-night declaring that he will be satisfied with such an enquiry as the Department proposes to make, an enquiry that will be, according to the admission of the First Minister himself, an enquiry to defend itself. I was pleased at the chivalrous words that fell from the right hon. the First Minister. He said that the officer accused was in his Department, and that he would be unworthy of the high position he occupied if he did not rise to defend him. I think it was his duty to defend his officer, and I am glad the right hon. gentleman has acquired so much chivalry, because a year ago I remember another hon. gentlemen spent two hours, an hon. member behind me says two days, in attacking an officer under the Government. But the First Minister never rose to defend him. He allowed him to be attacked during two hours, to be within the mark, and although I asked the First Minister if he had nothing to say, or if the Minister of Public Works had nothing to say, not one of the whole baker's dozen of the Cabinet rose and said a word in his defence. I will now state why I am not satisfied with the proposed enquiry of the Minister of the Interior, irrespective of what I have already stated. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), when the matter was up before, said this was an attack on the head of the Government and upon the Government, and he would vote against it, as it amounted to a declaration of want of confidence in the Government. That is an unfair position in which to place the question, but if hon. gentlemen opposite say that is the proper light in

which to construe this proposed enquiry, it is perfectly clear we cannot have a Government enquiry by the Government in regard to their own conduct. Then the Minister of the Interior has pre-judged the case, and he has disqualified himself from giving an unbiassed decision. He has stated that these charges are wholly foundationless; and if he has disqualified himself, how much more has the First Minister done so, for in the most unqualified way he declared that this gentleman whose conduct is criticised is incapable of having committed the acts with which he is charged, and that he has not done so. The First Minister is not going to have an enquiry to show that his whole opinion of this man's character is wrong, that he is entirely mistaken, that he at his age is so poor a judge of human character as to have been mistaken. No. The First Minister is going into this enquiry for the express purpose of whitewashing his own officer, feeling that he himself is charged. I say, then, it is due to the officer in question that his conduct should be tried by an independent tribunal. Let no person misunderstand my position in voting for this enquiry. I have not allowed my mind to be in the slightest degree prejudiced against the Commissioner by any of these circumstances. I do not attach any importance to these *ex parte* statements, but I repeat that his usefulness as a public man is gone unless his conduct is investigated by an independent tribunal that will conduct this enquiry openly and publicly and allow all parties to appear and prove the charges if they can, and, if they fail to do so, to have this officer reinstated in the good opinion of the people, which is his due. I, therefore, say that inasmuch as the hon. First Minister and the Administration generally have by their action displayed prejudice, they are not to be considered as disinterested persons, and it is, therefore, necessary that an enquiry should be conducted by disinterested persons under such sufficient guarantee as will entitle the witnesses to be examined under oath, and in order that the public generally may tender evidence. A departmental enquiry is an enquiry of a friendly character, it is one in which no evidence is taken under oath; and how, therefore, can it be an enquiry in regard to facts which are in issue? These charges are not going to be admitted. There will be a conflict of testimony. How, therefore, can an effectual enquiry be carried out by the Department? Such a proposition is not a satisfactory one to the country or to the cause or to the officer in question, and I deplore, for that reason, that when an hon. member of this House, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), chooses to take upon himself the odium and the onus of pressing for such an investigation as the hon. gentleman proposes, he should be made the party accused. Some hon. gentlemen have sought to turn the whole debate against him. Just as we know the counsel in a case turns against his fellow counsel, when there is no other defence. I think that the conduct of those who have criticised the conduct of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is not worthy of the occasion. It is not just to the hon. gentleman, it is not just to this Parliament, it is not fair that when any hon. gentleman, in a sense of duty, wishes to take upon himself in the interest of the country, an unpleasant task that he should be attacked, and that hon. members of this House should feel, that in discharging their duties to their country, they render themselves liable to be ungenerously treated in this House, and, doubtless, by those opposite, outside this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It think it is important that the House should be put in possession of the time when Commissioner Herchmer made application to the First Minister for an investigation in regard to these charges. I would ask the First Minister if he will state to the House the date of the letter which was sent by Commissioner Herchmer to him, asking that an enquiry should be made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not got the letter here. I do not remember the date.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was it previous to this debate in the House or since?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has long ago been said that he would be quite willing to have the matter investigated.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The First Minister stated that he had long ago received a request from Commissioner Herchmer that an investigation should be made in this matter. His memory must enable him to say whether that has been sent before the commencement of the debate in this House, or since.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will be able to tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) in opposing the amendment of my hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has made a speech, which I think, when he reflects on it, he will be ashamed of. It was an ungenerous attack without the least provocation, because when I commented on his argument, I dealt with his argument, and in analysing his argument, I spoke as one gentleman might speak of the argument of another, and I spoke as a friend. The hon. member however gets up, and without a shadow of foundation, he makes the suggestion that, in some way or other, I had received some favor of some kind from Commissioner Herchmer. I state, Mr. Speaker, from my place in Parliament, that there is not a tittle of foundation for any such statement. It is a statement for which he has not the least justification, and it is made with the same recklessness in which he vented his surmises against the legislative assembly in the North-West, in his previous speech. Sir, the hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) is a man of humor, I do not know that I can call him a man of wit; his repartees nearly always take the form of some personal fling, and when my hon. friend the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) interrupted him during this debate, and told him there was no foundation whatever for saying that the members for this House had been refused anything by Commissioner Herchmer, he at once said that, "I did not say that, but if the cap fits you, you can wear it,"—a most refined, a most delicate sally. It stamps the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) as a man of quick wit and ready repartee and as one capable of being an ornament to any assembly. And, Sir, to-night, what does this hon. gentleman do, who I thought was a personal friend of mine? The hon. gentleman finds it necessary to get up, not to defend Mr. Herchmer, but to attack me for doing what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock)

properly describes as a most unpleasant duty. Does any man suppose that it is a pleasant thing for me to be opposed to the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government? What can I gain by taking a course which the right hon. gentleman is opposed to, and when he is opposed to it, it means his whole party.

An hon. MEMBER. Not all of them.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; because he has great influence, and properly great influence over his party.

Mr. McMULLEN. With one exception.

Mr. DAVIN. No; there is no exception. The right hon. the Premier has as much influence over the man who is speaking now as he has over any of his party. I may tell you that if the frowns of the right hon. gentleman have any terror for me, it is only because of my affection for him. It is that alone which arms that frown with terror for me. But, Sir, I say that nobody can have influence over me to the extent of preventing me doing my duty in this House. I have a duty to perform and I do not care how it may result to myself. I can parody the words of Edmund Burke and say:—

"I know the map of Canada as well as any man, and I know that the course I take does not lead to preferment."

But, Sir, I am taking a course to do my duty, and when I do this, my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) who, in a sense, comes from the West, and who shows to-night, as he has shown before, that he knows nothing about this question, comes forward to throw unworthy and foundationless flings at a man that he ought to consider and regard as a colleague. The other day I treated him very differently. The other day he came to me and to other North-West members; he wanted to organise a deputation of remonstrance to the Minister of the Interior. I and others agreed to go with him; I agreed to make that remonstrance, and what did the hon. member do? He funked and fled like a coward.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. I wish to make a personal explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. I rise to the question.

An hon. MEMBER. Don't interrupt him. Wait till he is finished.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was quite ready to go with the hon. member, but as I say he went to Montreal, and we heard no more about the deputation.

Mr. MULOCK. What was it about?

Mr. DAVIN. It does not matter now, but I want to show the way I dealt with him. The hon. member for Selkirk said that there is nothing specific in the charges I made. Why, Sir, any one who followed my statement knows that I did make specific charges, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) who was a little *défiant*, said, notwithstanding, that while there were some general charges, some of them were so specific that they ought to be taken into account. Yet the hon. member for Selkirk gets up and he has summoned audacity enough—I do not think that is too strong a word to use—he has summoned audacity enough to stand up and say there were no specific charges, when the evidence to the contrary is recorded in *Hansard*. The hon. member also quotes the right hon. the Premier, who said that some of the charges had been investigated, and some had been found not to be true. Of course, it is implied by that that some were found to be true, and I believe that it is a fact that some of the decisions of Mr. Herchmer have been condemned by the Department and have not been allowed to be carried out. Now, Sir, I repeat that I have no personal end or aim in this course I am pursuing. I am expressing the opinion of the Territories. That is my sole object in doing this unpleasant duty, and when I, so to speak, find myself like Ajax defying the lightning, I think it is pretty hard to see the issue abandoned, another issue sought to be raised, a red herring to be drawn across the scent and the mind of the House diverted from what is really before us.

Mr. DALY. I desire to make an explanation. The hon. member says he agreed to come with me on a deputation to the Minister of the Interior, and that I funked it by going to Montreal. I desire to say to the House that such is not the fact. It was on Saturday, I think, that I saw the hon. gentleman, and on Sunday I received a telegram at 9 in the morning, asking me to go to Montreal. I went there expecting to get back on the Tuesday, but, unfortunately, I was detained and did not get back until Wednesday. When I was in a position to go with the other members, the hon. gentleman was not to be found, and that is the reason the hon. gentleman did not come with me.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not so. When the hon. member came back from Montreal, I asked him what about the deputation, and he never said a word whether he would have the deputation or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. It would be very interesting to some of us on this side of the House who have listened to this discussion if these hon. gentlemen would tell us what all these troubles were about, and what this remonstrance with the Minister of the Interior was for. Were they refused a favor? Was my hon. friend opposite ambitious for a position in the Department of the Interior? It has been said they were both ambitious for it, and thought the hon. Minister ought to have stepped down and out and given them the place. I think they would gratify some gentlemen on this side of the House if they would take us into their confidence and tell us what all these troubles are about.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Watson:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Gillmor,
Bain (Wentworth),	Godbout,
Barron,	Innes,
Béchard,	Jones (Halifax),
Boisvert,	Kirk,
Borden,	Lang,
Bourassa,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brien,	Macdonald (Huron),
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McMullen,
Casey,	Meigs,
Choquette,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cimon,	Mitchell,
Davies,	Mulock,

Davin,	Neveu,
De St. Georges,	Paterson (Brant),
Dessaint,	Purcell,
Doyon,	Rinfret,
Dupont,	Robertson,
Edgar,	Ste. Marie,
Eisenhauer,	Scriver,
Ellis,	Somerville,
Fiset,	Trow.
Fisher,	Watson,
Geoffrion,	Wilson (Elgin).—52.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Landry,
Bergeron,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bowell,	LaRivière,
Boyle,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Cameron,	Lovitt,
Cargill,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Carling,	Macdowall,
Carpenter,	McCulla,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),
Chapleau,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cochrane,	McKay,
Cockburn,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Colby,	Madill,
Coughlin,	Masson,
Curran,	Mills (Annapolis),
Daly,	Moncrieff,
Dawson,	Montague,
Denison,	Patterson (Essex),
Desjardins,	Pope,
Dewdney,	Porter,
Dickey,	Putnam,
Dickinson,	Riopel,
Earle,	Roome,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Small,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Smith (Ontario)
Ferguson (Welland),	Taylor,
Freeman,	Temple,
Gigault,	Thérien,
Grandbois,	Thompson (Sir John),
Guillet,	Tyrwhitt,
Haggart,	Vanasse,
Hale,	Wallace,
Hall,	Ward,
Hesson,	Weldon (Albert),
Hickey,	White (Cardwell),
Jamieson,	Wilmot,
Jones (Digby),	Wilson (Lennox),
Kenny,	Wood (Westmoreland).—76.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Brockville has not voted.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville.) I have paired with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I would have voted against the amendment.

Amendment negatived, and main motion negatived on the same division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ALIEN LABOR BILL.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That the Select Committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 8) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract of agreement to perform labor in Canada, have leave to make a special report.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. BLAKE. When the proposal was made for a Select Committee with the object which the First Minister stated, I then suggested that it would be necessary to give special instructions to the Committee. I am glad to observe that that proposition is now recognised *ex post facto*, although I think it should have been accepted in the first instance. I agree that this is the best way to remedy the defect in the instructions, and that the motion ought to pass.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. I now beg leave to present the report of the Committee.

OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS presented the first report of the Select Committee to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House.

CRIMINAL LAW.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) further to amend the Criminal Law.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section was allowed to stand, in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), in order that it might be redrafted. But on comparing it with the original Act, I think, it will answer all purposes and had better remain as it is.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the Committee to reconsider section 6, for the purpose of adding a sub-section. The object of the amendment is to prevent cases, which may possibly occur, of penalties being inflicted on females who have committed the offence under constraint or fear; and the way in which I propose to deal with this, is by providing that it shall be discretionary with the court or judge, to inflict punishment or not in such cases. These are the words I propose to add:

Provided that if the court or judge is of opinion that the female accused was a party to such intercourse only by reason of constraint, fear, or duress of the other party, the court or judge shall not be bound to impose any punishment on such persons under this section.

Mr. BLAKE. I must confess I have some apprehension that this is hardly likely to efficiently serve the purpose which I suggested for the consideration of the hon. Minister. I suggested the case in which a female of tender years—and it is upon such that this offence is committed—who had succumbed under the influence of fear, would be exposed to the penalties of the criminal law. I am not, however, at the moment, prepared to propose any more adequate remedy than the one proposed by the hon. gentleman, but I confess my objections are not completely removed.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Justice whether it would not be better that the female offender should not be punished. As a rule, she is always a person who is more or less under the control of the male offender. Such cases as have come to light, are cases of assault of the father upon the child; and under such circum-

stances, if you make her liable to punishment, she might be advised not to give evidence which would incriminate herself. The end of justice, which is to punish for any infamous crime, would be best served if the male offender were alone punished.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt, in most cases, the rule proposed would be a just one, but, not by any means, in all. There have been some cases in which the female has been guilty in as high a degree as the other party to the offence, and of perfect competence as regards freedom from restraint or duress. I had, when introducing the Bill, a letter from a very high authority stating there was one notorious case—and I mentioned it in moving the second reading of the Bill—in which the father lived in this condition with his daughter, and they had a number of children. They defied all remonstrances and threats on the part of the authorities. In such cases, the only possible means of preventing the continuance of the offence would be to punish both.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me the example does not at all justify the theory, because it is evident that the father must have obtained authority over the child when of tender years, and have kept that authority.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But if she is now of age and the mother of a large family of children, she is responsible.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, but she must have been debauched and demoralised at an early day. It is impossible to suppose this offence was committed except on one of tender years, who was unable to resist, or unaware of the gravity of the offence. I remember a case in Montreal, some twenty years ago, in which the father had taken advantage of his daughter, some twelve or thirteen years of age. His children were brought up in such a state of immorality and degradation that it would be hard to visit any criminal intent on the child.

Mr. BLAKE. I would submit for the consideration of the Committee, and especially of the Minister, that we have to deal with the balance of conveniences and inconveniences, and with the balance of difficulties on one side or the other. In the great bulk of cases, I think it will be admitted, that you have but one criminal, and, if the chance of bringing that criminal to justice in the great bulk of the cases is going to be diminished by a law which makes the other party, who is not substantially criminal, liable to fourteen years' imprisonment, are we not, for the sake of the exceptional case to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, and in regard to which the observation of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is of cogency, that this must have commenced by the criminality of the male, taking away our chances of punishing the criminals in the vast majority of cases?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that the danger of a suppression of the evidence is removed by the penalty which is provided. This seems to be the only way by which to stop the offence, to let both the offenders know that they are liable to punishment. I think that is safer than it would be to declare that the female shall not be punishable under any circumstances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to join my protest to that of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), as to the inexpediency of making the female offender subject to a penalty in this matter. I followed carefully the remarks of the Minister of Justice, but it did appear to me that the one point upon which he laid most stress was that, where these parties were defying public opinion and defying State and Church together, by continuing to live together, there was no way of preventing it except by making both parties liable to penal servitude for a term of years. If the male offender is subject to this punishment, it seems to me that there is no necessity for inflicting the penalty on the female offender. If, in addition to the natural reluctance which such parties would have to bear testimony, you add the punishment, even in the modified form which has been suggested for the female, you will, I think, interfere with the ends of justice. I know that the Minister of Justice is anxious, as we are, that this horrible brutality, which has, I am sorry to say, occurred too frequently of late years, should be stopped, and I go with him so far as to think that imprisonment and flogging should be inflicted on the guilty party; but I believe the guilty party to be, not in nine cases out of ten, but in 999 cases out of 1,000, the masculine offender.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When this takes place under the form of marriage, both parties can be convicted by evidence apart from themselves; but, when the crime is committed without the form of marriage, the only evidence which would be conclusive would be that of one of the criminal parties; so that, if you shut the mouths of both, you will rather defeat the ends of justice than assist them. I would suggest whether, in that case, it would not be better to let the woman go free, so that you will ensure the right to obtain her evidence.

Mr. CURRAN. I think the very fact that the woman would give evidence would be a guarantee to the court and jury that she was not guilty, and would ensure her acquittal. I sympathise entirely in the views of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and his colleagues. I am sure we are all of the same opinion. To my mind, we are making a big step if we adopt the views of the Minister of Justice; but I should like very much to see that in all cases where the offence has not been committed under the form of marriage, the female should be considered innocent.

Mr. BLAKE. It is possible that we may be drawing an Act here which will defeat itself in the great bulk of cases. What is going to be done when you are indicting one or other of these two persons? First, you indict the man, who is generally the principal offender. The woman will not be bound to criminate herself; it would be extremely unlikely that she would run the risk of doing so. My hon. friend says she would be held not guilty.

Mr. CURRAN. The presumption of the court would be that she is not guilty.

Mr. BLAKE. But we are dealing with the probability of advancing justice, of securing the condemnation of the really guilty party, and when the woman is liable to be placed in the dock on account of the commission of this outrage on herself, by her own relative, it may be, you cannot impress upon her a calculation of chances that by giving her evidence, though proving herself guilty, she may yet be making a door of escape.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let that clause stand.

Mr. BERGIN. I would like to recall the attention of the Minister to section number 2, of his amended Bill. If it is at all like the original Bill, it is likely to do very serious damage in the country. Now, if this becomes law, as it appears here in the original Bill, no man will be safe to take employment in any mill or factory in this country, where females are employed, because, at any moment he would be liable to blackmail; in any quarrel, or any ill-feeling, or any spite on account of his refusal to raise the wages, or to give them holidays, he will be liable to be victimised by a bad girl, or two or three bad girls, who may associate together for that purpose. I think the Minister would do well to reconsider this clause, and to make it less broad than it is. It is not confined alone to the superintendent of a factory, but it extends to any one who is employed with females, who has anything to do with the control or the direction of a female in the factory in which she is employed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to find that my hon. friend has taken exception to this clause. I pointed out this very objection when the Bill was under discussion in its original shape, and I have not altered my views at all. I think the Bill is very severe upon the proprietors of mills, upon the managers of factories, and the workmen employed in them. If the Bill is a necessity at all, it should go a great deal further, and include all females who are employed by men, whether as housemaids, or cooks, or servants, or typewriters, or shop girls—or any class of that kind. I think it is unfair to place a certain class at the mercy of what my hon. friend has described as loose women, and leave another certain class perfectly free. I must again reiterate the objection to the second section of the Bill in its present form. Either there should be less of it, or a great deal more.

Mr. BERGIN. I must correct the statement of my hon. friend, who describes as loose women those employed in factories. Of course, where there are a large number of women, five or six hundred, or a thousand, it would be very extraordinary if there were not some impure women amongst them. But I do not think any one ought to characterise the girls employed in factories as loose women. As a fact, I believe they are as virtuous a body of women as there is in the community. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Northumberland, that if this Bill is to apply only to factories, it is a reflection upon the character of girls employed in labor, to their very great disadvantage. I quite agree with my hon. friend, that this Bill, if it becomes law, ought to be applied to other classes of women who, as he says, are employed as housemaids, or cooks, or shop girls, or typewriters, and Government clerks as well.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to put my hon. friend right. I certainly did not class the girls employed in factories as loose women. I meant to say, that there is in every community certain loose women, and my hon. friend referred to the fact that there ought to be protection against loose women. I did not for a moment pretend to convey the imputation that the class of girls employed in workshops or factories are of loose character. As my hon. friend says, there are in all communities women of that class. I think, with him, that this section either goes too far or it does not go far enough. Either protection should be given to all women in the employ of any person, or the section should be struck out altogether. It is my belief, that we would best conduce to the morality of the country and to the prevention of what, I fear, will be a very serious ground of trouble, by striking out the Bill altogether, for there is an element of blackmail contained in that section of the Bill that this House ought not to legalise.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject was fully considered the other day, and the Committee divided upon it. I am not able to modify my views in regard to it, but hon. gentlemen will see, from the reprint of the Bill, that the section has been modified since its introduction, by allowing the testimony of the accused person to be given in all cases and requiring corroboration on the part of the prosecution. If hon. gentlemen desire the Bill to be more stringent and to apply to a larger class of female employees, let them draw a clause to meet the case and I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. MITCHELL. If women thirty years of age require protection where they are employed, either in factories or mills, girls and women employed in domestic service, in the Civil Service, or in any kind of employment equally require protection. Under these circumstances, I contend that either the Bill should go further and be made applicable for the protection of all women as against their employers, or else this clause should be struck out. I move that section 2 be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. I suggest to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that his motion would be inconclusive; but he should wait until the Committee report, and move his motion with the Speaker in the Chair. We have already divided once on this provision in the Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have no objection to allowing the matter to stand over until Mr. Speaker is in the Chair.

On section 16,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose the addition of the words "or a fine of $500."

On section 18,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On moving the second reading of the Bill I explained the object of this provision. I stated that it had been asked for by various labor organisations, who understood that the law at present was not sufficient to exempt them from punishment in the simple case of refusing to work. The present law with respect to trade combinations is this:

"No prosecution shall be maintainable against any person for conspiracy to do any act, or to cause any act to be done, for the purpose of a trade combination, unless such act is an offence punishable by statute."

The amendment I propose is simply this:

No prosecution shall be maintainable against any person for conspiracy in refusing to work with or for any employer or workingman, or for doing any act or causing any act to be done for the purpose of a trade combination, unless such act is an offence punishable by statute.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it considered to be the law at the present time, that a combination among workingmen, agreeing not to work in any particular capacity or in any particular employment, is an offence against the law? It seems to be a new offence against the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Members of trade organisations have been so advised, but that is not my impression as to what the law is. My impression is that they were not indictable for a conspiracy unless the combination was for something beyond that, and included, something in the nature of intimidation, coercion, or the boycotting of a person who does work. But if there is a simply agreement among the men, in accordance with their rules, that they will not work for an employer, it does not render them liable to punishment. They have been advised accordingly, and they have also been advised to the contrary ; and, under these circumstances, I think it is well to say that they are not liable for a simple refusal to work.

Mr. MITCHELL. Under these circumstances, I think there can be no great objection to the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister. I have never understood that workingmen were liable for a refusal to work, and I am glad the Minister agrees with me, although a different opinion has been given. I think it is quite proper that workmen may combine and agree among themselves that they will not work at any particular rate of wages for any particular set of individuals, if they confine the combination to that. I do not think there should be any penalty for that, and I am glad to find from the hon. Minister that under the law there is no offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am keeping words which are in the statute and which in the Bill I had omitted, namely :

"For the purposes of a trade combination."

What I called attention to, in moving the second reading, was, that the Bill as asked for would have the effect of rendering non-punishable certain conspiracies to commit offences against the common law, although the words of the first and second lines :

—"member of a trade combination,"

as I thought, went far in restricting offences to those punishable by statute. We have confined the wording to :

—"does any act or cause any act to be done for the purpose of combination."

Mr. BLAKE. My opinion is, that the revision of the statutes has effected a very serious and prejudicial alteration of the law, in respect to the particular class of transactions to which this law was devoted. For my part, I was apprehensive, when I saw the clause in the shape in which the hon. gentleman proposed it, and heard the reasons which he gave, that the diminished efficiency which the law has, under the Revised Statutes, would be altogether removed. I am, therefore, very glad to see that, whatever be the prefatory changes, the hon. gentleman has, at any rate, resolved to leave that diminished efficiency intact. My own impression is that the original efficiency ought not to have been impaired ; that the reference to that particular class of offences with which the Revised Statutes deal, and which was originally dealt with by prior legislation, to which I shall refer, should remain, and that the whole and entire vigor of the exception which was made as to statutable crimes should be preserved. In order that the position which I take on this subject may be apprehended, I will have to trouble the House with a brief reference to the statutes as they stood. The earliest statute which we have on this subject is 35 Victoria, chapter 31, passed in 1872, which was a law with reference to threats, violence and molestations. It provided as to certain defined acts, which were the acts it was thought expedient to make punishable specifically—certain defined acts arising in the connection of workingmen with one another, and maybe, of employers with one another—and it made these acts punishable by imprisonment, with or without hard labor, for not more than three months. There were provisions in that statute for the prosecution, under the procedure for summary prosecutions, by justices of the peace out of sessions ; and a power to appeal was given. There was, also, a very proper provision that the master, or the relative, or connection of the master, should not sit as a justice of the peace in such prosecutions. That Act was not found satisfactory, and in 1875, by 38 Victoria, chapter 39, that law was repealed and other specific provision was made, which, however, in itself was unsatisfactory. In the following year, 39 Victoria, chapter 37 (1876) was passed, for which, being at that time Minister of Justice, I happen to be responsible. Now, by the first section of that Act, the Act of the previous year was repealed, and by its second section the repeal of the first section of the original Act, 35 Victoria, was continued, and for it was substituted a more satisfactory section, as I conceived, and as Parliament approved. That new section dealt with the matter as affecting the relations of men generally, and not of particular classes of men, and it applied to these relations certain conditions which were constituted into crimes. Certain particular kinds of offences, now often called boycotting, and particular cases of a marked and defined offensive character, relating to intimidation by threat or otherwise, were specified. They were made offences, and it was provided that they should be punishable by the alternative of fine or imprisonment, summarily ; but that, instead of there being an appeal, if the accused party objected to being tried before the summary tribunal, the case should forthwith be treated as an indictable offence and prosecuted as such accordingly. Then the fourth section established for the first time the law as it stood until the Revised Statutes, with reference to this particular subject of conspiracy, and its provision is that to which I particularly wish to draw the attention of the Committee and the Minister of Justice. The fourth section provided :

"That no prosecution shall be maintainable against a person for conspiracy to do any act, or to cause any act to be done, for the purpose of a trade combination, unless such act is an offence indictable by statute, or is punishable under the provisions of the Act hereby amended ; nor shall any person who is convicted under any such prosecution, be liable to any greater punishment than is provided by such statute, or by the said Act as hereby amended, for the act of which he may have been convicted as aforesaid."

The statute then defines what a trade combination is. Now mark that the law of conspiracy was thus swept out of all operation in connection with acts done for the purpose of a trade combination, except in two classes of cases ; unless the act done was an offence indictable by statute, or unless it was an offence punishable under this particular Act, in which case, though not necessarily, an indictable offence, it was an offence of that particular character and defined in that particular way by the very Act itself, as I have described a moment

ago. Therefore, the law of conspiracy was abrogated, as to trade combinations, except in this particular class of offences defined, and in all cases of such graver offences, as are offences indictable by statute. Any conspiracy, then, for purposes of a trade combination, to do an act punishable only at common law, or punishable by statute under summary procedure, was no longer criminal and remained no longer capable of being prosecuted under the law of conspiracy. If it were one of these minor offences, not raised to the gravity of an offence indictable by statute, if it were a minor offence punishable summarily, it was swept out of the law of conspiracy altogether, if done in concert for the purpose of a trade combination. Such was the law, and so it stood and gave satisfaction until the Revised Statute passed; but in the Revised Statute, I find, an alteration was made, and it reads thus:

"No prosecution shall be maintainable against any person for conspiracy to do any act, or to cause any act to be done, for the purposes of a trade combination, unless such act is an offence punishable by statute."

So that you no longer have the protection, as to the gravity of the excepted offence, which existed up to that moment. All offences which are punishable by statute, even though of the most trivial character, and punishable in the lightest way and by the most summary procedure, are once more, by the Revised Statute, drawn within the wide net of conspiracy, even though they are things done for the purposes of a trade combination. This is a distinct enlargement of the exception, certainly not contemplated by me when I proposed the legislation, or by the Houses of Parliament which passed it at that day; and you will readily perceive that, having had a special interest in this legislation, I was surprised when I found that that diminished protection which was still awarded by the Revised Statute it was proposed further to impair by substituting offences punishable by law "for offences punishable by statute." I am glad we are going back thus far, but I hope we shall go back still further; I hope that all the protection which was given, and advisedly given, against the effects of this obnoxious law of conspiracy by the Act of 1876, will be restored by Parliament, and that the attempt—I do not know with what design—for all I know, it may not be a designed attempt—to diminish that protection and to enlarge the exception, will not, now that the attention of Parliament is called to it, be persisted in, but that we shall find Parliament disposed to restore in its full vigor and efficiency the Act of 1876. Now, Sir, this law of conspiracy is a very wide law. I declare that the alteration which has taken place renders it impossible to say how small a matter may not now be punishable as a criminal conspiracy, and introduces lamentable uncertainty into the operations of trade combinations. I have extracted a statement made by a very eminent legal authority, an ex-Lord Chancellor of England, in one of the very latest debates in the House of Lords, upon the subject of the law of conspiracy, and I will trouble the House by a perusal of it, inasmuch as it shows how wide is that net which the law of conspiracy spreads in order to catch the subject. Lord Herschell said this:

"I think exaggerated importance has been attached to the expression 'criminal conspiracy.' Many most excellent people have been guilty of criminal conspiracy without being deserving censure. The law of conspiracy is a wide net spread by the law of our country. An agreement between two people to commit a trespass is a criminal conspiracy, for it is to do an unlawful act. An agreement between husband and wife to smuggle goods into this country would make them guilty of criminal conspiracy, for it would be an agreement to do an illegal act. When I come to this subject, I get a little uncomfortable, for I am not sure that when I visited the United States I was not guilty of criminal conspiracy myself. It has been held that any combination to avoid the Maine Prohibitory Liquor Law is criminal conspiracy. I have a recollection of going to a watering place where the prohibitory law was enforced. The landlord of the hotel was not allowed to supply spirits for payment, but promised to obtain them for his customers. There was an item in my bill under the head of 'sundries' which covered the cost of the spirits, and I am afraid the innkeeper and I were guilty of criminal conspiracy. Any noble lord who has had experience of the criminal courts will know the length to which the law of criminal conspiracy has been carried. I am not prepared to say that any agreement to do an illegal act, or to do a legal act by illegal means, is not a criminal conspiracy. There is a case which is an apt illustration of my contention that there may be criminal conspiracy, even to boycotting, without much moral blame. There is a case now pending * * * in which it has been held that an agreement to boycott was an illegal conspiracy; and I apprehend that every illegal conspiracy is a criminal conspiracy, because it comes clearly within the definition. That is the case of a conspiracy by highly respectable steamship companies to treat people in a certain manner and so effect their trade. Although these companies may be guilty of criminal conspiracy, I am sure they will not feel themselves morally to blame."

Now, Sir, what I want to press is this: that, as the law stood as the Parliament of 1876 passed it, we abstracted altogether from the operation of the law of conspiracy, all acts done in pursuance of trade combinations, which did not fall within one of these two categories: first, that the act was indictable by statute, and so in its nature a grave offence, and, second, that the act was one of the offences specified in the statute itself, and which were particularly germane to the question of trade combinations. For anything outside of these, that the parties combined to do, they were free from being prosecuted for conspiracy. The revision of the law has changed that, to the detriment of the efficiency of that protection, by substituting the phrase "punishable by statute" for the phrase "indictable by statute," and has, therefore, permitted the application of the law of criminal conspiracy to acts, trivial and minor acts, done in pursuance of a trade combination, though those acts be not either indictable by statute or within the range of the specified crimes enumerated in the Act itself. What I ask the Committee and the Minister is that the efficiency of the protection which was given in 1876 shall be restored, and that a form of words shall be adopted which will accomplish that result.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are dealing with a class of offences in respect of which labor organisations, or, as they are known by statute, trade combinations, feel apprehensive of inefficient protection under the laws which allow them to be formed. The legislation is restricted entirely to such trade combinations. The particular case in respect of which the apprehensions of these trade combinations exist, as I stated to the Committee a few moments ago, is the indictment for refusing to work with or for any employer or workman. In respect of that, the amendment which I propose completely covers the case. It declares that they shall not be liable for refusing to work with or for any employer or workman. On reviewing the

clause which I had drafted for that purpose, but which was not as wide as the one I propose, the labor organisations passed resolutions and memorialised privately, by circular, members of the House, asking that the Bill should be amended in the direction in which I have framed this amendment. They were willing to accept the provision in the Bill, provided I substituted the word "statute" for the word "law" in the last line of section 18. But I have gone a step further, and, in order that their request be satisfied, I propose to declare that in no case shall they be prosecuted for refusing to work with or for any employer or workman. It seems to me that in doing that I meet the practical difficulty which has arisen, and I comply with the request of those who have considered this question fully for the last few years, and who are most concerned in it, the trade organisations themselves; and I may say to the House that they have not merely considered it from their own point of view and their own knowledge of the law, but they have been carefully advised as to every question which might arise out of it. Under these circumstances, I hope the hon. member for West Durham, after having stated the views he has expressed, and having explained what his view is as to the distinction in the law prior to the revision of the statutes and now, will not press the Committee to widen the provision which I state to the House; and the House will be already aware, from the requests they have had from the labor organisations, meets every practical emergency which has been suggested, and meets to the fullest extent the requests made.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I retain my very strong opinion that a very important protection to the labor organisations in the exercise of their power of combination has been removed, and that their position is extremely impaired; but after the hon. gentleman's statement that he has had communications from the labor organisations, and that they have informed him that they are perfectly satisfied with this legislation, I shall not now be wiser for them than they are for themselves.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the labor organisations scarcely apprehend the distinction which has just been proposed by my hon. friend from West Durham. It is certainly a very important difference, though technical, and probably on that account overlooked by the organisation; and if the attention of the organisation had been called to it, they would have only been too glad to avail themselves of the more stringent protection suggested by my hon. friend.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The very section which is now proposed—and I ought to have mentioned it sooner, out of deference to the hon. member for West Elgin—is the proposition he submitted to the House last year. I think he did so at the request of the labor organisation. I know, that after the Bill was introduced by him, delegates from the labor organisation waited upon almost every member of the House and requested their support for the Bill. But the Bill was not introduced early enough to reach all its stages. Delegates from a number of these labor organisations met members at the beginning of this Session, and requested that some such clause should be adopted. I proposed the clause which is in the Bill, and they distinctly agreed to that as sufficient for all their purposes. Since the Bill was introduced, they have issued a circular, to which the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) drew my attention yesterday, and a copy of which I received this morning. That circular contains the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, that we ask that Sir John Thompson's Bill to further amend the criminal law be amended by inserting the word 'statute' in place of 'law.'"

In addition to that, some eight or ten delegates, representing all the trade and labor organisations, waited upon the First Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Marine and myself, the other day, and made the request that the simple change should be made in my Bill of inserting the word "statute" for "law." I think the section I have proposed will be an improvement, and gives them further protection even than that; but considering, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, that it meets the request put forward by these organisations, and, as far as I can see, meets all the practical difficulties, it would be well to rest content with that much for the present, at any rate, unless a practical case is put forward calling for a change.

Mr. CURRAN. Judging by the observations of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), it would appear as if there will not be as much protection as formerly. What we must also take into consideration is the fact that these organisations are advised by legal gentlemen outside, whose views are very different to those expressed by hon. gentlemen here. I have often myself, when conversing with these people, found that points which appeared very clear to me, were taken exception to by them, under advice given them elsewhere. The hon. the Minister of Justice has met the request of these people on their own ground, and, perhaps, to some extent improved upon it. It is probably well to give them what they ask.

Mr. BLAKE. When I was called upon to legislate on this subject, I gave what I thought was right.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have given, not only what I thought was right, but more than they asked, and do not propose to give any more.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am to a certain extent satisfied with the clause introduced by the Minister of Justice, for I feel it is going in the direction of granting the relief which the labor organisations require; but I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that in the report, Mr. Elliott, the president of that organisation, in referring to the clause introduced by me last Session, stated that clause was introduced so late and the clause was so crudely drawn that it would not meet the acceptance of the labor organisations. The Minister of Justice, however, has accepted the clause, as I introduced it last Session, which the president of the organisation said would not suit their purpose, and he ought to remove the crudity with which it is encumbered. I would further recommend him to have communication with Mr. Elliott, so that he may get the approval and endorsation of Mr. Elliott. If the clause was so crude and unsatisfactory when it emanated from my hands and appeared upon the Order paper in my name, I cannot understand how it could have improved so very much by emanating from the hands of the Minister of Justice. I suppose the organisations of trade and labor

are very honest and sincere and candid, and I should judge the Minister would do well to reconsider the matter, and see whether the clause merits the approval of Mr. Elliott.

Mr. BLAKE. I read that correspondence, and I must say I formed the conclusion that the real opinion of Mr. Elliott was that it was not the clause that was crude, but the hon. member for Elgin.

On section 21,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose merely to make a verbal amendment, by adding to line 10 the words "by the defendant." This is necessary for the meaning of the clause.

On section 22,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This embraces two important provisions. In the first place, it provides that the appeal from summary convictions shall be to a judge alone, and not to a judge and jury. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., called attention, the other night, to the fate of appeals made against convictions under statutes, concerning which public sentiment is strong. Revenue cases form a very remarkable class in which convictions are continually defeated, by the effect of public sympathy. The principle upon which, I think, appeals of this kind should be regulated is that, as there is no jury permitted in the court of first instance, it is illogical that there should be a jury in the more efficient court to which the appeal is taken. The other clause is intended to meet the difficulty of obtaining the presence of witnesses on appeal, when the original conviction has taken place on their testimony. I have mentioned cases which have occurred in British Columbia and elsewhere, where convictions have taken place under the Indian Act, for selling liquors to Indians, for bringing liquor on the Indian reserve, and others; also cases under the license laws and under the Canada Temperance Act, where the conviction before the magistrate has very frequently taken place on the testimony of witnesses whom it is almost impossible to keep in the country without imprisoning them. It is, therefore, provided here that, when the testimony has been taken in writing and signed by the witness and certified by the justice of the peace, that evidence may be taken on the appeal. In answer to the observation of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), as to the obvious danger of the evidence being taken by the justice of the peace in a very crude form, I have endeavored to provide against that by stating that it shall be taken in writing and signed. It seems to me that, in that way, we remove as far as possible the danger of the evidence being taken loosely or carelessly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I retain my original opinion. I thoroughly approve of the change which the Minister has made in taking away the right of trial by jury on an appeal. One or two magistrates might try the case, but when it was appealed, either party was allowed to have a jury, though the tribunal was supposed to be more efficient. I am not satisfied, however, that the hon. gentleman is wise in introducing the proviso at the end of the section. There may be individual cases in which it might be desirable, but, when you pass general legislation to meet individual cases, you are apt to go wrong. In the vast majority of cases tried before the unpaid magistracy, the evidence is taken in the most imperfect form, and the magistrates are not bound to take it in writing at all. My experience is that, even where the evidence is taken in writing, it is merely transcribed as a memorandum. I would suggest to the Minister that he should insert the proviso:

Provided that the court appealed to is satisfied that the personal appearance of the witnesses cannot be obtained.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the word "cannot" is rather strong, but I will agree to this amendment:

Provided that the court appealed to is satisfied, by affidavit or otherwise, that the personal attendance of the witness cannot be obtained by any reasonable efforts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do you propose to allow testimony as to the credibility of the witness in the court below?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The courts have held the contrary. I know of cases where an unscrupulous party has left the country, so that his evidence could not be obtained in the appeal court, and the court would not permit any evidence as to his credibility.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps, before the Bill goes through, the hon. gentleman will call my attention to any such case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have raised the question myself.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Mills), that two cases have come within his own experience, should be a sufficient reason for guarding against that danger.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. After the word "not," in the 33rd line, I propose to add the words, "either as to the credibility of any witness or as to any other fact material to the enquiry."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I now call the attention of the Committee to section 25, which introduces the practice of taking a statement for the opinion of the court, and I propose to add the following as sub-section 14:—

Where, by any special Act, it is provided that there shall be no appeal from any conviction or order, no proceeding shall be taken under this section in any case in which such provision of such special Act applies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand now, after reading this section more carefully, that it will not come into effect at all unless rules are made by the court of appeal under Act 2 Victoria, chap. 40. I understand that if no other rules are made by the court, the section will be practically dead. That being the case, the opposition I intended to offer, I will withdraw.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is dependent on the judges. I now ask the Committee to return to the notices of amendments that I gave, and first as to section 30. I may explain briefly, to assist the Committee, that the first two are the sections which are introduced at the request of the Provincial Governments of Ontario and Nova Scotia, and are in accordance with Provincial legislation on the same subject. Section 30 is an extension of the provision in the Revised Statutes, which enables prisoners to be transferred from one

prison to another; and this will provide that when an offender has been sentenced, he may, by order of the Governor General, be transferred for the remainder of his term of imprisonment to any industrial school of the Province. The next section provides that he may be directly sentenced to an industrial school, subject, of course, to the control of the Provincial authorities who may find, at any time, that a school is overcrowded. We propose to act with their consent. In the case of a transfer from a prison to an industrial school, the consent of the Provincial Government is obtained. In regard to the 31st section, I may state that the Halifax Industrial School is a Protestant institution to which the Police Court in the city of Halifax has power to send offenders. This will extend the power to the whole Province: boys may be sentenced there from any part of the Province. The Provincial Legislature is making arrangements with the municipalities to provide for the maintenance of the boys after they go there. Everything will be conditional on the municipalities making arrangements for their support.

On section 33,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. St. Patrick's Home in Halifax is a Catholic institution. It is proposed to extend the provisions with respect to it from the Halifax Police Court to the whole Province.

On section 37,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This provision is to amend a provision in regard to St. Patrick's Home. In 1887, an Act of this Parliament was passed allowing the ticket of leave system with respect to boys in St. Patrick's Home in Halifax. It was passed at the instance of the manager of the institution, and, to a large extent, was an experiment, and the experiment has been found to succeed very well. The provision of the statute with respect to ticket of leave is simply this: that when a boy has been sentenced to the institution for a certain length of time, he may receive a ticket, signed by the superintendent of the home, the magistrate who committed him, and the Minister of Justice, authorising him to go at large; and it contains a provision that it is subject to revocation at any time when the boy commits an offence. The managers of the institution, however, think it necessary that a further amendment should be made in this direction: that when a boy who is allowed to go at large, is found to be incorrigible, he shall be subject to serve the rest of his sentence without being formally convicted again. We propose, therefore, to amend it in the direction of allowing the magistrate to issue his warrant immediately on the application of the superintendent of the home; but I propose to leave it discretionary with the magistrate as to whether he will issue his warrant or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section is giving excessive powers, and might be liable to abuse. There is no limit as to time. A boy may have been out of the home for years, and there is nothing the manager of the home is called upon to do, except to declare that he has reason to believe that the boy has misconducted himself. The boy may have left Halifax and gone to St. John, or Montreal, and the superintendent may have received information on which he may make a *bonâ fide* application, and yet the information may be exaggerated and wrong. Great injustice may be done, and some check should be provided. If the superintendent of the home lays his information, declaring he has reason to believe that a boy who has a ticket of leave has misconducted himself, that boy should be brought before the magistrate, who should hear and determine on the information, and not commit the boy back to the home unless he is satisfied that the information laid is correct.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a provision in the Revised Statutes on the subject, which meets the hon. gentleman's objection to some extent. It must be remembered, however, that the boy is out on a ticket of leave; and moreover, the institution is conducted by a religious order, on the most humane principles. The statute contains a provision limiting the age at which boys can be placed there, and limiting the term to five years. The provisions with respect to tickets of leave, may be found in chapter 183.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that section 70, sub-section 2, to which he has referred, does in a certain sense make provision for the contingency I anticipated might arise. But the section he introduces now eliminates all these checks. Of course, no Minister would arbitrarily withdraw a license; he would make proper regulations to see that justice would be done to the boy, but errors might arise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister whether he makes any provision for the period of time over which the Minister and the magistrate may excise control of a boy? Is the time limited, or is this power to continue during the whole life of the boy? It seems to me that if there is no reason for cancelling the license within a specified period, there ought to be no right to continue the punishment. Suppose a boy has served out half of his time, and more than half the remaining period has expired. I do not think the Minister and the magistrate should have power to order the boy again back to prison.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is quite clear, that under these circumstances they cannot send him back at all, because the sentence would have expired, and there is a provision which says that the sentence shall run from the day it is imposed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there should be some provision for a judicial enquiry upon the second representation of wrong-doing, before he is sent back to the reformatory. Suppose the parents, or the relatives, of a boy think he is badly treated, there is no provision to meet that case.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can make that discretionary with the magistrate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the rights of the parties ought be determined by law, and not left merely as matters of discretion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the Minister should provide, that before a boy is re-committed, there should be some investigation to show that the information laid by the superintendent of the home is well founded. There may be the utmost good faith in the party laying the information, but he is speaking of a boy not under his im-

mediate control, and such extraordinary powers are liable to abuse. The boy should have an opportunity before being re-committed, of excusing or explaining the charges made by the superintendent, and showing grounds why he should not be re-committed. The hon. Minister has sufficient knowledge of humanity to know that facts are exaggerated and distorted, and sometimes assume a different shape after a person has made an explanation. I think there should be some enquiry before a boy is re-committed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ask that this clause should stand over until I have an opportunity of considering the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. LAURIER. I notice that the ticket of leave can be put an end to on the information of the superintendent that the holder of the certificate is "misconducting" himself. That is a very general term and very undefined. Is there anything which explains what this "misconduct" would be?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is not, but I will look into the matter carefully. The next clause provides for escapes from industrial schools, and for misconduct in these schools.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that this clause is scarcely consistent with the recent judgment of the Court of Appeals; that where there is any violation of a statute, the Provincial Legislature shall state what the punishment shall be. Now, the Minister not only provides that those who escape shall be punished under the authority of an Act of Parliament of Canada, but also under the Act of the Legislature of any of the Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not see anything unreasonable about that. The violation of any statute is punishable by the Legislature which passes it; but it seems to me not unreasonable, when the Local Legislature has provided a place of detention, for this Parliament to step in and provide that it shall be a misdemeanor to escape from that place.

On section 18,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The addition which I propose to add to this clause is intended to define what constitutes valuable security. Section 2 of chapter 164 in the old statutes gives a definition of valuable securities, which includes receipts. That definition, before the revision of the statutes, extended to all the statutes; but in consequence of the transposition of the statutes and their separation in the revision, that definition no longer applies to the Act relating to threats by which money or valuable securities are extorted. In a recent conviction in the Province of Quebec, the article extorted by threats was a receipt, the point was reserved, and the court decided that a receipt was not a valuable security in the meaning of this Act, although it was in the meaning of the Larceny Act.

Mr. TISDALE. In the first part of the section, the valuable securities consist of securities whether in Canada or other British possession, or any foreign state, but in the latter part of the section, dealing with titles to lands or goods, nothing is defined as to where they may be situated. In Ontario, some years ago, a question was raised by way of demurrer, whether the land being in the United States, the title deed came under the Larceny Act, as there was nothing in the Act to show where the land was to be.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would add the words: "wheresoever the lands or goods may be situated."

On section 19,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The section I propose to add to this is a provision for the taking of evidence in a foreign country in a criminal case, and it is proposed that the judge of any superior or county court having criminal jurisdiction, may, on information being given him that any person who resides out of Canada is able to give material information relating to the pending case, appoint a commission to take the evidence upon oath of such person. The procedure will be as nearly as possible the same as that which prevails in civil cases.

Mr. TISDALE. The evidence should be presented before the jury as nearly as possible as it is given. Question and answer should be taken and fully transcribed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Should this not be made applicable to Canada also, so that a person residing in British Columbia, for instance, could be examined by a commission in a criminal case pending in Nova Scotia?

Committee rose and reported progress.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In view of the strong expression of opinion in the House this afternoon in regard to section 6, I propose to exempt from punishment the female, and have remodelled the section in that sense. I also propose to drop section 37.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. BERGIN. I give notice to the Minister of Justice that I shall move an amendment on the third reading.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Buttons of vegetable ivory, horn, hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, 10 cents per gross, and 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BECHARD. When the Committee rose Saturday morning, I thought it was understood and agreed by the House that when the Committee sat again, those hon. members who did not secure an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the imposition of a duty on imported flour, would be allowed to do so. Therefore, with your permission, I wish to make a few observations on that part of the tariff. During the debate which has taken place, it has been said by some hon. members who sit on the ministerial benches, that the

increased duty upon imported flour does not increase the price as long as we produce in this country a surplus of wheat. I must confess frankly that for many years I, myself, adhered to that theory as being sound, and I considered it a safe rule whereby a man could be guided in his appreciation of questions of this kind. But *experientia docet*, and facts on several occasions have demonstrated that that rule, like many other rules, although pretty good in its general application, is not without exception, and is not infallible. Now, Sir, we import into this country a large quantity of flour for home consumption. During the last year ending 30th June, according to the official documents placed in our hands, we imported for home consumption, 258,813 barrels of flour, for which we paid the sum of $1,000,301, and we paid in Customs duty, besides, the sum of $129,407.15. Now, Sir, who paid that duty? Surely it must be the consumer or the producer. That flour was imported from the United States, and I think the opinion which is entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite, that that duty was paid by the American producer to the Canadian Government, is inadmissible. The price of flour in the markets of the United States is not determined by the demand for the article in the Canadian market, but is determined by the demand on the markets of the world, and principally in the British market. Therefore, when a Canadian importer wants to buy flour in Chicago, for instance, he has to pay for that flour the price which it is worth there, and when he enters that flour in Canada, he is obliged to pay to the Customs the duty imposed on that flour by the Canadian Government. But he does not lose that duty ; that duty is refunded to him by the retail merchant to whom he sells the flour, and who, in his turn, is refunded that duty by the Canadian consumer. If, in this case, the duty was not paid by the Canadian consumer, how could it be pretended that the imposition of such a duty promotes the interest of the wheat producer in the western part of this country? Perhaps I may receive the answer which I have often heard given in this House before when questions of this nature were discussed, that the benefit to the Canadian producer comes from the fact that the duty secures to him a larger control of the home market. But, Sir, that control of the home market is secured to the home producer by restraining foreign importation by means of a Customs duty. Now, I ask, what advantage, what benefit could the home producer receive from the imposition of a Customs duty, intended to secure to him the control of the home market, if it does not at the same time increase the price of the articles consumed in the home market? Sir, I believe that this duty is paid entirely by the consumer, and that the opinion that the producer pays the duty, is in this case, at least, an absurdity. Sir, I protest against the increase of the duty upon flour, and in fact against any duty imposed upon that article which is a prime necessary of life. Flour should be admitted into this country duty free, but when a specific duty like this is imposed upon flour, the duty becomes unjust and oppressive, as it taxes the bread of the poor as much as it does the bread of the rich ; it taxes the bread of the poor workingman who earns it by hard daily labor, as much as it taxes the fine wheat bread of the rich man who has the means of enjoying the delights of life and of the *far niente*. But why is this duty imposed ? Certainly it is not for the purpose of revenue. We have a large surplus of nearly two millions of dollars ; the necessities of the revenue do not, therefore, require an increase of that duty upon that necessary of life. That duty is a blow dealt at the Province of Quebec in particular. It is well known that Quebec is not a wheat-producing country. A large number of farmers do not sow wheat at all and prefer to buy their flour. Spring season is late there ; the farmers cannot sow wheat sufficiently early to ensure a safe crop, and the wheat crop is a very uncertain one. Hence a very large number, probably the great majority of the farmers of that Province, do not sow wheat at all, because they find it more profitable to purchase flour. In some localities it is sown in small quantities, and sometimes there is not sufficient raised to produce the flour required for the farmers' consumption. The whole importation of flour in the Dominion last year for home consumption was 258,813 barrels. Of that quantity Quebec imported for home consumption 199,816 barrels, or about four-fifths of the whole importation. For that flour the Province of Quebec paid $749,138, on which a duty was imposed of $99,908. Supposing the importation to reach the same quantity during the present year, the duty paid at the increased rate proposed would reach $149,862. I repeat that this duty weighs more heavily upon the people of Quebec than upon the people of any other Province in the Dominion, and this duty, instead of being increased, should be entirely removed. During the Session, we have been informed that the hon. the Finance Minister received deputations from the millowners of the country, who presented their claims and submitted that their profits were so small that the duty on flour should be increased. The hon. Finance Minister agreed to their representations, and he now proposes to impose heavy sacrifices upon the people for the benefit of that class of manufacturers. If the farmers of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces also should choose to send delegates to interview the Finance Minister, and ask him to do something in the direction of giving them protection in compensation for the many sacrifices imposed upon them by this Government, I wonder what the Finance Minister would answer to them. Doubtless, he would tell them that they receive protection in the home markets for the sale of their horses, cattle, sheep, hay, potatoes, and many other articles of farm produce. He would add that the Government had imposed an increased duty on imported meats, and thereby granted them a high degree of protection. But the farmers would not fail to reply to him : "Sir, you come very late with your duty on meats ; the protective system has been in operation 10 or 12 years, and up to this time you never thought of imposing such a duty in order to stimulate the production of meat in Canada. But when you pretend that you give us protection in horses, cattle, sheep and other farm products, you are mistaken. We of the Eastern Provinces do not import them, because we do not want them ; on the contrary, we export them in large quantities. You cannot give us protection in respect to those articles. With respect to horses, sheep and cattle, only British Columbia, the North-West Territories and Manitoba import any quantity

of them, and they do so because it is cheaper to import them from the United States, lying on the frontier, than to buy them from Ontario." They would no doubt add: "You cannot give the farmers of this country any protection whatever, to compensate them for the heavy burdens imposed upon them; that is beyond your power; and the only thing you could do would be to secure the farmers good foreign markets where they could sell their produce with advantage. That is the only thing we ask, and we have a right to expect it from you." But of all the foreign markets where Canadian farmers can sell with advantage their produce, certainly the most advantageous is the market of the United States. The official documents prove that nearly one-half of the produce of the farms of Canada is exported to the United States; and that nearly fifty per cent of our whole commerce is done with that country, notwithstanding the double barriers which have been erected on both sides of the line to impede that trade. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not want that market opened. To-day they are opposed to reciprocal free trade with the United States. During two or three previous Sessions when we were discussing this question, those hon. gentlemen agreed that they were in favor of reciprocity, but they limited it to the exchange of natural products. But this year they told us very frankly that they do not want reciprocity even to that extent. In former years, and in 1878, those gentlemen preached the National Policy as a means of securing reciprocity. Now they maintain protection with a view of preventing reciprocity with the United States. I am glad to see that the question will be placed squarely before the people at the next election. Hon. gentlemen opposite will go before the country maintaining the National Policy, whilst the Liberals will go to the people upholding the flag of reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States. That will be the battle ground where the forces of both parties will meet. I have reason to believe that the Liberals may have full and complete confidence in the result of the conflict.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister of Customs state why this specific duty is imposed?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a specific duty at present on buttons. If the hon. gentleman will turn to section 71 of the Tariff Act, he will find that buttons, vegetable ivory and horn, are dutiable at 10 cents per gross and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Buttons made from other materials have been added to this list, making all bear the same rate of duty, and the reason why these qualities or kinds have been added is because they are now manufactured in Berlin, or in the County of Waterloo, very extensively. The protection which was formerly given to the other class of buttons has induced the manufacture of the class added to the item, and they have been placed on the same rate of duty, purely for protective purposes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am out and out opposed to a specific duty. You cannot impose a specific duty without doing an injustice to the cheaper quality of goods of the same kind. Now the common button to go on an ordinary coat will pay a specific duty, the very same as a button worth ten times as much, and consequently, I object to a specific duty on the ground that it strikes at the goods which are used by the poorer classes, and relieves to an extent, the wealthier portion of the community, who buy a better class of goods. It is the same in all lines of goods; specific duties are unjust. I may say this, and I hope I will be permitted to add to what my hon. friend behind me said; that, in my humble opinion, the Opposition in this House, in the face of the statement of the Government that they had a surplus last year and that they expect a surplus next year, will not be discharging their duty if they do not oppose at every stage, every single increase that is proposed by these resolutions. I contend that the Government have no right whatever to ask the sanction of this House, and particularly the sanction of the Opposition, to increases of duties, in the face of their declaration that they had a surplus last year and will have a surplus next year. By what right do you ask us to consent to this increase of duties imposing additional taxation on the people? I repeat that, in my humble opinion, the Opposition are not discharging their duty to their constituents, or to their country, or to the principles they hold that burdens upon the people shall be sufficient only to meet the annual demands upon the Dominion treasury, if they permit these resolutions to pass which increase the drain upon the resources of the people. Although it has been shown that when the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were in Opposition they declared that the Government of the day had no right to a surplus, and that my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright) was worried night after night by declarations that he had no right to ask the House to grant him a surplus, yet these hon. gentlemen now in power ask us to consent to the passage of items which inflict additional taxation on the people in the face of their declaration that they anticipate a surplus next year. If that is protection, it is protection gone wild and gone mad. If this is the legitimate outcome of the National Policy, then, Sir, I contend that it is time that the people of this country should study what the National Policy means. I am not going to further detain the House. I presume it is the desire of the Committee to pass these items; but so far as I am personally concerned, I shall lose no opportunity of expressing my views and offering every legitimate opposition to the passage of increased taxation on the people of this country, in face of the statement of the Government that they have a surplus. I feel that I would not be discharging my duty to the people who sent me here, if I did not offer opposition to every item of taxation the Government proposes.

Clocks and clock cases of all kinds, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like the Minister to explain why he charges for clocks and clock cases 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, while he charges for gold watch cases only 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BOWELL. Where do you find that?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is in your tariff, you ought to know.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman has been reading some other item. Under the old tariff watch cases were 25 per cent. *ad valorem* and the works were admitted at 10 per cent. It has been discovered that the cases and works are imported separately and that they are simply put

together by a pin. The original tariff was for the purpose of protecting the manufacturers of watch cases in Canada; and watch movements not being manufactured in Canada, they were allowed to come in at 10 per cent. We have increased the duty so as to make it more equitable. The duty on clock cases is increased to 35 per cent., while the movements, except for tower clocks, which are largely manufactured in Canada, are 10 per cent. I have no knowledge of any such item as that to which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) refers.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there any factories for the manufacture of clocks in Canada now?

Mr. BOWELL. I think not.

Mr. MULOCK. What became of the clock factory that used to be in Hamilton? Did it flourish?

Mr. BOWELL. It flourished out, some years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. It failed, notwithstanding the fostering care of the tariff.

Mr. BLAKE. I remember very well when the duty was put on to help that flourishing industry.

Mr. MULOCK. Inasmuch as the last duty of 25 per cent. wiped out that industry, is this new duty of 35 per cent. to make that dead industry deader still, or what is the object of it? Poor people are particularly affected by this duty. We know that the poorest classes of clocks, which are found in every household, are manufactured in enormous quantities in the United States and in England, as are also certain classes of watches, like the Waterbury watch and the Waltham watch. How is it expected that any possible tariff can be in the interest of the people while we have so limited a market?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman's recollection will carry him back far enough, he will remember that the clock industry never has been in a healthy state, either under the present tariff or any other, owing to the extent to which these articles are manufactured in the United States and in Europe, and the large markets they have to supply. The duty of 35 per cent. on clocks has existed for eight or nine years past; I suppose it was imposed in the hope that it would enable this industry to continue; but as the industry did not continue, the tariff was changed, and the duty on watch cases which are manufactured in the country, was fixed at 25 per cent., and on the movements at 10 per cent., the latter not being manufactured in the country. For the reason I have already explained we have raised the duty on cases to 35 per cent., as well as on the complete article, allowing the works to be brought in at 10 per cent. The cases are manufactured very extensively both in Toronto and in Montreal.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman expect that 35 per cent. duty on clocks will cause that industry to exist even in a feeble state?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to say that it will, but I think it will induce a much more extensive manufacture of the cases.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that my quotation was an error, taken from an old tariff instead of from this one. But, in my opinion, it is unfair to impose a duty of 35 per cent. on clocks, while you admit watches at 25 per cent. A clock is something that every man must have in his house, but a watch is not of the same necessity.

Mr. BOWELL. We are not proposing an increase in the duty on clocks. It has been the same for some years.

Mr. McMULLEN. But I say you should reduce the duty, as you have too much money now.

Cocoa paste and chocolate, not sweetened, one cent per pound.

Mr. BOWELL. This is an error; it should be 4 cents a pound, making the duty equal to the 25 per cent. duty which exists at present, the article being valued at 18 to 20 cents a pound. The duty is made specific in order to prevent the numerous frauds that occur in its importation. I also wish to add, "and other preparations of cocoa."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for taxing that at all when you admit tea and coffee free. Cocoa is a very useful and desirable article of food or drink for many people, and it appears to me that on the principle on which you make tea and coffee free, you should make this free.

Mr. BOWELL. It is more of a luxury than tea and coffee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that. Many people use it as a substitute for tea or coffee.

Collars of cotton, linen or celluloid, 24 cents per dozen, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears to me to be a most outrageous imposition. Here is a tax of considerably over 60 per cent., taking the average value of these collars, put on—for what reason under heaven? I suppose for the purpose of encouraging some trumpery manufacturer, and for that purpose every person in Canada has to pay this enormous tax. This is out of all reason and proportion. The average value of collars imported is considerably under a dollar a dozen, in the case, at any rate, of one or two of these articles, and you tax them two-thirds of 100 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. *Apropos* of this item, I may state what a leading importer told me about a year ago in relation to the duty on ladies' collars. He told me he had made a Customs entry a few days before, and in estimating the tax, first specific and then *ad valorem*, he found it actually amounted to 145 per cent. of the value of the goods. My hon. friends put this at 60 to 70, but I should not wonder if it was over 100 per cent. This system can be called nothing less than a system of legalised fraud. Why not make the tax at once so much *ad valorem*, and let the people know what they are really paying? I believe that when this system was first adopted the Government had to send to the United States for an expert, a man named Young, for the purpose of inducting them into this method of taxing the people, without their knowing what they had to pay. This is a most outrageous system. The Government should say honestly and squarely: We will tax you on collars, 50, 60 or 70 per cent., and then people will know what they are paying; but by this system of so much per dozen and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, the people do not know what they are paying, and that feature of taxation runs through the whole tariff.

Mr. McMULLEN. These collars cost from 3 to 5 cents apiece, or 40 to 60 cents a dozen, as ladies' collars will, wholesale; you put on 2 cents a collar, which makes a tax in itself of from 30 to 40 per cent., and then add 30 per cent, *ad valorem*, and the total tax comes to 65 and 70 per cent., and on the cheapest kinds of collars, 100 per cent. This specific duty strikes heavily at the poorer article, while the more expensive article is not taxed in anything like the same ratio. Collars costing 30 cents a dozen will have to pay the same specific duty of 24 cents as collars which cost 60 cents a dozen. In all these specific duties you strike at the poorer article, used by the poorer classes, while the better article, used by the higher classes, is taxed a comparatively light duty.

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt the tariff works precisely as the hon. gentleman says, but he forgot to mention that the dearer collars are met by the *ad valorem* duty. The specific duty was adopted for the purpose of meeting the undervaluation upon a very inferior quality of goods brought into the country, and the *ad valorem* duty was intended to catch, if I may use that word, the more valuable article.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was that the only reason for adopting that system?

Mr. BOWELL. That was the only reason I know of, and to give, of course, a good high protection. This is the old tariff, with the addition of the word "celluloid."

Mr. MULOCK. A cotton collar which will cost one-third the value of a linen collar will have to pay the same specific duty. In other words, you charge 6 cents on a cotton collar as against 2 cents on the linen collar. You are acting on the principle: "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." Is it fair that he should press to the wall the poor man, as he is now doing by making him pay three times more than the more fortunate man?

Mr. BOWELL. There are no cotton collars made.

Mr. MULOCK. Then why are you taxing cotton collars?

Mr. BOWELL. There are collars made with cotton inside and linen outside.

Mr. GILLMOR. I see that this duty on collars amounts in some cases to 33 per cent. specific, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, on collars costing $1.50 a dozen. Another class of collars, worth $1 a dozen, is charged 50 per cent. specific duty, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, so that you are taxing a large proportion of these collars of that class 80 per cent. There are many of those articles at that price which, notwithstanding that you are protecting them here, are imported and sold to the poor people all over the Dominion, and these you are taxing 80 per cent. The idea of taxing a poor girl, who wants to make herself agreeable, 80 per cent. for a little ornament! Should a maid or a bride be compelled to forego her ornaments? I think the last thing you should tax is one of this kind, which young women enjoy so much. On many of these articles you are charging 100 per cent., and I say it is an outrageous tariff.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) says that by this tax you are pressing the poor man to the wall. I think, by what my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) says, the Minister of Customs must be pressing the poor woman to the wall, and I am not sure that he would not come within the terms of the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

Mr. BOWELL. I repudiate the insinuation of the hon. member for Northumberland, but if I ever come within the provisions of the law, I will retain the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) to defend me, as he is best fitted for such work.

Cotton cordage and cotton braided cords, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must again put in my plea on behalf of the poor unfortunate fishermen. I think this is very unfair. There is no cotton cordage that I know of made in this country. There is some hemp cordage made, but this cotton cordage is used largely in the fishing boats on the coast of the Province from which I come. I do not suppose the Ministry have any bowels of compassion for the fishermen, though they have one Bowell who has no compassion.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman may be right to complain on behalf of the fishermen, but, if he were a farmer and found he was charged 35 per cent. on binding twine, he would have a great deal to complain of. The fishermen are allowed to import seines and nets free of duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you sure of that?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; look at the old tariff.

Mr. MITCHELL. We are dealing with the new tariff.

Mr. McMULLEN. My impression is that there is no increase in the tariff in that matter. I wish the Government would reduce the tax on binding twine.

Mr. BOWELL. We have not come to that. The reason for this duty is that the thread now bears a duty of 2 cents a pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and this cotton cordage and cotton braided cords is made very extensively in Ontario and in some other parts of the country. The item in the free list in regard to lines and twines is not interfered with.

Mr. GILLMOR. That does not make the cordage free to the fishermen. I received a letter from a fisherman, who is a friend of mine, the other day in reference to this duty. He says:

"To talk about the bounty we get, it is a bag of wind. Why, the extra duty each man pays on manilla that was free to fishermen until the Tory party got in power, is more than double the bounty. It makes no difference if we use home-made manila, it costs more per fathom than the American, for it is not so nicely made, it weighs more per fathom. We get more fathoms for the dollar and pay the duty, than to purchase the home-made manila. Yes, we will have to quit. Am completely ruined since the Tory party got in power. I want you to get a place for me in British Columbia; get a chance for me to work at any business,

"I can sell goods if you can get a chance for me with some of the men who come to Ottawa; you speak to them for me; I must quit here. Our fishermen can't live; they have cut me up; they can't pay their debts, and that means ruin to us, and it is getting worse and worse every year."

I know that this protective duty on the ropes that are used by the fishermen and others, is simply shameful, it is simply scandalous. It is poor

material, and it will weigh so much more a fathom, no matter how much duty you put on, and they will have to buy American ropes for their fishing business, and American boots. Talk about the bounty! Why, the difference between one pair of boots they are compelled to buy in Canada and those they can buy abroad, is more than the bounty you give the fishermen. What they pay extra in fitting out one boat for a few months' work, or the extra duty they have to pay on the rope they use in fishing, is more than all the bounty you give the fishermen. It is simply shameful.

Mr. BLAKE. The fact of the matter is, these poor fishermen would go and hang themselves if it were not that the tariff makes the rope too dear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did I understand the Minister to say just now that cordage for fishermen was free?

Mr. BOWELL. No; lines and twines.

Mr. MITCHELL. Lines and twines are a comparatively small matter compared with the cordage for fishermen. In the existing tariff, cordage of all kinds is 1¼ cents per pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. I was wrong in supposing that the hon. gentleman said it was free, but I want the hon. gentleman to take into consideration the condition of things amongst the fishermen, and make it free for them.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a re-arrangement of the tariff, without any increase of duty upon lines and twines, to which the hon. gentleman refers. I know that lines and twines are cheaper to-day than they were when this high tariff, as the hon. gentleman terms it, was placed upon the Statute-book. There may be reasons for that; the hon. gentleman may give other reasons. But I am not prepared to admit that it would be in the interest either of the fishermen or the manufacturing industries of this country, to put the articles on the free list, for the reason that they are extensively manufactured in Canada. From my knowledge of the invoices and of the importations, they are sold much cheaper now than they were five or ten years ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend talks about lines and twines—I never mentioned them. I said the cordage the fishermen require for outfits for their boats, ought to be upon the free list. It is a most dangerous occupation, and one that is followed entirely by poor men who have hard work to make a living for themselves and families. If you want to encourage the fishermen, you ought to put upon the free list, not only lines and twines, but the far more important article of cordage, which is required for outfitting.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The statement just made by the Minister of Customs is one, I think, that will create some astonishment, namely, that this duty on cordage is in the interests of the fishermen, as well as in the interests of the manufacturers. I would like very well if the hon. gentleman could explain to me how it can be in the interest of the fishermen that the duty on cordage should be placed at such a very high rate. I remember when the Liberal Government were in power there was, in the commencement, no duty on cordage at all, and when my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was Finance Minister, placed a duty of 5 per cent. on cordage, I remember still the indignant protests that were made by the present Minister of Customs, and by the whole Tory party throughout the country, that a Liberal Government were going to injure the fishing and shipping interests of this country by imposing a duty of 5 per cent. on cordage. It is really most refreshing to hear the hon. gentleman talking to-day of benefiting the fishermen by increasing the duty on cordage to 20 per cent. As has been observed by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), these duties take away more than the bounty which is given them. These high duties naturally involve high prices. The hon. gentleman says that cordage is much cheaper to-day than it was some years ago. That is another observation which is hardly warranted, I think, because the hon. gentleman will remember that cordage is an article, like others, which is affected by the value of the raw material, and if it is cheaper to-day than it was some years ago, it would be 20 per cent. cheaper still if this duty was not imposed. The fishermen along our coast have to buy this cordage, and it is a very heavy item in their outfit, and I do think that, considering the position the finances are now in, the Minister of Customs should take this into account and see whether he cannot make some reduction on the article. I know that in spite of the high duty which is imposed against the American cordage, a very large quantity of it is used by our people in preference to Canadian cordage. We have a rope-walk in Halifax, one in St. John and one in Montreal. They make a fair article; I do not know very much about it, but I know that I hear it constantly remarked that the American article is very much cheaper, even at the difference of value. The hon. gentleman will see that, by keeping on this heavy duty, he is putting a heavy burden upon a class of people not very well able to bear it. He is putting on them a still heavier burden in the shape of increased duties on beef and pork which they are compelled to use, and the flour which they have to buy. This burden will be insupportable, and I do not wonder that the correspondent of my hon. friend writes to him that they will have to abandon that mode of getting their living. With the duty on pork and beef, and this high duty on cordage, and the other articles which fishermen require in their daily occupation, it is more than that industry can bear, and I think the hon. gentleman has not been well advised, I repeat, in putting all these duties upon that class of articles.

Mr. GILLMOR. With regard to cordage being cheaper in Canada under this arrangement, my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), who was chairman of the Combines Committee last year, could tell us something about cheap cordage. There are some four or five factories for making rope in Canada—not more than five or six, at any rate. Evidence came before the committee that these factories went into an arrangement and combination and put up the prices of cordage in Canada, and each one of the manufacturers undertook to make a certain amount of cordage during the year, some more and some less. Those manufacturers that made less really obtained more money than those who manufactured more cordage, and

there was one concern that received between $4,000 and $5,000 for making none at all. By obtaining their "combine" price they were able to allow one establishment to lie idle and pay it thousands of dollars. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the benefits conferred on the country by the tariff! The moment manufacturers have an opportunity under this tariff to make a combination on rope, in which line there are only five or six manufacturers in the Dominion, they come together, and in an hour an arrangement is made and up go the prices. I know this has occurred. I went into a store to purchase a little cordage myself, and I was charged from 2 to 3 cents per pound additional three days after a "combine" had been made, and this without any reason except that the manufacturers had united to put up the prices and divide the spoils obtained from the fishermen and all purchasers of cordage. Members of the Combines Committee present know that this is a fact, and this was the immediate result of the tariff arranged to encourage rope-making in Canada. This protective system conduces to nothing else than combines.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member has not told the whole story. Mr. Massey, who is a manufacturer of implements, and a large purchaser of binding twine in Canada——

Mr. GILLMOR. I did not speak of binding twine; I was speaking of cordage.

Mr. WALLACE. Binding twine, according to Mr. Massey's evidence, is cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States. It is true that we had at one time a combination, but the combination was destroyed, and now there is very little danger.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Massey told us in the Combines Committee that he could not buy binding twine at reasonable prices, and that he would be compelled to go into making binding twine himself.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). From my recollection of the evidence I cannot agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). I think we had only one manufacturer of cordage before the committee.

Mr. GILLMOR. We had two, one from Montreal and one from St. John.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I thought we had only one, from St. John. That witness distinctly stated that the combination did not affect the price, but that the rise in price, to which the hon. member has referred, was caused by a combination in the United States, which obtained a monopoly of the raw material out of which cordage is manufactured.

Mr. GILLMOR. There was before that committee a manufacturer of cordage in Montreal, who had gone into the combination and had broken it up, because he thought $6,000 might as well go to the people as to a firm which did not manufacture any cordage.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Mr. Massey stated positively that he was opposed to the present price charged for binding twine. He said that the raw material came into Canada free, and the manufacturers had the benefit of all the duty upon the raw material in the cordage, and the price charged was too high. He went on to state that we required 3,000 tons of binding twine.

Mr. GILLMOR.

General LAURIE. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has pointed out that rope is very largely used by the fishermen in the Maritime Provinces, and especially on our own coast. I wish to point out as an advantage arising from the stimulus given to the manufacturers, that, with all the rope our people consume, only $3,125 worth was imported from the United States last year.

Mr. MITCHELL. They could not import it on account of the high duties.

General LAURIE. An industry has been established and home consumption created, and our people have been called upon to pay only $659 in duty. Therefore, instead of this being an enormous burden, it is a very trifling burden on the people.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am surprised that an intelligent gentleman like the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, who represents a fishing county in Nova Scotia, should actually rise and put forward as a reason why there is no hardship inflicted on the fishermen, the fact that only $659 duty was charged on rope imported into this country. The duty of 30 per cent. is so high as to compel our people to take the inferior article manufactured by these "combines" protected under this high tariff.

Mr. MACDOWALL. In the course of the discussion which occurred on the Budget the other day, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) made certain statements as to the amount of duty paid by farmers on binding twine, and they were answered by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). It was proved by the latter hon. gentleman, that binding twine is sold at a lower price retail, than it is sold at wholesale in the United States.

General LAURIE. Referring to the assertion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that our fishermen have to put up with an inferior class of cordage, I distinctly assert that the rope they are able to obtain from our own factories is quite as good as that which they are able to import.

Mr. MITCHELL. I happen to have been largely engaged in shipping and ship-outfitting for about twenty years, and I happen to know something about the trade, as perhaps my hon. friend may do. I, therefore, speak from experience. Our mariners and seamen infinitely prefer American manila to what is manufactured here. The hon. gentleman said that only $6,000 worth of cordage was imported. Why not make the duty 60 per cent., and then there will be none imported. That is a specimen of the logic used, to show that this tariff does not impose hardships on the people.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I import a good deal of rope during the season, and I find that it is much preferred to Canadian manufactured rope. It is considerably lighter than that made in Canada. On that account it is cheaper to use American rope, and the quality, moreover, is softer, and it wears better. Hon. gentlemen opposite would lead the country to believe that high duties lower the price of articles. Surely they do not intend to lead the country astray by declaring that a high tariff has the effect of making articles cheaper, for that is really nonsense. It is a piece of injustice on the part of the Government to increase the duties on rope and other articles used by the fishermen, who

are about the poorest class of the community, especially the shore fishermen. On the other hand, Newfoundland fish is allowed to come in free of duty, and so our fishermen are not protected, while compelled to pay heavier duties for the benefit of the manufacturers. I repeat that it is an injustice to levy taxes on the poorer classes, to put money into the pockets of rich manufacturers. It is true that some articles the fishermen use while prosecuting their calling are free of duty, but, on the other hand, the families of fishermen will suffer from the high duties imposed on all the goods they consume. It is a great mistake to levy taxes on bread and other necessaries of the poorer people, while you leave them only cornmeal and molasses at a trifle lower duty, and which are supposed to be cheapened under the tariff. I again insist that it is a great wrong to be constantly levying taxes on the poorer classes for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of the rich.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error in saying that we are increasing the rate of duty. It is only a re-arrangement of two items. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) had said we would be ill-advised in continuing the rate of duty, it might apply with some force, but when he says we were ill-advised in raising the duty he was in error, because we do not propose in this matter to change the tariff. This proposal is only to take the words "cotton cordage" out of the items which bear one and a quarter cent per pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, and to make it a separate item, leaving a duty of 30 per cent. The cordage referred to by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and others, still remains as it was under the old tariff. Whether that is advisable or not, I do not intend to discuss now. I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) would find some difficulty in pointing to any remarks of mine with reference to this item in 1874, for which he said he then denounced the then Minister of Finance. I do not think it requires me to say to those who have known me, and who know the views I entertain on trade questions, that I always spoke in favor of a protective tariff; whether that was right or wrong I will not discuss now, but if I did speak on the tariff in those days, it must have been on general principles. I am certain I said nothing about imposing a duty on cordage.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister does not perhaps remember the occasion, but it was when it was supposed that my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright) was going to bring down a tariff increasing the duty generally, and when his leader then was prepared, as it was well known, for a speech either way.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not know that. Not my leader.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes; and the leader of the party, practically; that is the present High Commissioner. He then denounced the Government of which I was a supporter for having entered the thin end of the wedge of protection. I do not remember having heard my hon. friend the Minister of Customs taking exception to the views then pronounced by Sir Charles Tupper. The question of protection was not then before the country, and it was only in their extremity, finding that they could not get the ear of the country in any other way, and at a time of extreme depression, that the Conservative party announced their National Policy, and that the hopes that they held out to the employés and to the mechanics, and to the laborers generally, that they were going to reap a great advantage from such a policy, placed them in the position they hold to-day. My remarks which were objected to by the Minister of Customs were to the effect that I thought he had been ill-advised in increasing the duties on articles such as beef, pork and flour, which the fishermen were obliged to purchase and which they could not raise. If the Government required an increased revenue from these articles, I thought it was time that they should consider the whole question of the National Policy and not burden these poor people with further heavy taxes. The hon. gentleman and his friends took exception to a duty of 5 per cent. on cordage when the Liberal Government was in power; and I think that can be proved by reference to the debates of the House at that time. The hon. gentleman has gone back on the principles of himself and his party from that time down to the present, and he has gone on imposing duties on a class of goods which bears very heavily on the poor fishermen who cannot afford it. His last proposal, to put a duty on beef and pork, is another illustration of this, which the hon. gentleman cannot deny. Unless he is going to amend this tariff, and allow them to have beef and pork at a lower rate, he cannot get over the dilemma he is in, that he is now proposing to put very heavy burdens on the shoulders of a class of people who cannot afford it.

Mr. BOWELL. It is very singular that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), with all his knowledge, cannot understand what I stated. The last remarks he made were, that I was imposing additional burdens on the people who use this cordage. I have already explained that there is no change in the rate of duty on this article. It remains the same. It is somewhat singular logic for one of the leaders of the Opposition to accuse me of having gone back on my principles, and then in the same breath to say that I increased the tariff still higher than before. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House as long ago as 1869 he would know that one of the first speeches I made in this House—whether it had any effect or not I will not discuss—was in favor of protection, and I complimented Sir Alexander Galt, then Minister of Finance, on the course he had pursued in placing a duty on woollens, and especially on blankets, which induced the manufacture of them in this country to a very large extent, and which caused them to take the place of the article previously imported from Europe.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What year did you say?

Mr. BOWELL. 1869.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood you to say 1879.

Mr. BOWELL. Yet the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) tells me I have gone back on my principles. I, individually, have always advocated the principle of protection ever since I knew anything of politics. I am not going to argue the question whether I am right or wrong, or whether my hon. friend who sits opposite me, who is a free trader pure and simple, is wrong. But whether I

am right or wrong, the charge of going back on the principle does not lie at my door. I hold the same views on this question I have always held, and I state from long experience—although it may be ridiculed—that the putting on of a high duty upon many articles will reduce their price.

Mr. McMULLEN. Pshaw.

Mr. BOWELL. It may not reduce it in the first instance, but experience in this country has taught us that the competition among the different manufacturers has reduced the price on most of the articles that are manufactured in the country to-day, and that they are manufactured in the country now, notwithstanding the tariff, and sold at as low a rate—many of them—as they are in the United States.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, not at all.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be impossible for the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to keep his mouth closed for at least five minutes when any one is speaking, while he indulges in talking himself for two or three hours at a time. If he will learn to act with ordinary courtesy, we will end our discussion in a much better spirit. He should allow us at least to finish our remarks. I do not expect to convert him, because that would be an impossibility, and I have not that power. He is too fixed in his opinions, but I listen to him with all the attention I possibly can, but if he can show me I am wrong I will be glad to acknowledge it. I rose to resent the assertion of the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that I, now or on any other occasion so far as trade is concerned at all events, have gone back on the principles I held.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope, and I rather incline to think, that the Minister of Customs is generally more accurate in matters of detail than he has shown himself now. The House will observe, that the hon. gentleman says he complimented Sir Alexander Galt, in 1869, for putting on increased duties on woollens.

Mr. BOWELL. No; previous to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You were not in Parliament previous to 1867.

Mr. BOWELL. But he introduced a Tariff Act, putting on a duty on woollens, before I came into Parliament. It was for this I complimented him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood you to say that in 1869 you complimented Sir Alexander Galt in this Parliament. Now in 1869, the tariff had been reduced to a uniform rate of 15 per cent. or thereabouts, and the First Minister of this Dominion took occasion, in my hearing, to state that he was extremely glad to see that the tariff had been reduced from 20 per cent. or thereabouts, to 15 per cent., and that this was a forward step in the direction of assimilating our policy to the enlightened and generous policy which prevailed in Great Britain. Those were the sentiments entertained, I will not say by the hon. Minister of Customs' leader in 1869, because in 1869, or at any rate in 1870, the hon. gentleman was kicking over the traces and objecting, in common with myself, very strongly to the induction of the then Finance Minister, Sir Francis Hincks.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not wish to enter into what the hon. gentleman's views were, when he first entered Parliament, whether they were protectionist or not. What I have endeavored to press upon him is this, that the people who have to pay this 30 per cent. on cordage are a very poor class, who ought to get some relief. The hon. gentleman draws a herring across the track to avoid a specific answer to my question, by speaking of something I never referred to at all. He answers some of the gentlemen who have spoken on this by saying that he has not increased the duty on this item at all. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) tells us that in the changes which have been made in these 350 odd items, nineteen-twentieths of them are increases. Is it any virtue to say that he has not increased the duty on this article? No; but the lack of virtue consists in knowing the difficulties of the industry and not reducing the duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. I just wish to say, in reply to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who compares the price of binding twine in Canada with the price in the United States, that if he does not know, he ought to know, that in the United States last year there was a combine in binding twine. Do we want to encourage combines here? We are doing it. There is a combine in this country now in binding twine, as there is in the United States. But for that combine, binding twine could be sold at 11 cents a pound in the United States, whereas it was sold at 17 cents a pound, and the manufacturers of Canada combined and put it up to the same price here. I know that binding twine was imported from the United States last year, and after paying the duty of 25 per cent., was sold cheaper than the Canadian twine. That is a legitimate outcome of the National Policy which we have in this country, and which they have in the United States. But you may preach to the Minister of Customs for a month to show him the pernicious character of his policy, and you make no impression on him whatever, simply because he is blindly attached to it. You might as well try to shampoo an elephant with a thimbleful of soap-suds.

Cotton denims, drillings, bed-tickings, ginghams, plaids, cotton or canton flannels, flannelettes, cotton tennis cloth, or striped zephyrs, ducks and drills dyed or colored, checked and striped shirtings, cottonades, Kentucky jeans, pantaloon stuffs, and goods of like description, 2 cents per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BOWELL. This is the old item, with the following words added: "flannelettes, cotton tennis cloth, or striped zephyrs." They were formerly rated under this heading at some ports, but at others they were passed at different rates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state the lowest rate and the highest per square yard at which these goods are invoiced?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that these articles will range from 8 or 9 cents to 25 cents a yard.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would make a difference of from 20 to 40 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is another evidence of the pernicious operation of this specific duty. The cheaper kinds of these goods are used by the poorer classes for dress goods, and the better kind is used for making pantaloons and ginghams for dresses for children, and it is unfair to impose 2

cents a yard on these goods without reference to their value. It gives an advantage to the rich class over the poor class. I do not think we should lose any opportunity to point out the pernicious effects of this system, which strike in every case at the poorer article. I suppose that is done because the poorer qualities are made in this country.

Mr. BOWELL. They are all made here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then why put on this specific duty? If they are all made here, the specific duty is not necessary; the *ad valorem* duty is quite enough.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty was put on in order to protect the manufacturers, and since the protection has been given they have established their mills, and all these articles are now manufactured in Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. If they are, the specific duty is not necessary.

Collars of cotton, linen or celluloid, 24 cents per dozen and 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an enormous duty, ranging from 60 to 66 per cent., and on the lowest class it must reach 100 per cent. The same observations are applicable to it as to the duty on collars. Why is there such an enormous departure in these particular articles from the general rate? Are there any manufacturers which the hon. gentleman thinks specially deserving of encouraging, and how many are there, if any? It seems to me outrageous that the whole people should be taxed for the benefit of one or two manufacturers, who cannot employ very many hands.

Mr. BOWELL. This was classed among the tariff items in 1882, with the object of protecting the manufacturers, and all I am now doing is adding the two words, "celluloids" and "xylonite."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the protection given is out of all proportion to that given in other articles, and there ought to be some special reason for such extraordinary protection.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know of any. It is simply for protection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But, surely, a protection of 100 per cent., or even 60 per cent., is most monstrous on an article in ordinary use. A protection of 35 is bad enough, in all conscience.

Hammocks and lawn tennis nets and other like articles manufactured of twine, N.E.S., 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BOWELL. These were not enumerated under the old tariff, but were rated at 25 per cent. and the twine 5 per cent., so that really the article out of which they were made bore a higher rate of duty than the manufactured article. We have given a special rate of 5 per cent. above the article out of which it is made.

Drain pipes, sewer pipes, chimney linings or vents, and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed, earthenware tiles, 35 per cent, *ad valorem.*

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Does this include drain tiles?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is drain tiling exempted?

Mr. BOWELL. It is provided for in the old tariff, and has not been interfered with. The only change we have made by this item is to add chimney linings or vents, inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed, and earthenware tiles. There is no change in the rate, except in one or two articles, which is at 25 per cent.

Feathers, viz.: Ostrich and vulture, undressed, 15 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. McMULLEN. You should increase the duty on that which will bear a duty, and take it off something else. The hon. gentleman admits this kind of thing at 15 per cent., and charges 35 per cent. on a pair of common cuffs which a poor woman has to wear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Vulture feathers belong properly to the combines, and must be lightly taxed.

Apples, 40 cents per barrel.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We import a few barrels, but for every barrel that comes in from the United States we export more than two. If we put 40 cents a barrel on these apples, it is only human nature to suppose that the United States will put the same duty on our apples, so it will be fulfilment of the old adage, that a man may cut off his nose in order to spite his face. Last year the Province of Ontario imported 14,162 barrels of apples, and exported to the United States 119,504 barrels, or nearly twelve times as much as that Province imported. It is interesting to note the reason why the people of Ontario import these few barrels of apples. There are early apples which ripen in the Southern States long before any apples are ripened in Ontario. Is there anything particularly wrong in our having a few ripened apples brought in before we have any of our own? Then, Quebec last year imported 31,096 barrels of apples. A large portion of the Province of Quebec is not fitted for raising apples, and I would ask if there is any reason for taxing the people there 40 cents a barrel on the small quantity of apples which they import. Nova Scotia has also been a sinner in this respect. That Province imported 3,370 barrels from the United States, but they exported 19,997 to the United States. They imported those apples for the same reason as the Province of Ontario did. The apples ripen earlier in the United States than in Nova Scotia. Is there anything wrong in the people of Nova Scotia desiring to have a few early apples before their own are ready to use? Nova Scotia is one of the best apple-growing countries on the face of the earth, and that Province has sent back to the United States six barrels of apples for every one which it has imported. New Brunswick, some parts of which are not fitted for the raising of this kind of fruit, imported 9,609 barrels. Is there any sense in making the poor people there pay 40 cents a barrel on these apples? It is the same thing in regard to other Provinces. This is a fair illustration of the way in which this tariff is going to work. This might be looked upon as a small matter, but it must be taken into consideration as a part of the system which the Government has adopted of endeavoring to force the United States to refuse to us reciprocity in these natural products. I need not point out to the House that the Government has gone back on its principles in this matter. In 1879, when the Government in-

augurated the National Policy, the reason given was that they wanted to force the United States into a reciprocity in trade, and that, if they did not succeed in that, they would have a reciprocity in tariffs. Their main object was, as they said, to obtain reciprocity in trade, and they inserted a clause in the Act providing that, whenever the Americans threw off duties on natural products, Canada would do the same. I need not point out how loath the Government were to carry out the law which they themselves had passed, but it was only after we had been exporting to the United States these articles free of duty for some time that they threw off the duty on apples and other natural products which the United States had admitted free. Now, however, the Government have thrown off the mask and have declared that they believe that reciprocity in natural products would be detrimental to this country. They are trying to provoke the Americans to reprisals, and to compel them to lay duties on these articles. I have pointed out that for every barrel of apples we import, we export two. The Government are trying to compel the Americans to charge twice as much on what we export as the amount charged on what we import. This is a fair sample of the system of protection. It is taking $2 out of one pocket to put $1 into the other. I suppose this is called statesmanship, but if a private individual were to follow that course, sure and certain ruin would be the result, unless in the meantime his friends took the matter into their own hands and confined him in a lunatic asylum.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. This item was placed on the free list some few years ago. Why has that been changed? Last year we imported 78,798 barrels of apples, at a cost of $128,782, and exported to the United States 144,618 barrels, which brought us the amount of $230,208. It is clear that trade has been to our advantage, and I cannot see why we should return to the old duty. Is it not to be feared that a retaliatory duty may be imposed upon our apples, the exportation of which brings us more money than we pay for those which we import. I know that people in some villages on the Richelieu River, and other places, get their living by importing apples from the United States, which they transport to the interior portions of the Province of Quebec, where they sell them. Some apples of this kind are very cheap in the United States; but with this specific duty of 40 cents a barrel, it will kill that trade altogether, because the duty per bushel will be more than the price paid for the apples. I think, therefore, it is clear that this duty will ruin that trade with the United States, and injure the country on the whole, more than it would benefit it.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to add to that item the following words as an amendment: "including the duty on the barrel," in order that the package clause may not be applied to the place where imported. As the House is aware, packages containing articles bearing a specific duty, are also rated at 20 per cent.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much revenue are you going to lose by it?

Mr. BOWELL. We got no revenue before, and I do not suppose we will lose by it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Coming, as I do, from a section of the country where a very large number of agriculturists have extensive orchards, and where extensive exportations of apples are made every year to the United States, I think it my duty to protest against placing this duty upon apples, because, as was stated by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), it must be borne in mind that by this action we are inviting the Government of the United States to retaliate and place a duty upon apples which are exported from this country into the United States. It must be evident to every man of common sense that by this duty we are injuring the farming community of this country who are extensively engaged in the production of apples, because, throughout the Niagara district and in the counties west, a great many farmers are engaged almost exclusively in the growing of apples, and they find the United States market the most profitable market in which to sell their apples. Why, Sir, it is a common thing in the fall of the year, in apple time, to find American buyers coming into every county and every township in the section of the country where I live, and buying up the whole produce of a farm in the apple line; therefore, I say it will be a direct injury to the farmers of the country to have this duty imposed upon apples. It has been shown by the hon. member for West Middlesex that we export double the quantity of apples that we import, and if the Americans retaliate and place a duty upon our apples going into their country, we put by this item a direct tax upon the farmers of this country; we injure them to the extent of this duty for the simple reason that we would be unable to export our apples on the same terms as we formerly did. I say on behalf of the farmers of this country, who are largely interested in the production of apples, that this is an imposition upon them which the Government should abstain from making. It is well known that the farmers cannot be protected like the manufacturers. The manufacturers can be protected; they have been protected, and the Government of this country know that they have been protected, from the fact that they have on many occasions received assistance from the manufacturers of this country in order to enable them to carry the elections. We know that funds have been subscribed largely by the manufacturers' association of the country in order to bolster up this protectionist Government. Only the other day, in the city of Toronto, at the annual meeting of the manufacturers' association, I observed that the fees have been raised to $25 from $10, which they formerly were. What do they do with these fees? What does the manufacturers' association of this country require these fees for? I say these fees are levied upon the manufacturers throughout the length and breadth of this land, not for legitimate purposes in connection with their organisation, but for the purpose of creating an election fund for the support of this protectionist Government. When an opportunity is offered to the Government to refrain from an injury to the farming community of this country, which will induce the Americans, in whose country we find a market for a large portion of our apples, to put on a duty equal to the duty that we impose upon their apples coming into this country, I say no man who has the interest of the farming

community at heart will support the Government in this monstrous proposition.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not surely mean to say that we find a market for the larger portion of our apples in the United States?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. members for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) and for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) have read a statement from the blue book published by the Government, which is the authority for the statement which I make.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 676 he will find that we sent from the different Provinces last year of apples, green or ripe, 144,618 barrels to the United States, and he will find on page 675 that we sent to Great Britain 619,217 barrels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to say, you send twice as many to the United States as you imported from them. I fail to see how that meets my hon. friend's argument as to the extreme folly of imposing a duty here. The fact that we send a large number of apples to England does not in the slightest degree affect my hon. friend's argument that when we only buy one-half as many from the United States as we send there, it is a very foolish thing to tax them.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be very foolish, but the statement was made positively that the United States was the principal market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. BOWELL. I say it was. That was the only point to which I referred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was not my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. BOWELL. It was precisely his statement; I think I did not misunderstand him. When I pointed out that there were three times as many barrels and more, nearly five times as many barrels, sent to England as to the United States, it was simply to show that England was the principal market for the product of Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. My contention was based upon the export of apples from the section of the country I come from, in the Province of Ontario. When I commenced my remarks I spoke of the section of the country I come from. Everybody who knows anything about the apple-growing district of the Province of Ontario, knows that a large portion of the apples exported from that section go to the United States. I do not pretend to say that the larger proportion of the whole country go to the United States. I was only speaking of the section of the country where I live.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is equally wrong in that statement.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is wrong again. If he would look at the exports from Ontario he will find that there were 80,000 barrels more sent to England than to the United States.

Mr. BOYLE. I do not think it is a reasonable thing that we should be deterred from protecting our fruit-growers by the fear that the Americans will put a retaliatory duty upon apples. As the Finance Minister stated the other day, we are now endeavoring to build up a national policy irrespective of the United States, and this holding up our hands in horror, in fear that the Americans may do something if we do something, I think is unworthy of the Canadian Parliament. In reference to the export of apples, I find, from an American almanac, figures given for the year 1888, showing that of the apples which the Americans imported from us not one barrel was entered for consumption, but all were for export again. Moreover, the United States itself is an exporting country for apples. They exported, in 1888, 487,000 barrels to other countries, so we cannot look for any live market there for our apples. The 144,000 barrels exported from Canada to the United States were bought by speculators to be reshipped to England, so if the Americans do put a duty on our apples, it will only have the effect of increasing the trade between this country and Great Britain direct, instead of through American buyers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Since the removal of the duty two years ago, our apple trade has gone up by leaps and bounds. Instead of our apples being sent to the United States for purposes of exportation, they have gone to Chicago and the western market. If the duty is not reimposed, we will have an exceedingly large trade in that direction; but if we impose this duty, the trade next year will be less than for the last two years.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where are the apples consumed in the United States that go from the Niagara district and from the County of Huron.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. A great many apples are sent from my district to the Western States. A friend of mine two years ago sent 5,000 barrels to Denver, Colorado, where they were sold for at the rate of five apples for 25 cents. The Minister of Customs defends the imposition of the duty on the ground that we send more apples to Great Britain than to the United States. It is a very childish argument that, because we send a great quantity to Great Britain, we must destroy our American market. It is part of the Government's policy of endeavoring to cut off all intercourse between us and our best customers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I repeat it. Our aggregate trade with Great Britain was equal to $80,500,000, while that with the United States reached over $94,000,000. I insist that the Government have taken a step calculated to destroy our trade with the United States. One year the Government are endeavoring to negotiate a commercial treaty with Spain; another year with France; another year are sending delegates and samples of goods to Australia; another year we are sending to Cuba and subsidising steamers to establish a little trade with the West India Islands, while at the same time we are endeavoring by every means in our power to destroy the great market that lies at our doors. The men who are guilty of such a policy are fit candidates for a lunatic asylum.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Our exports of apples from Ontario to Great Britain reached 199,000 barrels, and to the United States 119,504 barrels.

Mr. CARLING. How many did we import from the United States?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. 14,000 barrels.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I speak for my section of the country, and I repeat that our American

neighbors come in and buy our apples and take them to the United States. Even admitting that we export more barrels to Great Britain than to the United States, from Ontario, I say that this change in the tariff will be a direct injury to our people, who, for years past, have sold their apples in the United States; for I utterly fail to understand how the Government expect to benefit our farmers by attempting to destroy a market in the United States for 119,504 barrels of Ontario apples every year, and smaller quantities from the other Provinces. We are destroying the market of our apple growers, and we are not offering any benefit to the farmers for the injury we are inflicting.

Mr. TAYLOR. How are we taking away the market for our apples? The markets still remain. So far as we are concerned, we are not interfering with the markets, for the Americans can come in here and buy our apples. We are simply legislating for Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These remarks are made by a gentleman who is retaliating against the labor laws of the United States. This is the gentleman who set himself up to defy the United States Government on the St. Lawrence River; this is the gentleman which is now engaged in an enquiry to ascertain what we can do to prevent American labor coming into Canada. He promises this House that the United States Government is going to stand idly by and see this Government impose a duty of 40 cents a barrel and not retaliate. Americans are like Canadians, and if we are going to retaliate, they are going to retaliate in turn and we may expect nothing else.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have as good a right to retaliate as have the Americans, and the hon. gentleman says the Americans will, no doubt, put a duty on apples going in from Canada. The Americans, by their Alien Labor Act, have prevented laborers from Canada crossing the line and working in the United States, and yet residing in Canada. I have here documents to show that at Point Edward twenty-six families were added to the exodus, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and other hon. gentlemen opposite are, no doubt, glad to see taking place every other day, on this account.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why do you not issue a proclamation against it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The exodus is going on, simply because the United States say their Act provides that Canadians living in Canada cannot perform work over the line. Yet the hon. gentleman finds fault because I want Americans to be placed on the same footing as Canadians, and to say that Americans resident in the United States cannot perform work in Canada. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will support my Bill at the proper time. He does not want to cringe to the United States or to any other country. We want fair play in labor as well as in apples.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We do not want to cringe to the United States, but we do not want to induce them to retaliate, and to impose a duty upon an article we desire to export to that country; and it is interfering with the interests of our farmers to impose this tax on apples coming into Canada, in the retaliation which must follow by the United States Government putting a similar duty on apples sent in there. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is not the man, who in the committee was proven to be one of the sinners engaged in employing American labor in his carriage factory at Gananoque. I am not a member of that committee; but I understand, from a gentleman who is a member, that the only evidence which was produced before that committee, with regard to the employment of alien labor, was to the effect that the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was the only man in Gananoque, or in that neighborhood, who employed American labor; and yet he gets up in this House and talks his patriotic sentiments about keeping Canada for the Canadians—he, the very man, who is chairman of that committee, and who is actually the guilty party. He is the only man who is proven before that committee to be guilty of actually employing alien labor in his own factory.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just want to say to the hon. gentleman that that statement is untrue. We do employ in the factory belonging to the company of which I have the honor of being president, some four families who have removed over from the United States. They were Irishmen by birth, and were not American citizens at all. They came from the United States, engaged with us; removed their families to this side of the line, and added to the population of Canada, and they have resided in Canada since the three years we have been running our factory. That is bringing the exodus the right way, and not doing, as my hon. friend wants to do—forcing the people from Canada to the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt, my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), has read the fable of the wolf and the lamb, for he is now playing the part of the wolf. He has told us that if we dare to put on this 40 cents a barrel duty on apples, the Americans will retaliate. Why, the McKinley Bill, which proposes a duty of 25 cents a bushel on apples, was a week or ten days before Congress, before the Finance Minister made his Budgets peech. The hon. gentleman is, therefore, accusing the lamb of mudding the water up the stream, though he is far up the stream. At the same time it would be just as well for hon. gentlemen opposite to state facts as they exist, and not to be accusing the Government of adopting a policy which may lead our neighbors to take another course, which might be, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) argues, injurious to us. From the facts before us we know that the proposition to put a duty on apples was made to Congress before we propounded our tariff at all. I have just one word to say to my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) who is generally fair in anything he says. He attributed to me certain remarks which I never uttered. I said nothing whatever on the point to which he referred. It was a creation of his own mind, and he set up a little man and knocked him down again most valiantly. The only object I had in rising, was to point out what I really did say, without any argument, apart from the statement, which was that the figures given in reference to the exportation of apples were not correct, in accordance with the trade returns. I made no argument.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You scarcely ever do.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not necessary when referring to you. If I were replying to the hon. gentleman who has interrupted, I might say it is impossible to reply to any arguments when he speaks, because he never utters any.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is evident from what the Minister of Customs has said that the House can easily discern why this duty of 40 cents a barrel has been placed upon apples. He has told us that the Tariff Bill, now under consideration in the United States, provides that there is to be a duty of 25 cents a bushel on apples going into the United States, and this paternal Government of ours, feeling and dreading that the United States Government would get the start of them, and put on this duty before they could succeed in putting it on, have made up their minds that they should put a duty of 40 cents a barrel on apples before the United States Government have passed this proposed law. I maintain that is no justification for this Government putting on this duty. The United States Government have not as yet legalised or passed that tariff, and it is doubtful whether it will be passed. I think that this Government have shown undue haste in endeavoring to retaliate against the United States, before the United States has sanctioned this duty which the Minister of Customs talks about, as likely to be imposed on our apples going into that country. I hold that this is a very ill-advised act on the part of the Canadian Government and that it is not in the interests of the farmers or of the apple growers of this country. I fancy that when the time comes the apple growers of this country will tell the Government that this duty is not in their interest.

Mr. CARLING. I would say to the hon. gentleman that the quantity of apples imported into Canada from the United States, last year, was 70,000 barrels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know that; it has been stated six or seven times already.

Mr. CARLING. It was stated by an hon. gentleman that the import was only 30,000 barrels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The other figures were given half a dozen times over.

Mr. CARLING. You might have known it, but the House generally did not seem to know it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would just wish to say to the Minister of Customs, who accused me of misrepresenting him, that if I did misrepresent him I had no intention of doing so.

Mr. BOWELL. I believe that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If I have done it I am sorry for it. The Minister of Customs made a statement just now that the McKinley Bill is before Congress. I wish to ask him if he is well advised on that fact, and if it has been reported upon by the Committee of Ways and Means?

Mr. BOWELL. I find the whole tariff in the New York *Tribune*. I will look and see what it says in regard to it. Perhaps some of the hon. gentleman's colleagues who have been down to Washington, can give more information on this point than I can.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it the Minister of Marine and Fisheries you refer to?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not believe it was possible that we should have a Canadian statesman, or one who calls himself so, so excessively ill-advised as to the constitution and practices of the United States, as to use such an argument. It is an exhibition of most gross ignorance on the part of any man in Canada, who calls himself a statesman, not to know more, or appear to know more, of the usages of the United States Congress in dealing with these matters, than members on our Treasury benches appear to do. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Customs ought to know—and if he does not, I should think that any child in our schools who has had the opportunity of receiving an ordinary common school education, could tell him—that the Constitution of the United States is so wholly different from ours that the action of any of their committees, whether it be of Ways or Means or any other, bears not the slightest resemblance to the action of himself and his colleagues in now bringing this matter before our House. The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Chairman. A proposition to amend the United States' tariff by the Ways and Means Committee of Congress can be in no respect put in comparison to the action of the Canadian Government in bringing down a proposition to this House on their own responsibility. Prior to the action of the Government in this matter, the chances were a thousand to one that the McKinley Bill as it now stands—and particularly that part of it that affects us—would have no chance of passing. There were strong interests which were opposed to the McKinley Bill; there are still considerable interests which are opposed to it; but, Sir, the action of these gentlemen opposite has enormously strengthened the hands of the men who would like—I will not say to deliberately injure our commerce—but to pass measures which will be exceedingly injurious to the best interests of a very large number of the producers of Canada. Until this Government had acted, until this Government had introduced these retaliatory measures—for such they are, on their authority and on their responsibility, there was a very good chance indeed that these items in the McKinley tariff would not pass. I hope they will not pass even as it is, but I tell you that the hon. Minister of Customs and his colleagues have done all that mortal men could do to imperil our trade of $94,000,000 with the United States, and to induce the United States Congress to pass the almost prohibitory clauses contained in the McKinley Bill; and in so doing they and their supporters are in the highest degree traitors to the best interests of the Dominion of Canada, especially the interests of the agricultural classes.

Mr. BOWELL. The usual flight of oratory and indignation has been exhibited to-night by the hon. member for South Oxford, and the usual epithets have been thrown across the House of utter ignorance of the constitutions of the United States and Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite correct.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is getting almost as bad as the gentleman behind him; ignorance, presumption, and almost every other epithet, is constantly being thrown across the House by that hon. gentleman. I am inclined to think that he is under the impression that the whole knowledge of the world is concentrated in his own cranium. I have no objection to his thinking that, or to his accusing

me of ignorance, whether political or otherwise; it is a matter of very little consequence to me. If he thinks it is not beneath his dignity to indulge in epithets of that kind, we on this side can afford to accept them for whatever they are worth. If the McKinley Bill is no indication of the feeling of the people of the United States, or of the feeling of Congress or the House of Representatives, how is it that he and his friends have been continually hurling across the House, the fact that a Mr. Hitt, with whom it has been said the hon. gentleman has been in close communication for some time past, has introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives affirming the principle of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, or whatever he calls the fad? Is he so ignorant of the constitution of the United States, as not to know that the mere introduction of a resolution—and any member of Congress can introduce such a resolution—is not an expression of the feelings and intentions of the people of the United States until it has actually passed or become law? Yet the hon. gentleman has told this House and the country, over and over again, that that is an expression of the feeling of Congress, that they are extending the olive branch to us, and that we should accept it, when in fact it is of no more effect than the McKinley Bill. Let the hon. gentleman put the cap on if it fits him. The McKinley Bill is as much an opinion of the people of the United States, while it is before the Committee of Ways and Means, as the resolution of Mr. Hitt is. He can indulge in his epithets just as long as he pleases; all I can do is to commend him to the people when he appeals to them again, when he can hurl them forth with just as glib a tongue as he has done so often in the past, and I venture the prediction that the result will be just what the past result has been of such speeches, and epithets, and language, on his part towards gentlemen who happen to differ from him on the trade question or any other question. I am quite willing to be styled a thief, as he insinuated the other night, or to be called ignorant of the constitution of the United States, or anything else that pleases him. I admit that I had not the early advantages which the hon. gentleman had; but I am not prepared to admit that I do not understand the constitution of the United States and the constitution of Canada just as well as he does, with all his advantages and all the wealth with which he is surrounded. I am quite willing, so long as it pleases, that he should continue to accuse us of ignorance, presumption, audacity, thievery, and everything else he chooses, and leave the people to judge between us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is tolerably aware that I shall use just such language as I please within the limits of parliamentary rule, and if you find me out of order you will not find me unwilling to retract; but I am perfectly within the limits of parliamentary order in describing the hon. gentleman and his colleagues as manifesting the most gross ignorance of the constitution of the United States, and I repeat the statement. What did the hon. gentleman say? Why, he compared these propositions brought down by the responsible government of Canada with the propositions advanced by a particular committee of Congress. I did not say that

the resolution passed by the Committee of Congress had no weight; but I pointed out that that resolution, in the stage to which it had advanced, was utterly inadequate ground or reason for any action being taken by this Parliament. Ours is a cabinet government, as the hon. gentleman I suppose knows, or ought to know, while theirs is a presidential government.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that, of course.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging from the language he used in reply to the hon. member for Brant, I supposed, and I had a right to suppose, that the hon. Minister of Customs was entirely ignorant of the fundamental differences between our Government and that of the United States. The point is this, and the hon. gentleman has not attempted to meet it. An ordinary Tariff Bill, such as that now before the United States Congress, is subject to perpetual and constant modification; and I point out to this House, but more especially to the people of this country, whose interests are going to be most prejudicially affected by just such clauses as this under discussion, that if these gentlemen had held their hands, if they had not wantonly challenged to retaliation the people of the United States, there was a strong probability that the adverse interests in the United States, which would be more or less affected by the passage of this McKinley tariff, would have put such obstacles in its way that it would never have got through. I tell these hon. gentlemen that by their most imprudent, their most insane folly, because it amounts to that, they are, by every clause of this kind, putting the strongest possible arguments in the hands of those persons, whoever they are, who wish to injure the trade of Canada with the United States, to enable them to enforce all the oppressive prohibitory measures contained in the McKinley tariff. If the hon. gentlemen had possessed any sort of proper appreciation of their position, they would have waited at least until the McKinley Bill had passed one House of Congress. Had they then chosen to pass retaliatory measures, there might have been some show of propriety for them, though we might have doubted their wisdom; but they have been guilty of an extreme lack of statesmanship, and I shall repeat here and on every hustings if need be, that if our barley trade, our egg trade, and our whole trade of $94,000,000 with the United States is destroyed, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues more than all others will be responsible for it and the injury that will follow, by their foolish conduct in inciting the people of the United States to a war of tariffs.

Mr. COLBY. I do not think the hon. Minister of Customs endeavored to give, or thought of giving, this House any exposition of constitutional law, either as regards Canada or the United States. He has simply mentioned the fact that the McKinley Bill had been published to the world before the propositions which have been submitted by the Minister of Finance were made known. He did not attempt to say that the McKinley Bill was in any sense in the position of a measure brought down by a Cabinet Minister under our system of constitutional government; he did not go into that feature of the case, but simply stated the fact as it is, and that gave an opportunity to the hon.

gentleman—an opportunity of which he availed himself with a good deal of eagerness—to rise, and, with real or simulated indignation, attempt to sit upon the Minister of Customs. Well, the Minister of Customs is a very knotty stick to sit upon, and any gentleman who attempts to sit upon him will not usually find that he is occupying a very comfortable seat; and I do not think that gentleman, or any other gentleman who goes out of his way deliberately to sit upon the Minister of Customs, will be any the more comfortable or happy for having done so. But this is quite aside from the mark. The hon. gentleman has told us that he proposes to declare in this House, and upon every platform in the country, that if this McKinley Bill becomes law this Government will be responsible, because of the tariff they introduced. That may be very good party tactics, very good partisan talk, but there is not one single word of truth or one particle of common sense in it, and nothing will convince the reasoning men of this country that it is anything more than simple political clap-trap. The McKinley Bill is the deliberate outcome of the strong sentiment which governs the minds of the dominant party in the United States, and whether that party change the tariff this session or not does not depend in the slightest degree upon the action of this Government. That Bill will be carried or defeated, just as members of Congress deem it to be for the advantage or not of the people of the United States, without any reference to us. No subject has occupied the serious attention of the public men of the United States, for the past year or two so much as the unfortunate condition of the agricultural classes in the Eastern and Northern States in the Union. I took the opportunity, the other evening, of referring to the condition of the farmers in the State of Vermont, and hon. gentlemen opposite resented that comparison, because, they said, Vermont was not a fairly representative agricultural State. Well, I would refer them to the State of New York, where, according to the report of the State agent, real estate has depreciated thirty-three per cent. in the last ten years. It is a fact well known and undisputed, that, in the Eastern and Northern States of the Union, there is most serious depression. Party men will attribute that to one cause or the other, but the thinking men of the United States are of opinion that this depression is the result of causes which could not be controlled by any fiscal policy whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Flies on the wheel.

Mr. COLBY. Flies on the wheel, if you like. It is controlled by a condition of affairs which cannot be remedied. It is the competition of the West with the East; the opening up of new virgin lands in the West, those large cheap farms, and the application of labor-saving machinery, by which one man can do the work of ten men; and it is the low rates of transportation from the West to the East, which have also been reduced three or fourfold within a few years, so that the productions of the Western States are brought as cheaply into New York and Boston as the production from farms less than two hundred miles away. The butter from Iowa comes into New York and Boston in refrigerator cars, as cheaply as butter from the State of Vermont in the ordinary car, and in far better condition, and the cheap corn in the West controls the prices of grain in the East. It is from that competition that these eastern farmers are suffering. It is inevitable; it is regrettable, but it cannot be prevented. The local market, which was an excellent market a few years ago to those in proximity to the large manufacturing towns and cities, has lost its advantage, because the farmer in the West has as cheap and almost as quick access to it as the farmers in the East. This condition of affairs is exciting every farmer in the Eastern and Northern States, but besides that fierce competition which he must meet from the West, he has also to meet the milder competition from the Canadian farmers in the markets of New England and New York, and along the border, and he says it is quite enough to be compelled to be subjected to the inevitable competition of his own people without being subjected to the competition of the Canadian farmer. In the exercise of their rights they call upon the legislature of their country to defend them from that competition, competition of a milder form, but still competition from the Canadian farmer. They are represented in the cabinet by Mr. Blaine, by Mr. Proctor of Vermont, and in the Senate by Mr. Edmunds, by Senator Morrill, the author of the Morrill Tariff, and by Mr. Frye. They have an able body of influential men representing them, who will defend their interest, and it is that sentiment which has caused agricultural protection to be a leading feature in the McKinley tariff. Whether we did or not change our tariff, their course would be the same. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken ought to know the United States very well. He visits it sometimes; he studies in it sometimes; he visits New York and Washington; and I appeal to him to tell me whether any large portion of the people of the United States really take an interest in the tariff as between Canada and the United States? Does California care a rap what tariff exists between us? Do Colorado, Texas, the Southern States feel any interest in it? Do the Middle States know anything about it? How many of the people of the United States really know what tariff there is between Canada and the United States, outside these people on the border, who feel the competition of Canadian goods in the markets which are already flooded by the products of the West? It is the people who call upon the public men to put a stop to that by a high tariff, and their public men are able, influential men in the Cabinet and in Congress. Hence the McKinley Tariff was a foregone conclusion, and nothing we can do can have any effect either as regards its coming into force or not coming into force. Instead of the people of Canada reproaching the present Government for having foreseen a thing which, I say, was inevitable, they will thank us for not resting without action for a year or two, or three years; they will thank us for foreseeing what anyone who had any judgment might have foreseen, that agricultural protection was about to be adopted in the United States, and for adopting in self-defence protection for our own industries. No truer word has been uttered than the statement of the Finance Minister, when he said that no portion of this tariff, was conceived with any feeling of retaliation. This tariff was matured by the judgment of those who desired to protect the agricultural interest in this community. This Government believes that the farmers of this

country should feed the people of this country, that the farmers of this country should feed the lumbermen of this country, that the farmers of this country should feed the manufacturers of this country. It cannot be disputed that the lumbermen of Canada find the farmers very good customers. What better customers have the lumbermen than the farmers, who are spread all over this broad Dominion, whose buildings are principally constructed of lumber which they have to buy from the lumbermen? Let the lumberman and the manufacturers, who sell so much to the farmer, be willing to reciprocate, and to buy from the farmer as they sell to the farmer; and so give the Canadian farmer the Canadian market. We know that two million dollars worth of pork products comes into this country every year, displacing and crowding out of the market here, what should legitimately be the profit of the Canadian farmer on his own produce. I am speaking generally on this subject, and, consequently, I refer to that particular item as a convenient illustration. I say that this Government has adopted a policy of agricultural protection in the interest of the farmer. Gentlemen on the other side sneer at it. They say we want to placate the farmers by this in order to get their votes. We will not be deterred by sneers of that kind from pursuing the clear path of duty. That path is open to us, and it is to give the Canadian market to the Canadian farmer. We, in Canada, are able to produce all the meat-foods which the people of Canada can consume. Look at the great North-West, with its almost unequalled facilities for the production of food, whether beef or pork, or any other kind. In placing these duties we not only help the people of the North-West alone, but we help every Province in the Dominion and every part of the country, even as far as Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), who is sitting at my side, brought up two carloads of pork from Prince Edward Island to use in his own shanties, and he is intending to buy more from Prince Edward Island. He prefers to buy pork from Prince Edward Island, and from the farmers in the Eastern Townships and in Canada generally, to buying the western corn-fed pork from the United States. I believe this industry will be benefited by the policy of the Government. I believe that the lumbermen of this country are a liberal-minded body of men. I believe that they are perfectly prepared to take their share in the fortunes of this conntry, and I believe that they are willing that the farmer shall have the means to live as well as themselves. I believe that the manufacturers of this country and the workingmen of this country will not complain because we ask them to eat the food which Canada produces—Canada, which is an agricultural country *par excellence*. I only rose to say that I believed that the McKinley Bill, or any other Bill providing for agricultural protection in the United States, was a necessity with the Republican party which is now dominating the United States. That party could not have done anything else if they acted in accordance with their record, and with the policy which they have propounded and supported. If there was a free trade Congress and a free trade Government, and if a free trade sentiment prevailed throughout the United States, some other panacea might have suggested itself to the Government there, but, as public sentiment exists in the United States, this agricultural protective tariff was one of the inevitable and necessary things which must grow out of the present condition of affairs. That may for a time inconvenience us and prove a temporary injury to some interests, but I believe that, in the end, it will prove to be a benefit to the country at large by making us more independent and self-contained, by throwing us more upon our own resources, and by enabling us to become an independent country. If not, if this should have the effect of injuring, not temporarily, but even permanently, some great interests in this country, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are not prepared to whine or complain about it, and to say that the United States are not entitled to do in these matters as they please. It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to look after the interests of the people of that country, and, therefore, it is their duty to pass a Bill, similar to the McKinley Bill, if it is in the interest of the people. It is also our duty to look after the interests of our people. We should not say to the people of the United States that they are doing us an injustice. They are simply doing their duty in the interests of their own country. It is our duty to look after the interests of this country, and if we find foreigners sending in large quantities of produce which can be profitably raised by the farmers of Canada, it is our duty to protect our farmers, and to relieve them from that inconvenience. This tariff was conceived in no spirit of retaliation whatever, but any one might have foreseen what were the predetermined, what were the inevitable results of the election to power of the present party which is dominant in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is quite unnecessary for me to say that I wholly and entirely take issue with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Colby) in every part of his speech; and I tell the hon. gentleman that I believe he knows a great deal better than his political exigencies permit him to state. I believe that he is wholly mistaken in thinking that the McKinley Bill was at all a foregone conclusion, except in so far as the suicidal folly of himself and his colleagues have made it so. Now, Sir, it is just such conduct, it is just such speeches, it is just such a foolish policy as we have had enunciated by a gentleman who ought to have known better, the President of the Council, which has sent, in all human probability, a million of the choicest members of our population from our country to the United States. It is this policy of protection—this suicidal contention with the United States; it is this policy of exorbitant taxes specially directed against the interests of the farmers, as shown by every line of this tariff, not excepting these items we are now discussing, which have caused agriculture in Canada to be less profitable than it ought to be, and which have contributed to send, as I have said, something like one in four of our adult male population, if not one in three, to the United States, quite double and treble the numbers since the hon. gentlemen got into power and the National Policy was inaugurated. The hon. gentleman tells us that the condition of agriculture in the United

States, at any rate in the eastern and northern parts, is extremely deplorable, not being able to perceive, apparently, that if, after 27 years of protection, the condition of United States farmers is so deplorable, as he and his friends state it to be, there never was a stronger argument put forward here or elsewhere against a protective policy than the condition of these favored portions of the United States. The hon. gentleman says that there are certain causes that cannot be controlled. So say we, so say I, and the House cannot have forgotten with what denunciations this very Chamber rang when I told the hon. gentlemen opposite that it was not under all circumstances in the power of the Government to produce prosperity. Sir, they insisted that a Government that could not produce prosperity by Act of Parliament was not worthy to sit on the Treasury benches, and now, Sir, we are told that there are uncontrollable causes. He says there are some causes that are not controllable by the Government of the United States which lead to the present unfortunate position of a large number of the agriculturists. But there were causes which were in the highest degree controllable, and chief and foremost among those causes were the enormous burdens of taxation inflicted in the interest of protected manufacturers on the people of the United States, and though, perhaps in a lesser degree, inflicted in the interest of the combine and of the protected manufacturers, on the agriculturists of Canada. That is a controllable cause, and the hon. gentleman knows it well, and it is to an enormous extent by reason of the plundering tariff in the United States, by reason of the fact that the hard earnings of the people have been wrung from them under the guise of law, to fill the pockets of persons like the hon. gentleman and his friends, and the friends who subsidise him and act as paymasters for himself and the present Government, that the condition of the farmers in the United States is such as he describes it, and the condition of the farmers of Canada is such as I have described it. That is the reason, and that is the controllable cause, and an easily removable cause, and so long as that cause exists, just so long will the condition of the farmers of Canada more and more rapidly approximate to the condition which he has described of the farmers of the United States, until it may well come to pass that the farmers in Canada may be selling land as he tells us the farmers are selling it in the best parts of Vermont for $3 and $5 an acre, with all improvements thrown in. That is the goal to which we are hastening, and in no one way are we hastening towards it faster than by just such enactments as the hon. gentleman is inviting us to put on the Statute-book.

Mr. COLBY. With the advantages of unrestricted reciprocity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unrestricted reciprocity means free trade and the abolition of a large amount of our taxes, and it will bring about to us a vast amount of prosperity. Now, the hon. gentleman, and I thank him for it, the first of all his colleagues, has thrown off the mask. For ten or twelve long years the whole policy of the hon. gentleman and his friends, and their press, has been to persuade the agriculturists of Canada that he and they were most desirous of bringing about reciprocity in natural products, at any rate. Not merely did his colleagues, not merely did his leader, not merely did his press and his followers, but he himself has repeatedly held out this policy as the one best likely to secure the desirable end of reciprocity in natural products, which we heard this hon. gentleman tell us the other night would be an unmixed calamity to the farmers of Canada. Now, Sir, what is the use of all this? The hon. gentleman cannot pretend to say that these additional taxes are put on for revenue, because his colleague, the Finance Minister, has told us that we have a surplus secure for the present year, and for the next year and for the year after. What earthly good will it do our farmers to increase the revenue in this manner? I repeat to him, as I have told him before, that as regards the one article in which perchance a few farmers may obtain the advantage of an additional tax upon pork, it would be infinitely more beneficial to the farmers of Canada if he were to admit, as we have repeatedly asked him to do, corn free to feed the pork, and they would make ten times as much out of that as out of the paltry duty of one or two dollars additional on pork, which pork will be used by the lumbermen, and as the hon. gentleman well knows, and every gentleman here knows the truth of what I am saying, the lumbermen will continue, notwithstanding this increase of duty, to buy the vast portion of their supplies, just as they do now, in the Chicago markets. He knows, and they know, that no greater sham and delusion was ever put on the Statute-book than this duty on pork, in so far as it is declared to be a duty which will benefit our farmers. I tell the hon. gentleman again that so far from this duty helping the farmers, he and his friends are doing all they can to strengthen the hands of those parties in the United States who are clamoring for an increase of duty. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman is very well acquainted with the United States. I do not know whether he was born there; I believe he was educated there, an advantage which did not fall to my lot, and I rather think the hon. gentleman is connected in many and near ways with the United States. He knows very well, and his argument shows it in the clearest possible manner, that this McKinley tariff at the present moment is only supported by a mere fraction of the people of the United States, that a very large number of States take no interest in it. He knows perfectly well that the two parties in Congress are almost equally balanced, that this Bill must pass in all human probability in this Congress, or it will never pass. I believe, to-day, that the Republican party have a bare majority of eight on the floor of the House of Representatives; I doubt if they have even that. That Congress expires this year; their successors are elected, I think, in the month of November. Now, there are many and numerous interests in the United States hostile to this Bill. There are also, as he truly says, certain influential and dexterous politicians who may have a personal interest or a political interest in pushing this Bill through. I appeal to this House. Is it possible for any man to play more directly into the hands of the very gentlemen whom the President of the Council named as being desirous of pushing this Bill through, than for the Cabinet of Canada to introduce these retaliatory resolutions? Why, Sir, out of his mouth he is convicted. He

admits distinctly there is only a small portion of the United States that have an interest in this Bill, that there are a small lot of influential politicians who may desire to bring it about, and he professes to be incapable of seeing how powerful a weapon he is putting into their hands for the purpose of bringing about their object. Now, Sir, I know what I am speaking of, as well as the hon. gentleman, and I tell him this: That no single act could have been brought forward in Parliament less calculated to benefit the farmers of Canada, and more certain to play into the hands of the knot whom he speaks of, and who may desire to put these duties on our products, than the identical provisions of this tariff which we are now considering.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I desire to say a few words in answer to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He says that the President of the Council appears to be acquainted with the people of the United States. I have no doubt the President of the Council is acquainted with the people of the United States, and I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is himself trying to become acquainted with the people of the United States, if all reports speak true. Now, I do not know what objection there is to the President of the Council being acquainted with the people of the United States, and knowing what they are doing. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Oxford how the present resolutions before this House could be the cause of the McKinley Tariff, when the McKinley Tariff was introduced two weeks before these resolutions were introduced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will answer the hon. gentleman's question, if he wishes. I never said this was the cause of the McKinley Tariff, but what I do say in this: If the McKinley Tariff is passed these resolutions will be the cause of it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I believe an intimation was given at Washington as to what course would be pursued by this Government, in order that Congress might so shape their resolutions as to form a policy for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the next general election. To show that this is true, I will read a report sent from Washington, indicating that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as leader of the Reform party in this country, will, when he gets into power, use the Reform party in order to bring about such legislation as will be pleasing to the people of the United States. I find a Washington despatch to the Boston *Globe* as follows:—

"Though the most important of the American neighbors of the United States, Canada is not represented in the Pan-American Congress, that country is embraced in Mr. Blaine's plan. Operating directly through Mr. Hitt, now Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in co-operation with the Liberals or free traders of the Dominion, Mr. Blaine has succeeded in rousing on the other side of the border a tremendous feeling in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, as shown by the vote on that proposition a few days ago in the Canadian Parliament, when the reciprocity party carried their side.

"Sir Richard Cartwright, leader of the Canadian Liberals and the coming Premier of the Dominion if his party can gain ascendancy over the Tories, has within a month or six weeks been in Washington in consultation with Mr. Blaine. The agreement was then reached between the two statesmen that while Mr. Blaine was pushing reciprocity with South and Central America in the Pan-American Conference, Sir Richard Cartwright was to do all in his power to lead Canada up to free trade with the United States."

I think I am justified in saying that the hon. gentleman is well acquainted with the people of the United States; that he knows as much about the legislation, as much about the purposes and desires and future operations of the statesmen of that country, as he knows about the purposes of the statesmen of this country. But I do not think it was a handsome spectacle that while this Parliament was sitting, the hon. gentleman, being accredited by the people of a constituency as their representatives on the floor of this House, should go to Washington and be in free consultation with the statesmen of the United States as to the kind of legislation they should introduce in order to push the people of Canada into passing such legislation as might be conducive to the welfare and prosperity of the people of the United States. We have desired, and for years we have endeavored to bring about reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). That is, a reciprocity based upon such an arrangement as will suit the people of this country, but not unrestricted, undefined and undefinable reciprocity which hon. gentlemen opposite are talking about at present. In what have all our negotiations resulted? What was the result of the negotiations conducted by the late Hon. George Brown when he was accredited to Washington? No attention was paid to him; even his representations were not considered by the House of Representatives or the Senate; he was treated with contempt by the people of the United States.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Never.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I, as a Canadian, have no desire to be placed in that position any longer. We Canadians can live as Canadians by ourselves if the United States do not care to trade with us. It is in no spirit of hostility that this tariff, or any other tariff, has been introduced into this House. It is framed directly in the interests of the people, and, especially, latterly, in the interests of the farmers. This particular item under discussion is placed in the tariff at the desire of the apple growers, who raise apples for the home market, or for export. If this is the desire of the apple growers, which it is, why should not the Government introduce legislation in order to give them a market in this country? Hon. gentlemen opposite would lead us to believe that the only market for the produce of the farm is to be found in the United States. Our great markets are Liverpool and Europe, and all our surplus products must eventually find their way there. For this reason, that this continent as a whole is an over-producing continent in agricultural products, and if we sell in the United States, we sell for middlemen who transfer the products to Liverpool and receive the benefit, and also the price of the transportation. Not only does the middleman receive his profits, but all the railways receive payment from Canadian farmers for the transportation of these products. So there is nothing consumed in the United States that is grown in Canada except in this sense, that instead of eating one bushel of American wheat, the people may eat one bushel of Canadian wheat, and export the bushel of American wheat. And so

it is with respect to the meat question. England to-day is filled with the dead meats of the United States. Do you pretend that the United States is a market for Canadian dead meat? The Americans are not allowed to land live stock in England, but they send in dead meat. Thus it is clear that the markets of the United States are in no sense markets for the farmers of Canada. It is true that Canadian products are sold to the United States, but they are sold to middlemen who send them to the European market. Look at Chicago and Buffalo to-day and at the elevators and refrigerators that are filled with American grain and meat, and any man will be convinced that the United States is in no sense the direct market for the product of the Canadian farmer. The producers of Canada have a right to the best and most careful consideration of any Government, whether Reform or Conservative. In this sense, and in every sense, this Government has acted correctly. Give the Canadian producer the Canadian market, and thereby build up the great producing element in this country not only in manufacturing but also in farm products.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have been much amused at the speeches to which I have listened. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has told us that they do not want our products in the United States. Why, then, have we been selling the Americans more than half the exports of Canada? Why has not the National Policy, which has been in force eleven years, changed the current of trade and taught the Canadian people where they might obtain most money for their products? We have had the humble confession of the President of the Council that Canada is now in a state of depression, that half of the people are poor and ground down; and the remedy he proposes is that you should go to work and cheat and plunder the other half to help those in distress. That is the logic of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, that because the farmers are depressed under protection, therefore the lumbermen who are not quite so much depressed must be called upon to give them $2 or $3 more a barrel for pork; and because the farmers are depressed, therefore operatives and workingmen and all engaged in other callings have to be compelled to put their hands in their pockets and assist the farmers that the National Policy has impoverished, and you cannot deny it. That is the trouble with our friends on the other side of the House. They talk about the depression of the agriculturists in the United States, and the depreciation of farm property in Vermont, New Hampshire and other States, but I can tell them that the cause of that is 27 years of a false, pernicious, and ruinous protective policy. My hon. friend says that the policy of the ablest men in Congress is to relieve the farmers. Now, with regard to the shaping of a fiscal policy, I myself think that nations ought to be independent. I think that the United States ought to shape their own policy and that Canada should shape her policy. I would not allow any other man to regulate my affairs, and if I was responsible for the nation, neither would I allow an outsider to meddle in my business; but I hold that we, in Canada, should not follow the pernicious example which has ruined the agriculturists of the United States. It is excessive taxation that has ruined them, and it is excessive taxation that will ruin our farmers. They are not all on the one side in Congress, in favor of this protective policy; not by a great deal; they are very evenly balanced, and some of the ablest men of that country are proving that the depression of the agricultural interest is due to excessive taxation. Abundance of agricultural products is not the cause of business depression; yet the policy he proposes is that the people of Canada should have less to eat and less to wear and less comfort of every kind. In order to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked in this country, we have got to pay two prices for everything we want. What a false and pernicious policy! I am glad to see that the people of Canada are not to be hoodwinked by this policy any longer, and the Government, knowing this, propose to skin another class of the population in order to help the agricultural classes, as they say, whom they have already skinned and ruined by their protective system. I suppose my hon. friends are sincere, but I regret that they are not more enlightened upon trade questions. Now, let us examine the causes which have made the agriculturists of Canada depressed. The goods imported into Canada last year amounted to $74,475,139, on which we paid duties to the extent of $23,742,316. It is under the mark to say that the people of Canada consume three times the amount of goods and wares of all kinds, that are manufactured in the country, than those which were imported, and that would make the consumption $223,435,417. Now, I contend that, as the people of Canada consume three or four times as much as they import instead of paying duty on imports amounting to $23,742,316, we pay nearly $100,000,000 on the goods manufactured in this country, which goes in the pockets of the manufacturers. Not only have the farmers been paying this $23,000,000 on imports, but they have been paying a tribute of nearly $100,000,000 to the manufacturers. There is no doubt about that at all, and that is what the ablest men of the Democratic party and the revenue tariff party in the United States are declaring to-day. I will quote to the House a few extracts. Ex-President Cleveland in his last message to Congress says:

"That the tariff renders it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers of certain articles which are protected and taxed to sell them for a price equal to that demanded, for the imported goods that have paid the Customs duty, so that it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people who never used any of the foreign products, purchase and use the things of the same kind in this country and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price, which the duty adds to the imported article."

Now, I have gone into the stores in many places in Canada, and I have talked with the merchants, and I have found that there are three or four times as great a quantity of the goods manufactured in Canada, sold to farmers and to consumers generally, as of the imported goods. I am assured by these merchants that, without any exception, they always add the duty to the price of the manufactured domestic articles. Let me quote from another able man in Congress, Mr. Benton McMillan, whom I have no doubt the hon. President of the Council, and other gentlemen,

know to be among the ablest men who hold a seat in Congress. He says:

"It is estimated that for every dollar paid into the treasury on imported goods, there is paid to the manufacturers of this country five, so that the tariff taxation costs not only what is paid into the Custom house, but the incidental increase of expense upon all, or a greater part of the dutiable goods made and consumed in the United States. The lowest estimate that can possibly be placed in this increased cost to the people is hundreds of millions of dollars."

I quote from S. S. Cox, member of the House of Representatives of the United States, in a speech of last year:

"It will not be doubted that it is an under statement that to get $200,000,000 into the treasury it cost $1,000,000,000."

In another part of the same speech he says:

"If I am correctly informed the sum thus paid is five or six times the amount of the duty."

These are extracts from speeches made in Congress by these able men who have clearly pointed out the cause of the depression among the agriculturists in the United States, and the same cause applies to the depression existing among the farmers in Canada. There is no reason in the world why Canada should be depressed, were it not for the enormous cost of living and the added cost of everything they use on their farms. Everything they use is taxed, and our friends opposite must know it. What has come over hon. gentlemen opposite when they are obliged to admit that there is depression in Canada? They told us that there was to be no depression in the country when they got the National Policy well under way, and after they had it in operation, when oats or barley or any other commodity went up a cent a bushel in price, no matter from what cause, they pointed to the National Policy as being the means of increasing the price. What can they say now, when everything is depressed in Canada? How do you expect the country can improve by taxing the meat on the workingmen and the laborers all over the country, who do not now get fresh meat more than once a week, and some of them not more than once a month? How are you going to help them by doubling the price of meat and pork? Is that policy kind to the poor, the hungry, and the needy? Is that the way you are going to help the workingmen, by making the articles of absolute necessity for their existence twice as dear as they would be under free trade? I am a free trader. I want to see the people getting their food and clothing cheap, and that is the evidence of good times for me. But your policy is to keep out everything the people desire, and make it as dear as possible, and by that means make this country rich, and comfortable and happy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to say a word or two on this item, coming as I do from a county which is largely interested in the apple trade. I suppose there is no county in Ontario so deeply interested in it as that county, as it is well known to be particularly adapted to fruit raising. This duty of 40 cents a barrel on apples will not, I think, be of much advantage to the farmers of Canada, for this reason, that we import 70,000 barrels, and export some 763,000, so that it is quite clear that we produce a great many more apples than we need. It must certainly be to our advantage to import the small quantity we do or else we would not import them. I find that the Province of Ontario imports only some 14,000 barrels, but the Province of Quebec imports a very large quantity. There is no doubt that these apples come from southern climates and ripen before our own crop comes into market; consequently, the importation is an advantage to the people of Canada, and to put this duty of 40 cents a barrel on these apples will be of no advantage to our own people, but will only injure those who have been in the habit of importing those early apples. I think it would have been far better to have allowed those apples to come in free, because they do not enter into competition with our own fruit at all. It is perfect nonsense to say that this is going to be a protection to our farmers, when we export so much more than we import. Now, I may take this opportunity of saying that, in my opinion, it would have been far better for Canada if no changes whatever had been made in the tariff this year. I quite admit that some of the changes will benefit the farmers in the part of the country from which I come, notably the increased duty on pork; but while I would like to see those farmers benefited, yet I cannot but recognise the fact that every single dollar you are putting into their pockets comes out of the pockets of the people of the other portions of the Dominion. If the Government had the interests of the farmers at heart, they could easily, in a great many ways, have helped them without increasing the burdens of the people in other parts of the country. For instance, salt is an article of prime necessity to the farmers of Ontario. In my own county it is estimated 20,000 barrels of salt are consumed every year for different purposes, besides a large quantity which used to be applied as a fertiliser to the land, and I am sorry to see that in all these changes there has been no change in the duty on salt, which is subject to a duty of 15 cents per 100 pounds, besides a heavy duty on the barrel. In the town of Courtright, in the County of Lambton, salt was selling, last fall, at the wells at $1.10 a barrel, while right across the River St. Clair, at Marine City, in the State of Michigan, the same kind of salt, with the same weight in the barrel, was selling at 60 cents a barrel. Our firm deals largely in salt, and we had occasion to purchase five or six carloads for our own use, and we bought that salt floated across the river and put on the cars at Courtright for 60 cents a barrel. This was early in January of this year. So that the farmers of Ontario have to pay 50 cents a barrel more for their salt than they ought to pay, or than they would pay if the duty on salt were removed. The firm who sold us that salt told us that the average price for salt in Marine City, last year, was 56 cents a barrel, at which price they were enabled to meet all expenses and pay a handsome dividend to their stockholders. While they could do that by selling their salt at 56 cents a barrel, our salt men in Ontario have been charging $1.10 a barrel. There is this also to be borne in mind, that the Government get scarcely any revenue from salt, as there is very little imported into Canada, and if they have the interest of the farmers at heart, why do they not remove that duty altogether? By that simple act they would enable the farmers of Ontario to save 50 cents on every barrel of salt they buy, and my own county, which consumes 20,000 barrels every year, would save $10,000 a year on that article alone. There are many other things on which the duties could be reduced to the great

advantage of the farmers, without increasing the burdens of the people in other parts of the country. I am sorry that any changes at all have been made in the tariff this year, and I believe the action of the Government in making them, and especially in re-imposing the duties on apples and green fruits, will, as the hon. member for South Oxford has said, cause the Americans to increase their tariff. As the President of the Council has stated, there is great pressure brought to bear upon the American Government in order to help the farmers of the New England States who are suffering from severe depression. Lands in those States have decreased in value and become unproductive in a great measure as they do not raise the grain they formerly did, and the whole tendency of public opinion in the United States has been that something must be done to help these farmers. That has been the cause of the agitation for the imposition of duties on goods from Canada, but, as the hon. gentleman also stated, a large portion of the people of the United States neither know nor care anything about Canada. California has no interest in anything imported from Canada. The southern States are equally indifferent, but if it was going to be to their interest to have a lower tariff imposed by Canada, they would support the Democrats in their efforts to reduce their tariff, and thus get their goods into Canada free. Consequently public opinion in the United States has been somewhat divided on this point. A large portion of the people are in favor of increasing the duties on goods from Canada, and a large portion are opposed to that. The action taken by the Government at the start held out no hope to the people of the United States that we were in favor of free trade relations, and especially the unfortunate words of the President of the Council, that he and his Government were decidedly opposed to reciprocity even in natural products. For my life I cannot see how any man who looks at the interests of this country can help acknowledging that reciprocity with the United States in natural products would be greatly to the advantage of our people. I cannot conceive anything that would increase the welfare of Canada so much as a reciprocity treaty with the United States. When we look at the great quantities of exports which we send there — all our barley, horses, wheat, eggs, lambs, sheep and horned cattle of all kinds. Why do we send them there? Simply because it pays us best to do so. We would not send them there if we could get more anywhere else. We are trying now the experiment of growing two-rowed barley to send to England; but our farmers tried that experiment years ago, and it fell to the ground, because they found that it paid them best to send their barley to the United States. We send our cattle there and our lumber, because it pays us to do so. Look over the Trade and Navigation Returns and see the enormous quantities of goods which Canada sends to the United States, even under a thirty-five and forty per cent. tariff. It will be the worst possible thing that could happen this Dominion if by any chance the legislation now before Congress should pass. If a duty is placed upon barley, horses and cattle, that will practically exclude our stock and our grains from that market. Therefore, I think the course we are taking to-day in raising our tariff, and especially in replacing on the dutiable list those goods which we put on the free list a few years ago, cannot fail to have the effect of proving to the people of the United States that we are not in favor of reciprocity. They need not entertain any doubt on that subject, since the President of the Council has said that the Government are opposed to reciprocity, and that it would be the very worst thing that could possibly happen for the farmers of this Dominion. I regret very much that those changes have been made. We might have reduced the duty on coal oil, our people are taxed to death. Coal oil can be bought in Detroit for one-half the price we must pay here. Not only the farmers, but the mechanics, artisans and manufacturers are suffering very much on account of the stringency of the tariff. It is known that when the crops are poor and prices low, that affects all other branches as well. I will not detain the House longer, but will conclude by again expressing my regret that those changes should have been made in the tariff, as I believe they will have the effect of strengthening the hands in the United States of those who are in favor of the McKinley Bill.

Mr. MASSON. I will only take up the time of the Committee for a few minutes, in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The statements of the hon. gentleman with reference to this duty upon apples are in keeping with the statements of the Opposition in reference to all duties for the protection of farm products. He has told us most positively that the duty on apples will not increase the price even to the growers in his own county, although he admits his is an apple-growing county, but he declares the duty will increase the price for the consumer all over the rest of Canada. Such statements carry their own contradiction, for they are not reconcilable with each other. It is the claim of free traders generally that the duties increase prices, but if they do they must increase the prices to the producer as well as to the consumer. When we find this one-sided free trade class declaring that the duty does not increase the price to the producer, but does to the consumer, we have a new version of the free trade doctrine. The protectionists on the other side appreciate the fact that the duties enhance the price at first, and, if the condition of the producer is not immediately enhanced, at all events he obtains a better market. This policy produces a home market, which every one who is acquainted with questions of trade must admit is the best market. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that, while this increases the price to the producer, it does not increase the price to the consumer, that the price finds its own level, and in the end it does not cause any increase of price to the consumer. We heard it stated the other night that the increased duty on flour would not benefit either the farmers or the millers, and yet we were told that it would increase the price of flour to the consumer in the east. We were told by the member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that the increased duty on flour would not increase the price of flour in Nova Scotia or the other Eastern Provinces because there was a different class of producers who were contending for that market, that the producers of America and the producers of Canada were competing, that the wheat crop of the Western States was brought into competition with the wheat of western Canada, both of

them seeking their markets in the east. It has also been stated that in Boston and other eastern markets, Canadian flour, either in bond or out of bond, could be purchased at the same price as American flour. We were told that, so long as Canada exported one bushel of wheat or one barrel of flour, such duties as these would not enhance the price. What are the facts which are patent to every farmer who studies the market as the quotations are published in the newspapers? The markets in Canada have, for many years past, been better than the markets in the towns and cities of the United States in comparison with what they were before the introduction of the National Policy. The statement is made that the duty will not increase the price of apples, and I have no no doubt that the hon. gentleman will apply the same reasoning to the duty on flour, although I understand that a short time ago he desired to have the duty on flour increased. And for what reason? The hon. gentleman would apply one rule to flour and another rule to apples, but that might be accounted for by the business which the hon. gentleman follows. From the evidence which we have as to the existing price of flour and from what we know as to the markets of the United States and of Canada, I submit that the increased duty will prove a benefit to the farmers and the millers of Ontario. It has been asked why such a benefit was not given years before. The argument of the hon. gentleman is that there was no necessity for protecting flour when we were exporting it; that, while we were producing a surplus of wheat and flour, and exporting more than we were importing, a duty could have no effect in raising the price. It was not until the evidence of the Trade and Navigation Returns was produced in regard to the last financial year, when we were brought face to face with the fact that Canada had imported over half a million barrels of flour, equal to a million and a quarter bushels of American wheat, ground in American mills into flour, and imported to be used by the people of Canada, that the fallacy of the hon. gentleman's argument was apparent. The hon. gentleman says that a great many of the American people do not care much about Canada, that they have not cared much for the interests of Canada in any part of their history, that they abrogated the reciprocity treaty which existed from 1854 to 1866, in their own interests and not for the benefit of Canada. He says that neither of the two great political parties in the United States think of framing a tariff for the benefit of Canada, that both those parties are determined to frame their tariff entirely regardless of the interest of Canada. He might go further, and say that neither of these two parties is in favor of free trade or of anything like it. The question involved in the last presidential election was not a question of free trade against protection, but of an honest and fair protection against prohibition. The present tariff in the United States, which is very high, was originally framed not for the purpose of protection but for revenue, and now they are clinging to the high duties which have been imposed regardless whether the people are taxed beyond the necessities of protection or not. One of the political parties in the United States holds the view that the duties are too high, but they are as strong protectionists as the other party, though they desire that the tariff should be framed for the purpose of protection simply, and not for the purpose of taxation.

The hon. gentleman said he was grieved to hear the President of the Council state that he was opposed to reciprocity in natural products, and I may say that the majority of the farmers in Ontario are pleased that the Government, through the President of the Council, have stated that they are opposed to reciprocity in natural products. It was a very strong Liberal farmer, a great supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, whom I first heard make the statement "you are protectionists for the manufacturers and not for the farmers. You are willing to give away the protection you have given the farmers, if the United States will give reciprocity in natural products." That was the statement of a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, who knew that the farmers of Ontario were obtaining a benefit by the tax put upon the importation of natural products, and he feared that this Government would carry out some scheme that would allow natural products again to come in free. I believe it was the hon. gentleman who followed the Finance Minister in the Budget debate, who first stated that an increase of duty on farm products was a bid for the votes of the Ontario farmers. That statement showed that he recognised the fact that the farmers of Ontario would appreciate the benefit which this Government was offering them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman explain why the Government is offering reciprocity in natural products to the United States every day by their statutory offer?

Mr. MASSON. Such an offer was put upon the Statute-book and was assumed to be enforceable by hon. gentlemen opposite in detail. Such an offer was placed upon the Statute-book when it was believed, by supporters of the National Policy, that reciprocity in trade would be better than reciprocity in tariff. That was the statement made then, and honestly made, for the reasons I explained the other night, that the people looked back to the good times of those years and forgot the other circumstances that caused the good times, and gave credit to reciprocity for them. But our experience for the last 11 years has shown that our markets to-day in Canada are better, relatively speaking, than they were before; they show us that where we were below the American markets, comparing market with market, we are now above them; they show that where our export price before was way down below the American export price, for the last three years our export price has been higher. I refer more particularly to the larger products such as wheat and grain. We find with regard to them that when American grain came in free—and the same thing applies to apples—their grain, their apples and their fruits come in earlier than ours. This applies with more force to grain than to fruits, because fruits are of a more perishable nature and do not glut the market so long. But in the case of wheat, before our Canadian farmers had their grain ready for the market all our large milling establishments had their mills and their storehouses full of American grain, so that when our Canadian farmer had to sell his grain he had to sell to some trader who would sell to another trader, and so on until it was sold in England. Now, the theory on which protection is said to benefit the producer in this case and also to benefit the consumer, is that it brings the consumer and the producer nearer together. It will

be admitted that the producer who first produces the article and passes it out into trade is the man who sells it at the lowest price. The same principle applies at the other end—the man who consumes is the man who pays the largest price. Every hand through which the article passes makes a profit and increases the price. There is the cost of storage, there is the cost of transportation, there is the cost of insurance to protect it while in storage and while in transport. All these things add to the price until it reaches the consumer. The producer gets the lower price and the consumer pays the higher price, and the policy of protection is to bring these parties nearer together by creating a home market, so that the producer may deal more directly with the consumer. Protection increases the manufacturing industries, it increases the population, it increases the consuming power of the country, and in doing so it brings the producer and the consumer nearer together. There are fewer middlemen between them, and the articles are also consumed quicker ; there is less cost in storage, there is less cost in maintaining them, and, consequently, all this gain is divided between the consumer and the producer, and in that way both are benefited. At the very inception the producer will be benefited by an increase in price ; in the long run the consumer will get the benefit, for as production increases, all these things will go to equalise the price and both will receive a benefit. Our experience during the last eleven years shows that our millers did pay a higher price than the American millers, that the home market was higher than the American market, and the retaining of our home market higher forced our export market higher, until in course of time our export market was far above the export market of the United States. So that the example drawn from our experience shows that what was contended for by protectionists on that point has been realised in practice.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to have a ruling from the Chairman, whether at each stage in the discussion of this tariff, it is proper to go into a general disquisition as to the merits of protection and free trade. I would like to know, because at some stage in the progress of these resolutions I may desire to take advantage of the ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is travelling beyond the item.

Mr. MASSON. I have only been following the remarks of several hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question. However, I cheerfully bow to the ruling of the Chair, and if it is enforced to the end of the debate, I shall feel that I have contributed something towards shortening the debate. I had nearly concluded my remarks when the hon. gentleman interrupted me, and I will only say further that there is no doubt that the statement made by the hon. member for Kent that the American fruit comes in earlier than ours, is a cogent reason why there should be a duty placed upon it, because in coming in before ours it captures our markets. They are producers also to a larger extent than we are, and they pour in and fill our markets, and thus our producer has got to seek a distant market for this perishable article, instead of having a market at his doors. In so doing the prices are not only reduced for the time but permanently and generally reduced.

Mr. WALDIE. We have listened to a very able dissertation from an hon. gentleman who evidently does not understand matters of trade, because I never heard that our export market price could be above the price of the market to which we exported, because the moment such an advance took place exportation would cease. I represent a county where apples are a very large item of export, and where the people are very much interested in small fruit culture, but I am not aware that they asked for the protection of apples. Apples have been free in this country. And imports of apples have taken place owing to rates of freight and for geographical reasons. There were imported in the Province of Quebec 30,000 barrels, from Rochester, Oswego and Ogdensburgh, part to be sold in Montreal, and the balance exported. As they came in free they paid no duty, but the transportation charges were beneficial to our railway companies. We are an exporting country so far as apples are concerned and the quality of our apples command good prices. If the statements of the Minister of Customs and the President of the Council were correct, that this tariff is a Canadian tariff, there was no necessity to prove that the McKinley tariff was sure to come into force. If we are legislating purely for Canada, the Government had an opportunity in 1887, to place a duty on fruit, and they did so, and then they receded from that duty, I suppose in the interests of Canada. During the discussion today, it has been asserted that, because the McKinley tariff was sure to come into force, these changes in our tariff were justified. That is making it a retaliatory tariff, which hon. gentlemen opposite have always denied. I am not in favor of a retaliatory tariff, while I am in favor of a Canadian tariff, and I am quite willing to endorse any proposition that is in the interests of our people. I do not think the duty on apples is required, or is in the interests of the people.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words in reply to the President of the Council. That hon. Minister led the House to believe that the McKinley tariff was virtually adopted by the United States, and that the course now dopted by the Canadians was because the McKinley tariff had become a fixed fact. In the State of New York, in Boston, Buffalo and several other large cities a most hostile feeling has been developed towards certain provisions in the McKinley tariff, including hides and potatoes ; and it is very doubtful whether that Bill will become law. The imposition of the duty on apples was undoubtedly a great mistake, especially in view of the fact that we are large exporters of apples. While we export largely to Great Britain we also export largely to the United States, and it is not in accordance with common sense to slap one of your best customers in the face. The worst feature of the whole action of the Government is that they are driving the Republican party to carry out the retaliatory policy introduced by the McKinley tariff.

Mr. BORDEN. I wish to take exception to the statement made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) to the effect that this duty was inserted at the request of all the producers and exporters of apples in Canada. I represent a region of country that exports as many apples as

any other portion of Canada, and I know that statement is not a fact. On the contrary, the Fruit Growers Association of Nova Scotia took up this question and passed a resolution to the effect that they hoped the Dominion Government would not impose any duty upon apples, for fear that the United States might retaliate by a corresponding duty. It is only fair to my constituents that I should make this statement, and I have a letter from the President of the Fruit Growers Association, one of the most prominent Conservatives in the western part of Nova Scotia, and another letter from the secretary of that association, also a very prominent Conservative, saying they hope the Government will not reimpose this duty. In addition to that, I would remind the Government that only during the present Session a convention of the representatives of fruit growers in the Dominion was held in Ottawa. The Minister of Agriculture was present, and he will bear me out in this statement, that an attempt was made by certain delegates to have a resolution passed calling on the Government to impose a duty on apples, but the resolution was withdrawn. The position taken by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) is not sustained by the facts; and so far from wishing anything of this kind, the fruit-growers, at all events in the eastern portion of the Dominion, were exceedingly anxious that it should not have been done. Independent of those opinions I have quoted, I think it is very unfortunate that the Government should have taken this step. Apples constitute one of those articles contained in the famous statutory reciprocity offer made to the Government of the United States. It is one of the articles upon which the United States withdrew their duty some time ago, and to which action the Government of this country responded only two years since. Even supposing, as our Government claim, that the McKinley Bill is more or less a *fait accompli*—which I do not admit—it is very unfortunate at this particular juncture and exceedingly unwise that the Government should take this step. Surely they could have waited for another year, and if Americans had adopted a duty upon apples, and it were then thought wise that our Government should propose one, it would have been time enough for them to have taken this course. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) very properly pointed out that this duty cannot help the fruit-growers of this country, while it is a tax upon an important article of food. It cannot benefit the fruit-growers because of the fact that the apples imported into this country are imported before our own apples are ripe. It is sufficient to look at the trade returns to prove that the duty will not have any beneficial effect. We imported last year only about 70,000 barrels of apples, while we exported about ten times that quantity. Admitting even that the apples imported are used in this country—which is not at all established, because it is probable that most of them were shipped to the old country from Montreal—the small importation could have no effect on supply and demand, when it is shown that we export ten times the quantity. One hon. gentleman has spoken about our getting a home market for our producers. What would be the good of a home market for our own producers when we export 700,000 barrels of apples? If our producers had nothing to depend upon but the home market they would be in a very sorry plight indeed.

Mr. WATSON. I cannot allow this item to pass without raising my voice in protest against this very unfair and unjust tax on the people I represent. This is a tax placed directly on the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, because in those Provinces we do not grow apples, and our apples have to come from Eastern Canada or from the United States. We are so situated in Manitoba that the freight rates are against our bringing them cheaply from Eastern Canada. By this tax you compel us to bring our apples a thousand or fifteen hundred miles, instead of allowing us to bring them one-half the distance, from the United States. We are told by the Minister of Finance that he has a surplus, and I cannot see any reason whatever why the Government should place apples on the dutiable list again, if it is not for revenue purposes. The balance of trade in apples is in our favor, because while we only import 70,000 barrels a year, we export to the United States 144,618 barrels, and to Great Britain 619,216 barrels, or ten times more than we import. This duty is a hardship on the people of the North-West. If the Government are going to force the people of the North-West to take their apples from Eastern Canada instead of from the United States why do they not say so? I do not see that even the other Provinces outside of Manitoba will be benefited by the imposition of this duty. In 1888, the first year apples were on the free list, and before people got in the way of it, Manitoba imported 5,000 barrels from the United States. I have no doubt that when the returns come down for last year we will find that instead of 5,000 barrels we imported 30,000 or 40,000 barrels from the United States, because last year the apple crop in Ontario was almost a failure. If the Government wished to help the fruit-growers of the country they would succeed much better by placing shrubs and trees on the free list than by placing a duty on apples. It is hard to understand the logic of the arguments of the hon. the President of the Council. A short time ago he told us that free trade in the natural products of the country would ruin the Canadian farmer, but he tells us to-night in a lengthened argument that the Americans now feel that they have to put up a wall of protection against the Canadian farmers, because they are competing successfully against the American farmers in the United States markets. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's logic, unless it is that the position he occupies now is not the same as that occupied by him some years ago, when I used to think he talked good sense and good logic. As the Chair has ruled that we should confine ourselves to the articles under discussion, I am not at liberty to reply to the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite, some of which are very amusing to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We heard the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) stating that protection had done so much for the farmers that it actually forced the price of the product of our farmers above the prices of the United States. I do not know how he arrived at that sort of reasoning, for it is hard to understand how any natural product of our country could be forced above the export price. If the Government wish to encourage the people to

raise their own food, they should have admitted corn free instead of putting a duty upon pork, because it would be much more in the interest of the farmer. They say they are going to admit corn free for human food, but why should they not admit corn free to feed the hogs that make human food? Notwithstanding what has been said in this House about the farmers of the North-West by hon. gentlemen from Manitoba and the Territories, I may say that all that we want is a fair field and no favor, and we are prepared to compete with the agriculturists of any part of the world. We don't want you to say that we are protected in our beef and pork. We can grow those commodities there as cheaply as any place in the world, but we object to being taxed for everything that is used by the farmers. The people of Manitoba do want unrestricted trade with the United States. I regret very much that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have seen fit to again place a duty on fruits, because it appears to me that it is simply an attempt at retaliation against the American people. We do not want a revenue, and it appears to me that this duty is put on for nothing else but retaliation, and will no doubt have great weight with the Americans in inducing them to pass the McKinley Bill. Two or three years ago, after hon. gentlemen opposite had been arguing that unrestricted trade would be injurious to this country, Sir Charles Tupper came into the House and stated that so far as lumber was concerned, he would not reflect on the intelligence of this House by saying that the lumbermen would not be benefited by unrestricted trade. With regard to fruits, I find that on the 20th of February, 1889, a question was asked in this House as to the quantity of fruits imported into this country when they were on the free list. The question was asked by Mr. Boyle, the mem for Monck, and it was answered by the hon. Minister of Customs in the following words:—

"The value of our entire importations from the United States of green fruits, seeds, trees, and articles placed on the free list by Order in Council of the 4th April, 1888, from that date to 1st January, 1889, is $831,399. The amount of revenue which would have been collected upon such importations if they had not been placed upon the free list, is $219,636. The value of such importations from the United States for the corresponding period of the previous year, that is to say, from the 4th April, 1887, to the 1st January, 1888, was $498,183. The value of our exports to the United States of those articles, from 4th April, 1888, until 1st January, 1889, is $1,486,022, of which apples amounted to the sum of $1,315,452; berries, $80,000; seeds, &c., $50,000; leaving $40,570 for the smaller fruits."

Now, it appears to me that if we attempt to retaliate on the United States, even with regard to the duty on apples, we are going to be at a great loss, because according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Customs we exported to the United States nearly a million and a half dollars worth of fruit between April and January, 1889. It is a very serious matter for the consideration of this House, and those who represent the farmers here should in their interest protest against this increase.

Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, N.E.S., three cents per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty. Cherries and currants, one cent per quart. Cranberries, plums and quinces, thirty cents per bushel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to ascertain definitely what the weight of the package means. I understood the Minister to say the other day that he did not mean to include the crates in which a number of boxes are placed, but simply the small light boxes in which the fruits are stored.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the case. The crates were never charged duty under the old tariff, which read the same way as this, except that this is a lower rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is satisfactory so far as it goes. I am not going to revive in detail the discussion that has taken place on apples; but what has been said on apples applies to these items measureably. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman does not require these duties for revenue purposes, for it is more than probable that the increase will reduce imports, if not destroy them altogether. What we are doing here, it appears to me, is open to several objections. In the first place, we are going to destroy a valuable and important trade, which is increasing all the time; in the next place, we are deliberately depriving a very large number of our people of what may be called a luxury, but what in this climate is in many respects an extremely useful, wholesome and palatable contribution to the food of the people. I will read for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Customs and hon. gentlemen opposite an article from a supporter of their own, the London *Free Press*:

"The idea of raising the duties on such articles as fruits is one that does not now run current with public necessity or public opinion. The fact is that modern modes of transit have made it possible for us to avail ourselves of the early fruits that are grown to the south of us at a period of the year when our own fields are still in a frozen condition. The use of those articles is not only pleasant but valuable, and it seems to be an unnecessary interference with the habits of the people to place a tax on them in such a way, to such an extent, as to deprive the general consumer of the privilege of using the 'fruits of the earth'—no matter whence they may come—to his own advantage."

For once I entirely agree with the London *Free Press*, that this is in every possible shape or way an objectionable duty. There is no question that we were obtaining an immense quantity of valuable fruit from the United States, which could by no possibility be produced in this country; and there is no question that these duties are re-imposed, not in the public interest, but simply as a sop to a few fruit-growers in certain parts of the Province of Ontario. For their sake a gross injury is inflicted on the community, and in particular on several Provinces which are even less able than Ontario to supply themselves with fruit.

Mr. GILLMOR. In conversation with intelligent men I have often heard it stated that if the Government wish to encourage an industry that would be of vast advantage to Canada, they should encourage the production of jams, jellies and preserves for exportation, instead of importing them as we do now from England. The fruits are grown on perhaps the dearest soils in the world, but in England they have the advantage of cheap sugar, while we in Canada can hardly afford to preserve any fruits for our own use. In the Maritime Provinces, whatever may be the case in other parts of Canada, we have hundreds of thousands of bushels of native wild fruits going to waste on the ground every year, because we cannot go into the manufacture of jams and jellies owing to the high price of sugar. I see by the quotations to-day that

granulated sugar in England can be bought at three cents a pound. If it were so cheap in this country we could produce immense quantities of jams and jellies from these wild fruits, and send them to other countries.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister to explain why he has put these articles on the dutiable list. I have not heard him give any argument in favor of the motion. I think there ought to be a reason assigned.

Mr. ELLIS. The duty on these small fruits is certainly very objectionable to the people of the Province in which I live. The course of trade there is that we import in the early part of the season a great quantity of these fruits from the United States, and later on we send back our fruits to them, so that there is quite a trade both ways. The markets of Boston, and probably New York, are supplied with fruits like strawberries a fortnight later by our growers than they could supply themselves. Now it is proposed to put a restraint upon that principle by this tariff. With regard to peaches and fruit of that kind, which we cannot raise in the Maritime Provinces at all, the duty is objectionable, simply because these fruits are used largely as food when they are in season.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The imposition of this duty will be considered very objectionable in the Maritime Provinces. We rely upon the American market for our small fruits for about a fortnight before we produce them ourselves, and from that time forward they come into our market. Later in the season we send our fruits by steamer to the American market. That trade is increasing, and it would be disastrous to that trade if the people of the United States would entertain the view that the imposition of these duties generally, and on these items more particularly, means that we consider ourselves independent of them, and retaliate. Now, with regard to peaches, no matter what the duty is, we must get them from the United States, as Ontario is too far away for us to import them from that Province. If we had our choice and could import our peaches either from Ontario or from Boston, the hardship would not be so great, but, under the circumstances, we have to get them from Boston by steamer, which only takes from twelve to twenty-four hours, while from Ontario the voyage would take four or five days. The Government are, therefore, making us pay a duty, not to protect any one, but simply to take more money out of the people.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister what is the reason for the change in policy? Two years ago the Government put these fruits on the free list, and now they make them dutiable. Have the Government any continuity of policy, or is it a mere matter of whim? I would ask them also what is the weight of a basket of peaches, so that we may know what the duty per pound will really amount to?

Mr. HESSON. Numerous deputations of people interested in the fruit-growing trade interviewed the Government on this matter, and I had the pleasure of forming part of a deputation which waited on the Minister of Customs and impressed on him the desirability of protecting our fruit-growing industry. That industry was depressed on account of the Americans flooding our market for a few weeks previous to our fruits coming in, so that our people could not get a fair price for their goods. When the American fruits came in first, our people had to pay fancy prices, from 50 cents to 70 cents for strawberries, but when the time came for our fruits to be put on the market, they reduced their price to 15 cents and lower, and flooded our market with their cheap fruit, sometimes as low as 5 cents. Therefore our fruit-growers complained that the Americans had possession of the Canadian market. If people want these fancy American fruits, let them pay for them. They can have peaches at a cent a pound duty.

Mr. MULOCK. How much will that be on the basket?

Mr. HESSON. Fifteen or 20 cents. A small basket of peaches will weigh about 20 or 30 pounds, and a cent a pound is not expensive for peaches. It is perfectly in the line of the National Policy that these fruit-growers, no matter how humble they may be, should be able to make their honest living in their own country, and have the benefit of their own market. The hon. gentleman knows well that there was pressure brought upon the Government——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. HESSON. And the Government did not, as the hon. gentleman foolishly did, when he was in office, close their ears to the complaints of men in business who were endeavoring to make a living in their own country. That is what was wanted in those times. It was not considered that these men had a right to be heard. I say that the interests and the industries of this country required these men to come to the Capital and place their requirements before the Government. Those who are not depressed probably remain at home.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman said he accompanied a deputation of fruit-growers. Will he state who they were?

Mr. HESSON. They were from all parts of the country. The president of the association was here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who was he?

Mr. HESSON. He was Mr. Wellington, of Toronto.

Mr. MULOCK. Were the consumers represented on that occasion, or was it simply *ex parte*? I understand that my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces are compelled to obtain American fruit.

Mr. WATSON. This is a very unjust tax, and I was surprised to hear the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) express himself in favor of it. I do not know that he represents a fruit-growing constituency.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. We exported thousands of barrels of apples in 1888.

Mr. WATSON. What we are talking about now is small fruit, which is to be taxed 3 cents a pound. This is a tax which more than nine-tenths of the people of the Dominion will have to pay for the benefit of the fruit-growers in three counties in Ontario. I believe this will increase the price of fruit 100 per cent. Not only that, but these are perishable goods, and a great proportion of those which are shipped in are spoiled, and the consumer has to pay for the loss of the retail dealer. This is class legislation of the worst kind. I believe that,

including the package, the duty will amount to at least 4 cents a pound, and, perhaps, 5 cents.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Can you not grow strawberries in Manitoba?

Mr. WATSON. We grow very few.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was anxious to know why these duties were re-imposed. I can only give him the same answer as I did in regard to other articles. When the duties were previously imposed upon fruits, the growth of fruit was encouraged in this country, but, after the duty was taken off, hundreds of acres which were under cultivation had to be diverted to other purposes, and the capital which the fruit-growers had invested in those enterprises was lost. I have heard of cases where hundreds of acres were added to orchards and gardens to extend this industry and to supply the demand of this country, but, as soon as the duties were removed, the competition from across the line was so great that these lands became valueless for this purpose. The Government believing in giving protection to all classes of interests—not only to manufacturers, but to agriculturists and fruit-growers, but to all other interests—and believing that we have in this country all the area required to grow the fruits and at the same time to give employment to the people of our own country, have proposed that this duty should be re-imposed. The suggestion of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) was of a practical character and deserves the consideration of the Government. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that the exportation of canned fruits is growing very rapidly. I know that a very large quantity of canned fruits are being exported from the county represented by the hon. member for Prince Edward, and I am sure that this industry will grow just in proportion to the quantity of land brought under fruit cultivation there. As to peaches, I am informed that the weight per basket will reach from fifteen or sixteen pounds to twenty or twenty-two pounds. The larger basket, I am informed, will weigh from one to two pounds, and the smaller basket will not exceed a pound and a half.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. member for Lincoln could tell us the weight of the half-bushel basket?

Mr. RYKERT. From sixteen to twenty-two pounds.

Mr. MULOCK. That means a tax of from 16 to 22 cents, so it might average 25 cents a basket. I would like to ask the Minister what the effect was on the price of Canadian fruits when the American fruit was duty free.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell, but I suppose it affected the price of early strawberries.

Mr. HESSON. They were sold at Toronto for 5 cents, and less than that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Minister should drop this item referring to peaches. We cannot raise peaches in this country except in a small part of Ontario, and we cannot get them in the eastern part of Canada by express in less than seven or eight days, and by that time the fruit is spoiled. We shall have to get our peaches from the United States; therefore, I think this item of peaches should be dropped. If you are going to raise them in Ontario, and we could get them from Ontario, then your position would be sound, from your point of view, but in the Maritime Provinces we can neither raise peaches nor can we get them from Ontario. Therefore this is an entirely exceptional tax upon the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can get them from Niagara in 48 hours by express.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, unless you get them by express, which will cost you five times more than they are worth. By ordinary express you cannot get them under five or six days.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is nonsense to talk about peaches being sent from Ontario to the Maritime Provinces. We talked last year about sending buggy tops from Ontario to the Maritime Provinces; that is possible, but it is not possible with peaches. There is no better evidence of the gross injustice of your protective system than this very item. Here is a most desirable article of food. We cannot raise it in the Maritime Provinces, and we have to go to the States for it; therefore you are putting a direct tax upon the people of the Maritime Provinces. It cannot be defended even on protective principles. It is a gross injustice; but such is the demoralising effect of the tariff that even hon. members from the Maritime Provinces supporting the Government will be among the first to stand up and support this tax. I do not blame the Minister of Customs a bit; it is the members from the Maritime Provinces that I blame for allowing the iniquities of this protective tariff, because if they were true to the people who sent them here they would be able to prevent them. Still, they will support the Minister of Customs in this piece of iniquity, and in kindred pieces of iniquity, for the benefit of a few people in Ontario who may have a very good case as against their immediate neighbors. You may have a good case on behalf of the growers of peaches and small fruits in the western peninsula of Ontario, in preventing fruit from coming into that part of the country, that is, from a protectionist standpoint; but when you tax people a thousand miles away from them, I say the act cannot be characterised otherwise than as a piece of iniquity and an injustice. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for York ask if the consumers were invited to take part in the discussion when these taxes were agreed upon. He knows that the consumer's interest is not considered here, it is only the interests of a small class the manufacturers that are considered. This class of interests have all the consideration of the Government and they give a good *quid pro quo* in return. I have not seen any instances yet where the consumer's interest was allowed to override that of some small producer.

Mr. HESSON. It is not unusual to see a large quantity of fruit come down from California. And I do not think the Maritime Provinces are so far away from Ontario as we are from California. We have also seen fruit from British Columbia, and I have seen peaches, pears, plums and grapes from California. I venture to think that my hon. friend himself has seen California fruit in the markets of his own Province. I have myself seen in Brandon, and Winnipeg British Columbia fruits. As Prince Edward Island is no further from the fruit-growing

district of Ontario than is the State of California from its eastern market, the members from Prince Edward Island need not despair of receiving an ample supply of fruit from Ontario.

Peaches, one cent per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

Mr. PLATT. Experience has shown that the Ontario peach crop does not find its way more than one hundred miles east of Toronto, and even at Belleville there are ten baskets of the United States peaches to one basket grown in this country. Of recent years there has been no extension eastward of trade in the western Ontario peach crop, and it cannot compete with the American peach crop even as far east as Montreal. Reference has been made to the growth of the fruit canning industry in Picton. That industry is one that deserves to be looked after as carefully as the peach-growing industry, because it is of more general importance. The imposition of a duty on green fruits cannot in any way benefit the fruit canning industry, and it must have an entirely opposite effect. Great advantage accrued to this industry when we had free fruits. One season, when there was a smaller crop, one of the factories sent to the other side and got a schooner load of fruits, which were afterwards canned in Picton. The admission of peaches free would be of vast benefit to our canning factories. There could be nothing more outrageous than the imposition of duties on early southern fruits.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Minister of Customs any idea of the quantity of peaches grown in Canada?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell you.

Mr. WATSON. I thought perhaps the deputation that visited the hon. gentleman, with a view to securing the duty would have informed him. It appears that some years there is hardly any crop, and if there is any fruit that should be admitted free it is peaches. When the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Larivière) was a member of the Government of Manitoba and made up a statement of the disadvantages under which it was suffering, he protested very strongly against duties on fruits, and I will be glad to hear from him now.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION OF NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that, having received a notification of a vacancy in the representation of the Electoral District of New Westminster, B.C., by the demise of Donald Chisholm, Esq., I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ for an election in the said electoral district.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call attention to the report presented by the Committee on Printing, and to ask that it may be understood that that report shall not be adopted without notice being given, as it is desirable there should be some discussion on it.

Mr. BERGIN. I shall put a notice on the paper. I refrained from moving the adoption of the report to-day in order that I might consult the Premier about it first.

REPRESENTATION OF KENT, N.B.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister whether the rumor is true that a vacancy had occurred in the County of Kent, by the appointing of the sitting member to be county judge, in the place of the late Mr. Botsford.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE—ANDERSON'S CONTRACT.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to a letter published in the Montreal *Herald*, on the 4th of April, from Messrs. Anderson & Co., by which it would appear that the contract with them for a fast mail service was not terminated for the reason assigned by the First Minister. The First Minister said that Messrs. Anderson, having been unable to procure the necessary funds, had given notice that they could not carry out the contract, but these gentlemen reply as follows:—

"We consider it due to ourselves to state that the last sentence of this extract entirely misrepresents our reasons for surrendering the contract."

It is very important, in view of this statement, that the House should be put in possession of the true reasons which influenced the Messrs. Anderson—whether it was on account of the terminal points asked for by the Government, or the speed asked for, or any other consideration. It would be advisable, therefore, to have this contract and the correspondence relating to it placed before the House. It is very important, at this stage of the question, to know exactly how it was viewed by such an eminent shipping firm as the Messrs. Anderson, and it is due to the House that all the correspondence relating to the contract should be laid on the Table, so that the public may judge fairly the grounds on which the Messrs. Anderson gave up the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, as to whether or not the Government are prepared to lay the contract and papers before the House, this was discussed some three or four weeks ago on a motion put by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and the First Minister and myself replied that it was not in the public interest to do so. Matters have not changed since. As regards the question raised between the First Minister and

the Messrs. Anderson, I prefer that the First Minister should deal with that himself. My recollection is, that the Messrs. Anderson did not carry out the provisions of the contract because of their failure, for various reasons, to interest capitalists in the undertaking, and, therefore, they surrendered it into the hands of the Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has repeated the statement, that the Messrs. Anderson failed to carry out the contract because they were unable to supply the necessary capital. The Messrs. Anderson emphatically deny this. It is proper, in the changed position of the question to-day, that the House should be put in possession of the reason why the contract was terminated.

Mr. FOSTER. I will call the attention of the First Minister to the matter to-day.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 65) further to amend the criminal law.

Mr. BERGIN moved in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be sent back to the Committee with instructions to omit all that portion of the second section after the word "ward" on the tenth line and down to the word "is" on the fourteenth line of the Bill.

He said : I will state as briefly as possible why I object to the words which I propose should be expunged. The first portion of the clause, which relates to a ward and her guardian, is, I think, legislation in the right direction, but I object to the rest of the clause, because I think it opens the door to conspiracies and blackmail, and is likely to lead to much more injury than benefit to the community. Take the case of the manager of a department in one of our great cotton or woollen mills. If, for any reason, whether well or ill founded, one or more of the operatives desire to get rid of that manager, all they have to do is to conspire and take advantage of this Bill, and the man will be obliged to flee the country, or to await arrest and imprisonment. I understand that the Minister of Justice has provided a certain sort of security for the party who is charged, but that is far from being sufficient. It is true that the party may himself give testimony on his own behalf, and then it would be a case of one witness against another ; but anyone who is desirous of doing such an injury to an overseer can very easily obtain another to join in the plot, because it is probable that more than one may desire to remove the overseer, and in that case the man is completely at their mercy. I know that such things have occurred. We know that such cases have occurred in my own town, and we must, if possible, protect these people against conspiracies of that kind. Again, I object to this clause because it is class legislation. I am not aware of any reason that has been advanced to justify the application of this clause solely to persons employed in a factory. It may be said, and I have no doubt it will be said, that the labor organisations in this country have asked for protection of this kind for the female operatives. The mistake they make is that they have not remembered that theirs is not the only class in the community, that there are other classes, and I think it is a great mistake on the part of the labor organisations to ask for this special legislation, because, in a sense, it brands the operatives as being less able to protect their own virtue than any other class. It is, therefore, invidious legislation, and seems to me to stigmatise one class in the community unfairly. For these reasons, I think this provision ought not to be adopted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the House will not take the view the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) does, although I am aware that he has considered the subject very carefully and that he takes exception to the clause for reasons which influence his judgment. This section, as I previously explained to the Committee, is intended for the protection of operatives in factories. It is one of the measures which were promised in the Speech from the Throne in relation to labor, and it was pressed upon the attention of the Government by the delegates of the Knights of Labor organisation who were connected with the subject of legislation. I use the report made by that delegation, not for the purpose of influencing the opinion of the House on the ground that they represented an organisation which is powerful as to numbers and influence in the country, but because they were speaking for their own class, and they must have a better knowledge as to the necessity of legislation of this kind for their own class than the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) or myself. When persons having such knowledge ask for legislation of this kind, I think it would be very hard for Parliament to turn a deaf ear to them. The statement which they made in their report of last year is this :

"Although your committee is glad to believe that so far in Canada the evil does not exist to any appreciable extent, yet by reports from other countries, and through their knowledge of the conditions which sometimes exist in workshops and factories where women and girls are employed, they are convinced that it would be the part of wisdom at the present time to throw around female employés special legal protection against seduction by employers, superintendents and foremen, who, by reason of their power over them, may be in a position to unduly coerce them. We have, therefore, urged upon the Premier and the Minister of Justice the desirability of enacting legislation making it a criminal offence, punishable by severe penalties, for any employer, superintendent, overseer, foreman or other person exercising authority over a female employé to have illicit intercourse with such female employé, either with or without consent. The views of your committee seemed to meet with the approval of both gentlemen, who expressed themselves as favorable to such a measure, provided proper precautions were taken against the Act being used for purposes of blackmail. We would, therefore, recommend that it be an instruction to our successors to press for legislation in the direction indicated."

I take it that, in answer to a request of that kind, it is not at all sufficient to say that the legislation demanded may be made an evil use of. The same arguments—only in a greater degree—could be availed of against any section of our criminal code, and against any part of the criminal law imposing punishments of any kind. I say in a greater degree, because here we have taken unusual precautions to provide against the abuse of this section.

Mr. MITCHELL. How ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have provided in this case that—as is provided in only two or three other cases in the whole criminal code—the accused person can give evidence in his own behalf. We have also provided that there shall be corroborative evidence of the testimony of the

accuser, and that there shall be evidence also of the previous chaste character of the accuser. Under these circumstances, not one of the hon. gentlemen who contested the progress of this Bill in Committee was able to suggest any other safeguard that should be adopted, but they met it with the statement that it was liable to abuse, and for that reason the people should be refused the protection to which they are entitled, and which was requested on behalf of a large section of them. Now, with regard to the other clauses of this Bill, I submit it does not lie in the mouth of an hon. gentleman making an argument against the protection that is given here to say that there are other classes who ought to have the protection extended to them. That, as an argument, would be available to my hon. friend if he proposed this Bill should be referred back to Committee for the purpose of enlarging its provisions and extending them to other classes. On this point I have simply to say now, as I said in Committee, when, I think, the hon. gentleman was not here to hear me, that we have a particular request from those who have a right to be heard for legislation of this kind; we have evidence of an evil existing to some extent in this country, and likely to grow, when we regard the experience of other countries, and we propose here practical legislation to meet a practical evil. When necessity requires this provision to be enlarged, I think I may hope for the support of the hon. gentleman to make it extend to any class that asks for protection, or that shows a case for such protection to be given. I think, when we consider the discretion which will exist on the part of the court, and when we remember the precautions which are taken in respect to the evidence of the defendant, it is very difficult to imagine a case where there might be a successful conspiracy for the purpose of securing the conviction of a foreman or a superintendent who is distasteful to the employé.

Mr. MITCHELL. It will be in the recollection of the House that when this Bill was introduced and the hon. gentleman gave an explanation of the motives and object of the Bill, I took exception to this particular section on the ground that it would prove a fertile source of blackmailing. Now, that objection still stands. It is a well-known fact that blackmailing very frequently prevails, and that women are just as liable, indeed far more liable, to be the authors of blackmail against men, than that they should be the victims of the evils to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and which he states are the foundation of this section of the Bill. Now, the hon. gentleman bases this measure upon the fact that it had been indicated in the Speech from the Throne. Well, that may be, but there are a great many features in that Bill, and it does not follow that because it was indicated in the Speech from the Throne, therefore every feature of that Bill, every section of it, should be adopted *verbatim et literatim* in this House. The hon. gentleman says that the reason why the Government promised this legislation in the Queen's Speech was the fact that the Knights of Labor—I presume it is from their report that the hon. gentleman read—asked that legislation of this character should be passed. He says they are much better

informed as to the wants and interests of their class than the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, or myself, could possibly be. Now, what is that recommendation which was made by this Labor Commission? Their report merely states that this evil had existed in other great and populous countries, in large communities on the other side of the water and on the other side of the line, where larger crowds of females are crowded together, and perhaps with less facilities for keeping the sexes separate than we have in the factories of this country; but the very report which the hon. gentleman has read declares that no positive evil of that kind exists in this country. Therefore, he asks this House to adopt legislation in anticipation of any evil which may possibly arise, but of which we have no evidence that it exists at present. I entirely agree with the amendment moved by my hon. friend, and it will receive my support. I hold this legislation is unnecessary, that it is uncalled for. If the hon. gentleman founds an argument to this House in favor of this legislation upon the report of the Labor Commission, then I say this Bill does not go far enough. What the hon. gentleman should do, in order to be consistent, is to strike out the restrictions that he has introduced in this Bill where he uses the word "factory, mill or workshop," where he says protection is necessary for females associated in labor where they are grouped together in buildings, and he should apply this very clause to all classes of female labor, because we know that if they require protection in factories, mills or workshops, they require it equally in the wholesale and retail shops, where they are grouped together by the dozen, throughout the chief mercantile centres of this land. They require it equally in the numerous offices where lady type-writers are brought into close proximity with the people who employ them and who control them; they require it equally in offices of the telegraph companies, where you will find thirty or forty of them grouped together under one or two gentlemen; they require it equally in telephone offices where the same condition of things exist, and in the offices of the Civil Service, where females are employed and who are under the control of the heads of Departments. I may tell my hon. friend that the Civil Service has not always been considered the purest place for ladies to be engaged. The hon. Minister stated the other day that he had never heard such a thing even hinted at. Let me ask his associates in the Council, let me ask those hon. gentlemen who sit in Council with him every day, whether they have heard anything of that kind. Let me ask any member of this House whether he has ever heard, and I will venture to say that nine out of ten of the members of this House have heard reports of that kind. Then, Sir, is it not required in public schools? There is also the large class of servants employed in the numerous hotels throughout the country, and indeed in every branch or occupation where females are employed, and where they require protection equally as much as they do in factories. Now, Sir, I object to the legislation of my hon. friend on these grounds. First, I say that the clause is not necessary at all, and that it will afford a strong inducement to blackmailing. In the second place, if it is required at all, it is unfair that an important class and the most numerous

class of females in this country should be precluded from the benefits of the protection which the hon. gentleman says is so necessary. I do not attach the same meaning to that report of the Labor Commission that the hon. gentleman does. I do not understand that the Labor Commission have asked for the legislation which the hon. gentleman has introduced in this Bill; they certainly have not asked for partial protection to one particular class of people; they have asked for protection to all, or they have asked it for none. Therefore I shall support the amendment of my hon friend.

Mr. CHARLTON. It will be in the recollection of the House, no doubt, that several years ago I had the honor to introduce a Bill dealing with offences of the character dealt with in this Bill; and the great objection raised to that Bill in the discussion of the subject during several Sessions was the objection raised to-day, that it would lead to cases of blackmail, that the Bill would lead to many offences of that kind. After struggling three or four years the Bill became the law of the Dominion, and it has been the law for several years, and many cases have been tried under it. It contains the same provisions with respect to evidence as are found in this Bill. It gives to the party accused the right to give his evidence, and it requires corroborative evidence, and I think experience of the public with respect to that Bill, will be a very good criterion as to the results which will follow the present Bill. I have never heard of any case of blackmailing under that Act; I never heard of any attempt of blackmailing under that Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have you heard of the other case?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; many cases have been tried under the Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman name instances?

Mr. CHARLTON. I cannot give them just now. From time to time reports appear in the newspapers of trials under that Act; and in the practical operation of the Act we have pretty fair evidence that it is impossible to blackmail under its provisions, and it will be equally so under the provisions of the present Bill submitted by the hon. Minister of Justice. I do not believe any danger exists on that score, and I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill so far as objections with respect to blackmailing may be made against it. I can agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that the provisions of the Bill might possibly be extended, but the Bill, so far as it goes, is a good measure, and I have no fear whatever that the evil results anticipated by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), with respect to abuses under it by levying blackmail, will ever be realised.

Mr. TISDALE. I will read what a learned judge of the Superior Court of Ontario said only yesterday in connection with offences of this sort. I am told that a considerable number of hon. members of this House do not believe attempts to blackmail are made in this country, so the remarks of this judge to the jury will be applicable. The case before the court was one of blackmail, a money claim for indecent assault. His Lordship, addressing the jury,

"Spoke strongly of the action of parties who bring cases of this kind into court for the purposes of blackmail. This was the second action of the kind tried at these assizes, and a very bold attempt to extort money. 'That may be tried in some of these cases once too often,' he said, 'and when the proper case comes up I shall not hesitate to instruct the County Crown Attorney to prosecute for perjury. These attempts at blackmail are becoming too common, and the imposition of a long term of imprisonment is the only way of dealing with that class of people.'"

I propose to support the motion of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), and largely for this reason: I believe if the employés of factories, the women employed there, were asked the question, they would say they did not want legislation of this sort. I am not going to be instructed by the Knights of Labor or any other class, except those who suffer, when I am asked to vote for a measure to pass into law. There may have occurred occasionally cases of seduction, but I have no evidence that legislation of this character is required, and I will, therefore, vote for the amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Bergin:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barnard	Mara,
Bell,	Marshall,
Bergin,	Masson,
Bryson,	Mitchell,
Cargill,	Moncrieff,
Carpenter,	O'Brien,
Cimon,	Pope,
Coulombe,	Prior,
Davis,	Roome,
Denison,	Rykert,
Desaulniers,	Shanly,
Earle,	Small,
Girouard,	Temple,
Hale,	Tisdale,
Hickey,	Turcot,
Hudspeth,	White (Renfrew),
Joncas,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
McKeen,	Wilson (Lennox).—36.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	Jones (Digby),
Armstrong,	Jones (Halifax),
Audet,	Kirk,
Bain (Soulanges),	Kirkpatrick,
Bain (Wentworth),	Labrosse,
Béchard,	Landerkin,
Bergeron,	Lang,
Blake,	Langelier (Quebec),
Boisvert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Borden,	LaRivière,
Bourassa,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Bowell,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Lister,
Boyle,	Livingston,
Brien,	Lovitt,
Burns,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Cameron,	Mackenzie,
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Carling,	McCulla,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McDougald (Pictou),
Casey,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Casgrain,	McIntyre,
Chapleau,	McMillan (Huron),
Charlton,	Madill,
Choquette,	Meigs,
Cochrane,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cockburn,	Mills (Bothwell),
Colby,	Montague,
Cook,	Montplaisir,
Corby,	Mulock,
Costigan,	Paterson (Brant),
Coughlin,	Patterson (Essex),

Curran,	Perry,
Daoust,	Platt,
Davies,	Porter,
Dawson,	Putnam,
Desjardins,	Rinfret,
Dewdney,	Robertson,
Dickey,	Robillard,
Dickinson,	Rowand,
Edgar,	Ste. Marie,
Eisenhauer,	Scriver,
Ellis,	Semple,
Fiset,	Skinner,
Fisher,	Smith (Ontario),
Flynn,	Somerville,
Foster,	Sutherland,
Freeman,	Taylor,
Gauthier,	Thérien,
Geoffrion,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gillmor,	Trow,
Godbout,	Tyrwhitt,
Gordon,	Vanasse,
Grandbois,	Waldie,
Guay,	Wallace,
Guillet,	Watson,
Hall,	Welsh,
Hesson,	White (Cardwell),
Holton,	Wilmot,
Innes,	Wilson (Elgin),
Jamieson,	Yeo.—124.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now that the policy of the Government in protecting women has been affirmed by this House, it is due to the consistency of Parliament that the Bill should be altered so as to protect all women, whether employed in factories or not. I hold that hon. members who voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), which I had the honor to second, have by their votes declared that they endorse the principle of protecting females who follow pursuits of manual labor, no matter in what capacity. I have, therefore, prepared the following amendment, which I now move :

"That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee, with instructions to omit the words in the thirteenth line of the second section, 'in a factory, mill or workshop,' and in the fourteenth line, 'in such factory, mill or workshop,' and in the fifteenth line, 'in such factory,' and in the sixteenth line, 'mill or workshop;' also, in the twelfth line to change the word 'thirty' to 'twenty-one.'"

This will include all classes of female labor, whether they are type-writers, to whom we have referred ; shop girls, who are employed by hundreds through the Dominion ; telegraph girls, who are also employed by hundreds ; telephone girls, who are numerously employed ; female clerks in the Civil Service, clerks in general employment, or female scholars in the numerous schools from one end of the country to the other. If protection is needed for girls in workshops it is also needed for girls employed in stores, telephone and telegraph offices and in the Civil Service, and I wish this House to be consistent, as I desire to be consistent myself. I do not approve of such legislation as is proposed by this Bill ; but the House having adopted the principle, I bow to its judgment, and now that we have decided that protection of female employés is absolutely necessary, let us make it general, and give type-writers, telegraph and telephone operators, shop girls, women in the Civil Service, females attending our schools, that protection. The proposal should recommend itself to the good sense of this House. It will be carrying out that moral legislation of which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), two or three years ago, set so bright an example, when you, Mr. Speaker, used my name as the seconder of his motion. I repeat that I do not consider such legislation to be necessary to protect female employés, who are pretty well able to protect themselves ; but the House having decided to give that protection, if it does not give protection to these other classes I have enumerated it will not be acting consistently, and the legislation of the country will have a peculiarity about it that will not recommend itself to the logical character of the legislation which it passes. Therefore, I move this amendment, seconded by my hon. friend, Mr. Charlton.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very glad to see that the hon. gentleman has changed his opinions, but I object to the speed with which he goes when he changes his mind.

Mr. MITCHELL. Speak louder ; I cannot hear you.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very sorry for that, but I will say it again. I am very glad indeed that the hon. gentleman has changed his mind as to the necessity for a provision of this kind in the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not change my mind ; I changed my action.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am unable, then, to enjoy the pleasure of understanding the hon. gentleman as being consistent in this matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are very simple.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I fancy so, and the hon. gentleman is very candid when he tells the House that he has changed his action without changing his mind. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact in regard to the amendment which the hon. gentleman proposes is simply this. We have, with regard to the Bill as it now stands, a tangible request from a responsible body, upon evidence which was before them and which was before the Government, of the necessity for legislation as far as the Bill goes. We have no cause, and we have no request, and we have no reason to believe, that more stringent legislation in that line is necessary at the present time. When a case is presented for us, or when representations are made for legislation so stringent as that is, we will come to the House and ask that the Act be amended. Until then, I think that the House would not be justified in making the provisions of the Bill so wide as to ensure what the mover of this amendment desires, namely, its ultimate defeat. As regards the provision as to age mentioned in this amendment, it was considered in committee, it was divided upon in committee, it was carried by a majority of two to one in committee, and it was carried on representations made to this House that cases had occurred calling for the intervention of the law, in respect to which the limit of age which appeared at first in the Bill, was altogether too short. Under these circumstances, I think the Committee will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think the hon. the Minister of Justice was in a very fortunate position to throw upon my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the charge of a change of opinion. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman is relieved to some extent from that difficulty by the frank statement of the hon. member for Northumberland, which I have understood from the beginning to be his attitude—

that he had not, in fact, changed his opinion. Upon the propriety of his pressing the House to make what he thinks a bad law a worse law, of course opinions may differ. My own view is, that if I entertained the opinions of the hon. member for Northumberland I should not propose the amendment. I do not think there is any obligation upon us, because we think that legislation is bad, to make it worse. But with reference to the suggestion which the hon. Minister of Justice made, that he was surprised to find a change of opinion, and the speed with which that opinion was changed, I repeat that I do not think he was in a very fortunate position to institute such a criticism upon my hon. friend from Northumberland. I am of the opinion, also, that the hon. Minister was in a very unfortunate position when he proceeded with another part of his argument—in fact, the only other part of the argument which was put forward by him—that we were the recipients of no request, no suggestion, no warrant of any kind, for passing such legislation as this. Why, Sir, the Bill which we have before us contains a clause just the same as that which the hon. member for Northumberland proposes, with the exception that it is more enlarged than that suggested by the hon. member for Northumberland. The Bill, as the hon. the Minister of Justice, the organ of the Government on this occasion, introduced it into the House, as he requested the sanction of this House for it, as he called upon us to pass it, as he proposed it to us, as a good and requisite law, contains, I say, language differing from that of the language of the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, in this only, that it is larger. It is the same, in fact, with the exception that it does not contain a limitation of age. The second clause of this Bill, as the hon. Minister of Justice, upon first thoughts, brought it down to us, reads thus:

"Every one who, being a guardian, seduces or has illicit connection with his ward, or who seduces or has illicit connection with any woman or girl of previously chaste character, who is in his employment, or who, being in a common employment with him, is, in respect of her employment or work, under, or in any way subject to, his control or direction, is guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to two years' imprisonment.

So that it contains the exact proposal of the hon. member for Northumberland, except that it includes no limitation of age, which the hon. member for Northumberland introduces. Therefore, I say that we, independent members of this House, who are called upon to deal with legislation, can hardly accede to the view of the Minister of Justice, that we had no request to legislate in this direction. We had a very authentic request; we had a request to which the majority of this House, during my long experience of that majority, has lent implicit obedience, and to which it has given its adhesion always. We had the request of the Government of the day, who proposed the clause. But the hon. Minister may say: "I have a right to change my opinion;" and he may also say: "Second thoughts are best." Well, Sir, he gave us his second thoughts, because he gave us the Bill reprinted, as proposed to be amended in committee. I have his second thoughts here, and while he varied other provisions of the Bill, on second thoughts this second clause remained the same; so that the improved and more matured and further consideration of the Minister of Justice, after having the benefit of time, of the suggestions of others, and of the reconsideration of his colleagues—his second thoughts were the same as his first thoughts, and still differed from the member for Northumberland's amendment only in the one particular to which I referred, namely, that his law was larger in that it made no limitation of age, as the hon. member for Northumberland does. It was not until the third time that the hon. Minister had reflected that he came down to alter the clause, which he now says he brings forward only because the labor organisations asked for it. Under these circumstances, I repeat the observation that the hon Minister of Justice was hardly warranted in discussing with the hon. member from Northumberland his changes of opinion, and that he was hardly warranted in addressing to us the proposition that we had no request for legislation like this. What moved the hon. gentleman when he introduced the Bill, and what moved him when he reprinted the Bill, to bring in and to continue this clause in the enlarged sense, I cannot, in view of his present attitude, say. But, I presume, that it was after consultation with his colleagues, and because he and they agreed that the legislation was wholesome. I believe, Sir, that it is wholesome legislation; I believe, that with reference to those who are in a position of subjection or dependency, it is very wholesome legislation, and this legislation is confined to those in such a position; and, therefore, because I agreed with the hon. Minister when he brought in the Bill, because I agreed with him when he introduced it in its second form, and because I agree, not with the opinions, but with the action of the hon. member for Northumberland, I propose to support the amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may, perhaps, be allowed to make an observation or two on the singular speech which has just been addressed to this House, and in which the hon. member for West Durham, with very little warrant indeed, has accused me of inconsistency in reflecting on the hon. member for Northumberland for having changed his opinion on the course to be adopted with reference to this Bill. To start with, I made no such reflection on the hon. member for Northumberland. I said that I was glad that he had changed his opinion; he had as good a right to do it as I had, if I had changed my opinion; but what I commented on was the statement that the hon. member for Northumberland had done what the hon. member for West Durham is now doing, changed his action without having changed his opinion. Now, it is true, the Bill, as I introduced it, provided for the prohibition of this offence committed by any employer with his employé. It was introduced for the purpose of meeting the very grievance which is now before the House, but it was defective in this particular, that it was not restricted to factories, which was the particular case we had in hand; and on reflection, and on conferring with members on both sides of the House, I found that they were willing that legislation should be adopted for the particular case for which it was asked, and that that would satisfy all demands for such legislation. The hon. gentleman has taunted me with having second thoughts on this question, and he has referred to the reprint of the Bill in which the clause appeared as it was in the first print. I had nothing to do with the second print; I never distributed it or had it distributed;

I asked that it should be cancelled as soon as I found that it was about to be distributed, and I immediately substituted the Bill which was before the House yesterday.

Mr. MITCHELL. Your name is on the back of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not care whether it is on the back or on the front ; I am simply stating a fact. But what of the second thoughts of the hon. member for West Durham ? The hon. gentleman sat for three days in committee on this Bill, and during all that time he never offered the amendment which he now thinks should be inserted in the Bill at the third reading. I should like to ask him where he got his second thoughts, and I should like to remind the House that it was at his instance, on his own motion, and at his own pathetic appeal, that the Committee agreed to extend the age from twenty-one to thirty years. Now he proposes, on second thoughts, to vote for the amendment to strike out that change.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not in order to strike out the change in age that I propose to vote for this amendment, but because, as I said, with reference to another clause, a greater amount of justice on the whole will be obtained by the clause as proposed to be remodelled than by the clause as it stands. The remodelled clause enormously extends the class of cases of persons in a subordinate and dependent position to which the law shall apply. So extended, I believe it is wiser and safer that there should be a restriction of the age, and I believe more good will be done by passing the clause with the wider application, but with the restriction of age, than by confining it to one particular class with the age extended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is to be regretted that passion or feeling should be introduced into the discussion of a question of this kind. I think the hon. member for Northumberland is ill-advised in coupling the amendment as to the age with the other limitation in the clause, because some will be disposed to accept the one portion of his amendment and not the other ; and I am disposed to accept both. The clause we have passed says that any person who occupies a position which gives him an improper influence over a female under his charge shall be liable for a misdemeanor. The three classes included in it are a guardian over his ward, an employer over a woman in his employ, and a workman over a female in a common employment with him who is at the time subject to his control or direction. If we adopt the principle that an employer or workman who seduces a woman under his control in a factory should be punished, on the ground that she is not a free agent, I cannot understand why the principle should be confined to them. The Bill does not go so far, with the words struck out, as many hon. gentlemen suppose. The woman seduced must, in the first place, be of previously chaste character ; in the second place, she must be under the control or direction of the person who seduces her ; and in the third place, she must be of a certain age. I think, therefore, that the principle we have adopted in the clause as it now stands is one that should be agreed to without the limitation which the hon. gentleman has inserted in the last reprint of the Bill. The first part of the section refers to a guardian who seduces his ward ; the second part to an employer who seduces a woman in his employ, and the third part to a man who, being in the common employment, seduces a woman who is in any way subjected to his control or direction. A man in common employment with the woman would not be liable for the offence unless it were proved at the same time that the woman was under or subject to his control or direction. This is the principle on which we carried the clause—that it is supposed that the woman is not a free agent. With these limitations and guards, I submit that the fresh limitation brought in, limiting the section to a factory, mill or workshop, weakens unnecessarily the legislation, and I shall support the amendment of my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. I just rise to say a few words to set myself right with this House in regard to the manner in which I think the hon. Minister of Justice has attempted to mislead the House with regard to my attitude. I appeal to the members of this House who listened to the remarks I made when I seconded the motion of my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), if I did not distinctly state that I was opposed to the extension of the principle, and I supported his motion because my conviction was that such protection was unnecessary. I stated distinctly then, that, as a matter of justice, the House having decided that this legislation was necessary, I stood convicted in my own mind that my judgment must be wrong ; and therefore, when I bowed submissively to the will of the House, what else was there before me but to ask this House to make its legislation consistent with the opinion it expressed. The hon. gentleman should not have attempted to mislead the House as to my attitude. I will say nothing about the course of the hon. gentleman and his uniformity of opinion in relation to this matter. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has sufficiently dealt with that, and placed my hon. friend in a queer position. Is he to be taunted, too—the hon. member for West Durham has defended himself, but I may say a word in that connection—is he to be taunted, too, because while he believes the limitation of time should be thirty in place of twenty-one, but still finding a larger extent of protection to females in my amendment, coupled with a reduction of the term from thirty to twenty, and having the option either of accepting a larger protection than he believes to be necessary or losing the whole, he should allow the minor idea he entertains to be subservient to the larger benefit. The House has voted that we must give protection to women. Let us give them that protection as extensive as possible, and it is the duty of every hon. gentleman to support the amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree in the observations of the hon. member for Northumberland or my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Blake). It is very important, in our legislation, that we should undertake to legislate with the view of correcting grievances, and not undertake to punish sin as if sin were a crime. In so far as Acts of this sort affect the good order and well-being of society, it is important we should consider them. Where there is a wrong being done, where there is an immoral coercion exercised by one party over another with a view of injuring reputation or

character, we have the right, as a legislative body, to intervene ; but it does seem to me that if the House undertakes to go as far as the hon. member for Northumberland proposes, it will altogether go beyond the line marked out by any real grievances which have been suffered or endured. Other hon. gentlemen may hold a different opinion, but I certainly entertain the view that the clause is better for the accomplishment of the object it has in view, as it stands, than if it were widened in the way proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland. What does this clause propose to deal with ? It proposes to deal with grievances and wrongs arising out of the dependency of one class of the community upon another. Does that dependence extend as wide as the relations between employer and employed ? I do not think it does. I do not think anyone here will pretend to say that is the position of things. In many cases, the employed are as independent as the employer, and there is no necessity for protection in such cases—as, for instance, in the case of ordinary household service or the employment of educated females. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that a literary woman, employed as a clerk, stands in the same position towards her employer as the ordinary hired woman in the factory ?

Mr. MITCHELL. I say she stands more so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I believe that statement would be regarded by any woman so employed as an imputation on her character and her ability to take care of herself. Why, a woman in a factory, if dismissed to-day, knows not where she may be employed to-morrow. She is only fit to perform certain work. She may be one of a large family in straitened circumstances, and from the necessity of her position is entitled to the protection of this House. Does experience point out injuries in other cases in the same way ?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with my hon. friend. I do not believe it tends to promote the moral standing of the people throughout a community to undertake to extend protection, which, experience shows, is not called for and in cases where, experience shows, instead of the employed being dependent on the employer, the difficulty is to get the employed to continue in that relation. If the hon. gentleman can show that the classes here spoken of—those in the factories, mills and workshops—do not embrace all the classes in which this extraordinary dependence exists, he will make out a case for adding others; but it seems to me, the very wide provision he proposes by his amendment is not one which experience shows to be necessary, and therefore I prefer the clause, as it now stands, to the amendment.

Mr. MITCHILL. Just one word in reply to the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman asks if literary women are as dependent upon their employers as women in factories. They are ten times more so. The masses of women in factories and workshops can find employment anywhere. Can literary women or women in shops ? No, they cannot ; and therefore the hon. gentleman's illustration does not apply to the position he has taken.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to one observation of the hon. member for Bothwell, I would say it has been established by statistics, carefully obtained in England, that the ranks of prostitution are recruited, not mainly or even to any large extent from factory girls, but out of all proportion from the ranks of domestic servants seduced by their employers.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I had hoped my hon. friend would not have coupled the two propositions in the resolution in your hands, Sir, because I find myself unable to vote for the whole proposition as submitted, although I would be glad to vote for the proposition to reduce the limit from thirty to twenty-one. So far as I am concerned, I have not changed my opinion with regard to this measure. I have never thought, and do not now think, that the measure is necessary ; and therefore I voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). Although there is a great deal of force in the argument of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that if you adopt the theory that protection is necessary to any class of women in any employment against their employer, or those who are in common employment with them, you should extend that protection beyond the limits defined by this Bill, yet, holding the opinion I do, that this legislation is not necessary at all, I find myself compelled to vote against the amendment of my hon. friend, because I hold, if legislation is bad it ought to be confined within as narrow a limit as possible. Therefore, while prepared to vote for the reduction of the age to twenty-one, I feel obliged to vote against the other proposition.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish just to say a word in explanation of the vote I shall feel obliged to give upon the amendment now before the House. Had I been in my place at the time, I should have voted for the amendment of my hon. friend the member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), but not having had the opportunity of doing so, I desire to say that I think the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) only makes the matter worse, that it only makes the clause more mischievous than it was before, and I think it would be difficult to adopt any more mischievous legislation than that which we are now passing. I feel satisfied that, while we are trying to remedy one evil, we are opening the door to an evil which is much worse. I do not desire to detain the House, but I wish to enter my protest against this legislation altogether, believing, as I do, that the result will be that many young men who have had little experience in life will find that they are the seduced, and that they are in a position which will entail a fearful amount of sorrow and suffering upon themselves and their families. I think that the mothers of Canada, when their sons are going to enter upon a city life, will feel still more alarmed as to the dangers they are to encounter than they do now, when they find that this Bill has been placed upon the Statute-book.

Mr. TISDALE. I beg to move, in amendment to the amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to

substitute in the twelfth line of the second section the word "twenty-one" in place of the word "thirty."

That is the strong ground which I have taken from the start in regard to this Bill. I regret that I was absent from the Committee when the change was made. I had read that clause, and I supposed that there would be no question of changing the age. I know of many other members who were inclined to pass the clause in its original shape, but they never supposed that such a change would he made as to raise the age to thirty. According to our law, if a man or woman ever comes to the age of discretion it is at twenty-one years of age, and I strongly object to anything being placed on the Statute-book which will have the effect of saying that the age of discretion for all purposes is not twenty-one years. I told the Minister of Justice that I proposed to move this amendment, and he asked me not to do it then, but to do it at this stage of the Bill, so that the business of the House might be proceeded with. This being an opportune time, and this being one of my principal objections to the Bill, I move it now. I am opposed to the principle of this legislation altogether, but as the House has expressed an opinion to the contrary, I must bow to it, and I, therefore, take what, in my opinion, is the second best proceeding.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of hon. members to the fact that it would be better to have only one way of drafting amendments to motions which are before the House. The amendment should be that certain words should be struck off and others substituted. In this case, for instance, the amendment should be that all the words after the word "instructions" should be struck out, and then the amendment should instruct the Committee to alter the word "thirty" to the word "twenty-one."

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the sub-amendment is out of order altogether, as it is not applicable to the amendment which I moved, and I think it should not be put.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is in order, because it proposes that part of the amendment be struck off, and that the latter part of the amendment should be changed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to correct you?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am correcting the Speaker on a matter of fact, which, no doubt, has escaped his attention. I contend that, on that ground, the amendment is out of order, because it is not an amendment to the one I have moved.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I think, is correct on the point of order. What my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) wants, can be obtained by moving his amendment subsequently.

Mr. TISDALE. I submit that the amendment to the amendment is in order, if it proposes to drop a material part of the original amendment. Supposing the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) were lost, would it then be in order for me to move this amendment?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. TISDALE. Because, if I could not move it then, the House having already pronounced on the main question, I could not have an opportunity of proposing to reinstate the age as in the original Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. As a matter of form, I think the amendment to the amendment is out of order, but I think it would be in order to ask the House to affirm one part of the amendment and to disaffirm the other part. At the same time, I have no doubt that it would be in order for the hon. gentleman to move his amendment after the other amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to put my motion in order. I confess that I am quite ignorant of the technical rules of the House, but I wish my amendment to be put as an amendment to that of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. MITCHELL. The question has been called, anyway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) will withdraw his amendment, because those who are supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and are also in favor of the amendment to the amendment, will be obliged to vote against the latter. I want to support both amendments, and if the hon. gentleman withdraws his amendment he can move it subsequently.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) will certainly get a larger support for his amendment if he moves it independently than if he moves it now as an amendment to the other amendment, because he must see that it will eliminate from the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland the words which many members desire to see adopted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would advise the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) not to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), because he is opposed to the change suggested by the hon. member, as, in fact, it was at his suggestion that the age was changed from twenty-one to thirty.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a statement worthy of the Minister of Justice. It amounts to saying that my suggestion was disingenuous because my opinion as to the age is different from that of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). I made a statement very clearly to the hon. member for South Norfolk, that if he withdrew his amendment now, he could move it again after this amendment was disposed of, but that if he moved it now, it would, if carried, defeat the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland; so that several members who were in favor of his amendment would have to vote against it in order to prevent the defeat of the other amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have just one word to say in reply to the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale).

Mr. SPEAKER. I think hon. gentlemen are getting out of order by speaking several times.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking on the amendment to the amendment, if it is before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken on this amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not spoken on this point.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let the point of order be ruled on.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let me say one word to the hon. gentleman. He knows that amendment was prepared by myself, and was only to be moved in case my amendment failed, and I think he is not pursuing a course that will commend itself to this House.

Mr. TISDALE. I think it is necessary I should make an explanation. In the first place, I am obliged to all the hon. gentlemen who have offered me their advice. I always appreciate that, but I generally prefer to follow my own judgment. It is true, as the hon. member for Northumberland says, that he gave me that amendment; it is true, he told me that two others were going to be moved, but I did not say whether I would support either of them. It is equally true, as twenty gentlemen, at least, on this side of the House know, that I told them not only to-day, but after my interview with the Minister of Justice, that I would move such a resolution as that. When the discussion took the turn it did to-day I thought that the most opportune time for my motion was after the main amendment was lost, and that the present was the most likely time to carry the amendment in which I felt an interest, and by which I hoped to shorten the proceedings. I propose to press my amendment to the amendment, and leave the House to decide.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the ruling of the Chair, whether the amendment to the amendment is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I decided that the sub-amendment was in order, inasmuch as it tended to strike off part of the provision of my hon. friend, and to accept another part.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Tisdale:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),
Barnard,
Béchard,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Borden,
Bowman,
Bryson,
Burns,
Cargill,
Carpenter,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dessaint,
Dickey,
Doyon,
Earle,
Ellis,
Ferguson (Welland),
Gauthier,
Gigault,
Gordon,
Hickey,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Labrosse,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
McCulla,
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McKeen,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Mulock,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rykert,
Ste. Marie,
Shanly,
Small,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Turcot,
Wallace,
Watson,
Weldon (Albert),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox).—71.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Bergin,
Blake,
Boisvert,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brien,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Carling,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Cook,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Daoust,
Davies,
Dawson,
De St. Georges,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Foster,
Freeman,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grandbois,
Guay,
Guillet,
Hall,
Hesson,
Holton,
Innes,
Jamieson,
Kirk,
Jones (Halifax),
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier (Quebec),
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lépine,
Lister,
Livingstone,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Mackenzie,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Meigs,
Mitchell,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Essex),
Perry,
Platt,
Porter,
Purcell,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Scriver,
Semple,
Skinner,
Smith (Ontario),
Somerville,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Trow,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Waldie,
Welsh,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Elgin),
Wood (Brockville),
Yeo.—98.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has not voted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I had paired. I would have voted against the amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barnard,
Barron,
Bergin,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyle,
Brien,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Cimon,
Cook,
Davies,
Davis,
De St. Georges,
Desaulniers,
Dessaint,
Earle,
Eisenhauer,
Innes,
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier (Quebec),
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
Mackenzie,
McMillan (Huron),
Meigs,
Mitchell,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Pope,
Porter,
Prior,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Shanly,

Ellis,	Somerville,
Fiset,	Tisdale,
Gauthier,	Trow,
Geoffrion,	Turcot,
Gillmor,	Waldie,
Godbout,	Watson,
Gordon,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Guay,	Wilson (Elgin),
Holton,	Wilson (Lennox),
Hudspeth,	Yeo.—74.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Audet,	LaRivière,
Bain (Soulanges),	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Béchard,	Lépine,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Boisvert,	Macdowall,
Bowell,	McCulla,
Bryson,	McDonald (Victoria),
Burns,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cameron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Carling,	McKay,
Carpenter,	McKeen,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Chapleau,	McNeill,
Cochrane,	Madill,
Cockburn,	Mara,
Colby,	Marshall,
Costigan,	Masson,
Coughlin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Coulombe,	Mills (Bothwell),
Daly,	Moncrieff,
Daoust,	Montague,
Dawson,	Patterson (Essex),
Denison,	Purcell,
Dewdney,	Putnam,
Dickey,	Riopel,
Dickinson,	Roome,
Doyon,	Rykert,
Dupont,	Skinner,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Small,
Ferguson (Welland),	Smith (Ontario),
Foster,	Stevenson,
Freeman,	Taylor,
Gigault,	Temple,
Grandbois,	Thérien,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hall,	Tyrwhitt,
Hesson,	Vanasse,
Hickey,	Wallace,
Jamieson,	Weldon (Albert),
Jones (Digby),	White (Cardwell),
Kenny,	White (Renfrew),
Kirkpatrick,	Wilmot,
Labrosse,	Wood (Brockville).—88.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the main motion is put, I desire to get a statement from the Government. The majority, I understand, is only 12. During the term of Lord Dufferin, in 1873, when I had the honor to be slightly responsible for public affairs, a crisis occurred, and I recollect that Lord Dufferin declared at that time that if the majority of the Government in a division was not greater than the number of the members of the Government in the House, the Government were practically defeated. I would now like to ask the right hon. gentleman what course he intends to pursue under the circumstances?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The majority is greater than the number of the members of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. Their number is only 12, I understand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is 14.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then the Government is saved by a majority of 2.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to direct attention for a moment to another description of concerted action than that to which our attention has been directed this afternoon, and upon which I made some observations yesterday. I refer to the provision with reference to trade combinations. It is not my intention to engage in the fruitless task of pressing my views to a division, but I will simply take occasion to record them. I move the following amendment:—

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the eighteenth section by omitting the proposed substituted sub-section of section 13, chapter 173 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:—

"No prosecution shall be maintainable against any person for conspiracy in refusing to work with or for any employer or workman, or for doing any act, or causing any act to be done for the purposes of a trade combination, unless such act is an offence indictable by statute, or punishable under the provisions of the twelfth section of this Act."

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McNEILL. I move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee, with instructions to amend the second clause by inserting in the tenth line, after the word "one," the words "being over twenty-one years of age."

I wish to explain that the purpose of the amendment is to protect boys under twenty-one years of age from the operation of this Act. It seems to me that it is a proper thing that an inexperienced boy should be protected from this Act. Boys who come to the city, for the first time, from a country place, and fall into the hands of designing young women and are seduced by them, are by this clause liable to punishment by two years' imprisonment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman who has proposed this amendment has not fully considered one feature of the clause, which seems to make it unnecessary to adopt a provision of this kind. The Bill makes it punishable for any person, and it desires the age to be defined, to seduce or have improper connection with any person in his employ, in a factory, mill, or workshop. The man is not likely to be under twenty-one years.

Mr. BERGIN. There are many under that age who are superintendents in mills.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the word "direction" mentioned in the Bill is a very wide term, and it is difficult to define or limit its meaning. Any boy who happens to be a little in advance of some young woman connected with the same work and has the direction of it is subjected to the penalty of this clause. Any boy who has only arrived in the city a few weeks ago, may be superior in knowledge to a young woman who came into the factory about the same time, and have her as a subordinate, although she may be a city girl and a very different sort of person.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BRIEN. I desire the Minister of Finance to take up Nos. 171 and 182 with respect to nursery stock already purchased in the United

States. I find from the information in my possession that the duty is now practically prohibitive, and it is necessary that a decision should be arrived at in regard to this matter. In the section of country from which I come delivery should take place now or next week, and if they are not allowed to take the consignments out at the old duties much loss will be inflicted. When you add the new duty to the cost the amount exceeds that which can be obtained for the stock. If the stock be not allowed to be taken out under the old duties the orders cannot be fulfilled. I have a letter here which I desire to read.

Mr. FOSTER. I have received several representations of a similar nature to those received by the hon. gentleman. The resolutions must be taken in order. There are other interests besides those of nursery stock, and quite as pressing interests, and we will get through the work all the more rapidly if hon. gentlemen opposite will assist in the despatch of business.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. BRIEN. Before you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was calling attention to the fact that I thought it would be desirable for the Government to allow trees and nursery stock, which had been ordered in the United States some time ago, to be admitted into Canada under the old tariff. These contracts were entered into in the fall of the year, when there was no possibility of the men engaged in this business having any knowledge that a change would be made in the tariff. In fact, it might be considered that it was very unlikely a change would be made in this respect, because it was only in the year 1888 that trees and nursery stock were placed on the free list. Neither the farmers nor the agents had any idea, therefore, that a duty would be imposed. I have a communication from a gentleman in the constituency I have the honor to represent, which, with the permission of the House, I will read. It states the difficulties which will arise unless these articles are admitted under the old tariff. It says:

"KINGSVILLE, 9th April, 1890.

"DR. BRIEN, M.P.,
"Essex County, Ont.

"DEAR SIR,—I write you to-day, asking you to use your influence with the Minister of Customs regarding the nursery stock which I have bought in the United States, and cannot bring it into Canada on account of the heavy Customs duty. My stock of grape vines cost me $8 per 1,000 in New York, while the duties are $30 per 1,000, being nearly 400 per cent. over value of stock. The duties alone are more than what I have re-sold the same stock for; consequently it is cheaper for me to lose the entire stock for which I have paid than to pay the duty. I am of the opinion there is a great mistake in duties on vines, as 400 per cent. means to prohibit their importation.

"Yours, etc.,
"WELLINGTON WIGLE."

The name of the gentleman who signed the letter will easily indicate what his politics are. It may be said that if the permission is granted in this case it should be granted in various others, but I think there are special reasons why this permission should be granted to those who have ordered this nursery stock. In the first place, they may not be able to obtain what they need in this country, and it is too late in the year now to re-order, so that the consequence is that the country will be either deprived of the use of this stock altogether, or those engaged in the business will lose money. I cannot help but thinking that the Government, in imposing this duty, have done so for want of thorough information on the matter. As the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance will see, the new tariff is entirely prohibitory in the case of some of those articles. There have been some precedents for the course which I now ask the Government to take. It was done in 1887, with regard to the duty on iron, and I will read the clause of the Act which refers to this matter. It says:

"All goods actually purchased on or before the said thirteenth of May at any place out of Canada, for importation into Canada, on evidence to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs of the purchase having been so made, and all goods in warehouse in Canada on such day, may be entered for duty at the rate of duty in force immediately before the said day; but the provisions of this section shall cease to have force and effect on the first day of July in the present year, excepting that goods from the United Kingdom or any British possession, carried by way of Cape Horn may be entered in British Columbia under the provisions aforesaid until the first day of November in the present year."

I will also trouble the House with a short extract from a speech delivered by Sir A. T. Galt, under similar circumstances, in 1859. This speech was made some time after the Budget had been brought down, and on the occasion of a similar request as that I am now asking being made in the House. I might say that when Sir A. T. Galt made this speech the changes in the tariff were not anything so great as at the present time. He said:

"That he had stated last evening that the Government would be prepared to consider the way in which the important interest of Upper, and he might say Lower Canada, would be affected by the immediate changes that were about to be made in the mode of levying duties.

"The Government had taken the matter into consideration, and he was now prepared to state the modifications which he felt it his duty to move in reference to certain articles.

"1st. With regard to tea. Being desirous to interfere as little as possible with this article, the Government have come to the determination, that the duty be reduced from 25 to 15 per cent., and that it shall not take effect until January next.

"With regard to sugar, he thought the same causes were in operation which had rendered it convenient to reduce the duty on tea. But it was intended that the new system with regard to them should come into operation on the first of June next, which he thought would give sufficient time for merchants to make arrangements to meet it."

The change referred to by Sir A. T. Galt was simply from a specific to an *ad valorem* duty; but in this case it is imposing a heavy duty upon goods which, previous to this proposed tariff, were on the free list, and the reasons for making the concession which I ask in this case are far stronger than the reasons which induced Sir A. T. Galt to make the remarks I have quoted. I might say that, for my part, I think that this duty is an injustice to the section of the country which I represent, and which is largely interested in fruit-growing. The policy of the Government being to protect our native industries, I think it would be desirable that the fruit trees should be allowed to remain on the free list. They are to the producer of fruit what the raw material is to the manufacturer, and I think it would have been better policy to have allowed these fruit trees to remain on the free list. In looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that, in 1889, we exported fruit to the amount of $1,675,818, which is equal to 37 per cent. of all

our exports of manufactured goods. Under the circumstances, I think the least the Government can do is to allow the fruit trees which have already been ordered to be brought in under the old tariff. Unless they do that, a great injustice will be perpetrated on the people who have ordered these fruit trees, and no benefit that I can see will accrue to the country apart from the amount of duty received. It has been stated that the duties imposed upon small fruits will be of great advantage to the fruit-growing sections of the country ; but, considering the heavy duty imposed on fruit trees, that advantage will not be very great. Taking as a basis the imports of fruit trees and nursery stock last year, the amount of revenue that will be received from these duties will be something like $50,000. What we in our section are afraid of is, that the re-imposition of these duties may lead to retaliation on the part of the Americans. Living close to the border, as we do, we produce many small fruits, and I believe the fruit industry might be cultivated to a very profitable extent in that part of the country. I hope, therefore, that the Government will see their way to grant this slight request, in justice to the farmers who desire these fruit trees, as well as in justice to the agents, who had no idea that fruit trees, at any rate, would be placed on the dutiable list. They thought that whatever change might be made, fruit trees, in accordance with the policy of the Government, would probably be left on the free list. I am very anxious to have a decision on this matter as soon as possible, because the season is already so far advanced that it is time that these fruit trees were planted. Unless an immediate decision is come to it will be too late for the farmers to order their stock elsewhere, many of them will lose their purchase money, the country will lose the benefit of the trees, and a great deal of inconvenience will result to all parties.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I quite agree with all that has been said by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien) in reference to this matter. I think it would be only right if the Government would allow orders which have been already taken, to be filled, without imposing the duty. As has been stated so ably to the House, orders were taken during the winter ; and I may say that in consequence of the very large fruit crop which we had in the western part of Ontario last year the farmers made up their minds to go into fruit-growing much more extensively than they have done heretofore, and, therefore, gave a much greater number of orders during the winter, and the duty on these is so large that it will be quite impossible for the nurserymen to fill their orders on the old terms. So that I think that, for this season, at all events, the Government ought to allow the stock to come in without paying the duty.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to endorse what has been said in reference to this fruit tree business. I acknowledge that it is very difficult for the Government, when framing a tariff, to make any exceptions, and I think that should not be done unless a special case is made out. From what I understand of this fruit tree business, in my opinion it is a special case, because the trees must be ordered in the fall, and they cannot be delivered until the spring. In this respect they cannot be considered like ordinary goods, which can be brought in at any time, for the dealers in these trees gave their orders last fall, when they had no idea that there was going to be a change made in the tariff. I think this is one of the cases in which the Government ought to try to see their way to remit the duty for this year, and I would certainly strongly urge them to do so. In doing so, I do not think their action will be inconsistent with applying the ordinary rule to other things, unless a special case is made out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When I was going west a short time ago a gentleman engaged in this business spoke to me on the subject. He had been taking orders last fall and winter for fruit trees, and he had not the slightest idea that there was going to be any change made in the tariff. It was rumored about the time I was going home that a duty would be placed on these trees, and if so it was going materially to injure his business, because he was bound to deliver the trees for which he had taken orders, and any duty that might be imposed would come out of his own pocket and would be a very serious loss to him. He urged that the sales already made should be allowed to be carried out without the duty being imposed. He appeared to me to have a very strong case. He stated that he had made application to the Department of Customs to that effect, and he was very much concerned about the matter. I hope the Government will see their way clear to permit such cases as this to be fairly considered, so that those engaged in the business will be able to get them in as they did last year.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this matter have made out a very strong case, but seem to be at a loss for a precedent on which the Government can act. Speaking from memory and subject to correction, I think I can give them a precedent which meets the case. When the tariff was rearranged some few years ago and an increased duty put on iron pipes and plates and other articles of which iron formed the chief constituent, the importers of Montreal and Toronto were very much in the position of the fruit tree men, and several of them applied to me in the matter. I stated that they had a strong case, and that they should lay the matter before the Government. They came to the Government in a body, and I think the Government agreed that whenever it was shown that an actual order or shipment had taken place, prior to the imposition of the extra duty, these things would be allowed in free.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was confined to contract.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well, to contracts if you like ; but the principle was recognised that where actual purchases were made under the old duty these purchases would not be subject to the additional duty. While on this question, I will speak on a cognate subject, that of fruits and early vegetables. It is a mistaken policy to tax fruits and early vegetables coming into this country. On our continent climatic difference exists to a great extent. It is summer now in Georgia, Alabama and the Carolinas ; ripe strawberries are growing in those regions, but we cannot get these luxuries without paying an enormously heavy duty. Later on, when their

season for strawberries is over, we can export ours to the United States and the same remarks reply to gooseberries, raspberries and other berries. In the matter of eggs, too, we get eggs early in the season from the States, and later on we export eggs to the States. Why should we have to pay a heavy duty on these fruits and other products, which are almost necessities for the health of the children of this country? I think the Government would show judgment and a proper regard for the health and welfare of our community if they would allow these things to come in free. In any case they should grant this request of the fruit tree men, and carry out the same principle with regard to fruit trees which they carried out with regard to iron.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) ought to convince the Government that it is their duty to follow the precedent they established with regard to iron. It is well known that all the orders taken for fruit trees from our farmers are taken in the shape of contracts. The agents go around in the fall of the year and get the farmers to sign contracts for the number of trees they require, to be delivered in the spring, and in every case where these trees, shrubs, plants and grape vines are imported in the spring, they were bought on fall contracts. The interests of the men who sold the vines and the trees are not the only interests to be considered, because it is well known that fruit-growing is becoming an important industry all through the Province of Ontario especially, and, I presume, also in other Provinces. The farmers enter largely into this branch of industry, because they find they can make more money in this way than by growing cereals, and this duty will be a serious blow to that industry. The duty will, in some cases, be prohibitory, and the consequence will be that the agents who have taken the orders will fail to fulfil them, and the farmers who have given the orders will be unable to obtain the stock they intended to plant for the purpose of starting or increasing their fruit-growing farms. Just to show the large amount of money at stake in this matter, I will read from the Trade and Navigation Returns the imports in 1889 of fruit trees and grape vines:

	No.	Value.
Apple	542,886	$37,692
Cherry	25,072	2,024
Peach	84,583	6,385
Pear	77,752	11,100
Plum	67,843	10,823
Quince	9,433	962
All other fruit trees and seedling stock of the same.	.....	10,056
Blackberry, currant, gooseberry, raspberry and rose bushes	.....	8,349
Grape and strawberry vines.	.....	6,435
Shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants...	.....	34,731
Total		$128,557

It must be manifest that if we imported that quantity in 1889, a larger number of orders has been given during the past year for importation this spring. It would be a great injustice to the farmers and fruit growers if the Government insisted upon putting a duty on the stock coming in this year and ordered by contract last fall. I hope, therefore, they will seriously consider the matter, and not do this injustice to the farmer and fruit growers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt whatever that the regular practice always has been, and of necessity must be, to decline to consider cases in a general way parallel to this, but the Minister of Finance must be aware that this is done because, as a general rule, merchants are pretty well able to guess what the tariff changes will be, and it would be very unfair to assist them in obtaining moneys that belong to the public. But this is an exceptional case, and there are precedents for dealing with such cases. I can give the hon. gentleman a somewhat analogous case, though perhaps not exactly the same in detail, but practically the same in principle, which occurred, if my memory serves me, under Sir Francis Hincks. The tea duty was remitted, and I think Sir Francis Hincks had then recourse to the extraordinary expedient of paying a sort of bounty to the parties who held tea, and whose tea, as he alleged, was in a certain sense depreciated in value by the duty being throw off. Speaking from recollection, that was the course taken by the Government in 1871 or 1872, and certainly that would be a greater stretch of precedent than would be involved in recognising the contracts which have been made under the circumstances stated by my hon. friend. Of course, this is a matter wholly within the discretion of the Government, and although I think no harm could arise—particularly after what has been done before—in recognising these contracts, I am not prepared to press the matter further than to point out to the hon. gentleman what has been done by his predecessors. As to the general question of the tax upon grapes and apple trees and the like which has been brought up, I would call the attention of the House to this fact, which I think should weigh with the Government. It is of the greatest possible benefit to fruit growers all over this country to be able to obtain fresh stock, fresh apple trees, fresh plum trees, fresh peach trees, and so on. That is equivalent to obtaining seed from different localities, and I have no doubt that all over this country, and particularly in the older settled portions, it will be found that a great number of our fruit trees are dying out and it would be desirable to replace them by fresh stock from the United States or elsewhere. We may discuss this at greater length when the items are before us in committee, but I call the attention of the Finance Minister to that view of the question.

Mr. KIRK. This is a matter of considerable importance to the Province of Nova Scotia, from which I come. I have taken no part in this discussion so far, because I felt that the Government, like Ephraim, have been joined to their idols, and, therefore, it would be better to leave them alone. I think that the adage that "those whom the gods intend to destroy, they first make mad," must apply to the Government. I think they have gone mad, and for that reason, perhaps, they should be allowed to have all the rope they want and they will soon hang themselves. The duty on fruit trees is of great importance, especially to the eastern portion of Nova Scotia. In that section we have not gone very extensively into the growth of fruit, though they have raised fruit very extensively in the western portion of the Province. Recently, however, our farmers, who have been under the impression that the climate or the land,

or both, in eastern Nova Scotia, were not adapted for raising fruit, have found that fruit can be raised with profit, though, perhaps, not as well as in western Nova Scotia or in some other portions of the Dominion. Many farmers in eastern Nova Scotia are beginning to plant young trees and cultivate young orchards, and with considerable success. I will give a little of my own experience in this matter, in order to show the necessity for the farmers being able to secure their trees fresh and green for the purpose of planting. Being a farmer myself, I have been doing something in this matter in a small way. Although I have tried to raise fruit trees for a number of years, I have never succeeded very well ; but in 1888 an agent from one of the Ontario nurseries came to me and solicited an order. I gave a small order for $5 worth of trees. I forget the number of trees, but they were to be delivered in the spring. Afterwards, a gentleman came along who represented a nursery in the State of New York—I think in Rochester. I told him I had given an order to a firm in Ontario for all the trees that I intended to plant the next spring. He explained to me that the railway connections were so bad that the trees I would get from Ontario would very likely not grow after I got them. I thought there might be something in that, and I duplicated my order, but I got nearly twice as many trees from the Rochester firm as from the Ontario firm for the same money. When I received the trees from Ontario in the spring the roots appeared to be dry. However, I planted them ; some of them died ; others were sickly, and remained sickly to the fall. The trees I received from Rochester were as green and fresh as when they came out of the nursery. I planted them ; they grew beautifully, and have been doing well. I do not intend to say a word against the Ontario nursery, but the condition of the trees was owing to the distance they had to be brought.

Mr. DENISON. What firm was it ?

Mr. KIRK. I think it was Stone & Wellington, of Welland, Ont. This has been my experience. I not only got more trees from the Rochester firm, but better and greener trees, and they grew better. I do not know how they will turn out later on. Most of what I got from Stone & Wellington died, while those which I got from the Rochester nursery thrived. I think, therefore, that it is wrong for the Government to prevent us from getting these trees from any place, no matter where, in a proper condition to grow. I do not pretend to say that the fault was in the firm in Ontario. It was simply that the trees had to be brought such a long distance and were kept so long on the way that they were dried up before they arrived, and were of very little use when they came to me. Naturally, I would not again give an order to that firm in Ontario for fruit trees, because, if I were not shut out by the laws of the land, I would order my trees from Rochester, in the State of New York.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am certainly in full accord with the hon. gentleman who brought this matter before the House. There are many reasons why I think the Government ought on this occasion consider the representations made to them in reference to granting, for the time being, the importation of fruit trees of various kinds from the United States. As has been stated, they have before them examples, in 1887, where contracts had been entered into and agreements made between different parties, and they allowed the articles that had an increased duty placed upon them to come in under the former duty. Here we have an example of this kind, that in reference to contracts entered into by the Car Wheel Company to supply car wheels at a certain price for a certain firm, and the Government allowed the pig iron that was necessary for the completion of that contract to come in, and the firm were unable to manufacture the necessary number of car wheels that they had contracted for. That was only reasonable. I know this to be the case from the fact that it occurred with a firm in the town from which I come. Then, again, it was only two years ago that the Government changed the policy they had been pursuing before that time. Before that time they had a duty placed upon small fruit trees coming from the United States, and the nurserymen here found the Government changing about so suddenly, having placed duties upon these trees one year, and suddenly, by Order in Council, changing or removing the duty, that they felt an uncertainty, they felt that they were justified in making up any deficiency they might have in their nursery, by going to the United States and importing a certain number of trees to complete their orders. Orders are taken either in the fall or during the winter, and they have to supply these trees at a certain figure. Now, unexpectedly—because no one imagined for a moment that the Government had removed the duties on these trees, on account of their standing order having been placed upon the Statute-books ever since their fiscal policy came into operation—they removed that two years ago. I say, could any of these nurserymen for a moment imagine that the Government would suddenly come down and impose a duty upon these trees and place those individuals who had engaged in these contracts at a disadvantage, and compel them to pay a heavy duty upon fruit trees coming from the United States ? I do not think the Government could for a moment expect these men, after they had entered into a contract upon the faith of the Government having removed the duty from these trees, to go on and cultivate trees in Canada. Now, I say, the Government on this occasion are bound in honor to allow, for the time being, all trees to come in here where the individual importing those trees can give satisfactory evidence that the contract had been made prior to the imposition of the duty upon these trees. While we are appealing to the Finance Minister to deal justly by the farmers and the farming community, to deal out to them the same meed of justice which they granted at the proper time to the rich and affluent manufacturers, those who are engaged in the manufacturing industries of iron and other things, while we are compelled to do that to-day, it is very soothing, no doubt, to the Finance Minister, because he goes off quietly to sleep. I think that shows the amount of interest the Government of the day take in the farming community. I say, in all fairness to the farmers, in all fairness to those small nurserymen, an important class, these small nurserymen in Canada who have not a sufficiency to supply all the contracts they have entered into, that they should have the duty

removed, or, at least, they should be allowed to bring into the country the amount necessary to fill all the orders they have taken. I hope that the Government, though I must confess it is a despairing hope, will consider the just claims of these individuals and allow them to import their goods into Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, changes in the tariff must be kept a profound secret, that is in the public interest, and when they are announced they will take parties by surprise, and in tariff changes there will be more or less hardship entailed upon individuals, and I recognise that it is a delicate matter to ask the Ministry, after the tariff changes have been announced, that they should make an exception in the levying of these taxes, and it is only when a special occasion is made out that I think they ought to give it consideration. I do not wish to weary the House by repeating arguments ; no doubt the Ministry have made up their minds ; at least they have had the benefit of the views of parties generally in reference to it. I do think that in this individual matter that a special case is made out. From the nature of the transaction, the contracts have been made necessarily some months ago, and the delivery necessarily being delayed, not because parties were not ready to take them, but on account of its being the winter season, and they not being able to ship them, it might be viewed, it seems to me, as a transaction absolutely closed under the old tariff. Another point that I may just mention that has not been dealt with is, that in many cases the people who will suffer hardship under this change in the tariff are agents, who will lose, perhaps, all their commission. It will not come upon the seller in the United States, who could view it more pleasantly, nor will it come out of the consumers or be divided among them, else the burden would be lighter ; but in many cases the losses will go on accumulating upon the agent, who is generally a man just earning his livelihood, and as I understand it, he being unable to fulfil the contract that he has made with these individuals, must suffer the loss himself. A variety of circumstances might take place. I only instance this as one of the hardships. I have had communications from nurserymen who are interested in growing stock, and they state they have to import certain kinds of stock ; so even they are somewhat interested in the matter. On general principles it will not do to urge it to its full extent, but I have made these remarks because my attention has been called to it, and I have had some pleading letters from those who could ill afford to pay the amount of duty they would have to pay if this change must take place. I have more faith than the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) in the Ministers, and I think the representations made will, at all events, receive their consideration.

Mr. BOYLE. I scarcely think hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this subject are really serious. It would be a delicate matter for the Government to accede to the wishes expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not see why nursery stock should be placed in any other position than other imported goods. Great changes have been made in the tariff in other classes of articles, such as hardware and dry goods. Orders for those goods were also given long before the tariff came down, and if the Government allowed an exception to be made in the case of nursery stock it would likewise have to be applied to other articles. The Government, in taking any steps in that direction, would be opening for themselves a matter of extreme difficulty. Moreover, decreases in duty have been made in some cases, and if the principle urged by hon. gentlemen opposite is adopted I do not understand why refunds of duties should not be made in those cases to which I have referred. I hope the Government will stand to the tariff as it is, and not make exceptions.

Mr. WALDIE. It must be remembered in dealing with nursery stock that they are perishable goods. The trees have been removed from the soil, and are either in course of shipment or have already arrived, and sold under contract. A loss is entailed on some one, and it is not reasonable that the Government should cause that loss to fall upon a nursery dealer, a man who is engaged in selling fruit trees. Those trees having been placed on the market at rates that were acceptable to the farmers and fruit growers, the contract should be filled without loss to the dealers.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) stated that no exception should be made in regard to trees. I hold, however, that they form an exception to almost every other kind of products. There are only two seasons when they can be removed, fall and spring ; they may be ordered at any period during the year, but they can only be removed at those two seasons. Almost any other goods can be brought into the country at any time. Where farmers are prepared to increase their orchards or plant young orchards the land requires special preparation for trees, and if the trees are not forthcoming they have to prepare the soil a second time. I hope, as exceptions have been shown to have been made, that this question will receive the consideration of the Government. The Government profess to be deeply interested in the agricultural community. This is something in which the agricultural community are interested, and the farmer who plants an orchard is going to receive an injury unless he is able to get the trees at the old rates of duty. As an injustice will be inflicted on the gentlemen who have made contracts with the farmers and the farmers themselves, the Government should give this matter their favorable consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not propose to go into the discussion of the question at this time, which has been referred to by so many hon. gentlemen opposite, as to the propriety of putting a duty on either fruits or plants. That will more particularly come when the item which we are approaching will be before the Committee. I may say, however, with respect to the question of the reduction of duties that, as has been admitted by two hon. gentlemen opposite who are very well capable of speaking with respect to such subjects, it is a pretty delicate matter to approach and difficult to touch. No one knows when tariffs are framed what propositions are going to be brought down. The tariff must be brought down at once and go into operation at once, and it is impossible for any branch of trade to previse what changes will be in the tariff, and the community must take their chances as to the raising and lowering of

duties. The precedents which have been cited are two, I think, only two in all our tariff history; one was with reference to the duty on tea, which occurred a long while ago; and the other was in 1887, in regard to iron. The hon. Minister of Customs tells me that only a few days ago he had an application for payment on some of the tea in store when the duty was removed, which remission of duty occurred so many years ago. However, these two are the only exceptions, I believe, in the course of our tariff history. With respect to the tea duty, I do not think that is analogous, and even if it were, I think it would be a rather extraordinary policy to pursue from a tariff point of view. With respect to the question of iron, I think that transcends the question which has been spoken of to-night far and far away. We must recollect that in 1887 not only were there tariff changes on iron, but numerous other tariff changes, and petitions and representations were made to have an adjustment of duty or the duty collected on the old rate on numerous other articles besides iron. It was only in the case of iron the principle was admitted, and only in cases where it had been bought and shipped from the old country, and where it was contracted for here, and actually sold; so that other sales had been made and other operations had been predicated upon the basis of the iron sold. Of course hon. gentlemen all know how far these shipments of iron go as a basis for the general trade of the country, and to what a large extent they would affect the different interests. If hon. gentlemen can show that, in the case of nursery stock, so large and fundamental an interest as that is involved, they would have an analogous case, but I do not think they have shown it. It is impossible to give this remission of duty upon nursery stock and to shut the door upon others which run on about the same lines, and which are far more important and far larger than the one which has been spoken of. For instance, there are importations of dry goods. Merchants from different ports in the Maritime Provinces have written me, and they have stated: "We have sold our dry goods, our importations are later in coming to our ports than we had expected, when they come they have to pay an increase of duty, and we have to lose the whole of that, because our goods were sold upon the supposition that the duties would remain as they were." There would be no justice in allowing the nurserymen a remission of duties, and to keep the dry goods men from having the same treatment. Hundreds of similar applications on other lines of goods have come before me and before the Minister of Customs in the same way. Therefore I say, to grant this would be to open the door, and it would be opening the door on behalf of an interest which is not at all the largest involved. My hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has a good deal to say about the poor farmer. If we discuss this matter about the remission of duties, we ought to do so without saying it is riding hard on the poor farmers or upon anyone else. We ought to discuss it on the fairness of the question involved. I do not think, however, that this is a farmer's grievance. I suppose that these nurserymen who live on the other side of the line, and who have agents to sell for them in this country, will lose something. These agents sell the stock on commission; they are to deliver at a certain time, and at a certain price, and the farmer has only to pay that price. It is the nurseryman who has to deliver the stock. I suppose that the money lost will come upon the nurserymen, but it will certainly not come on the poor farmers. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) took one illustration on which to found a general argument. He says that because he took one order of stock from somebody in Ontario and it turned out bad, he would, therefore, not take any more orders from Ontario, and he argued that there should be no tariff wall to prevent him getting his stock from the United States, where he had placed one order for stock, which fulfilled his expectations. I may tell my hon. friend that a great many people who placed orders in the United States have received stock which is not fitted for this country at all, and which has proved an utter failure. The argument would apply one way as well as on the other. I do not believe that, from the amount involved, or the magnitude of the interest involved, or the principle involved, that we should make an exception in favor of the nurserymen. I do not see how it could be done, while the door is shut against a great many claimants of a similar kind. The attention of myself and my colleague was first called to this matter by the member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), who pressed the claims of the nursery agents before us. I told him at that time that we would take the matter into consideration, and give a decision as soon as possible. I think the House must take the decision which I have foreshadowed to-night as being the only one the Government can come to in this case. It is come to, not because we wish to oppress the farmers, not because we wish to oppress the agents or the nurserymen, or anyone else, but simply on the principle involved, and which, I think, is a general one in all tariff legislation.

Mr. LAURIER. If this duty were imposed with the object of levying a revenue I would be disposed to agree with a great deal of what has been said by the Minister of Finance, because he states that the tariff, when it is formulated, is laid upon every one alike, that it would not be fitting that anybody should be relieved from the burden, that everybody must take it as it comes, and if it so happens it strikes upon someone in particular, this one has only to submit. This proposition is true, but it is a proposition which applies only when a duty is levied with the intention of raising a revenue. Of course revenue has to be levied by taxation. Taxation is a necessary evil, and when taxation strikes upon this one or the other, he has simply to bear the burden which is imposed upon him for the good of the community. But this principle does not apply here, because this duty is not levied for the purpose of obtaining a revenue to carry on the business of the country. This taxation is proposed simply to favor a few individuals who happen to be nurserymen on this side of the line. The hon. gentleman says it is not imposed with a view of oppressing anybody; but it certainly is imposed with a view of favoring somebody, and I ask is it right or fair, when a tax is simply levied to favor someone, that you should unduly oppress some others who are injuriously affected by these duties? I can easily understand, if this duty were levied for the common good, and to fill up the coffers of the country in order to

carry on public business, that these men, even though they contracted last fall for these goods to be delivered this spring, would have no complaint, and would have simply to submit to the universal law. But when they see that this duty is levied upon them, and made to oppress them, not with a view of benefiting the community at large, or for the purpose of obtaining necessary revenue, but simply to favor this one or that one who happens to be in that same trade, then it certainly seems to me that they have just as good a right to complain as the iron importers had a right to complain a couple of years ago. I cannot see what difference there can be in this present instance and the case of the iron importers. The Minister of Finance has laid down some distinction, the force of which I cannot comprehend. He has stated that the iron trade is a large trade, and that it would create disturbance in some way, but in this case the principle of the importation is the same and the contract is made in advance for the good of those who happen to want those articles. If there was an occasion to remit the duty two years ago, there must be the same occasion at this present time, and if there was occasion twenty years ago to remit the duty with regard to the importation of tea, it seems to me that the present is a parallel case. Under all these circumstances, I believe that the Government ought to accede to the demand which has been made on behalf of those who have contracted, last fall, for the supply of those goods.

Mr. TISDALE. I must again refer to this subject, if I be allowed to do so, in order to correct the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to the reasons given for this application for remission of duty. I think he must have been misinformed as to the grounds of my application to his colleague, or otherwise I should not take the liberty of asking the indulgence of the House again. My case was this, and I know of several other cases of the same sort, where the dealers themselves in Canada have ordered these goods; they have sold them at certain prices, and they are bound to deliver them now. They had to order them last fall, and as they cannot deliver them in the winter, they have to deliver them in the spring; therefore they must lose the amount of this duty. It is not the nurserymen of the United States who lose, but the dealers here who have bought the goods, and who are bound to pay for them, and have sold them in this country. This duty is, therefore, a direct loss to the people of this country. That was the case I put before the Minister, and I feel very strongly that if a special exception was ever made it should be made in this case, because the nurserymen could not help giving their orders before these duties were announced. This is not like the ordinary course of trade, where a man buys and sells right away, and he takes his chances; possibly those goods may go up if the tariff is raised, and he gets the benefit of that. But the season controls the operations of the nurserymen, for they have to give their order at a particular time of the year, and when they sell them at a particular price, they have to deliver them and they must lose the amount of this duty. In one case I know a man, who is not able to afford it, will lose $500, if this duty is not remitted, and I have been told that there are a number of cases of the same kind. I think, therefore, that the Government should remit the duty in this case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that it has been urged on the Minister of Finance that there is a very peculiar feature in this nursery trade which, perhaps, does not appertain to any other trade in articles imported into this country. Transactions in fruit trees, vines, and so forth, are usually commenced in the autumn and are continued through the winter season; the orders are solicited, the sales made and the prices fixed at the same time; but the goods cannot be delivered at the time the order is made, but they must be delivered in the spring. The sales were made and the prices fixed before this tariff went into operation, and the only reason why the goods were not delivered was because nature barred their delivery through a portion of the year. In this respect, this is a peculiar case, and I would impress that view on the Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Dry goods importations are in the same position.

Mr. CHARLTON. The dry goods are not sold until they are delivered, either by sample, or by the goods themselves being placed before the buyer; but, in this case, the agent comes to a farmer and he says he has a certain line of nursery stock to sell, that the price is thus; and so the farmer knows what a standard apple tree, or plum tree, or grape vine is, and what the price ought to be, and the contract is made, and the delivery is to take place as soon as nature will permit it—that is, in the following spring. In the meantime, my hon. friend intervenes with his tariff and disarranges the whole transaction. That is a feature of the trade to which, I think, the hon. Ministers have not given due consideration. With regard to the cases instanced by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), I am aware, that in the county we represent there are dealers who are importers as well, and who have been making contracts with the nurserymen in the United States for supplies which cannot be obtained in Canada, and they will be the losers. Under all the circumstances, I think the reasons are peculiarly strong for making a similar concession in this case to what has been made before, in our financial history, on two occasions. I do not think there is any trade which can present so strong a case as this for a remission of duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to say a few words——

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I wish to say that when I asked, before the House parted at dinner time, that we should be allowed to go into Committee and discuss this question there, I was met with the suggestion, which I thought was a very sensible one, that the discussion might take place when the Speaker is in the Chair, so that an hon. gentleman should only speak once. If we are going to discuss it just as if we were in Committee, it seems to me the agreement will not be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and I was only going to make one remark——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken, and I hope a motion for adjournment will not be resorted to again simply in order to enable an hon. member to speak when he has no right to speak.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not have moved anything of the kind it it had not been a common practice in this House. I wanted to put myself right on one point, and the hon. gentleman right on another. However, I will defer that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. Minister of Finance will find that nearly all the trees likely to come into the country were ordered before there was any change made in the tariff. They must be ordered during the winter, with the arrangement that they are to be shipped just as soon as the condition of the country will permit their being planted. Therefore, the hon. gentleman will see that this is not a case of a few contracts having been entered into before the tariff was changed, but that all the trees and shrubs to be brought from the United States and planted this spring were ordered before any change was made in the tariff, and when there was no duty upon them; and it seems to me that if the hon. gentleman would allow these shrubs to come in under the old regulation he would be only doing what is fair to the various parties interested. They are not in the position of dry goods purchasers, many of whom, not having sold their goods, will simply add the duty to the price of the goods. The tree man agrees to sell at a fixed price, and that is the reason a contract is made; his order has been sent to the nursery, and he is bound by his obligation. In many cases the amount of duty exceeds the price of the article, so that it would pay better to lose all that had been paid than to import the article and pay the duty. Looking at the way in which these contracts are made, and the time they are made, it seems to me that the Government ought not to attempt to collect any duty on them during the present season. Any contracts made in the future should be, of course, subject to the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. The remarks made by the hon. gentleman on this question are, beyond doubt, true to a certain extent. Whatever changes are made in the tariff, some persons must necessarily suffer. I cannot myself see any difference between the position of the importer of fruit trees, who has made his bargain before the tariff came into force, and a wholesale dry goods merchant, who, through his travelling agent, has sold a large quantity of goods in different parts of the country, the price of which is raised by the tariff. If it be equitable to allow fruit trees, which are sold prior to the imposition of the duty, to be brought in free, it is equally equitable to grant the same privilege to a merchant who can show that he has sold his goods prior to the imposition of the new duty. I will give you a case in point. A wholesale merchant of St. John, N.B., on the day before the tariff resolutions were announced, entered and paid the duty on a whole cargo of glass which he had imported from Belgium, and which had arrived in port on the 27th April, and an entry made, paying 30 per cent. duty on the glass. He makes an application to the Department for a refund of the amount of difference between the present tariff and the old tariff, which is 10 per cent. How am I to deal with cases of that kind which are constantly arising, and they arise in every branch of trade in the Dominion? My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, said, very correctly, that only the other day, when I was coming out of the Russell House, an importer of tea, who has been doing the same thing for several years, attacked me on the street, saying that he had not received justice at the time tea was put on the free list, but that he should have been repaid a certain sum of duty which he had paid. Having investigated the matter, I could not say he was entitled to what he claimed, but he still persists, and I believe honestly, in pressing his claim. Ever since I have been in the Customs Department I have had applications made for refund of duty in connection with machinery which was admitted under the old tariff free, when not manufactured in Canada, and these applications are made with respect to shafting and belting and to other articles made in this country. From what has come to my knowledge since this House adopted the resolution with reference to the iron duty, a good many frauds have been perpetrated by agencies of foreign houses, declaring that the goods had been purchased before the addition of the tariff. I merely give these instances to point out the difficulty in the way of carrying out the principle the hon. gentleman advocates. I certainly can see no difference whatever between a man who has sold one hundred trees and has been caught by the tariff, and a man who has sold one hundred bushels of clover and timothy seed, and is in the same position; and many applications have been made to me, since the resolutions were presented to the House, for the free admission of these seeds, on the ground that they were sold before the resolution was adopted. If the concession be allowed in the one case, it will have to be made in the other cases. To my mind the seed men seem to have a stronger case than those men who import and sell trees, because, in some cases, the tree pedlers are the representatives and agents of foreign nurserymen, though I frankly admit all of them are not. I know cases where members of this House who have purchased trees and plants from American nurserymen, and that as soon as the tariff was announced they sent word to them, saying: We will carry out our engagements, and will divide the duty with you, if you will only take the goods. There are other cases again where, although the goods have been actually sold and the sellers responsible for them, the American nurserymen insist on the agent paying the duty, as I suppose, in most cases, the purchasers insist on the delivery being made. I am sure my colleagues and myself will give this matter, as we have given it in the past, our most serious consideration. If there were any way in which what hon. gentlemen desire could be done equitably to every branch of business there would be less difficulty in carrying it out; to select a particular trade at the expense of the others would not be equitable or justifiable.

Mr. COOK. I wish to say a few words on a matter which is of vital importance to the country, and particularly to some individuals. It is a matter pertaining to the fisheries in our inland waters, and I am satisfied that when it has been brought thoroughly to the attention of the Government they will endeavor to right the wrong which has been done. I will not make any elaborate statement, but will confine myself largely to reading extracts from papers and from letters

written by individuals interested. The Canadian *Sportsman*, a paper edited by Alderman E. King Dodds, of the city of Toronto, referring to the fisheries in Georgian Bay, says:

"We had hoped ere this to be able to chronicle a more enlightened policy by the Minister of Marine in connection with the better protection of fish in our inland waters. We have evidence in our possession which very clearly proves that the present system is altogether inadequate, and if the Government fail in their duty much longer it will take many years of costly work to remedy the mischief now being wrought, which by a more common-sense policy on the part of the authorities might easily be avoided. Illegal fishing is carried on in the most barefaced manner along the northern shore of Georgian Bay, and on a very large scale at that. There are men engaged in the work who are making thousands of dollars out of it, and though we are informed that the Government have been notified of such doings, yet that no official notice has been taken of it, and the illegal fishing still goes bravely on."

In another paragraph the same writer says;

"We understand the steam yacht *Cruiser* has been in these northern waters for two seasons past, but for all the good she does in protecting the fishing interest she might just as well be tied up at Midland City. We are not acquainted with the captain of the *Cruiser*, the vessel in question, but we have been told by those who ought to knew that he is totally unfitted for the duties he is supposed to perform. He knows nothing either of the habits or haunts of the fish or of the poachers who are so successfully plying their work, and we have been told on good authority that the pilot in charge of the boat is very much mixed up if he is not in the employ of a ring of fishermen."

This is a very serious charge. In the first place, according to this statement, the captain of the *Cruiser* is not capable of performing the duties with which he is charged, and it is further stated that the pilot of the *Cruiser* is implicated with poachers in this illicit fishing. Then, in another paragraph, it is stated:

"Such a state of affairs as is here outlined should not be allowed to exist, and we hope the Department at Ottawa will take some steps to ascertain the true condition of things in those northern waters. How to accomplish this work it is not necessary for us to outline. The Hon. Mr. Tupper is a young man of progressive ideas, and we are confident, if he will but charge his mind that a reform is necessary, he will require no prompting to select the proper means to cure the evil. The regular overseer over the stretch of waters we have alluded to has no chance to detect the law-breakers. If we mistake not, the Department only allows inspectors expenses for travelling over their territories during the close season; if at other times they obtain information which in their judgment should necessitate a personal inspection, they would have to pay their own costs unless the Department ordered them out. It can, therefore, be readily understood what an easy time of it the illegal fishermen have. The Minister has a wide field for the exercise of his abilities. The whole system of fishery inspection on the rivers and lakes in this Province is a howling farce, and the money paid out by the Government is just so much cash thrown away. Paying a man $100 a year and then expect him to properly guard fifty miles of water is an absurdity on the face of it, and we know of districts where the inspectors do not make more than a single trip in the year, and where poaching goes bravely on all the year round. If the Department at Ottawa will put half a dozen shrewd men on the trail they will in six months gather sufficient information to prove to the Minister that the present system is absolutely valueless, and that immediate reform is necessary if the Government care one straw about preserving the fish in our fresh waters."

This is a very serious matter, coming from a paper edited by such a strong Conservative as Mr. E. King Dodds. Then, on the 1st April, we find a letter in the *Empire* of Toronto, written by a party who signs his name "Collingwood," and it is to this effect:

"SIR,—I desire to point out the existence of an injustice which probably only requires to be publicly mentioned to be redressed. I have no doubt that the injustice referred to is quite unintentional, but its effects are very keenly felt by the fishermen of the Georgian Bay.

"It appears that about four years ago a regulation was passed by the Department of Fisheries at Ottawa forbidding the use of pound nets in any waters east of an imaginary line between Cape Hurd and Spanish River. The district thus cut off includes the fisheries of Collingwood, Meaford, Killarney and other most important stations—the heart of the lake fishing industry. Although many of the fishermen in this district have large quantities of these nets, they appear quite willing to abide by the departmental regulations, as they admit the pound nets to be very destructive and hurtful to the fishing industry.

"During past seasons, however, one C. W. Gauthier, has obtained from the Department a lease of nearly all lake waters west of the line referred to, with the privilege of setting pound nets. He has established fishing stations at the Duck Islands, Big Channel, Cape Roberts, Barrie Island and Bay, Grant Islands and North Shore, South Bay or Manitoulin Gulf, Mississauga Point and River, John's island, on both sides, and Spanish River. At all these points the pound nets are used, as well as at Thessalon Point, where another favored party has a lease.

"If it is advisable to prohibit pound nets at all—and the fishermen do not deny it—the points referred to are above all those at which the prohibition should come into effect, as they are all favorite resorts for young fish, being land-locked and protected from the heavy south-west gales which prevail in the waters east of the line. The use of pound nets is especially pernicious at rivers, and none should be allowed either in the rivers or within five miles of their mouths. It is a well-known fact that the lake fish go up the tributary rivers to spawn, and from this it will be seen how exceedingly destructive pound nets must be at such places as Spanish River, etc.

"All the fishermen of the Georgian Bay ask is that the prohibition of pound nets be made general, and not confined to any particular section. Their request simply amounts to an appeal for justice and the abolition of special privileges. It is surely not asking too much that the regulations which govern them should also govern Gauthier and others, who are practically the representatives of Yankee capital and Yankee companies.

"Yours, etc.,

"COLLINGWOOD."

In view of that letter, which appeared in the *Empire* on the 1st April, the member for East Grey asked this question, and received an answer from Mr. Colby as follows:

"Mr. SPROULE asked, Whether it is correct, as alleged in a communication which appears in the *Empire* of 1st April, that one W. Gauthier, a fisherman, has obtained a lease or license to fish with pound nets in the waters surrounding Duck Islands or in Big Channel, Cape Roberts, Barrie Island and Bay, Grant Islands and North Shore, South Bay or Manitoulin Gulf, Mississauga Point and River, John's Island, both sides, and Spanish River, also Thessalon Point? If so, is it the intention of the Department to continue the privilege to Mr. Gauthier while refusing it to the fishermen of the Georgian Bay?

"Mr. COLBY. The statement as alleged in a communication which appears in a copy of the *Empire* of 1st April, is not wholly correct. Mr. C. W. Gauthier does hold licenses to fish in the vicinity of Duck Island; he owns the island, having purchased it from the Indian Department; he also holds licenses to fish at Cape Roberts, at Grant's Island, Serpent River Bay and John's Island; but not at Bone Island Bay, not at South Bay or Manitoulin Gulf, not at Mississauga Point, not at Spanish River, nor at Thessalon Point. No licenses to fish with pound nets have been issued in Georgian Bay since 1885, except two, one each to Captain Allan and David Porter, in 1888. These were issued in connection with the operation of procuring ova for the hatcheries. No fishermen have been refused licenses to fish in waters in which licenses were subsequently granted to Gauthier. It is not the intention to grant or continue licenses to Gauthier to the exclusion of the fishermen of Georgian Bay or any other applicant."

Now, the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, (Mr. Colby) simply evaded the question. It is well known that Mr. Gauthier represents many American companies, and these companies have the privilege of fishing in our Canadian waters to the exclusion of our Canadian fishermen, and they use the most destructive nets. I received the following letter from a gentleman in Collingwood a

little while ago, and I may say that most of the fishermen there are supporters of the present Administration, and they deputed this gentleman to address me on the subject:

"COLLINGWOOD, 24th March, 1890.

"H. H. COOK, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—I thought I would let you know a few of our grievances and the way the Government of purity at Ottawa deal out fair play. It seems about three years ago that a line was drawn from Cape Hurd, Lake Huron, to Spanish River, allowing no pound nets to be set to the east of this line, which cuts us and others out to the eastward; that we have a stock of those nets to the value of five to six thousand dollars, and not able to set any of them, which means a big loss to us; that Mr. Gauthier, Marks, Dobie and others, have all the ground west of this line, at the following places: Spanish River, John Island, both sides, the islands outside of Algoma Mills, Mississauga River and Point, Grant Islands, and north shore opposite, Thessalon Point, Mississauga Channel, Cape Roberts, Barrie Island, Duck Islands and South Bay, Manitoulin Island. Those men must be good supporters of the Government. This is hardly fair, to allow those parties to fish while we and others have to keep our nets idle. I would wish you to inquire how many licenses are paid to the Department. They cost fifty dollars each license. We would be willing to lose our stock in nets if the Government would do away with them altogether. It would be better to fish east of this line than west, as in the North Channel the young fish would be protected and not caught off the same as they are now by those pound nets. Also, we were stopped from fishing a pound net at Horse Island, and since then the Department have granted a seine lease or license, one of the most destructive of nets, for it brings everything ashore, and the large fish only being shipped, while the small ones are thrown on the beach to the number of 40,000 to 50,000 in the season.

"Kindly attend to this and oblige,

"Yours respectfully,

"CHARLES NOBLE."

Now, of all the nets that could be used, I suppose the seine nets are the most destructive. A large number of small fish are brought to land not fit for shipping purposes, and they are thrown upon the shore and allowed to rot. Pound nets are also of very great injury to the fish, of which they catch large quantities. The hon. Minister has, as I said, in his reply, misled the House—I must say, misled the House. Whether he did it intentionally or not I will not say. I do not think he did it intentionally; but, if he did not do it intentionally the Department should be put in possession of the facts, so that they may have a knowledge of what is going on. I have here a copy of a letter that was addressed to the hon. Minister of Fisheries, on the 7th April, which I will read:

"DEAR SIR,—If not taking too much liberty we, as good Canadian citizens, would respectfully ask your consideration of the pound net system. We, as a firm, have in stock, from five to six thousand dollars worth of pound nets, and on account of an imaginary line from Cape Hurd to Spanish River, and no nets being allowed to be set to the eastward of such line, debars us from setting our nets, as all the available ground to the west of this line has been taken up by parties to all intents and purposes Americans, excepting Messrs. Marks & Dobie, of Thessalon. Also, there are two pound nets in South Bay, where the young whitefish go for protection in May and June. Also Mr. R. Green has a license from Fishery Officer Brinkman to haul a seine where we had a net at our line at Rattlesnake Harbor, Fitzwilliam Island, and from which there is from fifty to sixty thousand young whitefish thrown away in May and June. We think it is hardly fair to allow these people to fish in those bays and inlets, where the young fish go for protection, and deprive other equally deserving citizens from fishing in the open lake. The Department must have been misinformed by one of its fishery officers or those privileges would never have been granted to Gauthier and others. Now, Sir, we know that Gauthier, on the Duck Islands, Missisaga Channel, Cape Roberts, Barrie Islands, Barrie Bay, both sides of John Island, Algoma Mills, Missisaga River, Grant Islands and North Shore, opposite, has in some cases two and three nets on the one lead, and has between thirty and forty pound nets in use at Thessalon Point and Dollar Bay. Marks & Dobie have some five or six pound nets."

You will please remember that the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated there were only two pound nets allowed in the whole Georgian Bay, and that these were allowed for breeding purposes; but here we have the evidence of gentlemen whose authority cannot be doubted, that in one bay alone are thirty or forty pound nets set:

"Again, Sir, there has been pound nets set all winter in the Spanish River, and the same was reported to Capt. Wilson——"

I suppose Capt. Wilson is one of the overseers.——"Sault Ste. Marie, who came down to make a seizure, but was sent off on a false trail while the parties sunk their nets. There has been between thirty and forty tons of fish shipped from there this winter, which should have been left there, as no pound net or seine, under any circumstances, should be set or drawn within five miles of the entrance of any river. As within our recollections nearly all the great rivers were full of fish, and being easily taken at certain seasons of the year, have been depleted. Now, Sir, we believe it would be the best thing for the country at large to grant no pound net license whatever; but if any are granted, we will make application for (12) twelve licenses in the vicinity of Killarney, as our main business is situate there: but we would sooner lose the whole of our stock in nets if the Department will issue no licenses at all. The lightkeeper at the Sister Rocks, above Bruce Mines, has two pound nets in use also."

So you see that, although the Minister stated there were only two pound nets used in the whole of Georgian Bay, pound nets are used in almost every direction. I know that in the fall of the year fishing goes on as if there was no close season at all. Large fish come to the mouth of the river and close to the shore for the purpose of spawning, and they are taken in great numbers all along the line with impunity, no one looking after them whatever. I thought it my duty to bring this to the attention of the Government, and I trust they will look into the matter, because I consider it of vital importance that some measures should be taken to prevent our inland waters from being depleted of fish.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman has drawn attention to a subject which is of very great interest in the district I have the honor to represent, and which ought to be of very great interest all over Canada—that is, the preservation of the fish in the great lakes. There can be no doubt that there is a great deal of over-fishing going on in Lake Huron. There are so many appliances now between pound nets, seines and all other sorts of nets, that the lakes are actually becoming depleted. The fish are swept out and sent off fresh, packed in ice, to the American market. Our own country derives very little benefit from them before they are shipped away, and if the present state of things continues for a few years more we will have no fish at all. The Americans, on their side of the lakes, have succeeded in destroying fish so utterly that over long sections of the coast of Lakes Huron and Superior there are but few fish of any kind now to be found. On the Canadian side we are not yet so badly off, as the fish, until now, have been very abundant. They are getting thinned out in the Georgian Bay, but along the north shore of Lake Huron there are yet a great many. The hon. gentleman alluded to the Government vessel. There is no doubt that that vessel is rather too small for the service in which she is employed. There is not so much fault to be found with the captain, who is,

I believe, a very good and efficient man, as with the vessel; she is so small and unseaworthy that sail boats can pass her in a storm; indeed, she cannot venture out when sail boats are able to do so. The first thing, therefore, is to provide the captain with a better vessel, and then he will perform a better service. I repeat, that I believe the officer in charge is a very good and very competent man, and is very anxious to do his duty. There is a question connected with the fisheries of the lakes to which I wish to draw particular attention; but, before doing so, I shall first allude to the remarks made in regard to one Gauthier. I do not think Gauthier is more culpable than other fishermen. They all endeavor to get all the fish they possibly can catch, and he is a very active man, who has been very successful in securing large quantities of fish. There are several others who also fish very extensively. This leads me to draw attention to the fishing at the Duck Islands. In a little channel quite near the islands a very active and energetic man engaged in fishing. He set pound nets in the channel, and in a few weeks he caught 500 tons, which is a very large quantity. The same practice was followed in the same place the second year, and half the quantity was caught in three weeks. He tried it the third year and caught but few fish. I mention this to show the disastrous effect of pound nets in destroying the fisheries of the lakes. I could point to other instances where pound nets have produced the same effect. Further west, in another portion of my constituency, is the Lake of the Woods. There is a certain kind of fish there which has been until now very abundant. I refer to the sturgeon. The Indians of that part of the country, and they are very numerous, there being 3,000 or 4,000 on the shores of the Lake of the Woods, have depended chiefly, if not wholly, on the sturgeon as their means of subsistence. I am sorry to say that the pound net has made its appearance there. The Indians were in the habit of herding the sturgeon, in much the same way as the Indians of the plains herded the buffalo, and they drove them into particular parts of the lake. In this way they would not catch more than they required at a time. It was their habit to make pemmican of them and store it for the winter. But pound nets have come along, and the fish have been swept away. The Indians seeing that their sturgeon were being swept off became reckless themselves, and destroyed the fish which they formerly husbanded in large quantities; one set of pound nets in the course of one day, I have authority to say, caught 900 large sturgeons weighing about 100 pounds each. Nothing can stand such destruction, and in permitting it we are depriving the Indians of a means of subsistence. Their game is being killed off, and they have not advanced far in agriculture; and so, within a very few years, those Indians will be here demanding support from the Government, and it will have to be given to them. But this does not apply to the Indians of the Lake of the Woods only, but also to other Indians in all parts of the country. At Sault Ste. Marie for generations the Indians have depended very largely on their fish. They have been in the habit of catching fish in the rapids there, scooping them out by hand nets. Pound nets have, however, of recent years been introduced, not only on the British side, but on the American side, in the channels leading to the rapids, and the consequence is that the fish are being exterminated. They are killed before they reach the rapids. But, I may say, the Indians are not suffering as much now as they did a few years ago because they can now find other employment. A few years ago they suffered greatly from the destruction of their fisheries, but they now find work among the settlers who are coming in. I think hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have not done justice to the effort of the Fisheries Department to preserve the fish. The Department has exerted itself to its very utmost, and at Spanish River and Mississauga River they have prevented pound nets being set within a long distance of the mouths of the rivers, in order to allow the fish to ascend. Some years ago the Indians on the banks of those rivers were complaining very bitterly, and I drew the attention of the Department of Fisheries to the fact, and the Department immediately took the most effective measures within their power to prevent the fish being exterminated or nets set near the river mouths. I believe, with the limited means at its disposal, the Department of Fisheries is doing everything within its power. But when fishermen from the American side and from the Canadian side come upon the fishing grounds, and when the lakes become regularly covered with fishing boats and fishermen, how are you to protect the fish? It can only be done by stopping fishing to a very large extent. The population is increasing, and the people will have fish, and more and more fishermen every year are engaging in the business of catching them. There is one thing that might very reasonably be stopped, and that is the boat licenses. A fisherman gets a license for $5, and thereafter sets nets, and catches an immense quantity of fish, and throws the offal into the lake and frightens the other fish away. Those who fish systematically, if left to themselves, do not do so much harm; and if the fishing grounds were leased, or if certain sections of them were leased, to different parties, those persons would have an interest in protecting the grounds; but the men who have boat licenses are free rovers who go everywhere and follow the fish. Moreover, the fishery of the lakes is not like the fishery of the sea, for in the former case the fish are very easily exterminated. There are now complaints of the fisheries on the Newfoundland Banks being destroyed, and how much more easy it is to destroy the fisheries in the lakes? I am very glad attention has been drawn to this subject, and I hope the Government will take some steps in regard to it. It is very important that the Indians should be protected in the fisheries, and very important to future generations that the fish of these great lakes should not be exterminated.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am very glad that the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) has directed the attention of the House to the wholesale slaughter that has been practised on our fisheries in the northern lakes. I have spent two or three summers in the district of Muskoka and Georgian Bay and have witnessed myself the wholesale slaughter which has been prevalent there. It seems to me a pity, that while we maintain here so efficient a department under Mr. Wilmot, for the propagation of fish and their dissemination throughout the lakes, so little pains should be taken to see that this money so expended should result in proper

advantage. It is only to-night that I received from a friend a letter with reference to the destruction which has taken place in the neighborhood of the Manitoulin Islands, and which I will read to the House:

"The lake is well stocked with fine bass and other kinds of fish, which should be preserved for sport, but is in danger of being entirely depleted by fishermen residing at Mudge Bay, who during last summer—and I am informed in previous summers—have had ordinary nets, and trap nets set, with which they have caught tons of fine bass, shipping the same to Buffalo and other points. I saw nets of both kinds there last summer and felt strongly inclined to destroy them. I take my summer outing on the border of the lake, and hence my desire to preserve the fish from destruction."

It is not only on the lakes of Muskoka and Rosseau that this wholesale destruction is going on, but it is extending also to the Georgian Bay, and I was surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), which are corroborated by a gentleman beside me, who tells me that the vessel employed there to prevent this poaching and destruction of fish is utterly unable to perform the duty, that in stormy weather it is not safe for anyone to venture out in her, and that its movements are so slow that it is unable to overtake and capture those who may be engaged in this illegal fishing. I have no doubt that now that the attention of the Government has been brought to this matter, when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries returns from Washington he will display his usual energy in dealing with it. The fish in our upper lakes are comparatively as great a source of wealth to us in Ontario as the sea fisheries are to our friends in the Maritime Provinces, and they should be properly and efficiently protected.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This is a matter in which I am very much interested. But at this late stage of the Session, and at this time of the night, with important business before us, I do not propose to take up the time in a general discussion, which I should think it my duty to give to it on another occasion. I most earnestly ask the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to pay attention to the statements made by the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), because if they are true, or anything like true, it is a matter which deserves to be carefully and fully looked into. The use of pound nets on that particular part of the coast with which I am familiar has not been permitted by the Department, and has been practised to but a very slight extent last year, but if it is true that thirty or forty pound nets are in operation in the Georgian Bay, either with the permission of the Department or contrary to its regulations, it is a very serious matter. I hope the Minister will pay particular attention to this point, because it is the most important of all. The question of the boat licenses alluded to by the hon. member for Algoma is altogether too large a question to be entered upon at the present time, but the Department of Fisheries must make up its mind that if the fisheries of these inland waters are to be protected as they ought, more money must be expended and their officers must be paid a little better than they are now. One of the most useful and efficient of the fishery officers in that district has a hundred miles of coast to look after, and the Department only allows him $150 for the season's expenses. Anyone who knows that coast knows that they might as well dispense with the service altogether as to allow such a small sum. As to the vessel used in the protection service, I may say that anyone who knows anything about the Georgian Bay knows that it is in no way suited for the purpose. I quite agree with the motives which led the Department to purchase the vessel in the first instance, but she is not fitted for service on that part of the lake, although she may be found useful in some other waters. I would ask the Minister to give the statements made by the hon. gentleman to-night his immediate attention.

Mr. McNEILL. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen who have stated that the *Cruiser* is altogether insufficient for the work she is called upon to perform. The vessel is not seaworthy, and it is as much as a man's life is worth to go out with her in bad weather. We know very well that on the Georgian Bay we are sometimes subject to very bad weather, and have a very dangerous kind of sea, and, therefore, a good seaworthy vessel is necessary. I wish to say also, that the fishery overseers should have something like reasonable compensation for the work they are called upon to perform. They are obliged to look after the licenses, and to see that men are not fishing during the month of November, which is the close season. At this time of the year, when the Georgian Bay is very dangerous to navigate, these men have to go out very often in small open boats, at the risk of their lives, and they are paid only a miserable pittance, so that it is most unreasonable to expect them to perform their duties as they ought. I hope that the acting Minister of Marine and Fsheries will give this matter his immediate and careful consideration.

Mr. COLBY. I was not aware that this important subject would be brought before the House this afternoon. I can only say, at this moment, that the observations of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this matter will be most carefully considered in the Department.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Gloves and mitts of all kinds, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an increase. Why is it made?

Mr. FOSTER. It is an increase of 5 per cent. We are taking some of the articles which were formerly free, and putting them on the dutiable list, as they are now manufactured in the country. I find that the imports of gloves and mitts amounted to $346,059 last year, and it was thought only fair to give an additional 5 per cent. so as to retain the Canadian market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to say, this is a deliberate corner for the benefit of some friends of the hon. gentleman. These gloves and mitts are articles of necessity in our climate, and here the hon. gentleman, for no earthly reason, for he has plenty of revenue, is deliberately raising the duty on articles of prime necessity. I can only say that a more worthless reason I never heard given. It is only done to help some manufacturer. It is regular robbery.

Mr. FOSTER. It will rather have the effect of reducing the revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; it will add to the tax on the consumer, and at the same time diminish the revenue. It is bad every way.

Fur felt hats, $1.50 per dozen, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*
Hats and caps, N.E.S., 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*
Ladies' hats and bonnets, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to be allowed to drop items 73 and 75, and amend item 74 by making it read, "Hats, caps and bonnets, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*" That will have the effect of reducing the duty on fur felt hats, keeping the duty on hats and caps as proposed, and adding 5 per cent. to the duty on ladies' hats and bonnets. After a great deal of discussion and consideration we concluded that it would be better to have one item covering the whole, and to fix the duty at 30 per cent. It is almost impossible, for instance, in some cases, to tell the difference between ladies' hats and gentlemen's hats.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this not an increase of 5 per cent. on men's hats?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I really think there was no necessity for that. I have been in conversation with several dealers in Montreal on this very question, and the general opinion is that 25 per cent. is amply sufficient to protect the hat manufacturer of this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am informed by a gentleman engaged in the business of making hats and caps, that the alterations to the tariff will, no doubt, give additional protection to hats, but that the alterations affecting caps really put a duty of 59 per cent. on the material, which is a great deal more than the duty on the manufactured article, and that the cap maker would receive a good deal more protection under a 15 per cent. tariff than he will under the tariff which the hon. gentleman proposes.

India rubber boots and shoes with tops or uppers of cloth or of material other than rubber, 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*
India rubber boots and shoes and other manufactures of India rubber, N.E.S., 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. They were formerly 25 per cent. Gradually, however, these boots and shoes were made with the smallest amount of rubber, and the largest amount of cloth of different descriptions, and were ruled according to the duties on the different cloths. A great many disputes arose out of this at the Customs, and we thought better to make the division between India rubber boots and shoes with cloth uppers, and boots and shoes made entirely of rubber, the latter of which are charged at the same rate as before.

Corset clasps, spoon clasps or busks, blanks, busks, side steels and other corset steels, whether plain, japanned, lacquered, tinned or covered with paper or cloth; also buck, bone or corset wires, covered with paper or cloth, cut to lengths and tipped with brass or tin, or untipped, or in coils, 5 cents per pound and 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the minimum and maximum value of these articles?

Mr. FOSTER. They vary a good deal. We calculated the duties to average about 35 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At 5 cents per pound and 30 per cent. you are really putting on a duty of something like 45 per cent. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says the average value of these articles is from 30 to 40 cents per pound, which would make the average duty 40 to 45 per cent.

Mr. WALDIE. The average is 60 cents a pound, which would make the duty about 40 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very material difference from what the hon. gentleman states.

Ferro-manganese, ferro-silican, spiegel, steel bloom ends and crop ends of steel rails, for the manufacture of iron or steel, $2 per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the same duty. The only thing we have added is hub iron. Formerly we let that in at $2 per ton for the manufacture of steel, but it is also used in the manufacture of iron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the value, on an average, of these articles per ton?

Mr. FOSTER. About $25 a ton.

Builders', cabinet-makers', harness-makers' and saddlers' hardware, including curry-combs, carriage hardware, locks, butts and hinges, N.E.S., and tools of all kinds, N.E.S., 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. This is the same duty, but we have added butts and hinges, which we have taken from another item, where they are charged 1 cent a pound and 25 per cent. We have added tools of all kind. A large number of these tools were scattered in other parts of the tariff at the same rate of duty, and in one or two instances the duty is slightly raised, the idea being to include them in one item.

Mr. McMULLEN. Common butts are things which are largely used, and it is exceedingly unwise to increase the duty on them. A reduction should be made on harness fittings. These things are not made here at all, and I have known harness-makers complain very much about many things they have to get from the United States, on which they are charged an enormous duty. Is this the duty which formerly existed?

Mr. FOSTER. The very same. They are made here, I am told.

Mr. TAYLOR. These goods are made in a factory in Gananoque, which employs eighty hands in doing nothing else but making harness trimmings. I would like if the hon. Minister would insert after the word "hinges" the words "brass or copper rivets." We have an industry with a capital of $135,000 engaged in the manufacture of brass and copper rivets. A duty is charged on the copper wire of 15 per cent. These goods now come under the tariff as "manufactured brass or copper, not elsewhere specified," at a rate of 30 per cent. The makers pay 15 per cent. on the raw material, and made application for an increased duty, but, for some reason or another, these articles do not appear in the revised tariff. Although the parties engaged in that industry are politically opposed to me, in justice to it, it is my duty to advocate their claims.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whether they are or not opposed to the hon. gentleman, his proposition should require little consideration at the hands of the Finance Minister, if he looks to the interests of the consumer. I think it would be intolerable if applications of this kind were granted, for I presume the Finance Minister gave this

subject full consideration when revising the tariff, and having made a general increase all along the line, I hope he will not allow any additional charge to be hoisted on us in this way.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error. This is a reduction on butts and hinges, which formerly were charged 1 cent per pound and 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that I do not think this would be a good item in which to insert that. It has received some consideration at the hands of my colleagues and myself, but I would rather not insert it here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may state that I was not making any declaration on my own knowledge, but was simply giving information which I had received from a gentleman engaged in the saddlery business. I was told that the ordinary kind of saddlery and trimmings were made here, but that the finer kind was not manufactured in this country, and the duty upon that was very high.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman goes into the Department of Costums he will find that the most expensive goods, gold and silver plates and so on, are turned out by the factory in Gananoque.

Surgical and dental instruments of all kinds, 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that, where there is such a large unnecessary revenue, surgical instruments, of all things, should be admitted free. In the first place, they are tools of trade, and in the next place, as every medical man knows, no impediment should be thrown in the way of obtaining the best class of instruments. I must say that I am amazed that such things as this should linger in our tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. I might be amazed also at the strong plea of the hon. gentleman on behalf of surgical instruments as tools of trade, while the tools of the trade of the workingmen have to pay a higher duty. Surgical instruments only bear a duty of 20 per cent., and dental instruments, which formerly paid 30 per cent., are reduced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not appear to understand that surgical instruments are intended for the relief to suffering.

Mr. FOSTER. I had a faint idea that that was what they were for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is a barbarity to continue to tax these instruments. I may say further, that I object to taxing tools of all kinds. It is no reason for charging this duty of 20 per cent. on surgical instruments to say that other tools are charged a duty of 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The charge comes on the person by whom they are used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt the charge comes on the person who is suffering, and for whose benefit they are used. No doubt it is a direct additional tax on the unfortunate; and I may say without, I hope, hurting the susceptibilities of the hon. Minister, that I regard it as a brutal and a barbarous tax.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the Finance Minister will reduce the duty to 10 per cent. I think it would be a very fair protection to the manufacturers; but, I am not disposed to complain very much of this duty, because the Minister has considered the surgeons in regard to the instruments they require more than he considered those who require suspensory bandages. If this duty were reduced to 10 per cent. there would be a larger competition in the Canadian market, and I think the price would be reduced which we have to pay. If the surgeons are charged large prices for their instruments the money is taken out of the sick, and in the end it devolves upon the farmers and others who pay the surgeons. If the duty were reduced, no doubt the surgeons would be more lenient to their patients.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This tax is not on the farmers, but upon the medical men. These surgical instruments are not bought for each particular case, but one set of instruments lasts a surgeon for a number of years—sometimes for a lifetime—and certainly no surgeon charges more in any particular case because he has had to pay more for his surgical instruments. As to the different prices of instruments in the United States and in Canada, every surgeon knows very well that the surgeons of Canada do not use very many instruments manufactured in the United States if they can get the English instruments, which are very much better.

Mr. WALDIE. They pay the same duty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is a tax on doctors and not a tax on farmers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The price of these instruments is twice as high as it should be, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) knows. He knows very well that he can get the same instrument in the American market at a much less price than he can here, and I think that a little more competition from Germany or England or the United States would stimulate the Canadian manufacturer to make better instruments. We know that the English instruments are the best that are manufactured. Why should they be excluded in order to compel Canadian surgeons and dentists to purchase Canadian goods? I think 10 per cent. is quite sufficient protection for any manufacture.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I must say that I entirely disagree with the doctors on this occasion. If any class of the people ought to be made to pay towards the revenue it is the doctors. I would be in favor of increasing this duty to 35 per cent. I think the doctors are well paid, and if we taxed the doctors and the lawyers I think it would be a good thing for the rest of the community. It is ridiculous to hear doctors complaining that they have to pay a duty of 20 per cent. on these things which they bring in for use in the practice of their profession. These instruments last for a lifetime. I do not think this duty is bleeding any one. The doctors bleed the public, and they should not complain if they are bled in the interests of the community at large. I believe the doctors make more money than any class of the community except the lawyers. If this money is wanted for revenue I think we ought to get it out of the doctors and the lawyers.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). To some extent I agree with what the hon. gentleman has stated,

but I disagree with the assertion that the tax upon surgical instruments is monstrous. I agree with the last speaker that in proportion to their value and the length of time they last, and the money possibly earned by the man who buys the instrument, any surgeon or practicing physician in this country who has to buy any considerable number of instruments for his own use must, of necessity, earn a considerable income, and this is the smallest possible conceivable tax. I am not for a high tax, but to say this is monstrous, or burdensome, or barbarous, is simply ridiculous; it is the absurdity of ridiculousness.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I happen to know that men quite as high in that profession as the hon. gentleman is, or is likely to become if he were to live to the age of Methuselah, complain exceedingly of the expense of getting surgical instruments. I know that many skilful medical men, though, perhaps, not quite so well supplied with income as the hon. member for Brant supposes them to be, are prevented, by reason of the cost, from getting surgical instruments which would be very much to their advantage. For that reason I repeat that taxes of this kind are in their essence barbarous.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I certainly cannot agree with some of the remarks made by medical men on the other side of the House with reference to the cost of surgical instruments. It is well known that they are a necessity to the profession, and we know that in order to get a good quality of instruments we have to pay a high figure for them. The majority of surgeons purchase their instruments from the old country, they use comparatively few of those manufactured in the United States, and the duty placed upon a high-priced instrument is certainly very great. I have no sympathy with the remarks made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). If there is one man in the House more than another who raises his voice in fierce tones against injustice, hardship, and cruelty towards any class, especially the printers, that hon. gentleman is the very one to cry out. On every occasion where there is an item of expenditure going where printers are concerned we find him to be the defender of high prices for them. I would tell him here that if his knowledge of printing is not better than his knowledge of surgical instruments I pity the printing as well as I would pity the poor unfortunate patients if they were to ask him to select their surgical instruments. To say that a physician should be compelled to use an inferior knife, for instance, when he has to perform an operation, is to advocate a cruel principle. Every one knows that if you have to perform a difficult operation you must have a good instrument in order to do it skilfully. My hon. friend would say, no doubt, that it made very little difference whether you had a fresh instrument or an improved instrument, or whether you had an inferior one; that it was not worth while to go to the trouble of getting a new instrument. An hon. gentleman opposite said that physicians do not require new instruments very frequently. I pity the patient he has to treat if he adopts an old fashioned instrument that has been discarded. I say it is unscientific for any man in the profession to pretend that the old fashioned instrument used in years gone by are as efficient for performing an operation as the new fashioned instruments. Any man, to be proficient in his profession, requires to keep up with the improvements in instruments, no matter what the expense may be, and he must resort to the very finest kind of instruments if he is going to be a successful operator. I say the high duty placed upon these instruments shows on the part of the Government neither considerations of justice to the physician nor of mercy to the patient.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not very much surprised at the violence of the language used by the hon. member for South Oxford, but I am surprised at the statements he has made here to-night. He tells us that it is brutal and barbarous to make the duty on surgical instruments 20 per cent., that is, to reduce it from 25 to 20; whereas he, when Finance Minister, actually increased the duty on these articles to the highest point in his tariff, namely, from 15 to 17½ per cent. Where was his idea of barbarity then? On mechanics' tools and other tools of that class there is charged a duty of 35 per cent., while on surgical instruments the duty is reduced to 20 per cent., thus putting them on a better footing than any other class, which should be satisfactory to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not appear to be able to understand the plainest possible distinction. In that case there was a need for additional revenue; here you have a surplus of $2,000,000. In my case the duties were excessively moderate, in this case the duties are excessively high all around. How can a Government better employ a surplus than in applying a portion of it to the reduction of the duties? After all that has been said, it is clear these duties must press heavily on persons who are suffering, because everybody knows, who will give the matter one moment's consideration, that in many cases the suffering patient would be greatly relieved if the operator possessed the higher classed instruments than he can well obtain under this tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. Then the hon. gentleman's idea of brutality, monstrosity, and all the other adjectives of which he has such a wonderful command, consists in a 2½ per cent. duty. The hon. gentleman raised the duty on this article 2½ per cent; was it all right to resort to such a robbery, to commit such an inhuman act, as to tax this article 2½ per cent. additional when he wanted revenue. Surely he should have taken some other article in the tariff instead of adopting the monstrous principle of taxing surgical instruments. In 1879 when the general rise took place all the unenumerated articles were placed at 20 per cent. The present proposition is not to change that duty; it is simply to take it from one item, making a separate item of it, and add to it dental instruments, which formerly paid 25 per cent., and make them 20. That is the whole story in a nut shell. If we are brutal and brutes, the hon. gentleman must be an angel—unfortunately an angel in disguise, for the people of this country have never appreciated him. That is the difference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The difference is this: He has got a surplus and he is bound, according to the principles laid down by his own leader, to use that surplus for the reduction of taxes. I gave the hon. gentleman, the other even-

ing the exact words which were used by his late leader sitting on the Opposition side of the House, and in order that we might have an opportunity of comparing that gentleman's principles with his practice, I called the attention of the House to it. Now, if any one disputes it, I will send and get the *Hansard* and read the paragraph again. If hon. gentlemen choose to indulge in this kind of reply to a reasonable demand for using the surplus for the purpose of alleviating the sufferings of a class who desire to have their sufferings alleviated, we will have a little discussion over it. I point out that all through this tariff, where you have a surplus, your first duty is to use it for the purpose of relieving persons in distress. That first duty has been violated already by the maintenance of the duty on trusses and suspensory bandages, which I characterised very properly the other night. It is still further violated by the maintenance of this duty now. The duty is utterly insignificant in amount, and it does not produce any revenue of moment. I find on looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns that the value of the articles imported was $27,827, the duty collected on which was $5,566. I say it is utterly indefensible under the circumstances to maintain a duty like this; and for the express purpose of calling the attention of the House again to the contention of the hon. gentleman's friends and leaders I will read to them, as they appear to be so destitute of memory, and they cannot remember what was said on that side of the House, what Sir Charles Tupper said on the subject. He said:

"There never was a time when the hon. Minister of Finance had it in his power to deal with this question in a manner more just to the people than at present. He says we have a surplus of half a million. I say the Government have no right to have a surplus. If they have, they should endeavor to get rid of it, and the best way to do so is that pursued by us, and by the Government of Great Britain—by lightening the taxes on the people."

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who said that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sir Charles Tupper in 1875. It was a year after the increase of duties to which I referred, or to which the hon. gentleman referred. It was before this same National Policy, for taxing the people to the very last sliver for the benefit of certain "combines" and friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, was introduced. It was a year after I had made my speech on the tariff in 1876, when Sir Charles Tupper expected I was going to announce an increase of taxation, and that hon. gentleman, being interrogated by the member for West York, then Premier, admitted frankly to him that if we had brought down propositions to increase the tariff, that hon. gentleman, the exemplary champion of the National Policy, intended to have attacked us then and there on behalf of the Maritime Provinces for having introduced the thin end of the wedge of protection and ground the people of the Maritime Provinces under the iron heel of an Ontario Finance Minister. But, finding we were not going to tax the people, he made an appeal to a set of gentlemen who put themselves up for sale, and who, the moment I refused to buy them, went and sold themselves to hon. gentlemen opposite—yea, that was what they did. There never was an elector who sold himself for $5 who sold himself more completely than the protected manufacturers of Canada sold themselves to hon. gentlemen opposite. We did not buy them, and they sold themselves and their votes to hon. gentlemen opposite. On that occasion the late Finance Minister was prepared, whatever course we took, to take the opposite course, and he did not deny it. His principle was simply this: Whatever policy would pay him best, and give him more money or get him more votes that policy he was going to adopt. That is the policy hon. gentlemen opposite are adopting and acting on now. This tariff through and through is in defiance of their own recorded statements and propositions, such as I have read to-night, and yet they are prepared wholly and entirely to abandon all the principles they ever advocated, whether reciprocity in natural products or in regard to the distribution of the surplus, it matters not to them.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman read the speech Sir Charles Tupper was going to deliver?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This duty on surgical instruments at 20 per cent. may be deemed an excessive one. We, however, must take into consideration that the Government are determined to levy certain duties on articles imported, and the doctors should be willing to pay their share. The farmer has to pay 35 per cent. on his implements. Files are charged 10 cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and they are used by mechanics. Picks and hammers weighing three pounds are charged 1 cent. per pound and 25 per cent. The shovels and spades which are used by laboring men, workingmen, mechanics and farmers, are charged a duty of $1 per dozen and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. It, therefore, appears that imported articles used by farmers, laborers and mechanics are charged from 35 to 50 per cent. duty, and the doctors should not grumble at their instruments being charged 20 per cent. They can make more money and charge higher fees than probably any other class in the community. Indeed, I think that every medical man in this House should voluntarily rise and offer to have the tax increased to 35 per cent., because they are well able to bear their share of the burdens which it appears the Government are determined to impose on the people.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word in reply to the hon. Minister of Customs. I understand the Minister is anxious to have these resolutions passed through Committee, and I believe the Opposition were aiding him, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was endeavoring to facilitate the passage of the items as rapidly as was consistent with our duties as an Opposition. But the Minister of Customs last night embraced the opportunity of hurling across the floor very insulting remarks with respect to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman could not lose the opportunity to-night of speaking in the same strain. But the hon. gentleman must be very dull of perception if he does not understand the difference between a tariff drawn from necessity and a tariff drawn when there is no necessity for the imposition of duties. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) framed his tariff, it was to meet the necessities of the Dominion, but to-night we have a tariff when there is no necessity for its imposition. I hope the Minister

of Customs will hold his wrath in abeyance, and not allow his spleen to be aroused, as it was last night, when he got a little opportunity to have a fling, an opportune fling, at my hon. friend in front of me, who, I know, is assisting all he can to pass these items. I think if the Minister studies his own interests, and the interest of the progress of business, he will try to button up his wrath a little. Just keep quiet now.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no duty on tape-worms.

Mr. McMULLEN. Just keep quiet now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. With the permission of the House I will drop item 85 of the tariff. That will leave the duty on iron tubing the same as it is now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the duty under the old tariff?

Mr. FOSTER. Six-tenths of a cent and 30 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that equivalent to, *ad valorem*?

Mr. FOSTER. About 35, I think.

Mr. WATSON. This was a proposed change that I was very much surprised at, and I am glad to see that it is dropped; but even under the present tariff I think it is a very high duty, and one which is materially interfering with a large number of people who use this tubing. Now tubes for several purposes are allowed in at 15 and 20 per cent. and lap-welded tubes are allowed in at 20 per cent. to be used in petroleum oil wells. I do not see why the owners of petroleum oil wells have any better right to a cheap tubing than the manufacturers of radiators for hot water heating. This is an exceedingly high tax for the people of Canada, and it is all done for the purpose of maintaining one rolling mill in Montreal. I hold that specific duties are very unfair at any time, but they are exceptionally unfair on this particular article, because the price of tubing varies very much. I looked into this matter, expecting that the duty was to be increased, and I find that the discounts on this tubing in 1886 were about 80.

Mr. FOSTER. The discounts now are only about 60.

Mr. WATSON. I say that this specific duty is very unfair; for, when the tubing is cheap the specific duty makes the percentage very high. On manufactured radiators imported into this country the duty is only 30 per cent., while you practically tax the manufacturers of these radiators in Canada, at present prices, about 53 per cent. *ad valorem*. This is very unfair to the manufacturers of these radiators, for you practically charge a higher rate of duty on the raw material than you charge on manufactured radiators, and the result is that the radiator manufacturers have got to go out of the business. When the hot water heating system came into force some years ago these manufacturers of radiators started with getting tubes free. In 1877, the duty was 17½ per cent.; in 1885, 25 per cent., and in 1886 it was raised to 30 per cent., and in 1887 to 30 per cent. *ad valorem* and $\frac{6}{10}$ of a cent. per pound. The result has been that men who attempted to build up large manufactories of radiators for hot water heating purposes have had practically to go out of the business, because of the present tariff, and because the manufactured radiators could be brought in cheaper than they could be manufactured here. I would rather have seen the hon. Minister place these duties at 40 per cent. *ad valorem* than to place a specific duty on these tubes, because they vary so largely in price. Tubes are now worth $5.67 per hundred feet of 171 lbs., while in 1880 the import price was only $3.37. You can see that a specific duty is a very unfair duty on these things, while you allow the manufactured radiators to come in the country at an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent. I certainly say that you should not have a higher duty on the raw material than you have on the manufactured goods, and all for the purpose of attempting to build up one industry in Montreal. There is only one industry in Canada which makes these tubes, and I can say, from my knowledge of using Montreal and Scotch tubes, that the Scotch tubes are much superior. All these tubes under one and a-quarter inch are butt-welded tubes, and very often in cutting the thread of the end of the Montreal tubes they are cracked, and are practically useless. I hold that the manufacturers of radiators and the people who use these radiators are of a great deal more importance to have their interests considered by the Government of this country than a small manufactory in Montreal. Manufacturers who make a good radiator, and who have a particular care to do good work, will use the Scotch tubes. That being the case this duty is too much of a tax to put on the people in order to bolster up one manufactory. I believe that the Minister should reduce these duties to at least as low as the duty on the imported manufactured radiator. It will be seen that we imported a very large quantity of these tubes last year. If the Minister had not withdrawn this item I had intended to test the sense of the House on it by asking for a division, because the manufacturers of these radiators employ ten times more men in Canada than the manufacturers of butt-welded tubing in Montreal. That being the case, it is better to encourage the manufacturers of these radiators and people who use the wrought iron pipe, than to attempt to build up an industry that is not natural to the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Though the hon. Minister drops this item, there are some others that come under the same category. In this case you have an illustration of the difficulty of working a tariff framed purely for protective purposes. You will notice that in nothing more than in iron. When you started by imposing a duty on pig iron you found how it ramified extensively through all the different lines of iron manufacture, and, therefore, to be consistent with protectionist principles, when you have protected the first maker of iron, you have enhanced the cost of the raw material to the next man; he requires to have a proportionate increase in order to give him a fair chance in the market; following that, the finished product of the second man is the raw material of the third man; and so you have to go on increasing the duty, while, perhaps, there is still a fourth man whose raw material is the finished product of the third man. So that, to do justice to these manufacturers, you have to

increase the duties until they become something enormous, and people looking at them would naturally say that these manufacturers are bleeding the country to death. They would say, what a terrific duty is imposed on some articles, amounting to 40, 50, 60 or 70 per cent. ; and while they are right, it is not correct in many cases to say that these manufacturers are bleeding the country, because the fact is lost sight of that burdens have been imposed upon them by the imposition of duties on their raw material. The fact is that in the arrangement of many of these duties, while there is nominally a protection to the extent of 20 or 30 per cent. to the manufacturer, he has not that advantage at all. The consumer of course suffers, but the manufacturer has not a corresponding advantage ; it is taken from him by the protection given to another individual who precedes him, and whose finished product is his raw material. Thus a false estimate is often formed of the business of many of the manufacturers of this country ; and when people speak of the manufacturers alone being benefited they lose sight of the fact that many of the manufacturers—I do not know but I should be right in saying the great proportion of them—are injured instead of being benefited by this protective tariff, for the reason which I have mentioned. In that way, when the third or fourth man is reached, if he has a proportionate increase the taxation has reached a point which enormously presses on the consumers of this country. In speaking of this particular article I speak with a little diffidence, because I am not in the iron business and do not understand it as thoroughly as my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) ; but I notice that a firm, writing in the *Journal of Commerce*, who, I suppose, are conversant with this matter, say that at present prices of these pipes the increase in the duty from six-tenths of a cent a pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem* to 1⅞ cents per pound, is equal to an increase of 5 per cent. *ad valorem ;* but aside from that, the old rate—under which the specific duty, of course, amounts to less than it did when the price was lower—was equal, not to 30 per cent., but to 48 per cent *ad valorem*. Here is the position. There are industries in this country using this tubing as their raw material—the manufactories of radiators ; and this is becoming a large industry. In that and kindred industries, in which this tubing is the raw material, it must be inevitable that there are ten men employed—my hon. friend says a hundred, but I want to speak within bounds—in the manufacture of radiators and steam-fittings, to every one employed in the manufacture of tubing ; so that you can see that you are, perhaps, doing a greater injury to the development of the industries of this country, which you think you are promoting by your tariff, than if you left the first man without any duty at all, or had not called his industry into existence. When this duty was first put on boiler tubing, I pointed out to this House, for I was posted on that matter, that it was an impossibility for any tubing factory to be established in this country on a paying basis, for the reason that there was not as much consumption of the finished product in Canada in a year as one factory could turn out in a very short time, unless it was a very small factory, which could not compete with the larger ones abroad. But that policy was adopted, and the duty at once became a burden on all the steam boiler manufacturers in the country, employing thousands of hands, while this factory which was called into existence employed, I do not know how many. So far as lap-welded tubing is concerned, I suppose there is hardly a foot of it made in the country, and even the manufacture of butt-welded tubing, calls hardly any men into employment. The manufacturers of radiators, who employ a vastly greater number of men than this one factory, have only 30 per cent. imposed on their finished product, whereas the duty on their raw material amounts to 48 per cent. What is the result ? That must mean the crushing out of that industry which employs ten men, or as my hon. friend says a hundred men, to every one employed in the industry which this duty is designed to promote. In these iron duties we have an illustration of the difficulty of working a tariff which has an eye to protection alone, and which departs from the principle of merely levying a duty for revenue purposes and under the incidental protection offered, by which a protection sufficient to the development of the manufactures of this country was given, as was shown by their growth and increase and prosperity under our old revenue tariff. It is only fair to the manufacturers to point out that while excessive duties are charged to protect the articles which they produce, they are charged so much on the raw material they use that they lose the benefit of that protection and, in fact, are in a worst position than before the protection was introduced. It is plain to any one who will consider the question how that may be. It is shown in this business we are discussing more clearly than in any other subject which has come before us. I need not tell this House that the measure of protection an industry enjoys is the difference between the amount of duty on the raw material used by it and the duty on the finished product, and if the duty on the raw material is higher than that on the finished product the manufacturer not only gets no protection, but is absolutely legislated against. I believe the great bulk of the iron working establishments of this country, which employ thousands of hands, have been placed in a worse position than that in which they were under the 17½ per cent. tariff, owing to the imposition of these duties, as illustrated in the case under consideration, so that the consumer has to suffer from the heavy taxation without any benefit being derived by the manufacturers.

Mr. KENNY. I have listened attentively to the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman. I cannot agree with him when he says that no advantages have accrued to Canadian manufacturers from the present tariff as compared with the 17½ per cent. tariff. Of course, there is nothing in this world which is perfect, and, perhaps, even the tariff of the present Government, whose acts are generally so perfect, may have some imperfections. If there is an item in the tariff which is imperfect it is the item under consideration. I do think the manufacturers of wrought iron tube radiators are laboring under very great disadvantages. Their raw material pays a duty of 30 per cent. and six-tenths cent per pound, and when you consider that the American radiator, with which they have to compete, pays only 30 per cent., it is evident that the manufacturer of

the Canadian article is placed at a very great disadvantage. In addition, the manufacturer of the wrought-iron radiater is brought into competition here with the manufacturer of the cast-iron radiator, who pays, if I am correctly informed, only a duty of about 20 per cent. on his raw material. He is also brought into competition with the manufacturer of the boiler tube radiator, who pays a duty of 15 per cent. only on the raw material. I was hoping the Minister of Finance would have seen his way clear to make the duty on the 31-inch pipe imported for this purpose, at the same rate as the radiator, 30 per cent. It must be borne in mind that pipe of the dimensions used for the wrought-iron radiator is not now produced in large quantities in Canada, and it is difficult for these manufacturers to use the butt-piping. I regret the Minister of Finance did not see his way clear to make the tariff 30 per cent. on this item.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman is slightly wrong with regard to butt-welded tubing. There is no lap-welded tubing made less than 1½ inch in diameter, and there is none made in Canada, and the manufacturers of cast pipe radiators have to pay a high duty on their raw material. In fact, all manufacturers are placed at a great disadvantage by the high duties on iron. The price in Glasgow, of the iron used by the manufacturers, is 50s. and 6d. per ton, or equal to $12.10 per ton of 2,240 pounds, and $10.80 per ton of 2,000 pounds. The duty is $4.00 per short ton, and $4.48 per long ton, or 41½ per cent., and that is the duty which the manufacturers of cast-iron radiator have to pay on their raw material. To these figures we have to add $1.50 a ton bounty, and in a very few years, the Minister has told us, we may expect to see it at $2 a ton on the pig iron. Adding $1.50 bounty to the $4.48 per ton gives $5.98 per ton of a tax on this industry. And if you consider the loss in carrying the coal to the iron mines over the Intercolonial, and in carrying the iron from the mines to the manufacturers in Canada, you will find that we have to pay nearly $8 a ton for the privilege of using pig iron manufactured in Canada. Wrought iron is paying a duty of $13 per ton, which, on the price of Scotch or Welsh iron, will make 35$\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. Our manufacturers are not fairly dealt with by this Government, when charged such exorbitant price for their raw material. In connection with pig-iron, I believe the Government pay more bounty than they should, for I am informed that the manufacturers use about three-fourths pig iron to one-fourth scrap, so that they get a bounty for using up old scrap. The manufacturers of Canada are treated very unfairly. As the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has said, they are sometimes blamed for charging exorbitant prices, but they are placed at great disadvantage on account of having to pay the high duties imposed under the present tariff. In every instance, I say the manufacturer ought to get the benefit of an *ad valorem* duty. These specific duties are not fair, because a great many of the manufactured articles are admitted on an *ad valorem* duty, and it is not fair to place a specific duty on the iron, because iron rises and falls in value very frequently. My hon. friend from Brant said that this duty on tubing would amount to 48 per cent. The duty would have been 85 per cent. in 1886, because of the difference in price. It was $3.37 in 1886, as compared with $5.67 now. If the Finance Minister desires to do anything in the interests of the manufacturers he should be willing to allow them to bring in their goods at an *ad valorem* duty instead of a specific duty. The duty on welded tubing is entirely for revenue purposes, because there is none made in Canada, and I do not suppose there will be for years to come. The raw material should be admitted free for the benefit of the manufacturers, but you tax them on the raw material, and then you increase the duty on the manufactured goods, the result being that the consumer has to pay the duty.

Wrought iron or steel nuts and washers, iron or steel rivets, bolts with or without threads, nut and bolt blanks, T and strap hinges and hinge blanks, 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. WALDIE. I should like to know why T and strap hinges are not included with the other hinges at 35 per cent? They are used by the poorer people for their houses, their barns and their gates, and I think it is only right that they should be charged at 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. They are made in this country.

Mr. WALDIE. I am well aware of that, but so are butt hinges and other articles which are charged 35 per cent. This tax will amount to 45 per cent. if you include the specific duty, and I think the Government might very judiciously make the change which I have suggested.

Jellies, jams and preserves, 5 cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears to be a large duty on these articles, the average value of which is only about 8 cents a pound.

Mr. WALDIE. We are manufacturing them here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This amounts to a duty of about 60 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Where can you buy them for 8 cents a pound?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Your Trade and Navigation Returns state that they are invoiced at about 8 cents per pound, and, looking at the price of sugar in England, I think that is about a fair price. I find that 315,000 pounds were invoiced at an amount of about $25,000. The hon. gentleman will see that that is as nearly as possible 8 cents a pound, and, when you can get sugar for about 3 cents a pound, as you can in England, that would be about a fair price.

Mr. FOSTER. We make any quantity of these preserves here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will not make them as cheaply as long as sugar remains at its present rate.

Lard, tried or rendered, 3 cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to add after the word "package" the words "when of tin."

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that we have imported from the United States last year 8,389,011 pounds, paying a duty of $165,660. Lard is an element of food that enters largely into the consumption of the lumbermen and the fishermen as well as the farmers of this country, and I think

this is a duty which should not be imposed. It is taxing the food of the people, and of that class of the people who live in sections where no advantage whatever is derived from the protective policy of the Government. In my own county, where there is not a single industry protected under the National Policy that I know of, they consume a great quantity of lard in the lumber camps, and among the fishermen, who earn their living hardly on the water. Even among the farmers, lard is used in many cases in place of butter, which is used by the better classes there and in different parts of the Dominion. I think this tax is too high, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen—though I fear I appeal without success—to treat the people of the east with fairness. I think the report of the hon. gentleman treats the Maritime Provinces especially in a very unfair, unjust and severe way. I ask the hon. gentleman to consider, not the state of political parties, but the position of the people there. They are taxed upon all articles of food which are imported, and they have received no benefit from the operation of the National Policy. I find that $165,660 is paid in duty upon an article which largely goes into the consumption of the lumberman and the fisherman, and a portion also goes to the farmers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As far as I can understand, hitherto the packages in which the lard was imported were free of duty.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; they have been dutiable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where would the duty on packages be stated ?

Mr. BOWELL. The duty was levied on the packages with their contents. The authority is found in the general package clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we did not import eight million pounds of lard, but a certain quantity of lard plus packages ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What proportion of this total weight would be represented by the packages ?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a large quantity that comes in tubs a large quantity also comes in in barrels, some of tin and some of wood. The package so made would bear 20 per cent. duty in addition to the specific duty upon the contents of the package.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am advised, although the point is one on which I speak under correction, that the probable effect of the duty on the packages means that the importer or the consumer has to pay 3½ cents duty in addition to this 3 cents a pound extra duty on the package. That is an enormously heavy duty on an article like that, bringing it up to about 7 cents a pound. There is 50 per cent. on an article of food largely consumed by the poorer classes.

Mr. WALDIE. They are not charging a duty on the package of wood, as I understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have changed that to read "the weight of the package, when of tin, to be included in the weight for duty."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear the hon. gentleman say that. That would improve the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. If it is in barrels, it will bear the same duty it did before.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that the Government persist in refusing to make any modification in this duty on lard ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think any modification can be made under the general line of policy which has been adopted.

Mr. MITCHELL. Can you alter the general line of policy in order to extend a little justice to the Maritime Provinces ?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been so well received by the country at large that it would be a pity to alter it.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a universal outcry against the Government who have introduced it.

Mr. ELLIS. As far as this item of lard is concerned, it is not correct to say that it has been well received. In the Province of New Brunswick we import a great deal of this American lard. I think the value of it last year was something like $55,000 for 743,000 pounds. It is taxing the very class of persons who are least able to pay this kind of tax.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is used very largely in the manufacture of biscuits throughout the country. How would this tax compare with the tax on biscuits ?

Mr. FOSTER. We will come to that biscuit item later. We do not propose to change the duty on lard.

Leather-board and leatheroid, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that item come in the celebrated Inland Revenue Bill regarding stamps ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that goes without stamps.

Mr. BOWELL. This leatheroid is a combination of leather and paper and other things of which I have no knowledge, nor have we been able to discover what it is. It is used largely in the manufacture of trunks, and makes an article less liable to be broken than sheet iron trunks. We have been obliged to rule it as a manufacture of paper at 35 per cent. That precluded the possibility of manufacturers using it, as there is a certain quantity of paper in it, something of the papier-maché character. It is a very hard article.

Skins for morocco leather, tanned, but not further manufactured, 10 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to change it from 10 to 15 per cent., the same duty as it bore before.

Mr. WALDIE. These are the skins that we are importing in pickle now and manufacturing, and if you put 15 per cent. on them, and allow only 15 per cent. on the leather after it is produced, we have no protection at all.

Mr. BOWELL. These are tanned.

Mr. WALDIE. A large quantity of sheepskins is imported in pickle from Australia. Some of them are split in England and imported into this country and enter at 5 per cent. ; they are manufactured and sold with a protection of 15 per cent. When you add the increased weight of the skin in pickle as compared with the reduced weight when it is manufactured there is no protection at all. I think the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance have been misformed in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same duty that was on before.

Mr. WALDIE. Still there was an entry made of 10 per cent. on those pickled skins and they are treated as tanned skins.

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs never did rule a pickled skin as a tanned skin.

Mess pork, as defined by the General Inspection Act, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. What changes do you propose making in the duties on pork?

Mr. FOSTER. On mess pork we do not propose any change, except that the barrels containing the same shall come in free. In regard to item 102, we propose to divide it into two parts, making salt beef in barrels 2 cents per pound, and leaving fresh or salted meats at 3 cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that mess pork will be changed 1½ cents per pound, while other mess will be 3 cents per pound, which would cover pork not mess pork? That definition would cover clear pork and prime mess pork, and that would be charged 3 cents per pound as against 1½ cents for mess. It is well known that in Chicago during the last week clear pork has sold for half a dollar a barrel more than mess pork. Within the last four days mess pork has jumped from the price of clear pork to be $5 a barrel more than clear pork. In other words, a man who purchased, last Saturday, pork for his lumbering operations, would have to pay $15 for mess but only $11 for clear, which is a better quality than mess.

Mr. FOSTER. I admit that the facts may be as stated; but it was agreed that these three items would remain over and not be discussed to-night; I am simply stating the changes proposed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that the barrels have to come in free only in the case of mess pork?

Mr. FOSTER. Mess pork, as defined by the General Inspection Act, will only pay 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. What will be the charge on clear pork and on prime mess? Will the barrels for those kinds come in free?

Mr. FOSTER. Long clear cut pork is mess pork.

Mr. MITCHELL. Long clear cut is not known as an article of commerce, as is mess pork, and the same remark applies to clear pork. But I want to know whether clear pork is to be charged at 3 cents while mess pork, an inferior grade, is charged 1½ cents, and whether all the barrels will be allowed to come in free?

Mr. BRYSON. There is a point in the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). It is important that mess pork should be defined, because there are many varieties. There are several brands, such as Boston clear, Boston extra clear, and Boston heavy clear, all of which are mess pork, and should come in at 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not propose to discuss the question to-night, but I desire to know whether I understand correctly the statement the hon. Finance Minister has made.

Mr. FOSTER. I say the only change we propose to make in these three items is in item 102. Item 101 will remain as it was, item 102 will be divided as I have stated, and item 103 will remain as it was. Item 101, in reference to mess pork, may be found, when we come to discuss it, to include more than my hon. friend has to-night indicated that he supposes it will.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is satisfactory for me to know that my hon. friend takes the same view as I do—that is, that clear pork is included in the word "mess."

Mr. FOSTER. Let us leave it over until we come to discuss it.

Lubricating oils composed wholly or in part of petroleum and costing less than 30 cents per gallon, 7⅛ cents per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change in this. We simply make three items do the duty of four formerly.

Mr. WATSON. A specific duty on lubricating oils, as on iron tubing, is very unfair. Seven and one-fifth cents a gallon means about 100 per cent. on some of those lubricating oils. It is an unfair tax.

Mr. WALLACE. Oils used for lubricating purposes of any value, are worth from 40 to 50 cents a gallon.

Mr. WATSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Some of these oils manufactured from petroleum sell at 30 cents a gallon less than others. The oil used to-day on railways and for some steam engines, is only worth 10 or 11 cents a gallon.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets his information in reference to lubricating oils used on railways. We had an investigation recently which took us a week or two to ascertain the facts in connection with this very item, and I know that the invoices from the United States showed the value to be some 40 cents per gallon, and that the party importing it invoiced it below 30 cents, in order to evade a higher duty. That is the case to which I called attention the other day and that is one of the reasons why we change the duty.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; but the oil used for the journals of the freight cars only cost 9 or 10 cents a gallon.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that cheap oil is used very largely for lubricating purposes in some small factories, and for saw mills. Of course, there are lubricating oils that cost from 60 to 80 cents a gallon, but a good deal of these oils cost a very small sum. I cannot conceive why it is necessary to put such a tremendous duty on these oils. In this connection, I might say that I think it is to be regretted that the Government have not seen fit to reduce the duty on coal oil. Last year we imported 4,600,000 gallons of coal oil, and when you take into consideration the tax upon the barrels, the duty is over 70 per cent. I think it is unfair that the people of this country should be taxed to such an enormous extent to keep up this industry, and while we are making changes all round a change ought be made in this direction.

Mr. WATSON. I find that black lubricating oil used by the railway companies is sold at from $2 to $3 a barrel of 40 gallons. It is used for

lubricating steam engines and saw mills, and it only costs from 5 to 7 cents a gallon.

Mr. BOWELL. All lubricating oils, other than those which cost 30 cents, come in at 5 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. CARGILL. I do not know of any saw mills or of any flour mills in the country that are able to procure their oil at 10 cents per gallon.

Mr. WATSON. I did not say flour mills.

Mr. HESSON. Order. Shut your mouth.

Mr. WATSON. Who will shut his mouth? I wish to remark that I did not say flour mills.

Mr. CARGILL. I pay 40 cents a gallon. Cylinder oil is usually the best used, and we pay $1 a gallon for it.

Mr. WATSON. We buy the best cylinder oil in Manitoba for 85 cents. This black oil is I know used by saw mills, and they buy it at from $2 to $3 a barrel. Probably the hon. gentleman does not use it.

Mr. CARGILL. That is not lubricating oil.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Customs tells us that these oils are provided for elsewhere, but if I understand clause 108, everything that is lubricating oil, and costs less than 30 cents a gallon, will be 7½ cents a gallon.

Mr. BOWELL. Only if it is petroleum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that was imported at 7½ cents a gallon, it would be at 7½ cents duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; if made from petroleum in whole or part.

Opium (crude) $1 per pound, the weight to include the weight of the ball or covering.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the object of keeping the duty on opium? It is used constantly by every medical man.

Mr. BRIEN. I think this is a very objectionable duty. It amounts to an increase, because the weight of the ball is included.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is the same. That has always been included in the ruling.

Mr. BRIEN. There is no medicine used in practice more generally than opium.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is another tax on the sick, and I think it should be reduced.

Mr. TAYLOR. For the benefit of the doctors.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It does not benefit the doctors, because the doctors do not keep medicines, but it is a benefit to the sick. This is something that is used every day.

Colors, dry, N.E.S., 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. MITCHELL. I have had a letter from a tribe of Caughnawaga Indians, who complain that the duties on the dyes and paints or colorings they use in making baskets are increased very much. I do not know who they are, but I suppose that, hearing that I was a man who always looked after the interests of the poor, they wrote to me to see if I could get them any amelioration.

Mr. FOSTER. If they mean dry colors, they have not been increased. On the item of beads, they communicated with me, and I reduced the duty from 30 per cent. to 20 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.

Paints and colors, pulped or ground in oil or other liquids, N.E.S., 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that an increase?

Mr. FOSTER. That is on the whole an increase of probably 5 per cent. on a number of articles which were formerly at different rates. These paints and colors are made here, and are ground in linseed oil, which bears a duty of 30 per cent. I want to take from item 115, "all liquid, prepared or ready mixed paints," and add them to 114.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Halifax will notice that by this change the case he brought to my attention has been corrected; that is, the copper paint for vessels has been put under the head of 30 per cent. This has been done with all the commoner paints.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad the hon. Minister has made that change; but I have a representation with reference to another class of paints, that is, ready mixed paints in tin cans.

Mr. FOSTER. Those are changed to 30 per cent.

Paints and colors, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, $1 per gallon.

Mr. BOWELL. These were formerly unenumerated. We ruled them at 20 per cent. *ad valorem* and 25 cents per gallon. The reason was they contained a very large quantity of spirits. It came to the knowledge of the Department that they were imported largely from Germany, and the spirits then extracted, leaving the shellac just as valuable as while in the varnish. This will make the duty a little higher and prevent the smuggling of spirits in that way.

Paper hangings or wall paper in rolls, on each roll of eight yards or under, and so in proportion for all greater lengths of the following descriptions, viz.:—
(*a*) Brown blanks, white papers, grounded papers and satins, 2 cents.
(*b*) Single print bronzes and colored bronzes, 6 cents.
(*c*) Embossed bronzes, 8 cents.
(*d*) Colored borders, narrow, and colored borders, wide, 6 cents.
(*e*) Bronze borders, narrow, and bronze borders, wide, 14 cents.
(*f*) Embossed borders, 15 cents.
(*g*) All other paper hangings or wall paper, 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to add to the first item brown blanks and white blanks, printed or plain, at the same rate; and then white papers and grounded papers, not hand made, and satins, 3 cents, because those grounded papers are considerably higher than the white blanks or brown blanks.

Pickles in bottle, 40 cents per gallon, including the duty on the bottles, and each bottle holding less than one-half pint shall be dutiable as containing one-half pint, and each bottle holding more than one-half pint but not more than one pint shall be dutiable as containing one pint, and each bottle holding more than one pint but not more than one quart shall be dutiable as containing one quart.

Mr. ELLIS. Is there any change in the mode of collecting the duty on these articles?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is the way they were ruled.

Mr. ELLIS. I have a communication from a firm in St. John referring to item 138, pickles and sauces, but the objection they take is precisely the

same as that which was taken to item 127. They say :

"Under the old reading it was felt to be a grievance that we had to pay duty on a reputed or wine pint as though it was an Imperial pint. As a matter of fact, a 'reputed half pint' contains six ounces of liquid, or four ounces less than an Imperial half pint; consequently, to meet the inconsistency of the tariff it was proposed, for a cheap package, to import quarter pints or five-ounce bottles. You will at ence see that under the new interpretation of the tariff any bottle, even though it contains but one ounce, will be liable to the same duty as one of ten ounces, a most absurd and unjust way of fixing the duty. It would be far better to make it at once into an *ad valorem* duty.

"I do not think Canadians would mind so much if it were not that the Canadian packers of sauces, instead of putting up Imperial measure, take very good care to put up 'wine measure,' and the consumer is thus just as much defrauded (assuming that it was to prevent his being defrauded the curious regulation was made).

"No one will object if the old ruling is maintained, absurd as it is, only let quarter-pints be fairly recognised as such, and make them the minimum measure instead of one-half pints.

Plumbago, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to make that 15 per cent.

Woollen netting for the lining of boots, shoes and gloves, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. That is raised from 10 to 25 per cent. because that is now manufactured in the country.

Rubber belting, hose, packing, mats and matting, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber, 5 cents per pound, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. WATSON. This industry is very highly protected, and I think, if the duty were reduced on some of these articles, the consumer would receive a much better quality. Under the present high protective system it is almost impossible to import these goods. A man would rather give $10 more for a belt to drive a threshing machine of American manufacture than for one of Canadian manufacture. If the duty was reduced on some of these goods, the Canadian manufacturer would give a better article. I think I might call in my hon. friend from Bruce who will know the difference in the quality.

Mr. CARGILL. I can only say that I use both kinds of belting, and I prefer the Canadian article.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member is the only man I have ever heard who preferred Canadian rubber belting to American ; but, of course, he supports the Government on a high protective tariff. If he had to choose between the two without prejudice, I believe he would select the American belting.

Mr. CARGILL. I have used Canadian hose and belting, and American hose and belting, and in every case I have found the Canadian equal to the American article.

Soy, 10 cents per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very considerable reduction for the benefit of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am afraid the consumption will be very small.

Seeds, when in bulk or in large parcels, 15 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to make that 10 per cent.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that clover and grass seeds will be included in this. I suppose the Minister has had representations made to him as to the special hardship which the dealers in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces will suffer in consequence of the particular time when these tariff changes have been made. Generally seedsmen take their orders at an earlier time than this, but they do not import their seeds till later. I am aware that the Montreal seedsmen have given large orders to supply the country dealers, and through them the farmers at certain rates, and they will lose a large amount of money unless it is provided that seeds which were *bonâ fide* ordered before the changes were introduced in the tariff are allowed to come in free, as in the case of iron. I am sure everybody must appreciate the fact that in this way not only the seedsmen are going to suffer severely, but the public at large will still have to pay an increased duty. The farmer will be asked to pay the increased price of the retail dealers, and I fear very much they will have to pay the increased price of the importers who supply the retailers at the price agreed upon before the tariff was changed. I would like to ask the Minister whether any relief has been granted in this case. I know that strong representations have been made to the Government asking for this relief, and I would like to know whether there is any hope that such relief may be obtained for these men.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend had been in his place in the early part of the evening he would have heard an interesting discussion on this principle in the case of the nurserymen. After discussing it, I think the House came to the conclusion that it was impossible to grant relief in one case without granting it in all—with the exception of the hon. gentleman for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), who wished it granted in the case alluded to. Representations have been made by the seedsmen from various parts. My hon. friend will see the difficulty involved in giving remission, or allowing these articles to come in after the tariff has been fixed. However, the change from 15 to 10 per cent. will help them somewhat.

Mr. FISHER. I quite understand the difficulty. At the same time, this particular tax falls very heavily upon the Province from which I come and the Maritime Provinces. We all know that the season is later in those Provinces than it is further west, and the business of supplying seeds to the farmers has not been advanced so far in those Provinces as it has been in the Western Provinces. As a matter of fact, almost the whole incidence of this tax will, this season, at all events, bear upon Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. The people of Ontario, to a large extent, have already got their seeds, and the people of the North-West also, I suppose ; consequently the incidence of this tax will chiefly affect Eastern Canada. I may say that I think it is unfair, it is a hardship, to the agricultural classes in general, that grass seeds should be included in this paragraph. I regret extremely to find that a duty has been reimposed upon clover and grass seeds. These are seeds which in certain seasons we are unable to produce satisfactorily in this country, and we have to import large quantities from the United States. It is true that a few years ago we were able to export some of these seeds to the United States when their

season proved unfavorable, and when ours was favorable. I regret to see that these seeds are now made to pay a larger duty. It was a great relief to us heretofore to be able to get them cheaper in consequence of the duty having been remitted. At this time when we ought to refuse to place any further burdens on the farmers, it would be a great pity if we increased the prices of these grass seeds.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. gentleman is much mistaken in his assertion about seeds having been brought in from the United States after the duty was placed upon them. We use a pretty considerable quantity of clover and timothy seeds, and not only were these seeds imported into this country long before this duty was placed upon them, but they had passed through the hands of the wholesale dealers into the hands of the retailers, and from the retailers into the hands of the farmers, before this duty was imposed at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in Quebec and in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking of what has actually occurred. The farmers of this country do not wait till the seeding season is over to buy their seeds; the dealers do not wait until the seeding season is passed before they bring in their seeds into the country. The whole supply was in this country long before the duty was imposed.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman had listened to what I said he would have heard me state emphatically that such is not the case in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, whatever may be the case in Ontario and the North-West.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not suppose you know very much about the Maritime Provinces. Speak of your own.

Mr. FISHER. I happen to know that the Maritime Provinces are largely supplied with seed from the city of Montreal, and I have my information from the largest seed dealers in that city. Everybody who knows anything about the agricultural operations of this country knows that the seed time in the Maritime Provinces is later than it is further west. I pointed out particularly the fact that the incidence of this change of duty would bear particularly upon the Maritime Provinces and Quebec, for I had no doubt that in Ontario and the North-West these seeds had been distributed before this tariff was introduced.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am sorry the Minister has seen fit to impose a duty upon seeds just at a time when the farmers of Ontario, at least, feel the necessity of changing the system of farming, and in that change they must increase the use of clover and grass seed. There are many farmers who would do well to sow clover on every acre of land they have got, for the reason that clover is such a good fertiliser. There was a time, in the Province of Ontario, when we could raise our own clover seed, but for a few years past, on account of the clover midge, we have not been able to raise our own seed. I think that the Minister ought to have some consideration for the farmers of this country and give them an opportunity of procuring their grass seeds free. This is their raw material, and why in the name of goodness should the raw material in every direction be taxed against the farmers, when it is allowed to come in for every other class of the community. Seeing that the Government do not require the duty for revenue purposes, seeds ought to be placed on the free list. Clover is an actual necessity, and the longer we farm a great deal of our land, we must use clover in order to keep up the fertility of the soil. I, therefore, hope that the Government will see their way to putting at least clover and timothy on the free list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. While it bears heavily on the farming community it is not very satisfactory to the dealers. A case was brought to my notice in which a merchant in Durham inspected clover seed in Detroit on 24th March. It was not entered at that time, and the consequence is that he is liable to pay the present duty. Another merchant who bought clover seed a few days earlier, got it in free. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has spoken, no doubt, the sentiments of the farmers of Canada, namely, that clover seed should be placed on the free list, for if our farmers are not able to raise clover seed they should be allowed to bring it in free.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids for almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspaper advertisements or engravings, and all other like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, N.E.S.; and matrices or copper shells of the same, 2 cents per square inch.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns, and bases for the same, composed wholly or partly of metal or celluloid, three-fourths of one cent per square inch, and matrices or copper shells of the same, 2 cents per square inch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does this duty compare with the old duty?

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible to make any comparison. When that item was framed these matrices were of metal, and were very heavy. The duty was by weight, and amounted to something. Now the composition of the matrices has been changed, and the weight has been reduced to a minimum, so that the duty affords no protection. Accordingly we changed the duty from a weight to a measurement basis. In the first class, which is for trade and advertising purposes, the duty is 2 cents per square inch; for newspaper columns, $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent per square inch, which does not amount to the price of composition.

Mr. ELLIS. It is a great mistake to impose a duty on an article of this kind, which is a comparatively new invention of the printer's art. By it newspapers have been able to be started all over the country, in towns and villages where formerly a newspaper could not be printed, they thereby have the benefit of a local paper. This duty is imposed for the sake of one manufacturing establishment in Toronto, in order to give it protection; and it is proposed to shut out enterprises that would give employment to a great many persons, and which would have the effect of establishing newspapers in small towns and of disseminating useful knowledge. It is one of the most absurd propositions ever made in an enlightened country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). Anything that strikes at the material prosperity of the newspapers is not in the best interests of this country, and it should not be endorsed by this House. A proposition of this kind, which is calculated to do an injury to the press of the country districts, and perhaps in the cities likewise, is one

which this Committee should not pass—at all events, the rate should be reduced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I objected to this duty at the time it was imposed. The obstacle in the way of newspapers availing themselves of the stereotypes furnished in this country, is this: There is but one establishment, and all the newspapers are supplied with casts of the same sort. Now, by getting them from the other side, they generally make an arrangement not to furnish any two newspapers in the same district with the same plates. The hon. gentleman opposite, therefore, seriously burthens the newspapers of the country by this duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think the objections are well taken to this item. We have been discussing for a day or two the interests of the workingmen, and I have heard gentlemen on the opposite side continually finding fault with the Government because they allowed men to come into the country to compete with the laborers, artisans and mechanics who already live here. The real object of placing this high duty—and I admit it is a high duty—was, in the first place, to protect the printers of this country from a competition which deprived them of their labor; and, in the second place—and, I think, if we had no other reason this would be a good one—that some of the matter which is introduced in many cases from the United States is of a character not such as I am sure the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would like to see in the hands of his children or of the general public. If we want to educate the rising generation to be American in sentiment, and to be American in feeling, and to learn all the little incidents which have occurred in their country since the Revolution, at the expense of Canada, and to see the public men of the United States extolled to the seventh heaven, and all other public men denounced, we had better continue the system of allowing this kind of literature to be circulated among the people. I am quite aware that it will impose a higher tax on the publishers of these newspapers, if they continue to import these plates at a higher rate, but I believe that the good which will result from this duty, and the extra amount of labor it will give to the printers of this country, will be ample compensation. I am not a publisher now, but if I were in the business to-day I would support this duty with all my heart for the reasons I have given.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. Minister is quite wrong. In the first place, the effect of establishing more newspapers in this country is to give employment to more labor, and the effect of being able to use this matter is to start newspapers in places where they could not be supported before. It is true that there would not be quite as many men employed as if all the type was set up in this country, but if these plates are not allowed in you cannot have a newspaper at all in many places where they are established now. As to the matter selected, the Minister is again wrong. He states what he deems to be a general fact in regard to this literature, but it is not so. There may be some of it objectionable, but, if he objects to it, he can stop it by placing it among the indecent literature, and prevent its importation altogether. The on. gentleman has probably not time to read the p ers, but if he will read these selections he will find that it is as good literature as can be found anywhere, and that the selection is probably better made than if left to the ordinary editor, who is hurried and clips what he can. I am sure that the greater part of the literature is selected from as good authors as can be found in the literature of any country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his information. I accept it with due humility. If there is anything which I know something of it is the printing business, from the sweeping of the floor up to the editing of a newspaper. When the hon. gentleman tells me that this duty will prevent the establishment of newspapers in different parts of the country, and that it will not give more work to the printers, he will excuse me if I say he is in error. At present, you can carry on two or three newspapers with less actual work in setting up than you could with one ordinary newspaper under the old system. If you have men or apprentices to set up your type, you require more actual labor in one ordinary printing office than you would with three or four newspapers, by importing these electroplates. All you require with these plates would be simply to import them, mount them on blocks, insert in columns of newspaper, run off on a power or ordinary hand press, and you have the whole thing done. I think I know whereof I speak in connection with this matter. Perhaps I may have spoken a little too general in reference to the literature, for I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there are many stories of standard authors sent over; and there are also many of the sermons of eminent preachers in different cities, but I refer to the general character of the literature which is printed and circulated in country places by the newspapers to which the hon. gentleman refers. I never said that the literature was indecent, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis) used the expression. If he knows anything of the Tariff Act he would see that it is very difficult to rule certain literature indecent, and to keep it out. I might regard it as not agreeing with my own individual opinion, but I think he would hardly justify me in ruling it out on that account. I hope the House will carry these items for the reason, if not for any other, that it will enable us to give more employment to a worthy class of men—the printers of this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that this duty will cause more employment to be given. If the hon. gentleman could show that there would be the same number of newspapers, with the same amount of matter published under the new tariff, then it would be simply a question of arithmetic, and his statement would probably be correct. But that is not the case. The hon. gentleman knows that there are newspapers published at a low price—and they must be published at a low price, or they cannot find subscribers—that will cease to exist if this tariff is imposed. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman's proposition will wipe out a large number of newspapers that are at present comparatively prosperous, and will do so simply because of the high duties imposed. The hon. gentleman says it will give more employment to laborers, but if the arrangement wipes out hundreds of newspapers it will not give more employment to laborers. There is no doubt what-

ever about what the effect of the hon. gentleman's proposition will be, and it is within the experience of everyone who has some connection with newspapers that if the duties are increased the effect will be, not to give employment to parties to replace this matter by actual type-setting, but to wipe out certain newspapers altogether.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think that the newspaper press is so badly used in this country. I find, in the first place, that while other machinery is charged 35 per cent. duty, the newspapers are allowed to import their printing presses for 10 per cent.; and more than that, the Government deliver their newspapers all over the country, without charging them one farthing. I think that if this tariff keeps out this United States literature it will be a good thing for Canada. We know that the most disloyal sentiments to Canada emanate from these American electroplates. If we have them produced in Canada we will have a loyal sentiment promulgated through the country, instead of circulating American ideas emanating professedly from Canadian newspapers. I think that, in every way we view it, the idea is a good one to have the electroplates produced in Canada, instead of importing them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance how much revenue he expects to realise from this source?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not base any hope on this of realising money.

Saccharine or any product containing over one-half of one per cent. thereof, $10 per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This seems a very remarkable clause.

Mr. BOWELL. This article is prohibited in France altogether; it is prohibited in England for use in breweries, and in Belgium there is $12 a pound placed on it. The smallest possible quantity will change the whole character of any article into which it is put. It is a new discovery from the distillation of coal tar, and it is found to be injurious.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PONTIAC JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BRYSON moved that the petition of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company be now read and received, and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders. He said: The Bill is to consummate an agreement pending between the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway for a portion of the line between Hull and Aylmer. It appears there is some doubt as to the right of the companies to enter into this agreement, owing to certain legislation which took place in the early days of the Session, and I make this motion with the view of removing this doubt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)

Motion agreed to.

STEAMBOAT ENGINEERS' LICENSES.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) to amend the Act respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examination and licensing of engineers employed on them. He said: By the Act of 1886 the engineers who had previously been engaged in this work were given a certain time to come in and get their certificates renewed, but some of them were not aware of the provision and did not come in. They are not a class of men who are likely to be generally aware of amendments made to the law, and, through no fault of theirs, many of these engineers lost their certificates. This is intended to relieve them from the effect of the provision in the law, of which they were unaware, though they will be still subject to the other provisions of the law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE DROP BOXES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CASEY) asked, Who is the contractor for collecting mail matter from the drop boxes in Montreal and delivering it at the post office? How long has he held the contract? How much is he paid for the service? Was the contract let to him by public tender? Has it been renewed to the present contractor without calling for tenders? When does the contract expire? Will tenders be called for when it expires?

Mr. HAGGART. The name of the contractor for collecting mail matter from the drop boxes in Montreal and delivering it at the post office is Patrick Kennedy. He has held the contract from the 1st September, 1883. The sum paid for the service is $4,031 per annum. The contract was let by public tender. It has been renewed to the present contractor. The contract expires on the 31st August, 1891. In regard to the last question, I cannot say what the Postmaster General at that time will do.

MR. JOHN ABELL.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire to bring to the notice of the House a matter which, I think, is of some public importance, and is certainly of importance to certain people in this country. Some time ago, it was stated in this House and outside of this House, that Mr. John Abell, of the city of Toronto, a gentleman who was doing a large business there as a manufacturer of steam engines and machinery of various kinds, had become insolvent, and that his property had passed into the hands of Rice Lewis & Son, and that it was employing no hands. I have received the following telegram from Mr. Abell:—

"Mr. Cook's remarks reported in the *Mail* concerning my business are entirely unfounded, and I am surprised that any member of the Commons should make such a statement without first verifying his premises. The assertions that I have lost money through coming to Toronto, that Rice Lewis & Son Co. control my business, and that there is an Abell Manufacturing Co., are

all false. On the contrary, I have made money by coming to Toronto, and I am to-day worth far more than when I left Woodbridge. I own, manage and control my own business, as Mr. Cook might have readily ascertained, and I shall expect him to withdraw what he has said in the House in as public a manner as he has made his assertion.

"JOHN ABELL."

We have waited for the hon. gentleman—if honorable would apply to such conduct as that——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE—and we have waited in vain for any such retraction. I have also here a letter written to Mr. John Abell by the firm of Rice Lewis & Son, Limited, in which they say:

"DEAR SIR,—We have had our attention called to the statement in the *Mail* newspaper of this date, in which Mr. Cook, in his place in the House of Commons, has seen fit to make the statement that the Abell Manufacturing Company are in the hands of Rice Lewis & Son, Limited. We have written to our member, Mr. Cockburn, and have requested him to contradict this statement from his place in the House of Commons. We are sorry that you should be dragged into publicity in this way without any reason or cause whatever."

I think, in reference to those statements which have been made by Mr. Abell and by the company of Rice Lewis & Son, it is my duty to bring these facts before the House, and to have the statement contradicted as publicly as it was made. I have known Mr. Abell for many years. He lived nearly 40 years in Woodbridge, where he built up a large business, which he afterwards transferred to Toronto. He has also built up a reputation for sterling honesty and integrity which any man in this country might be proud of. He has, from the smallest beginning, by his indomitable energy, by his ability, and by the qualities which are prized by all good men, given himself a name in this country and a reputation which should not be ruthlessly and needlessly assailed by any man in this country, be he a member of the House of Commons or not. I am very sorry that the hon. member for East Simcoe has not seen fit, in face of these facts which he knew of before, to withdraw the assertions he has made with reference to Mr. John Abell.

Mr. COCKBURN. I may state, in confirmation of what my hon. friend has just said, that I did receive a letter from Rice Lewis & Co., one of the largest firms in Toronto or in the Dominion; and they most unqualifiedly denied the statements made in this House by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook). I had myself hoped that it would have been unnecessary for me to rise in the House and draw his attention to the misstatements which he then made; I had fondly hoped, although I was deceived in my hope, that a sense of honor of what was due by gentlemen, would have led him to get up in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am perfectly in order. I stated that I had hoped. I did hope it then, but I hope it no longer.

Some hon MEMBERS. Order, order. Take it back.

Mr. COCKBURN. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House hope that he will correct the misstatement, they have more expectations than I have.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am perfectly in order. I merely stated that I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would withdraw the words, would withdraw the very serious charge which he had made against a most respectable house, a house with which he might be proud to be associated, if he ever had the chance of being taken into such a partnership. I hope that since a most explicit denial has been given by Mr. Abell, and also given by a firm of such respectable standing as Rice Lewis & Son, that the member for East Simcoe will consider it a duty which he owes—I do not say to himself—but which he owes to this House, and which he owes to these gentlemen whom he has maligned, to withdraw the statement which he made in this House, and express his regret for having given utterance to a statement so utterly unfounded.

Mr. COOK. If anything has been said with reference to the financial standing of Mr. Abell he can thank his friend the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) for that statement, because I never mentioned the name of Mr. Abell until after the member for West York had mentioned the name himself. I am led to believe that Mr. Abell has not been a success in business in the city of Toronto; that when he went there he purchased a large quantity of land, at that time of little value, and since then land has increased rapidly in value, by which fact he has been able to extricate himself from the difficulty in which he had been placed by his removal to Toronto. That statement was made to me by a member of the firm of Rice Lewis & Co. I am in a position, as I said before, to make this statement on the faith of a partner in the firm of Rice Lewis & Co., who told me of this transaction. I have been told since that the greater portion of the building occupied by Mr. Abell, on Queen street, is not operated by him, and is not occupied at all; it is only the southern part of the building that he occupies, and the number of men is not very great. I have no desire whatever to injure Mr. Abell in the least, or any other gentleman doing business in this country. I say again that Mr. Abell's name came to the front by the action of the hon. member for West York—his indiscreet friend, his pretended friend, in fact, the man who comes here and attempts to browbeat the members of this House because of a statement that the hon. member made himself, that he had heard from responsible parties who were themselves interested in that transaction. Now, as regards the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn): We know something of the doings of that hon. gentleman. We know that there are a class of men in that city who have formed themselves into syndicates who operate in booming property to the disadvantage and to the ruin of a great many others. I will give you a little idea of the manner in which that business is done. It does not lie in the mouth of that hon. gentleman——

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, are there to be no "limits" to this hon. gentleman?

Mr. COOK. It does not lie in the mouth of that hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I will ask my hon. friend not to insinuate anything against the hon. member for Toronto. I think the language of the hon. member for Toronto was rather strong, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not follow his example.

Mr. COOK. I will endeavor, then, to set the hon. gentleman an example. Now, Sir, there are certain gentlemen who are interested in syndicates in the city of Toronto, for the purpose of booming property; there are a number of such syndicates. One syndicate buys a tract of land in one part of the city, and another syndicate buys another tract of land in another part of the city. Suppose there is a piece of land worth $5,000. One gentleman in one syndicate would put a ficticious value upon it of $30,000, and another gentleman in another syndicate, in another section of the city, does the same thing, and then they trade together, and report that they have sold the land at these ficticious prices.

An hon. MEMBER. Who does that?

Mr. COOK. A gentleman of the syndicate, most of the parties, not every one, but a great many of them who are interested in lands in that part of the city. I do not say the hon. member for Centre Toronto is one of that class; I would not impute motives of that kind to the hon. gentleman, although he can impute motives to other gentlemen in this House, and he can make statements that are derogatory to the honor of gentlemen on this side of the House, and he can compare them with other men—with Mr. Abell—and say that they would be glad to be taken into certain firms. I have never said a word against Mr. Abell. I believe him to be a highly respectable citizen. I have never said a word against him; I only repeated statements that, as I said before, were given to me by a member of the firm of Rice Lewis & Co. I hope it will not injure him, if he is in such a position that it would injure him, but at the time I was only illustrating that this iniquitous tariff policy of the Government had actually ruined that man. I am glad to find it stated by the hon. gentleman that such is not the case; I am glad that he has escaped. He is one of the men who have escaped, and he has been fortunate, for many have fallen under the harrow of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. And that was the manner in which this was brought to the attention of the House. I have been told—I did not see this in the *Mail* newspaper the other day—that some friends or pretended friends of Mr. Abell telegraphed him the statement, and then he supposed he was being very unjustly dealt with, and therefore he gave the papers his statement, which he was very foolish to give. I wish to add this statement: that so far as I was concerned I was only stating what was given to me by a member of the firm of Rice Lewis & Co.

Mr. WALLACE. So far as regards the statement——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to make a statement with respect to myself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there has already been enough personal explanation on this subject, and the business of the House should be proceeded with.

Mr. HESSON. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), that I brought up Mr. Abell's name in this House. I will show how much honesty there was in that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say dishonesty; I said I would show how much honesty there was in it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This practice of moving the adjournment of the House is so reprehensible that something should be done to put it down.

Mr. WALLACE. It was said by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), that a large manufacturer had left Woodbridge and come to Toronto, and that to-day he was not worth a dollar and did not employ a man. As only one large manufacturer left Woodbridge and came to Toronto, I say the hon. member for East Simcoe could not have referred to anyone else except Mr. Abell. That was the way in which the reference was made; he did not mention the name at first, but he mentioned it in such a way that every one knew that reference could only be made to Mr. John Abell. Then the hon. gentleman attempted to get out of it by saying that some property other than his manufacturing establishment is at present not owned by Mr. Abell. But what has that to do with the statement made, that he did not own a dollar and did not employ a man? The hon. gentleman further said that if Mr. Abell was a good man and in prosperous circumstances he could not be hurt by any malicious statement made. Some men cannot be hurt by any statement made; but although Mr. Abell stands high, a statement of this kind, made on the responsibility of a member of the House, is likely to do a great deal of injury. I am sure there are men, not only on this side of the Atlantic but on the other side of the Atlantic, who would be pleased and gratified if their transactions with certain Canadians had been as satisfactory to them as the transactions of Mr. Abell had been to his creditors. I am sure certain Glasgow shareholders, on the other side of the Atlantic, would be so, as is pretty well known.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a lesson to be drawn from this incident. If the manufacturers of agricultural implements are so very successful, perhaps the Government will consider whether they should not remove the duty of 25 per cent. from that class of goods.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the attention of the House, as I did yesterday, to the fact that at this period of the Session it is an abuse of the privileges of the House to move the motion for adjournment at the beginning of its sitting, more especially when there is no other object to be served than that of securing a repetition of what has already been said.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that while yesterday I obeyed the suggestion made by you, Mr. Speaker, and took my seat, that course was not followed to-day on the other side.

THE ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the House resolves itself into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire to draw the attention of the Postmaster General and the House to a matter of which I gave the hon. Minister private notice some time ago—the unfortunate position of our transatlantic mail

service. Last year a discussion took place with respect to improvements in this service, and it was contended by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that we should not seek to obtain a service of the same character as that between England and New York, that is greyhounds running at a speed of twenty miles an hour. It was then stated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that some of our own Dominion lines were prepared, if the Government were willing to accept a reasonably fast service, to complete and put proper steamships on the line. The Government did not see fit to do so. They required a service varying from seventeen to twenty knots; they were not very definite or clear as to what they required. They, at all events, gave us to understand that they required an extremely rapid service, and they were going to enter into a contract with Messrs. Anderson, and we were told that contract was approaching completion. Since then we have learned that the Government were unfortunate in their dealings with Messrs. Anderson and they have not arrived at any contract, and at the present moment the country is not in a position to know whether the statement made by the right hon. Premier as to the cause of the failure or the explanation of the Messrs. Anderson is the correct explanation of the facts. We should know that, and we should know it at an early date. The point to which I desire to call attention is the fact that the service we have to-day is in about as unfortunate a position as it can be. Loud complaints have been made from time to time, particularly by passengers, as to the condition of the vessels now engaged in that service. I do not know that the owners of the line—the Allan line—are to blame so much; I think they are probably not so much to blame. They were willing to enter into a proper contract and to supply proper boats; but the Government would not accept their offer, and the mails are being carried under a very temporary contract indeed. Of course, when the contract is only a temporary one we cannot expect men to invest large capital in the service, and we must expect to obtain very inferior boats. Such is the present condition of affairs. I hold in my hand a letter written from Halifax by a passenger who arrived on the *Peruvian* the other day, and the facts stated therein are such as demand the attention of the hon. Postmaster General. The writer says:

"I arrived here yesterday in the *Peruvian*. We had a terribly rough passage of fifteen and a-half days; head winds and high seas all the way across. The old steamer's boilers are 16 years old, and the certificate of seaworthiness expired five days after we left Moville. The Captain could not press her, and, as it was, some time was lost in repairing the old boilers as we came along. There was great indignation among the passengers at having been entrapped on board an old thing practically without a certificate, upon the understanding that they had taken passage on a first-class steamer carrying the Canadian mails. They wanted me to draw up a round robbin, an indignation protest, but I declined, as I could not be bothered. We intended coming out by the *Parisian*, which was advertised to sail on the 13th, put forward I take it, as a decoy to prevent passengers going by other conveyances, and then she was withdrawn for fourteen days on the plea that further repairs were needed."

If the statements made in this letter are correct, and they are written by a gentleman in whose credibility I have every confidence, and who is a practical man and knows what he is talking about, that steamer sailed with a certificate of seaworthiness which expired five days after she left Moville, a state of affairs which calls for the interference of the hon. Postmaster General. The fact is, we talk about inducing passengers to come out by our Canadian lines, but unless we have better steam vessels to offer them than are on the line now, we need not hope for any increase, but, on the contrary, we may look for a large decrease in our traffic.

Mr. KENNY. I think it is very much to be regretted that the hon. gentleman did not bring this matter forward by resolution, when the hon. members of the House who take an interest in the question might have had an opportunity of preparing themselves to debate it. I cordially agree with every remark that has fallen from the hon. gentleman in reference to the very unsatisfactory condition of the present trans-Atlantic mail service. The hon. gentleman, and hon. members of this House who take an interest in this question, are aware that lately one of the subsidised ocean mail steamers of the Canadian Line actually had not coal enough to carry her on a fourteen days passage across the Atlantic, and was obliged to burn part of her cargo to enable her to land her 700 passengers at their destination. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has read a letter pointing out the fact that the steamer *Peruvian* was fifteen and a-half days making the passage from Liverpool to Halifax to which he refers. Hon. gentlemen who crossed the Atlantic in the days of the old paddle steamers of the Cunard Line will remember that it was very exceptional when one of those steamers was more than fourteen days on a passage. I myself have made many passages in the old Cunard paddle steamers, and I was never more than fourteen days crossing the ocean. Yet, here we are to-day subsidising a line of steamers, one of which takes nearly sixteen days to cross the shortest Atlantic route. There is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House while this matter is under notice, and that is the fact that the present contract enables the subsidised steamers to make their terminal ports outside of the Dominion. On an average, there are from twenty to twenty-five passages made by these subsidised steamers between England and Halifax and Portland. Every one of these steamers lands on an average from 1,000 to 1,500 tons of freight in a foreign port, while for the past two years they have not landed within the Dominion more than an average of 200 tons of freight for transhipment by mail to points in Canada. When we consider the very large disbursement necessarily involved in the discharging of the inward cargo of these ships, and the loading of their outward cargoes, hon. members will recognise that we are actually subsidising a line of steamers to build up a foreign port at the expense of our own ports. Now, Mr. Speaker, as regards the insinuation that the Government is to be blamed because the contract was not made with the owners of the Allan and Dominion Lines, the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) is conclusive evidence that from the unsatisfactory manner in which they performed the service they are not entitled to any special consideration. I think, therefore, that it was wiser in the public interest—as unfortunately the price of iron has advanced, and consequently the price of steamers is very much increased—that the Government

should wait for a year and secure a service which shall be satisfactory, and which shall have its terminal ports within the Dominion, than to renew anything like a permanent contract with companies which have done their work so very unsatisfactorily as these two companies have during the past two years.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) I may state that in the contract existing at present between the Dominion Government and the Allan Line of steamers the terminal ports are: Moville, Liverpool, Halifax, Quebec and Montreal. A contract was entered into on the 12th of the present month, I think, which is only to last for one year. Speaking from memory, as I did not know that this matter would be discussed to-day, I may say that I do not think the *Peruvian* is one of the contract vessels. There are only four or five of the best vessels belonging to the Allan Line in the contract, and we have the opportunity of substituting four or five vessels for them; among the latter three or four vessels which the Allan Company promised to have repaired and fitted up with triple-expansion engines. I think the contract requires a speed of fourteen knots per hour. As to the *Peruvian* which the hon. gentleman speaks about, as soon as I got his letter notifying me that he intended to make the enquiry, I sent the following telegram to the Allans' in Montreal:

"Notice is given that inquiry will be made in the House of Commons as to the condition of the *Peruvian* when she left Liverpool on her late trip to Halifax. Please enable Postmaster General to reply by giving him all the information in your power."

I got the following answer from Mr. Allan:—

"The fact of *Peruvian* having British Board of Trade certificate that she was in every respect fitted and found as a mail and passenger steamships, is ample proof of her efficiency. The Board of Trade surveyors would not have allowed her to leave Liverpool had anything in her been deemed inefficient."

That was the answer I got to the query.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, the fact that she took fifteen days to come to Halifax from Liverpool is *primâ facie* very strong evidence that she was not fit to be a passenger or a subsidised mail steamer.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think she is a subsidised mail steamer now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This discussion proves what I have been endeavoring to show the House for some time, namely: that the Government have been very remiss in their duty in not dealing with this question in a practical manner. It was evident from the first that the position taken by the Government, as announced by the Minister of Finance, could never be realised. We were told by the Minister of Finance that they were going to establish a line of twenty knots per hour boats, equal to the fastest lines leaving the city of New York. Those who were at all familiar with the subject assured the hon. gentleman that no contract could be entered into for such a speed, on such a basis, for anything like the amount which the Government were offering for that service. That prediction has been justified by the withdrawal of Messrs. Anderson from the temporary contract which they entered into. Now, it is very important to understand this question thoroughly, that the House should be in possession of a correspondence to which I referred yesterday, because it is evident that the Government did enter into a contract, and it is evident that for some reason—whether on account of the terminal ports on the other side, or the speed required from the vessels—Messrs. Anderson were not able to carry out the contract. I, therefore, repeat that before we can discuss this question intelligently we should be put in possession of the reasons which induced Messrs. Anderson to sign the contract with the Government. I regret very much to observe that the Government have not proposed a renewal of the subsidy which was in the Estimates last year.

Mr. FOSTER. What subsidy?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The $500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not in the Estimates.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was a resolution. Up to the present time the Government have given no intimation to the House of their intention to ask for a renewal of that subsidy. Whether it is required or not I do not know; if it is required, I hope they will deal with it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an Act of Parliament.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then that stands in a different position; I thought it was in the Estimates. However, be that as it may, the Government do not show any anxiety to improve the mail service. They have had it in their power at any time during the last year or year and a-half to make a contract with responsible parties for a service of sixteen or seventeen knots, which is all that this country requires. I think the Government must be satisfied of that fact; their own press has stated that to be ample; and they have at this moment an intimation from reliable companies that they are willing to put on steamers to undertake the service on that basis, but the Government give them no encouragement. The Government still adhere to their absurd idea of attempting a twenty-knot service. The two companies who have been performing this work for some time have now some large steamers under contract. I know that one company, and I believe the other, have intimated to the Government that if they would make an arrangement with them they would have these steamers made capable of seventeen knots. But the Government are shilly-shallying and putting the matter off from year to year. It must be remembered that the Government are not accommodating the companies by giving them the mails to carry, but that the companies are accommodating the Government; they are merely carrying the mails as an act of favor, and they will not make the same effort as they would under other circumstances; and unless the Government are prepared to deal with this matter in a practical manner the service will go on next year and the year after in the same unsatisfactory way as it did last year. I do not know anything about the long voyage which has been referred to, but I know that these companies have done good work in the service of Canada in the past, and if during the winter time a tempestuous voyage is longer than usual, I suppose it is susceptible of explanation. I do not stand here to justify these companies, because their service to the country is a sufficient justification; but what I repeat is that the Government, by their want of promptness and business management, are allowing this affair to drift on in an unsatis-

factory way. We know that the temporary contract expired on the 12th of April, and if they renew it for another year, when it is up to the 12th of April next year, they will be in precisely the same position that they are in to-day; and no company, no matter what their resources may be, can go into the market and get a line of steamers ready, with the necessary capacity, under one or two years. The steamers have to be contracted for and built, and all their arrangements to be made; and so this delay may go on *ad infinitum*. The sooner the House and the country understand the position of this matter, the sooner I hope public opinion will react on the Government and compel them to do what any reasonable business man would do under the circumstances, provide for a permanent service without unnecessary delay. The Government are responsible for the unsatisfactory manner in which the service stands at present, and apparently they do not intend to take any immediate steps to bring about a remedy.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not propose to occupy any time beyond what is necessary to endorse every word that the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has said. I think the course of the Government is unfair to the Allans, who were the pioneers of this service, and who for thirty years have performed the work as well as any company could possibly do it. It is utterly impossible to expect, with the delays and want of determination on the part of the Government as to what will be done, that these gentlemen can, under temporary arrangements, give the country that accommodation which it has a right to expect. I believe the Allans' have one or two fast steamers, and, with the Dominion Line, performed the service each alternate week with their steamers, and if one of the steamers has made one long voyage, I do not think the Allans' should be condemned for that circumstance. I think the Government ought to take some decided step to give the Allans a permanent contract, with the understanding that they will improve the speed of the vessels, or else adopt an arrangement with some other company. Something ought to be done, and not have the service depending on temporary arrangements.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the question of the mail service, the *bonâ fides* of the Government was, of course, shown in its recommendation to the House of a very large vote in order to get as good a service as was possible between our own country and European ports. The House very generously placed the sum asked for at the disposal of the Government, and the Government lost no time in inviting tenders in the most public manner for a service of a high class. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know that the provisional contract given to the Messrs. Anderson was after a length of time returned to the Government, because of the inability of the Messrs. Anderson to carry out the contract.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What speed was provided for in that contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will know what the speed was, together with all the conditions, when it becomes proper to bring the correspondence down to the House. We have already discussed the question of bringing down the correspondence, and the Government have stated that they do not consider it best in the public interest that it should be brought down at present. I was going on to state that it was no fault of the Government that the Messrs. Anderson were not able to carry out the provisional contract. Hon. gentlemen know that there was a very great rise in the price of iron, and consequently in the cost of ship building, which made it unwise for the Government at such a time to ask for tenders for another contract; but the Government in the meantime made a provisional arrangement with the Allan Line. I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen opposite that we cannot expect a perfect service from the Allans for a short time under a mere temporary arrangement. The Government have not, however, lost sight of the main part of the business, which is, as soon as possible, and at as an advantageous a rate as possible, to get the best possible service between this country and the old country, and we are now taking steps to bring that about. The Government have not been lax in the matter, or failed in any way in putting forth all proper efforts, and at present the Government is losing, and, in the interim, will lose no time in trying to obtain what I think we all wish, a reasonably good and well equipped service for carrying mails and passengers between this country and the English ports.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me that the Government are treating the House in this matter as if they were a parcel of children. I do think that we are perfectly competent to discuss this matter and to receive the information which would enable us to do so; and I doubt exceedingly whether, when the correspondence is brought down, it will be found there were any valid reasons in the public interest for not acquainting the House with it. What information has leaked out appears to point to a very strong difference of opinion between those gentlemen and the Premier, or whoever was conducting this matter on behalf of the Government. It does appear to me that nothing will be lost in the public interest by discussing this thing fully on the floor of the House. The House is aware that business men all over the country entertained from the first the very gravest doubts as to whether it was at all possible to carry out what the Government proposed to do, and I believe that the policy enunciated by the Government, more particularly that part which proposes a terminus at a French port, is utterly indefensible from any point of view and calculated to injure the prospects of the line in the highest degree. Under these circumstances, it was the duty of the Government to bring these down, and the public interest is more likely to be injured, a bad bargain to be made, and the public money to be lost, by refusing the information than by bringing it down.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. the Minister of Finance said the Government were still in negotiation. The hon. gentleman must know that they have an offer from one company at least, and that the Dominion line, to entertain the proposition to put on steamers of seventeen knot speed and to make arrangements at an early day to convert a steamer, which this company is now building, of some 6,000 tons, into a seventeen knot boat, but when they approached the Minister of Finance, they could not get any assurance that the Government would entertain such a proposal. Therefore, neither that

company nor the Allans would proceed to make the arrangements necessary to carry out such a contract. If the Government had been willing to enter into an arrangement for a seventeen knot service at a moderate rate, probably for considerably less than the amount placed at their disposal, we should have a seventeen knot service at an early day.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Sugar-candy, brown or white, and confectionery, including sweetened gums, 1½ cents per pound and 35 per cent *ad valorem*.

Sweetened biscuits of all kinds, candied peels, popcorn, preserved ginger, condensed milk, and condensed coffee with milk, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to make some transposition between 150 and 159. After sweeetened gums in 158, I wish to add candied peels, condensed milk, when sweetened, and condensed coffee with milk, when sweetened. These belonged to that category before, and I find they were transposed to the second one, 159, to which they do not properly belong. The duty is left the same.

Cut tobacco, 40 cents per pound, and 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. FOSTER. Cut tobacco came in the same as other tobacco. A change has been made so as to give an increase from 30 to 40 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the supposed value of that cut tobacco?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Kirkpatrick) informs me it is retailed at $1.50 per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is with the duty added. If I am correctly advised, the original value is very small. Speaking impartially, for I neither smoke or chew, nor intend to, it must be remembered this is a luxury very largely indulged in by a large number of people. And although, if you want revenue, I would have no objection to your getting it out of tobacco or spirits, I am told that this tobacco costs only 7 cents a pound, and in that case the addition to the duty of 10 cents a pound requires some explanation, and ought to bring a large addition to the revenue. How much do you expect from it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not very much, I think. There has been no distinction between the cut tobacco and the plug tobacco, and this is to make the distinction between the cut and the plug. Cut tobacco is supposed to be so much sweeter than plug tobacco, that I think no one will object to this duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, it is a rather stiff addition to the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I should not like to cut it myself for the difference.

Mr. WALDIE. Does this apply to cut stems as well as to the cut leaf? The cut stems are only worth about 10 cents a pound, and they are sold in large quantities in barrels.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any idea how many people there are in this country who are expected to make their living by cutting tobacco?

Mr. FOSTER. We have no statistics in regard to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to know how much revenue it is expected to get from this.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no way of telling that by the returns, because this was not denominated before. I do not think it will be very large.

Files and rasps, 10 cents per dozen and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to drop that item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the effect of dropping it?

Mr. FOSTER. That will leave it as it was before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the duty before?

Mr. FOSTER. 35 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad that is dropped, because I intended to move in regard to it.

Picks, mattocks, hammers weighing 3 pounds each or over, sledges, tracks tools, wedges or crow bars of iron or steel, 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might call the attention of the Government to a curious fact in connection with this tax, which is illustrative to some extent of the way in which our tariff works. In the first place, I would ask if this is an additional duty?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not a matter of very great moment in one sense, but it is slightly noteworthy as to the effect of the tariff. I find that there is a very considerably higher duty on all this class of goods imported from Great Britain, which imports our goods free, and the duty which is levied on goods of the same class from the United States. The duty on the goods from Great Britain appears to be about 52 per cent., and the duty on goods from the United States something under 40 per cent. I wonder that the hon. gentlemen do not remedy that anomaly; I wonder that these loyal British subjects have such a curious way of showing their loyalty.

Mr. BOWELL. Where do you find that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On page 227 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that the value of these articles imported from Great Britain was $2,329, on which a duty was collected of $1,195, which is about 52 per cent. From the United States, the imports amounted to $3,878, and the duty was $1,469, which, speaking roughly, is about 35 per cent., or a little more. To show our loyalty, we tax these articles of prime necessity about 17 per cent. more when they come from Great Britain than we do when they come from the United States. If I had done that, I suppose the whole of the members on the other side of the House would have risen up to denounce me as a traitor, but the hon. gentleman does it without a whimper being heard from the loyal Imperial federationists on that side, none of whom, by the way, I see here at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has observed the different qualities of these articles imported from the United States and Great Britain, respectively, or he would see that, if the same class of article came from Great Britain as that which comes from the United States, there would be no difference in the duty, but if the quality which comes from Great Britain is better than that which comes from the United States, the duty is necessarily larger.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The House will observe that the Minister of Finance does not deny the facts; he does not deny that there is a duty of 17 per cent. extra on the British article to that which is imposed on the American article, so that the Government are discriminating against the loyal British article, and in favor of the traitorous United States article.

Shovels and spades, shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut to shape for same, $1 per dozen and 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the supposed value of what are called shovel blanks and spade blanks? What I want to ascertain is of some importance. It might save the hon. gentleman some trouble if he could give us the equivalent of these double duties. For instance, what does the specific duty on shovel blanks, coupled with the *ad valorem* duty, amount to? If I am correctly informed, I understand that the duty on these articles ranges from 50 per cent. to 75, or even 80 per cent. This appears to be an outrageous duty, whether it is imposed for purposes of revenue or for purposes of protection. These are articles which are used by every agriculturist, by every market gardener, by almost every day laborer, and this appears to be a monstrous duty to impose upon such articles, and I cannot conceive on what score such a large duty can be defensible. In the first place, it can hardly produce any revenue; and, in the next place, it is a direct tax on articles of prime necessity to the agricultural population.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, in an article like shovels and spades with such a large range of prices, it is difficult to get any duty which, if it bears heavily in the one case, would not bear lightly in another, that is, to range one duty for a large class so as to bear equally on all the parts. If the shovel and spade are of a small variety and low value, then $1 per dozen added to the 25 per cent. may be a high duty; but if these tools are of a better grade and the price is higher, then the duty is very small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the value of a high grade and what is the value of a low grade?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the figures, but they must range between a very low and a very high limit.

Mr. WALDIE. These common shovels are worth from $3 to $4 a dozen. I think that would be 60 per cent. on the common kind. I am glad that none of them are imported into Canada, because they are too common. When we come to a better quality I do not think the duty is more than 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be still less in some cases.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Seeing the hon. Finance Minister is not doing this for revenue purposes, I hope that he will take the interest of the farmers into consideration. It is an article of prime importance to every farmer of the country. It is used by them in their barns and stables, and it is an article that every laboring man who works in the country has got to provide for himself. In Western Ontario, a large number of workmen make their living digging drains in the summer, and here they have got to pay 45 per cent. on picks and over 32 per cent. on shovels. I can remember that, last Session, the hon. Finance Minister showed us how the incidence of taxation would bear upon the wealthy man who went to New York to buy pianos, upon which he would pay 20 per cent. Last night it was shown that the physicians, a class far better able to spend money than the farmers are, would only pay a duty of 20 per cent. on surgical instruments; while here, the laboring men and the farmers have to pay from 45 to 50 and 60 per cent. on their shovels and spades.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman and the House will observe that I have not in this instance commented on the manufacturer's part in this matter, for the reason that I am inclined to believe that these enormously high duties do not afford them anything like the protection that appears to be involved, by reason of the enormous increase which the policy of the Government has made to the cost of the raw material, the iron and steel required to be used. But I do want to draw attention to the innumerable ramifications of the duty on iron, and the immense additional duty which has lately been put upon iron in the raw state, and it almost compels the Government to maintain these excessive high taxes on articles of common use. You cannot possibly continue to tax iron without, as in this case, taxing the agriculturists enormously higher than they need to be taxed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think we should allow this item to pass without pressing upon the Minister the necessity of reducing the duty on spades and shovels. It is an outrageous thing that farmers should be called upon to pay 45 or 50 per cent. upon spades and shovels simply because it is not thought desirable to have them manufactured in this country. We have no desire to prevent the introduction of these articles, but we say that the protection granted under this tariff is unreasonable. Shovels and spades without the handles are charged a specific duty of $1 a dozen, besides 25 per cent.; that amounts to 45 or 50 per cent. I cannot understand why the Government should do this. An enormous quantity of these tools are used in this country. I think that the protection on these goods in this country has been going on long enough to enable parties to make spades and shovels without the assistance of the Government. This manufacture was going on in Canada before the National Policy was introduced, and I do not think it is necessary that the Government should keep their ears open to the remonstrances of those people who are anxious to make more money out of the people than they are entitled to make. It is a piece of gross injustice; it is simply for the purpose of building up a huge wealthy institution and giving them power to collect from the people of this country money that they are not entitled to.

Mr. WELSH. I quite agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Huron, and other gentlemen in this House, and I will suggest that the Finance Minister strike out the 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, and leave the $1 a dozen. That would be about 8 cents on every shovel. If the farmers and laborers of the country pay 8 cents into the revenue on every shovel they use, I think that would be quite sufficient. I have never interfered with this tariff much, but I would suggest to the Minister that he make this change on behalf of the working classes.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I could not adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend who spoke last. That would be rather against his own policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then lay the duty on the other way, strike out the $1 a dozen and leave the 25 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is very accommodating. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), proposes that we should drop the 25 per cent. and leave the $1 a dozen, and when he finds that that would tax the poor man's shovel and leave the fancy shovel of the amateur almost without any duty, the hon. member for South Oxford then turns round, and is willing to have it fixed the other way. Although there is a high duty, these shovels are largely made in our own country, and the competition between the shovelmakers themselves keeps the price down. I think the hon. gentleman can buy good shovels, as I have to sometimes, very cheaply indeed, on account of their being manufactured by several firms, and the competition keeps the price down. My hon. friend for Halton (Mr. Waldie) can bear testimony to the good grade of these shovels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We brought in last year 47,000 spades and shovels without handles, so it is tolerably clear that, with a higher rate of duty, the Canadian manufacturers must charge close up to the limits of it, or else this 40,000 would not be brought in. It is curious to observe, again, that here, also, by an extraordinary freak of our tariff, we charge 52 per cent. on the English article as against 40 per cent. on the American article. An hon. gentleman near me suggests that it was not a freak; that it was done purposely.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very ungenerous.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The value of the English article is $6,192, and the duty on it $3,221, about 52 per cent. The value of the American article is $8,000, and the duty, $3,444, a fraction over 40 per cent., a direct discrimination against the mother country of 12 per cent. in the article of spades and shovels alone.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not each country pay exactly the same rate of duty?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apparently not. Our country is paying 52 per cent. on the value of the article, and the other pays 41 or 42 per cent., to be very exact, on the value of the article.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps there is a difference in the quality of the article.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be; but it does not affect the rate of duty. The *ad valorem* percentage, according to the hon. gentleman's own tables, on the articles imported from Great Britain, is over 52 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. 51 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the other is a little over 40 per cent. Where are all the Imperial Federationists? What are they thinking about while these important facts are being disclosed, in regard to discriminations in trade against the mother country?

Mr. FOSTER. They do not appreciate the facts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They do not appreciate any facts that bear on the questions, which are of great interest as between English and American goods. I know very well the temper entertained by a great many English manufacturers towards us on account of these irregularities in the tariff, with which they are very familiar. They are keenly alive to the facts in regard to the practical working of the tariff, and much has been said about our discriminating in favor of American as against English goods, for we find hon. gentlemen opposite are practically discriminating against English and in favor of American goods.

Mr. McMULLEN. The duty on shovels and spades is more than equal to 8 per cent., as has been stated. A dozen shovels will cost about $3.50, or as low as $3. A large number of these common shovels are used by farmers in the spring, and the duty on them will not be less than 40 or 50 per cent., while on the better quality the duty will be less.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to drop No. 168, and to leave the duty as before, 35 per cent.

Trunks, valises, hat-boxes, carpet bags and carpenters' tool baskets, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. Trunks bore a duty of 30 per cent., valises 10 cents and 30 per cent. A valise may have been of trifling value or worth $8 or $10, and the same remark applies to satchels. Carpenters' tool bags bore a duty of 10 cents each and 30 per cent., while in some cases the bag was not worth more than 10 cents or 15 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I would suggest is that carpenters' tool baskets should be placed on the general list, which is 20 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. I will do that, and strike it from this item.

Mr. COOK. The trunk manufacturers, under the benign policy of the Government, have been doing a rushing business. They can hardly supply the wants of the people who wish to leave the country. I thought, perhaps, it was part of the policy of the Government to increase the duty on trunks, in order to stop the exodus.

Mr. FOSTER. We will leave that to the hon. gentleman when he comes in.

Satchels, pocket-books and purses, 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. This is an increase of 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you require this 5 per cent. increase? Is it required for revenue purposes, or, if not, for what special purpose is it required?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not required for the purpose of revenue, but for the assistance of the branch of industry that is engaged in making these articles. Pocketbooks and purses are being well made in this country, but the manufacturers have to meet very heavy competition, and they have to pay a pretty large duty on the goods which enter into their manufacture, and so, when we came to work out the matter, we found that they had not very large protection. We, therefore, propose to give them an additional 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In my part of the country the necessity for the use of pocket-books and purses is rapidly diminishing, and I do not suppose this increased duty will burden the people very much.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there cannot be very much objection to the increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As regards my part of the country, which is adjacent to the city represented by the hon. the First Minister, the duty will certainly not damage our people very much. Where are the manufactories situated?

Mr. FOSTER. There are two in Toronto, some in Montreal and one in Hamilton.

Mr. MITCHELL. While the people in the constituency of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may not want pocket-books, they certainly will require, on account of the exodus, a good many satchels.

Mr. FOSTER. The duty on satchels has been lowered. If the poor people do not want purses, they will not have to complain of the duty, while wealthy gentlemen, like my hon. friend opposite, need not complain; and as regards satchels, the duty has been reduced.

Mr. GILLMOR. The coolness with which the Minister of Finance answered this question about adding to the prices of these articles for the benefit of the manufacturers, strikes me as a very singular thing. I can understand that the Government have a right to tax people, in order to carry on the affairs of the country, and to make people support our institutions. We have to submit to that. But when the Government of this free country proposes to take money out of the pockets of one class of the community to give to another class, I do not understand that principle of taxation. We are dealing with this question as though it was a trifling matter. The money which a man earns by his toil, or by his enterprise of any kind, is his own; and by what law, natural or moral, do you, gentlemen opposite, sit down here and openly admit that you are taking one man's earnings to give them to another man? I am astonished that in a free country, where we profess to be free men, and where every man has a right to what he earns honestly, that you are not ashamed to stand up here, in the nineteenth century, and propose deliberately and without a blush, that you are going to take a man's money and give it to another man. Why, if a private individual attempted to take money out of my pocket to give to another man, it would be a crime and he would be incarcerated. But you sit down here in free Canada, which has been educated and instructed from the pulpit, and you speak as a matter of course, that you are going to rob millions out of one class of the people to give to other people. You do not hesitate or blush to say you are going to tax everybody else and take from them their honest earnings to hand over to somebody who is making pocket-books or purses in Montreal or Toronto. I am astonished that men can sit quietly by and see such gross injustice done in this free country, where every man is supposed to earn his money honestly, and where we do earn it by hard toil. You do not seem to hesitate in this course, nor do you seem to think there is anything wrong in it, while to all right-minded people it is clearly a violation of the natural and moral law, and a violation of right. But you become accustomed to it, and the people have lost their independence and have become demented when they allow you to take their money in this manner and hand it over to other people. I see that hon. gentlemen opposite laugh at this; for they cannot see that there is anything wrong in robbing one man by law to give his hard-earned means to another man. The people submit to it, and why do they submit to it? Because party has robbed men of their independence and political morality, and independence of thought and action have been crushed out by your system, and we have to submit to be kicked, and cuffed, and spit upon for party purposes,

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have been a little astonished at the Minister of Finance, because he states that in this branch of business the competition has become very keen and that this duty is required to assist the manufacturers. I understood always that the National Policy was introduced to establish industries, but the Minister of Finance now says that when we have established more industries than the country really requires, we must impose an extra duty in order that these manufacturers may live. I would like to know when is this going to end? The competition is becoming too keen in all branches of industry. I visited one or two woollen factories, recently, and I found their shelves lined with goods and their mills standing idle; and these gentlemen will, no doubt, say: There is too much competition; we cannot carry on our business; we are losing money. Where is this bleeding of the general public going to end, if this pernicious system is to be followed, and if the Government is going to continue putting on a duty to encourage industries, and then, when you have encouraged too many of these industries, put on an extra duty to support them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather astonished that my hon. friend (Mr. Gillmor), after sitting here for so many years and seeing the course taken by the Government, should express surprise at what is being done now. Why, the Government is carrying out a scriptural injunction: "To him that hath they give, and to him that hath not they are taking away even that which he hath." That is the rule upon which the Government has long acted, and there is no reason, I suppose, why they should not still adhere to it. There is an advantage to them in pursuing this rule, because, when aid is required to carry on elections, it is much easier to deal with a few men than it is to deal with a large number, and so there is every reason why the Government should continue to pursue the course which it has hitherto adopted. Then again, Mr. Chairman, the Government are proposing to help people along in various enterprises, when otherwise they could not succeed at all.

They assume that the people of this country require a sort of commission of lunacy to issue on their behalf, and as they would be altogether incompetent to decide what course or what industries to engage in, in order that their capital might be profitably invested, the Government undertake to regulate these industries, that otherwise might not be established in the country at all. And so in the community, instead of every man being left responsible for the investment of his own capital and the conduct of his own business, the Government take paternal care of it, and undertake to decide for him what in other countries he is supposed to decide for himself. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Gillmor) has very old-fashioned notions. He has not learned the new notions which prevail on the Treasury benches, and which the Government have found so useful to them.

Mr. MITCHELL. In what way ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, the hon. gentlemen are on the Treasury benches, and they would not have been there under different circumstances.

Mr. MITCHELL. In what way ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend knows that quite as well as I do.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I know it, and I will tell you. It is in this way : When these people come up and want an increase of 5 cents specific and 5 cents additional *ad valorem*, I venture to say that they pretty generally understand that when the time comes around, $500 or $5,000 will be needed from them for the election fund. That is the way it is useful to the Government at election time.

Plants, viz.: Fruit, shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, N.E.S., 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps, Sir, it would be convenient that on this first item we should have a discussion on the following twelve, which are substantially the same. Of course I have no objection to carry it on item by item. I really think that, in the interest of the great mass of the people, at any rate, the Government ought to carefully consider this duty. The fact is, and I think it must be familiar to my hon. friends who take any interest in horticulture, that it is highly desirable, indeed almost vital, to the successful prosecution of fruit growing, that you should be allowed to get trees where you can get them best and in any quarter without impediment ; because, as everybody knows, our trees in this country are very apt to wear out. I hardly know at this moment where to go, in Ontario at any rate, to get anything like plum trees, which can be depended upon to bear fruit. I have tried in every imaginable quarter unsuccessfully, and that has been the experience of a good many of my neighbors ; and the same remark applies in a pronounced degree to all these duties on fruit trees and shrubs. Moreover, I believe, the tax imposed will bear an enormous proportion to the value of the articles, taking into account the larger number that perish in transport. We have already discussed the point, that a re-imposition of these taxes is *pro tanto* a repeal of the reciprocity clauses in the Tariff Act of 1879, and is likely to encourage retaliation from our neighbors, and I shall say no more on that. There cannot be much revenue, and even if there should be, it is not needed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

But, in my judgment, a considerable inconvenience will be experienced from the re-imposition of these duties by those who grow orchards, and I hope the Government will reconsider their intention of imposing them. I know why it is imposed, not for the general benefit, but in the interest of a few nurserymen scattered up and down this country. If these men could supply our wants, there might be something to be said for it, but in a country like ours, with such a narrow range of climate, it is exceedingly foolish to accede to their demands, by putting on duties which, if not prohibitive, will seriously interfere with fruit culture.

Mr. BRIEN. As the Government have already made some reductions in the tariff, perhaps they might consider whether they cannot reduced this duty. I see that grape vines costing 10 cents and less are charged 3 cents each. Would the inference from that be that if they cost over 10 cents they will come in free ?

Mr. FOSTER. No ; they come in under the general rate of 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BRIEN. Well, I hope the Government will see their way to making some reduction in these duties, which on the basis of our imports of last year, will be very burdensome. Last year our imports of nursery stock, with the amount of duty paid, were as follows :—

——	Number.	Rate of Duty.	Amount of Duty.
Apple trees	542,886	2 c.	$10,857 72
Cherry "	25,072	4	1,002 88
Peach "	84,583	4	3,383 32
Pear "	77,752	4	3,002 08
Plum "	67,843	5	3,392 15
Quince "	8,433	2½	210 72
Shade and ornamental trees	34,731	20 p. c.	6,946 20
Grape and strawberry vines	6,435	.....	24,131 25
Total	.....	.....	$52,926 32

Therefore this duty is really prohibitive. There are many inequalities in this tariff. The poor man who digs a grave has to pay from 35 to 40 per cent. on his spade, and the doctor has to pay only 20 per cent. on the instrument with which he probably killed the patient.

Mr. CARPENTER. So far as grape vines are concerned, we have three nurserymen in the county I represent, who, last year, propagated over a million vines, and what can be said of the grape vines can be said of almost every other class of fruit. All our nurserymen ask is to have the privilege of supplying our own people, which, I think, should be allowed to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All they ask is that the whole public should be taxed for the sake of half a dozen people. All they ask is that they should be allowed to put their hands into my pockets and into the pockets of everyone else who grows fruit, and rob us for their private advantage ; and the imposition of this duty is simply aiding and abetting robbery by these people. They have no right to take my money. The Government may have a right to take it for the general public defence and public utility. But there is the in-

wardness of the whole duty: It is for the purpose of robbing the public for the benefit of a few people, otherwise a million or more of these various articles would be imported from the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. gentleman is pretty strong in his language.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All protection is robbery, for that matter.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I can tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as fruit trees are concerned, we do not want any protection against a legitimate trade on the part of American nurserymen. But, when the market of the United States becomes supplied with trees, a very inferior kind are thrown together in packages and sent to this country, to be sold by agents to our farmers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. gentleman says "oh," but I venture to say that he never planted a fruit tree in his life, and knows nothing about the business. I have had some experience in this matter, and I can state that the farmer, after he buys his tree, has to wait for five or six years to ascertain what kind of tree he has got, and if he does not get the kind he ordered, but one of an inferior quality, he has no recourse against the person who sold it to him.

Mr. BRIEN. I repudiate any such insult, so far as the people I have the honor to represent, are concerned, because they do know the difference between these different plants and fruits.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I do not deny for a moment, that every farmer knows the difference in the different classes of fruit, but no man can tell by a peach tree, or a pear tree, what class of fruit it is going to bear when grown. He cannot tell by the bark, nor can he tell until the fruit grows upon the tree.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the hon. member for Welland, whether the large nurseries, such as those of Rochester, N.Y., have not a character as high as that of the nurseries in his own county. I would ask him, whether these people are not scrupulous as to the character of the stock they furnish. My experience as a farmer is, that the best nursery stock we get comes from the United States. These gentlemen have a reputation and a character to be particular about, and it is an object to them to maintain their reputation for business integrity. This proposition is simply one to make the farmers contribute thousands of dollars per annum for the benefit of a few nursery growers in this Province. It is not a tax in the general interest. It is an imposition on the farmer, and if this Government intend to do anything for the farmer—and they are professing to do something by the duty on meats—let them give the farmer, free of duty, the raw material or the stock necessary to put into his orchard for the production of fruits. Let him purchase that stock where he can get it to the best advantage, and not compel him to buy from a class of nurserymen who, it is claimed, supply inferior stock to that furnished by nurserymen in the United States. In my experience, I have found more inferior stock in nurseries on this side of the line than on the other. If, as the hon. gentleman alleges, the Americans dump on us their over-production at much less than it is worth, that is no disadvantage to the farmers, but, on the contrary, is an advantage to them.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. gentleman tries to make me say what I did not. What I did say was that we have no objection to legitimate competition, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, the surplus stock of the United States nurseries is sold to jobbers who bring this stock to this country and sell it to our farmers. Does the hon. gentleman not think that the nurserymen of this country have as high a character and are as careful of their reputation as those who grow fruit trees on the other side of the border. We have as high-minded a class of men in that trade as they have in the United States, but the hon. gentleman seems to think there is nothing in the shape of man or beast, or produce in this country, equal to the United States. As far as the nurserymen are concerned, we have as good nurserymen here as can be found in the neighboring republic. I do not say anything against the nurserymen on the other side, or against their legitimate trade, to which we have no objection. They are careful of their reputation and character in the markets where they expect to sell 90 per cent. of their goods, but the other 10 per cent. they sacrifice and sell to jobbers who carry them to this country, to sell to our farmers, and our farmers cannot tell, until the fruit appears upon the tree, the character of the fruit they are purchasing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has made a statement with regard to the farmers of Canada at variance with the facts of the case. The farmers are not so unenterprising that they will be ready to take any tree or plant the jobber may bring. Why should a jobber undertake to sell fruits of this class in Canada? Why should the 10 per cent. come into Ontario any more than in Michigan? Where does the hon. gentleman find trees purchsed by the farmers of this country of the kind he mentions? The hon. gentleman is drawing on his imagination for his facts. The truth is that the farmers of Ontario are just as particular about the character of the fruit trees which they plant in their orchard as any farmers in the State of New York and Ohio. I believe the farmers of Ontario are just as well informed, just as enterprising, and take as much pride in their farm operations as those in New York and Ohio, and are no more ready to buy the refuse stock which may be brought in from Rochester than to buy the refuse stock from the nurseries in the hon. gentleman's own county. It is trifling with the common sense of the House for any hon. member to address to the Committee the kind of argument the hon. gentleman has, from time to time, addressed to this House upon the question. He says you cannot tell what sort of fruit the tree will bear until it actually does bear. If that were so, you could not tell it from a nursery in the hon. gentleman's own county any more than from a nursery in the State of New York. The truth is that the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Can the hon. gentleman not tell the difference between a Rhode Island Green apple tree and a Northern Spy, between a Northern Spy and a Baldwin, yet the hon. gentleman parades himself before this House as a farmer. I venture to tell him that if he would go among the farmers in his own county, he would not find that they could not tell whether an apple tree is of the one variety or the other, and the argument that the farming population of this country are a class for which a commission of lunacy

must be issued and that the hon. gentleman himself must take charge of that commission, is assuming a good deal. Yet that is the position taken by the hon. gentleman. I believe it is of great importance to the Ontario farmers that they should go more largely into fruit-growing than they have gone hitherto; and it is not promoting their interests to put impediments in the way of their planting out large orchards in that peninsula which lies between the Great Lakes and the West. The hon. gentleman talks about the interests of the fruit growers. I will venture to say that the interests of the farmers in any one township, ten years hence, if the Government will take off the tax in this matter and leave trees and shrubs of all sorts come in free will be infinitely of more consequence than the interests of all the nurserymen from now until the day of judgment. The hon. gentleman proposes to sacrifice the interests of hundreds of thousands of people—interests that will affect the population to the extent of millions within a few years—for the purpose of promoting immediately the interests of a few parties who are engaged in the nursery business. Such a course is most unwise, yet that is the course the hon. gentleman proposes. I do not say that the nurserymen of Canada are not of as high class as those of anywhere else, but no nurseryman would, apart from all considerations of high principle, be so foolish as to sacrifice his future interests by selling stock which is of no value or not of the class represented. So far as I know, there are no job lots put up in the way the hon. gentleman speaks of. How are the American fruit trees brought into this country? They are brought by fruit tree agents who show the farmer a statement of the kind of trees he requires. Then a contract is entered into in which the varieties of trees are set out. They begin to prepare those trees in the early winter, and they ship them at the proper season when they should be planted. I do not believe, as far as I know, that any one of these American firms has attempted to impose upon the farming population a different class of trees from that which it has undertaken to provide. I have purchased a good many of these trees myself, and I have found, when they came to bear, that the fruit they produced was the kind which I had purchased. It seems to me that there must be great inequalities in this proposed list, and I do not understand upon what rule the Government are imposing these specific duties. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance what is the amount of the *ad valorem* rate he intends to impose upon the various trees and vines mentioned here, and whether that is intended to be uniform, or whether he intends to impose higher duties upon some sorts of trees than upon others?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) does not appear to be as well informed as many farmers are, in regard to the tricks which are perpetrated upon them with fruit trees. In the part of the country from which I come, orchards have been planted and the names of the trees have been registered, but, when the trees were bearing and the fruits were shown, disputes have arisen, because these fruits were not true to name, and we have had to send sample of apples to Beadle for examination, and those samples have been found to be of a different kind from what the trees were sold for. In my own garden, not one out of ten trees, that I obtained through an American agent, turned out to be as described. I have often been engaged as a judge of fruit, and I know that troubles arise annually with us, and we are obliged to apply to the nurserymen to settle these disputes, because the fruit is found not to be true to name, when the fruit trees were purchased. The hon. gentleman asks, what is the difference between the American nurseryman and the Canadian nurseryman in this respect? The hon. gentleman must know, as a lawyer, that if the Canadian supplies me with an article fraudulently, I can prosecute him; but, if the American nurseryman does not supply me according to order, and fraudulently imposes upon me by sending an article which I did not order, I cannot prosecute him, because he is outside the country. That is one of the difficulties in dealing with American nurserymen. He also says that he does not know of any job lots being sold. That proves how little he knows on the subject, because I am aware that many dealers have gone over to that country to fill job lot orders, and where fruit trees of any particular variety could not be conveniently got, the order was filled by others, less valuable and not true to name, and were practically worthless. I selected a number of fruit trees which were represented as a winter apple variety, which are the most valuable here because they last the longest, and, out of some twenty varieties, I have only one that was correct. Is not that fraudulent? Those were fruit trees from American orchards. It is the duty of Parliament to protect the Canadian farmer from being imposed upon in that way, and we should endeavor to exclude these American trees if we can find men at home with whom we can deal; and from whom we can get redress if they impose upon our farmers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. WALDIE. I do not see how this tariff can affect the honesty of the dealer at all. If the farmer buys from an unknown nurseryman, from a casual peddler of trees, he takes his chance, and buys at his own risk. The tariff does not affect the honesty of the dealer. It is known to everyone who is engaged in horticulture that, owing to the continuous climatic changes and the changes in the nature of our soil, the kinds of fruit which are most profitable and desirable at one time are not so desirable at other periods, that varieties of apples which were the most desirable kinds a few years ago are not so now, and that the more advanced horticulturists are desirous to bring in new varieties suitable to our soil and climate. As agriculture has not been so profitable of late years, a large proportion of the farming lands are being devoted to fruit growing, and I think these fruit trees should be admitted free of duty, in order to give protection to this industry and stimulate it. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that of recent years the growing of plums in this country has become profitable, the black knot has ceased to trouble us, and there has been a great demand of late for plum stock. There is a very limited supply of that among our own nurserymen, and, therefore, they have to import it. If we want a tree large enough to transplant at the present time, we have got to import it, and I do not think this 5 cents should be put upon it. The great bulk of the importation of

fruit trees is made by our nurserymen to supplement those of their own growth. They do not grow profitably the great varieties, they grow profitably only the leading lines, and they supplement by importation those lines from the nurseries that have a larger field of distribution. I do not think this tariff is protective in the proper sense, and I think the grower of fruits should be given the advantage rather than the nurserymen. It is the larger number who are interested in fruit growing who should get the advantage, and not the limited number of nurserymen.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is evident that the people of this country are to be taxed heavily for the benefit of a few friends of the Government living in particular sections of the country. It is evident from the observation of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), that he and a few others in his section expect the rest of this Dominion to pay tribute for their benefit. Now, the whole tariff, the whole financial policy of the Government, is nothing more or less than what has been called a system of legalised robbery, of making the many pay for the benefit of a few. Perhaps the Government are consistent in that respect, but when you look upon its bearing on the people of this country generally, the operation of the tariff in this one item, will be shown to bear most unfairly and most heavily on some distant Provinces, particularly Nova Scotia. Last year that small Province alone imported in the neighborhood of 160,000 fruit trees. The cultivation of fruit, as I observed the other night, is very largely on the increase. Public attention has been drawn to the fact that Nova Scotia possesses, from some peculiar reason, some climatic advantages which makes her fruit, and notably apples, mature more gradually, and they are of a better keeping quality than the fruit raised in any other part of the Dominion. Hence all through our western counties there has been of late years, a desire to extend the cultivation of fruit, which is found to be very profitable. Now, the people who are engaged in that industry in Nova Scotia know that in the United States there are horticulturists supplying these fruit trees in whom they can place every confidence. I am sorry to say, and I do not say it out of any disrespect to Canadian nurserymen, but I have heard it generally observed in our part of the Dominion that more reliance can be placed on the stock which is imported from the United States than on Canadian stock. I have not had any experience myself, but I believe to-day that if a Canadian traveller and an American traveller were to visit our district at the same time, the American traveller would get the order, even at a higher price for his trees than the Canadian traveller would ask, on account of the impression that exists that American stock as a rule is nearer to what it is represented, and more satisfactory on the whole. Now, this particular item well exemplifies the whole tariff system of the Government. I do not know why we should waste much time on this one item; it is an illustration of the entire tariff. The tariff is patched up here and there to benefit a local industry, to benefit a particular manufacturer, to benefit a certain class of people at the expense of the great body of the consumers. The Government have been going on, they have been driven on from their first position until they have come down now to the smallest, and meanest, and pettiest article that they can get within their grasp, and they raise a tariff from it under the pretext that they are going to benefit some individuals. Well, it may be that a few people in some part of the country may get a temporary advantage, but it will not last very long, and, moreover, it will not give them the control of the markets, in our part of the country, at least, because, as I observed, our people prefer the American article in which they have more confidence. The item of fruit which we had before us the other night, is an illustration of what I say. No matter if western Canada produces a million bushels ef peaches, they cannot be sent to the Maritime Provinces, and other fruits cannot be sent from that section to the Maritime Provinces; but still, in order to give these people in a few counties in the West, the benefit of keeping out American fruit for a short season, all the rest of the Dominion must pay tribute to those few fruit growers or nurserymen in the West. The idea is so absurd that if one were addressing an argument to reasonable men who were disposed to listen to a business-like and reasonable argument on any question, you might hope to make some impression, but the Government seem to be tied hand and foot, they seem to have no freedom of action in this matter. The Government seem to be completely in the hands of the manufacturers, and at last they have come down till now they are in the hands of the hon. member for Welland. We remember that in the discussion last year the hon. member for Welland threatened them, when the Finance Minister came down and took the duty off these articles. We know very well what the member for Welland threatened on the Government, and what he and his friends said, and he has now brought sufficient influence to bear to make the Government carry out what he wishes. I regret very much, for the sake of my own Province, that the Government has followed his advice. If these gentlemen in the western part of the Dominion choose to agree among themselves that everything is to be kept out for the sake of benefiting a few people in that industry, why, they may fight it out among themselves, if they can get the Government to back them up. But so far as this item is applied to the rest of the Dominion, I say it is disgraceful, it is a disgrace to any Legislature to attempt to force upon the people of a distant Province these articles, be they good or bad, be they of a superior or an inferior quality, when they can get from other sources their trees at a cheaper rate. The whole system which is advocated from the other side of the House, is entirely contrary to modern progress, to honest thought or to honest legislation, and is intended to benefit a few individuals at the expense of the vast body of the consumers of this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) introduced the question of character. No man on this side of the House has said one word about the character of the nurserymen in Canada until hon. members opposite had dragged it in. The hon. member for Grey went the hon. member for Welland one better; he declared he knew it to be so, he had personal experience, and found that nurserymen supplied articles that were not true to the name. Now, the

old adage is that nothing teaches like experience. I have a right to give my personal experience as well as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do not mean to say that nurserymen of Canada generally are in the habit of doing such things, I do not mean to say that their stock is not as good as the American stock, but I mean to say, taking them man for man, the character of the American producer stands just as high as the character of the Ontario producer. I speak from personal experience. I have purchased trees from the Rochester nurseries, and I found they arrived in good condition, were fair, standard trees, and, more than all, when they came to bear fruit they were true to name. I cannot say the same of all the trees I have obtained in this country. I have had trees from nurseries in Ontario, and from the neighborhood of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), and when they came to bear they were not true to name. I state that fact, and it is susceptible of proof; and I was not the only one who had that experience. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has remarked, this is a specimen of the tariff arrangement of the present Government. It is the old principle of taxing hundreds of thousands in order to benefit two or three individuals. I suppose the Government are determined to take this retrograde step, but I protest, in the name of the people, against necessary commodities being taxed for no other purpose than to enrich a few at the expense of the many.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I may say, for the information of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that it is not in a political sense I was discussing this question, because the only nurseryman in my county is secretary of the Reform Association. I may also inform the hon. gentleman, that before a nurseryman in the State of New York is allowed to sell in Michigan, he is compelled to give bonds that the character of the trees he sells is what he represents. If we had bonds of that kind given, perhaps there would be no objection to allow nurserymen to come over and sell fruit trees. I defy the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with all his agricultural experience, to tell the difference between apple trees by the bark and the limbs, for this can only be done by an expert. There is no question but that the nurserymen of the State of New York at the end of the season have job lots of trees which they wish to dispose of, and these are sacrificed in the Canadian market. I do not desire to refer to the paymasters, who have been mentioned by the hon. gentleman for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the statement, that the manufacturers are the paymasters of this Government, and of the hon. members on this side of the House. They call us hirelings from time to time; but, if that be true, I would prefer to be paid by the manufacturers than to be paid from Washington.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman's remarks have any force whatever it is that we ought to impose restrictions with respect to the admission of trees or nursery stock. If it has been found necessary in the State of Michigan to require bonds from New York nurserymen, it may be proper to do so here, and the hon. gentleman tells us that if such restrictions were in existence his objection to the free importation of American nursery stock would be removed. Very well; let us impose the restriction, and let us guard the farmers' interests in every proper way. That is, however, quite a different matter from increasing the cost to the purchaser. No one will object to the imposition of proper restrictions with respect to the importation of nursery stock.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have had an orchard planted nearly twenty years ago. Whenever farmers purchase from agents, either of American or Canadian nurserymen, let them purchase from known responsible men, and, I have no hesitation in saying, they will get trees true to name. I have planted a large number of trees, and I have also lost a large number; but I have lost more Canadian than American trees, and the American trees have proved to be true to name. During last winter all through Ontario, some nurseryman, a member of the Fruit Growers' Association, attended each farmers' institute for the purpose of instructing farmers with respect to beautifying their homes by planting fruit and ornamental trees. I believe this is a necessity in Ontario. Many of our farm dwellings have too naked an appearance, and do not look comfortable homes, for lack of fruit and ornamental trees; but the Government are not doing their duty to agriculturists in assisting them to beautify their homes and increase their orchards by placing heavy duties upon trees. I have found I can obtain trees more cheaply by sending to the nurseries on the other side of the line, than by obtaining them from agents. When we consider that the cost of an apple tree is from 12 to 14 cents, on which there is a duty of 2 cents per tree; when pear trees can be bought at from 25 to 30 cents, on which a duty of 4 cents per tree is imposed, I hold that the duty is in the interests neither of the nurserymen nor of the farmers. Such duties prevent the farmers from planting trees to increase their orchards as they would otherwise do.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I hope some alteration will be made in the rates of duties on the different trees. At present, the duty is the same on peach trees as on apple trees. There is a tax of 5 cents on each rose tree, the value of which ranges from 2 cents to $2.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That, as the time for the reception of reports from the Committee on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended until Thursday, the 1st May next.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I have some changes to make in these items in reference to trees. In item 172, make gooseberry bushes 1 cent each instead of 2; grape vines (item 173)), 2 cents each instead of 3; rose bushes (item 175), 3 cents each instead of 5;

apple trees of all kinds (item 176), 3 cents each instead of 2.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The effect of that addition on apple trees is to add two or three times more than you reduce on the others, because we import more apple trees than we do all the others put together.

Mr. FOSTER. The apple trees are higher in value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not say that you, especially, but the whole of you deserve to be hung on a sour apple tree for these duties.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you go marching along.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This duty on apple trees is a very heavy tax for our fruit growers in Nova Scotia, because, as I pointed out, we imported between $7,000 and $8,000 worth of apple trees. If the hon. gentleman wants to raise money for the benefit of some agriculturists in a few districts in Canada, he had better pass around the hat for a subscription at once, and then we will know who pays the duty, but he should not tax the whole people of the country for the benefit of a small industry such as that.

Mr. FOSTER. We propose to reduce plum trees (item 179) from 5 cents to 3 cents, and I hope to delight the heart of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), by stating that we will take off the 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on item 122.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And put it on the free list?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hear, hear; progress is being made.

Mr. BOWELL. Will that save the hanging on the sour apple tree?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, as far as the Minister of Finance is concerned, but we cannot afford to be too indiscriminate. There is a legend in the Hindoo which says that one good being saved the members of a similar Cabinet.

Cotton twine, 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does this duty amount to?

Mr. FOSTER. It will be about 35 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What reason has the hon. gentleman for putting 1 cent a pound on cotton twine?

Mr. FOSTER. It is now being made extensively in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely 25 per cent. *ad valorem* is enough, in all conscience.

Mr. FOSTER. If yarn pays a duty of 15 per cent. and 2 cents, it is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather you would allow the yarn to be put on the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. A greater difficulty would have to be to net in that direction.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many mills are there that make cotton twine?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the most of them make cotton twine.

Mr. WALDIE. There are two: one in Hamilton, and one in St. John, N.B.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman has any idea of the quantity of cotton twine consumed in the Dominion, and what the effect of this impost will be. We know what the imports are, but we ought to know also what sort of a burden this duty lays on the consumer. Twine is an article of very large consumption, and my impression is that this additional one cent per pound will be a very appreciable extra tax.

Mr. WELSH. A great deal of twine is used for various purposes. A considerable quantity is used in sail making and for fishermen's nets, and I do not see any reason for this additional duty upon it.

Twine for harvest binders of jute, manila or sisal, and of manila and sisal mixed, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is time there was a change. I think the time has arrived for putting twine on the free list. It is one of the things in which you might do some service for the farming community. We know that in the last Session or two the manufacturers of binding twine formed a combine and charged exorbitant rates to the farmers. They assigned many imaginable reasons for doing this—that the material had given out, and so forth—which is the ordinary ruse of combines. It is not only the amount of the tax paid into the Customs Department which indicates what the twine duty costs the farmer, but you have to consider the enhanced price. Surely, the hon. Minister, having regard to the hard times bearing on the farming community, might, to some extent, lighten their burdens; but nothing for the farmer can be placed on the free list; everything he requires must be taxed; there is no relief for him. This is a tax of which the farmer might be relieved, and I move that this item be put on the free list.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. Minister says there is no change in this item. The duty on binding twine at present is 1¼ cents a pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. The duty is 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. WATSON. This is a decided increase in the duty. I had occasion to make some remarks on this matter the other night, and I was replied to by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). That hon. gentleman read a long letter which he had received from the Massey Manufacturing Company of Toronto, and I will take the figures given in that letter to bear out my argument. Mr. Massey states:

"The price of a standard twine manufactured out of half manila and half sisal hemp we believe is worth in Chicago to-day, in wholesale consignments of say 100 tons, about 13½ cents to 14½ cents a pound, while pure manila is worth from 15 cents to 15½ cents a pound."

That is the wholesale price in Chicago, according to Mr. Massey, and no doubt he tried to make it appear as high as possible, and he admits that he charged the Manitoba farmers last season 19 to 20 cents a pound. That is an advance of 5 cents a pound on the American price, and if you allow 2 cents a pound for profit to the manufacturer for handling the twine, you have 3 cents a pound as the extra cost to the consumer, just what I claimed, the amount of the duty. The present arrangement is going to make it still higher.

Mr. FOSTER. We might as well have a fair understanding at the start. I tell the hon. gentleman that the duty on binding twine before was 25 per cent., and it is now 25 per cent. There has been no change.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I decidedly object to the duty of 25 per cent., and I will show that my estimate of the extra cost was entirely too moderate. I understand that 1¼ cents a pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem* was the duty in 1887, as I read it in the Customs law. But if we take 25 per cent. as the duty, we will find that on binding twine at 14 cents a pound wholesale, the price given by Mr. Massey, the duty amounts to 3½ cents a pound, and at 15 cents, it amounts to 3¾ cents a pound. That is an unfair and unjust tax on the farming community; and as I stand alone from the Province of Manitoba and the North-West in protesting against these high duties, I might give the reason which was assigned the other night by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) for supporting the tariff resolutions. He stated:

"With regard to the tariff, I might say that we in the North-West consider that during the past we have been one of the Provinces which has been a principal sufferer in that connection, inasmuch as we have nothing there that is protected."

That was the language used by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), a gentleman who, on all occasions, supports the Government. But he did not stop there, he had to give a reason why the members from Manitoba and the North-West support the Government; and I am satisfied a great many people ask the question repeatedly how it is possible they should do so, when the whole tariff bears so very unfairly on the people of Manitoba and the North-West. He said:

"I may be asked why do we in the North-West, if we all suffer in regard to these duties, continue to support this Government. One of the principal reasons is that in the North-West we have more confidence in, if you call it so, the jovial optimism of the policy of the Government than in the policy indicated by the leader of the Opposition."

Well, he may appreciate keeping his feet under the Minister's mahogany and have a good time generally while his constituents are suffering very grievously under the tariff. In fact, his position puts me very much in mind of the story of an American who had a lot of hogs to drive to market. He was advised to ship them by rail, but insisted on driving them himself. He was asked, on his return, how he got along and how the speculation turned out. "Well," he replied, "there was not much money in it, but I had a hell of a time with the hogs." Well, the members from the North-West are having a hell of a time with the hogs while their constituents are suffering from the high duties. The tax imposed on the farmers of Manitoba for the purpose of maintaining four or five manufacturers of this binding twine, amounts to such a figure that the people of Manitoba could better afford to keep every man employed in that industry in one of the first-class hotels in the country. We are paying, according to Mr. Massey's own figures, 3¾ cents per pound duty on it. It was argued that because it was not imported we are not paying the duty, but that is nonsense. If the Government were obtaining revenue from the tax there might be some excuse; but last year only some $150 were realised on it by the Government, and the balance went into the pockets of the manufacturers. When Mr. Stairs, a manufacturer of binding twine, was in this House a few years ago and I protested against the duty, the First Minister said: Stairs supports me, and I support him. No doubt, these few manufacturers contribute largely to the support of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to protect them, the whole country is taxed. In 1887, the duty was made 1¼ cents per pound and 10 per cent. but to-day as the price of twine advances the *ad valorem* duty is increased to 25 per cent. I am in favor of putting this article on the free list.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this House should consent to the resolution placed in your hand. We know very well that the farmers to-day are not in a position to stand this drain on their resources. Take the amount of twine a farmer requires for his crop. He requires two and a-half to three pounds for every acre taken off, which means 45 cents per acre for twine; or, in other words, it takes $45 worth of twine to take off one hundred acres of crop. There are about three thousand tons of twine manufactured in Canada yearly, on which the manufacturers get 5 cents per pound extra, by means of this duty, because twine can be sold at 12½ cents per pound, and it was sold last year at 18 cents per pound, which makes 5 cents per pound profit. Thus, on 3,000 tons of twine, the manufacturers have taken out of the farmers about $300,000 extra on twine last year. This is unfair to the agriculturists in their present strained condition, and it is nothing short of extortion to continue this duty which enables the manufacturers of twine to collect out of them $300,000 a year more than they would pay were it not for this duty.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). This is a very important question to the farmers. Three or four years ago the farmers had to pay $240 to $250 each for binders, because of the protection the manufacturers received; and to-day, on account of the duty on twine, it has become a very great question whether or not it will not pay better to throw the binders into a corner and turn again to the reapers, as the farmers find they can bind the grain cheaper in the old way than by buying the twine and using the binder. In this way the farmers are being deprived of the benefit of one of the most improved machines invented. In 1888, we were told by one of the most experienced men in Canada that we would require 3,000 tons of twine during that year. During last year we must have required 4,000 tons. The amount of duty on twine which went into the treasury was $14,547, but something like $300,000 must have been taken out of the farmers and put into the pockets of the manufacturers, and preventing him from deriving the benefit which he should derive from improved machinery. If it had not been that labor has been so scarce during the last season or two, I believe, the binder would have been thrown into the corner by many farmers.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not suppose I can say anything to influence the Ministry in reference to this matter, but it is one upon which the farmers feel very strongly. I suppose Ministers do not feel at liberty to accept any suggestion as to abolishing the duty altogether, but, from my own personal observation last summer, I may state,

that as soon as the hurried part of the harvest was over, it was a question with the farmers in my neighborhood, whether they would not drop their high-priced binders and go back to the old self-rake. As far as the difference between the manufacturers in Canada and those in the United States are concerned, the hon. gentleman should know that the manufacturers in the United States have to pay a duty on their raw material, before they commence to manufacture this twine at all, while our manufacturers obtain their raw material free. I think, a more moderate protection should be enough for us, when the Americans are handicapped in that way. I can assure the Minister that he could not do anything more satisfactory to the farmers, than to make a moderate reduction on binding twine. This duty is one of those irritating things which people notice particularly and which is certainly a great source of irritation to the agricultural population.

Mr. ELLIS. There must be a very large profit made in the manufacture of this article. Before the Commission on Combines last year, a gentleman named Morris gave evidence, a part of which I will quote from the Journals of the House. He was examined by Mr. Gillmor, as follows :—

"Q. Mr. Connors is in your combination? A. He was in, but there is no combination now.

"Q. How many men were there in the combination? A. Five.

"Q. You proportioned out what each one should make? A. Yes; we each had a stated percentage.

"Q. What proportion of all the quantity that was to be made for Canada did he make? A. On binder twine last year, he had a percentage, I think, of 10 per cent. of the whole; and, I think, he manufactured about two tons of twine.

"Q. How much did he get last year of the pool, as you call it, as near as you can tell? A. I think about $6,000 or $7,000. Perhaps hardly as much as that; it might be $5,000.

"Q. For not making rope? A. No; not making binder twine."

Here is a gentleman who made only two tons of this binder twine and received $5,000 as his share of profit. I think a suggestion of that kind should be taken advantage of by the Ministry and the duty should be reduced in view of all the circumstances of the case.

Motion of Mr. Mulock negatived—Yeas, 36; nays, 60.

Twine of all kinds not elsewhere specified, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. ELLIS. What is the increase on this?

Mr. FOSTER. 5 per cent.

Mr. ELLIS. This, I presume, applies to lath ties?

Mr. FOSTER. If they are twine, it will.

Mr. ELLIS. In the city of St. John, a large number of mills are employed in manufacturing refuse lumber into laths. The lath ties are used to tie up these laths in bundles which are sent back to the United States. It seems hard to tax this twine at 30 per cent. It was taxed at 25 per cent. last year, and an arrangement has been made both in Canada and in the United States as to the price on these laths. The Canadian maker gets the full benefit of that pool, which was made before this increase was spoken of, and he has the clear benefit of the difference between this and the old tariff, while he gets this laid down in St. John from the United States, for 1½ cents a pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What reason is there for the increase of 5 per cent. on this article?

Mr. FOSTER. Because it is being made in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And for the sake of two or three confounded manufacturers, for the sake of the paltry support or the paltry subsidy which the Minister expects from them, he is going to tax this article of universal utility.

Mr. MULOCK. Probably this 5 per cent. is the subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that may be so, and that these corrupt animals will make that return to the Government.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like the Minister to tell me if he does not think that 25 per cent. on this binder twine is sufficient under the circumstances, seeing that you can land it in the city of St. John for less than the St. John manufacturer could make it for even with a protection of 25 per cent., to which you are now adding 5 per cent.

Umbrellas, parasols and sun-shades of all kinds and materials, 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is another increase.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an increase which is designed to assist the industry of manufacturing umbrellas, parasols and sun-shades in the Dominion of Canada. Last year we imported $303,646 worth of these articles. There does not seem to be any good reason why a large proportion of these shall not be supplied by makers in Canada. The duty has, therefore, been raised from 30 to 35 per cent. The manufacturers have to pay 30 per cent. on the silk which forms the top of the umbrella, and also a duty on the other coverings, according to the grade of the umbrella; and the manufactured article being placed at 30 per cent., with the silk stuff at the same rate, gave very little opportunity for the industry to develop itself in this country. It is, therefore, proposed to add 5 per cent. to the duty and make it 35 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was in hopes that the factory was in existence.

Mr. FOSTER. It has already been started in the city of Toronto, and umbrellas will be more largely made in Montreal, where that industry has been established for some years.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then the factory must have been started before the additional duty was put on?

Mr. FOSTER. It was struggling, and we propose to help it.

Mr. MULOCK. When was it established?

Mr. FOSTER. One was started in Toronto five or six months ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect that the parties will manufacture all the umbrellas required to replace those which have been imported?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not expect they will manufacture all that we have heretofore imported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does he suppose they will manufacture one-half?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell how soon they will manufacture a-half or a-third, but I think the protection is sufficient to enable them to keep their industry going. If they manufacture one half, I shall be very glad.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As one-half the total tax on the present importation would amount to about $60,000, what the hon. gentleman is now proposing to do is deliberately to take $60,000 of the people's money in order to subsidise these two manufacturers, a sum representing the interest of two millions of money, if the hon. gentleman's expectations are fulfilled and they manufacture to the extent of one-half the present importation. That is the practical result.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only the theoretical result.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they manufacture equal to one-half of our importation we must lose the $60,000. The hon. gentleman knows that, as a rule, the duty paid is but an insignificant proportion of the total cost of the article. It may be more in this case ; that is a point on which he should inform the Committee. Taking his own figures, there would be an apparent loss of $60,000, less the duty received, on the articles manufactured. Can he tell us what that would be? Before introducing a proposition of this kind he ought to know what it would involve.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend should see that it is very difficult to tell what is involved in a proposition of that kind. It is absurd for me to go into a fanciful calculation of what will be done upon a matter which is but an experiment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point I put can be answered without knowing whether these people will manufacture one-third, or one-half, or one-quarter, or any proportion. I want to know what percentage of the 35 per cent. duty is represented by the cost of the material, which is about 30 per cent. That is a reasonable question, and one which should be settled between himself and the Minister of Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. I think probably about one-half.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does he mean that the cost of the material as imported is one-half ? which is a large proportion.

Mr. FOSTER. If it were silk covering, it would be more than one-half.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These umbrellas are by no means all of silk. A large proportion are of the inferior quality. He does not distinguish in his tariff what is silk and what is gingham, or alpaca, or other qualities.

Mr. BOYLE. I cannot understand by what method of computation the hon. gentleman arrives at the figures he has just given to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will explain when you have done.

Mr. BOYLE. If the manufacturer of umbrellas imports his covering, his handles, his ribs, he pays on the cost of these 30 per cent. into the revenue, while he only receives 5 per cent. protection. The history of all these manufactures is about the same. The cheaper and more popular class of goods used by the common people will be manufactured in his country, and the competition of the two factories will bring down the price to a reasonable figure. The higher priced goods, the tony goods used by the aristocracy, will be imported as usual, and will pay into the revenue 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. I think, therefore, the country will be benefited by this method of taxation, which will enable the people to buy their goods more cheaply, and will collect an additional tax from the wealthy, who are well able to bear it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The tax h would receive on $340,000 worth of importe umbrellas——

Mr. FOSTER. $303,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The tax on that would be, speaking roughly, about $120,000, more or less.

Mr. FOSTER. The duty collected is $91,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you are making it 35 per cent., and you must add to the amount one-fifth of $90,000, which will make about $120,000. That would be $50,000 less to the revenue by the result of this tax, supposing it resulted in the manufacture of one-half the articles which are now imported. Against that there is to be deducted the duty received on the raw material, whatever that may amount to.

Mr. BOYLE. Four-fifths.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No ; the Minister supposes one-half to be manufactured.

Mr. BOYLE. It would be about four-fifths.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the increased loss of duty would be also four-fifths.

Mr. BOYLE. No ; four-fifths of the material will be imported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is likely enough. However, in all probability, even assuming the Minister is correct, one-half the cost of the umbrella only is in labor, and the other half in the cost of the raw material, which is a high proportion. It may be correct in this case ; I cannot say. He would then lose the $55,000, less the 30 per cent. on what would be imported, which might be put at, perhaps, $20,000 or $25,000. There would be a loss, then, of $30,000, if the reduction of the importation does not exceed the figures the hon. gentleman gave.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In addition to that, if the same quantity is imported, the country will pay $15,000 to $20,000 more each year for their umbrellas than they are paying now.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes ; and getting them cheaper.

Mr. MULOCK. It is possible to discuss this question in two ways. We have the importation of the cotton umbrella and the silk umbrella. I see by the Trade and Navigation Returns that last year the value of the imported cotton parasols, umbrellas and sunshades, was $94,017, the duty upon which was $28,205.10. For umbrella materials for the same class of goods, I suppose, the duty collected was $16. The principal item of umbrellas imported was the silk for the more wealthy classes, while the umbrellas for the poorer people were imported in very small quantities last year. Was there a manufactory last year in Canada ?

Mr. FOSTER. They were manufactured in Montreal.

Mr. MULOCK. For how many years have they been manufactured?

Mr. CURRAN. They have been manufactured for the last five years, at any rate.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot speak of the importations prior to this date, but for the year 1889 there were only $94,000 worth of umbrellas imported, so that would not anything like supply the demand of the people here. It is quite clear, therefore, that the local manufacturers were able to manufacture for the last five years, under the protection they then had, all the umbrellas the people required. This one factory had a market of five millions of people.

Mr. CURRAN. There are several makers, of all kinds, in Montreal.

Mr. MULOCK. It is extraordinary that, this being the case, the price of manufactured articles should be kept so high. The Government are imposing this additional tax of 5 per cent. to put it into the pockets of the manufacturers, first taking it out of the pockets of the people. The increase is wholly unnecessary for any other purpose than that of enriching the four or five factories that are so ably represented on the floor of this House by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). Why should the same duty be imposed on silk umbrellas as on those of lower qualities? If an additional duty is required, it should be imposed on the better qualities, and the Government should have some commiseration for the poorer classes of the people.

Mr. FOSTER. The duty is an *ad valorem* one.

Mr. MULOCK. It is, but this is an increase of 5 per cent. It is not required for any purpose, except to toy with, and to carry on extravagant expenditures. This increase of 5 per cent. will fall on the umbrellas of the poor people. Had they been so prosperous under the care and management of the Administration that they can bear heavier burdens? Do the Government want a little re-distribution of their wealth; or are they carrying out the natural effects of this policy, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. There is no possible defence for this increase. The Minister of Finance cannot offer an explanation in regard to it. The hon. gentleman says that umbrellas to the value of $325,000 were imported, and, therefore, we should increase the tax on umbrellas. Why does he not tell us honestly and candidly, that a deputation came from Montreal, met him in the Secret Chamber, and took him by the throat and said: We must have a higher duty?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not have said so, because it would not have been true.

Mr. MULOCK. Who advocated the case on behalf of the people who were the consumers? No one appeared except those who advocated an increase of duty, and the Government are coming down in this particular case as they usually do. The only reductions we hear of are reductions made on the demand of manufacturers. If the manufacturers come here, or persons who are not going to pay the bill, their representations are listened to by the Government; but when the consumer comes he is never listened to, but he is taxed. There will be an end, I suppose, to this state of things some day.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has pursued his usual tactics of getting very violent when he has a weak case. The result as regards the manufacture of umbrellas will be, as it has been in regard to the manufacture of every article in this country, cheapen the article, and it has been the result of additional protection in nine out of every ten cases.

Mr. MULOCK. Is binding twine cheaper?

Mr. WALLACE. We have the evidence of Mr. Massey that in the case of binding twine, he had to pay as much for it in the United States as in Canada, and he had to pay the duty on bringing it into this country in addition. In cotton goods they are 100 per cent. better quality than we obtained when inferior articles were imported into this country. The same remark applies to agricultural implements. We have imposed additional duties on implements of every kind, and I defy any hon. gentleman to take any implement and show that its price has been increased, although there has been an increase in duty. On the contrary, there has been a large decrease in price. Only a few years ago, $280 was paid for a self-binder that would not compare with the article for which, to-day, less than half that money is paid. Take any article of hardware, cotton and woollen goods, and we have the same result. Additional protection has been given to the manufacturers of umbrellas and parasols, and if it is sufficient to cause the manufacture of them to any extent here, it will result in the article being produced at a lower price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen opposite will contend that so soon as two or three establishments are under way, the prices will be lowered. If the hon. gentlemen opposite have faith in their nostrum they should double the taxes all round, in order that goods may be obtainable for next to nothing.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Wallace) is posing in a different character from that he assumed a year ago. He was then acquiring fame by his antagonism to the results of this protective policy. He was chairman of a Committee to investigate the causes of the high prices under the combine system that prevails in Canada. He having assisted to build up a Chinese wall, placing the people at the mercy of the manufacturers, he got the Combines Committee appointed, and after sitting in incubation for some time they brought in a report, which, for the time being, covered the hon. gentleman with glory and fame. He is now, however, engaged in two businesses; he is creating a disease, and afterwards he is called in as the healing physician.

Mr. WALLACE. What did we find in that enquiry made by the Combines Committee? We found that the most obnoxious combinations were not manufacturers; we found there was no combination in woollen manufactures or in any class of agricultural implements. We found that the coal dealers of Canada had a combination, and although we found some combinations existing among manufacturers, those most hurtful to the people were not connected in any way with the manufacturing industries. If these existed, the measure we brought in last year, as it passed the Senate, and which we hope to amend this year,

will cure any of the combinations hurtful to the interests of the people.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has told us that the price of manufactured goods has been greatly reduced with a high tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. I say, by being manufactured in this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose it was the increase of price that stimulated increase of production. But the hon. gentleman says no. We put on a tax and on account of it we have diminished the price, and as the price is reduced the production is increased. No doubt he will tell us that the imposition of duties on wheat, barley and corn will act in the same way. And no doubt he will go among his agricultural supporters and tell them that by the imposition of taxes on corn, wheat and barley he has succeeded in diminishing the price and in securing a larger production. The home market is beneficial to the farmer, he thinks, because by the high taxes the farmer produces very much more than before, and produces it at very much less cost. Certainly, if the tariff operates to diminish the cost of manufactured goods, it must have exactly the same effect in diminishing the cost of producing cereals. The hon. gentleman will be consistent in explaining to his agricultural supporters how he secured the home market, and he will explain to the manufacturers how they are able to obtain breadstuff, at very much lower prices than ever before. I should think that the hon. gentleman would scarcely venture to address to the House arguments of that sort. They are hardly suitable for a backwoods school-house, and not being capable of imposing on the population of these districts, the hon. gentleman ought hardly to impose on the time of the Committee by saying that we put on a tax to put up the price of this article, and that we put on a tax to put down the price of some other article; both of which are produced in this country.

Mr. WALLACE. We, on this side of the House, will go back to the farmers and tell them that our policy has secured to the Canadian farmers the Canadian markets.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At a higher price.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; at an increased price in many instances, but in every case that they will have a secure market for their products, which is a most important point. We will also tell them that the members of the Opposition were anxious to bring in the products of the American farmers free of duty so as to drive the Canadian farmers out of their own markets. We can tell them in addition to that, that we have secured a tariff to-day which we believe will be a pretty fair and suitable protection for the farmers of Canada and which they are justly entitled to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would also quote such facts in illustration as this: that in 1878, the price of barley was from $1.10 to $1.15 a bushel, and that to-day it is from 32 to 35 cents a bushel.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the member for York (Mr. Wallace) next year, that if he will reorganise his Committee on Combines, I will put a witness in the box who will prove that binders were manufactured this year and turned out of the shop at a net cost of between $78 and $80, and that they were placed in the hands of the farmer at $140, because of a combine arrangement by the men who manufacture these binders. I want the hon. member to take that down and to remember it. The hon. gentleman also says that prints have been made in Canada, and that they are cheaper now than they were before.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not refer to prints. I said cotton goods.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, printed cotton goods. Those which are manufactured in Canada are of a very common style, and if you want to get a decent print, you have to buy an imported one. The people of this country are paying $166,000 a year extra duty for the purpose of supporting that one small printing establishment.

An hon. MEMBER. They do not print.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, if they do not print it is worse, because we are paying this $166,000 for nothing at all. That duty was put on ostensibly for the purpose of aiding that particular institution, which was brought into existence by the President of the Council, who stood at the head of the institution, and who advocated that this increased duty should be imposed, because they were going to manufacture all the prints that were to be used in this country. It is unfair that this country should be subjected to enormous taxation under the plea that the Government is trying to encourage home industries, when they are in reality only putting a law on the Statute-book to rob the consumers out of their just rights.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say to the Committee that the discussion for the last half-hour has been under the item relating to umbrellas. If the Committee would select those items which are a little more appropriate to the discussion, it would be better. I say that to both sides.

Watches, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to raise any objection to this, but my impression was that the duty was unduly high for revenue purposes, inasmuch as these are articles which used to be smuggled in, to a considerable extent, when the duty was high.

Watch cases, 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. CHARLTON. Why is the duty on watch cases higher than the duty on watches?

Mr. FOSTER. It is in order to help the industry here. Watch cases are made in the country; watch movements cannot be made in the country, and they come in at a low rate of duty, and the duty on the watch complete is kept at its original rate of 25 per cent.

Wire, covered with cotton, linen, silk or other material, 35 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the reason of the increase?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been raised from 25 per cent. to 35 per cent. because wire of brass or copper, which was formerly on the free list, has been placed under a duty of 15 per cent. It is already being drawn in Hamilton and Montreal, and it is proposed now to give it a moderate protection of 15 per cent.

Pails, tubs, churns, brooms, brushes and manufactures of wood, N.E.S., and wood pulp, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. MULOCK. In connection with this item, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that convict labor, in penitentiaries, is now being used for the manufacture of woodenware. I understand that some of the manufacturers of woodenware have already laid their remonstrances before the Government. It seems an extraordinary way to protect the manufacturers of woodenware, to put on duties against outside free labor, and at the same time to allow the free labor of Canada to be interfered with by convict labor. I have no doubt there are difficulties in the way of finding employment for convict labor, but it is the duty of the Government to see that it does not come into competition with free labor. I see by the report of the hon. Minister of Justice that his attention has been called to this matter, and I hope he will be able to inform the House that it is to be discontinued.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only penitentiary at which woodenware is manufactured is the Dorchester penitentiary, which is an amalgamation of the two penitentiaries that used to be at Halifax and St. John. The machinery which had been operated for years in those prisons was removed to Dorchester, and has not been added to in any way, and the output at Dorchester is not greater than it was in former years in the penitentiaries at Halifax and St. John. The product has not in any way come into competition with the product of free labor of the like manufacture, except as regards the supply. The prices we have always instructed our officers to keep up to the trade prices. That has been well understood. There was a complaint made recently that we had cut the prices so as to compete unfairly with free labor. That was investigated, and the fact was found to be quite the reverse—that while we had kept to the trade price, the free labor manufacturers were actually underselling the product of the penitentiary. But we came to a conclusion eventually, which was satisfactory to both parties, by which the manufacturers outside agreed to purchase from the Government the whole product of the penitentiary.

Mr. MULOCK. If all the manufacturers of woodenware in the country, and other industries, are satisfied with this arrangement, no one else can complain. I am not aware what induced them to make this bargain with the Government, but it is more than probable that it was "Hobson's choice" with them—that the Government insisted on maintaining their factory of woodenware, and offered this as a compromise, and that the manufacturers accepted it as the lesser evil. Nevertheless, that does not meet the case at all. The convicts are manufacturing woodenware, and to that extent are displacing occupation and employment for free men outside. The manufacturers may have made this bargain with the Government, but what about the laborers —were they represented? Did the Knights of Labor and the other labor organisations of the country come down and agree to this arrangement?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They never made any complaint on the subject, nor anybody else, except the manufacturers themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) seems to be extremely inconsistent in his argument, because, while he would wish to exclude the product of convict labor from coming into competition with the product of the free labor of the country, he is quite willing to admit the product of the labor of other countries without restriction. This class of men, although not the most desirable in the world, are consumers at home, and even if their product did come into competition with that of free labor, it would be, to my mind, less objectionable for that reason than the competition of foreign labor.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for East Grey approves, then, of convict labor coming into competition with free labor. I am glad to know where he stands. Is there ever a proposition made by the Administration, of which he does not approve?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I did not say whether I approved of it or disapproved of it; but I showed the inconsistency of the hon. member for North York in wishing to exclude the competition of convict labor at home, and admitting the competition of foreign labor.

Mr. WALDIE. I think the hon. member for North York is perfectly justified. He has a manufactory in his own constituency that he is bound to look after, and I do not think the Government should destroy it by putting prison labor in conflict with it.

Mr. MULOCK. There was at one time a manufactory in the riding of North York, but it was gerrymandered out of the riding.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that the chief manufacture of woodenware is by the convicts of the Central Prison at Toronto. They carry on a large manufacture.

Mr. MULOCK. No, they do not.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; they carry on the manufacture of woodenware there very extensively.

Mr. MULOCK. No; it is not the case. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Our institution at Dorchester does not send a bucket, or a tub, or anything else to Ontario. Every dollar's worth is sold in St. John or Halifax.

Mr. BLAKE. Let every tub stand on its own bottom.

Fibre ware, indurated fibre ware, vulcanised fibre ware and all articles of like material, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. That is a decrease. It was non-enumerated, and rated at 35 per cent. before.

Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat or other like animal, made up by the tailor, seamstress or manufacturer, N.O.P., 10 cents per pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. FOSTER. I wish, after the word "description," to put in "including horse clothing, shaped."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the increase the hon. gentleman proposes, and why?

Mr. FOSTER. 2½ cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not a very large increase, but it is in a bad direction. It is a specific duty, and will of necessity fall much

heavier on the cheaper articles of clothing than on any other. The case was bad enough before, but it is made very much worse by adding 2½ cents per pound. In the case of some of the coarse clothing, this will amount to a very large duty, coupled with the 25 per cent.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). While the Government are placing a heavier duty on coarse woollens, they are careful not to protect the farmers by putting a duty on the wool we raise. They allow the wool not raised in this country to come in free, and thus act unjustly towards the farmers who have to pay the extra duty on the manufactured goods. True, there is a duty on the wool similar to that which is raised in Canada, but that does not protect the farmers, because we have to export a large amount of the same description of wool. If the Government are going to impose an extra duty on woollen goods, why should they not consider the farmers by imposing a duty on the wool we raise. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the statement of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with respect to what Mr. Massey said about binding twine. The hon. gentleman stated that Mr. Massey said he could purchase binding twine as cheaply in Canada as in the United States. But what did Mr. Massey say before the Committee on Trade Combinations. Here is his evidence:

"Q. If you can buy twine elsewhere and get a better bargain, what is your complaint? If you are obliged from the combination, that would be a different thing? A. I say we can buy it and lay it down cheaper than the Canadians, after paying the duty."

It is unfair that the heavier class of clothing, which is imported into this country in a manufactured condition in considerable quantities, should have to pay a specific duty of 10 cents per pound. This strikes at the poorer quality of clothing, and in this way works an injustice to the workingmen.

Mr. BOYLE. That is a case where specific duties are justifiable. The only clothing made up, which we import under any circumstances, is that made out of English shoddy, the sweepings of factories, which weigh heavily, and represent small value, and are of no use whatever. They are very deceptive in appearance, and have no wearing qualities, but sell because they are cheap. The Government act wisely in prohibiting by a specific duty the importation of such goods.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman will not deny that the duty will apply to clothing made of good wool as well as that made of shoddy. The objection raised by the hon. member for Huron should be considered; and, if the specific duty is to be advanced 2½ cents per pound on woollen goods, the hon. Finance Minister should take into consideration the interests of the farmer, and impose a duty of 3 cents per pound on all grades of wool, for his protection.

Mr. FOSTER. In this item (201) there has been no change in the duty. That has always been the rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It used to be 7½ cents.

Mr. FOSTER. No; 10 cents and 25 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it was the hon. gentleman who led us into error.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Yeast cakes, compressed yeast and baking powders in packages of one pound and over or in bulk, 6 cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. After the words "one pound and over" strike out the words "or in bulk" and add "not exceeding fifty pounds.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is that *ad valorem?*

Mr. FOSTER. They run about 30 per cent. I propose a new item:

Compressed yeast in bulk or mass of not less than 50 pounds, 4 cents per pound.

Uncolored cotton fabrics, namely, scrims and window scrims of cotton, plain or colored, cambric cloths, muslin apron checks, brilliants, cords, piques diapers, lenos, mosquito nettings: Swiss, jaconets and cambric muslins, and plain, striped or checked lawns, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you added to the duty there?

Mr. FOSTER. 5 per cent. in the main, though some articles are reduced from 30 to 25 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the use of adding 5 per cent.? You say you do not want revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Most of these have borne a duty of 20 per cent. Within the last few years the cotton manufacturers have begun to make them of good quality, and it is thought that 25 per cent. is not too large a duty for all this class of goods.

Manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the Alpaca goat or other like animals, viz.: Blankets and flannels of every description; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, felt cloth of every description, N.E.S.; horse-collar cloth; yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn, knitted goods, viz.:—shirts and drawers, and hosiery, N.E.S., 10 cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the average weight of a pair of blankets? Does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman is proposing to increase the duty on these articles, when he proposes a tax which will fall heavily on every settler coming into the country, he should be aware of the manner in which the tax will fall.

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed it would be from five to seven pounds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you have a specific duty of 60 cents and 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on a pair of blankets. Supposing they were worth on the average $4 a pair, there would be a specific and *ad valorem* duty of $1.40 on one pair of blankets. In a country like this where a large portion of our population are exposed to a very inclement winter, though not an unwholesome one, it appears to me that such a duty is a distinct discouragement to settlement, and a serious tax on the mass of the population, and the hon. gentleman should give some better reason for burdening the population in matters of this kind.

Mr. BOYLE. Blankets are cheaper in this country than in almost any other country in the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And, therefore, we import many thousands of them.

Mr. BOYLE. The manufacturer's price varies from 35 cents to 45 cents a pound, but this is aside from the question, as we can get all the blankets we require as cheaply as they can be bought in England. Unless people want blankets made of fine Saxony wool, colored and ornamented in style, they can get all they require here. The same thing applies to clothing, This tax will prevent a number of spurious goods coming into this country, and it is in the interests of the people to prevent their purchasing that class of goods.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there is the smallest particle of foundation for the statements made by the hon. gentleman, then this tax is wholly superfluous. He tells us that blankets can be manufactured in Canada cheaper than in any other part of the world. Why, then, should we impose a duty of $1.40 on a pair of blankets? What possible use is there in that? If the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, he ought to second him in moving that the duty be abolished, so that those parties who prefer to get blankets where they can get the best, may have the privilege. Now, I happen to know that they cannot be bought in Canada at all as cheaply or as good as they can be bought from the other countries. I can obtain far better blankets from England than I can from Canada for the same price.

Mr. WALLACE. You cannot do anything of the kind. You can get a good quality of Canadian blanket made of pure Canadian wool, with no shoddy, a white blanket, because a white blanket is pure wool.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. What does the hon. gentleman mean?

Mr. BLAKE. I was cheering the ridiculous observation, that a white blanket is necessarily pure wool.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, always pure wool. A white blanket made from pure wool is bought to-day in Canada for 42½ cents a pound, of excellent quality, that makes $3.40 for the blanket. It takes about ten pounds of wool to make an eight-pound blanket, and that wool is worth about 21 or 22 cents a pound, say about $2.15 or $2.20 for the wool contained in that blanket. The balance is for the profit of the manufacturer and the profit of the wholesale dealer; so that there is no duty paid on the article at all, and the Canadian consumer gets the cheapest article that is made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And as a proof of that, last year this deluded Canadian consumer imported from England $48,230 worth of blankets, and he was idiot enough to pay $20,947 in duty. Argument is at an end, I must say, when we hear hon. gentlemen, in the teeth of the Trade Reports, make such assertions as we have just heard. As to the statement that white blankets can only be manufactured of pure wool, I am afraid the hon. member for York is a long way behind the age. He will find that his talented constituents, many of them, understand very well how to mix inferior wool with inferior shoddy.

Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. gentleman state where he ever saw a white blanket made of shoddy?

Mr. BLAKE. I can say that so far as it being the case that white blankets are necessarily made of pure wool, that wholesale merchants have to apply chemical tests to white blankets to find out how nearly they are of pure wool or otherwise. I have seen those tests applied myself and the result of them.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you find there was shoddy in them?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. Shoddy is wool, and the chemical test the hon. gentleman refers to is to determine not whether shoddy is mixed with it, but to determine whether there is cotton mixed with it. That is the class that is imported, but our Canadians manufacture pure wool white blankets. Those he speaks of, half cotton and half wool, are the imported blankets. The chemical test he speaks of will not distinguish shoddy and wool.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course not, because the chemical test is one which eliminates the vegetable and leaves the animal matter. What I said was that it was a ridiculous observation to say that white blankets were necessarily pure wool. I have seen the test applied with very unsatisfactory results to white cotton blankets.

Mr. WALLACE. What I said was that the white Canadian blanket had no shoddy in it, and the hon. gentleman knows I made that statement.

Mr. BLAKE. And what the hon. gentleman said was that it was of pure wool.

Mr. WALLACE. I said if it was of pure wool, there was no shoddy in it.

Wrought scrap iron and scrap steel, being waste or refuse wrought iron or steel and fit only to be re-manufactured, the same having been in actual use, not to include cuttings or clippings which can be used as iron or steel without re-manufacture, $2 per ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this scrap supposed to be worth? Just now what would you call that *ad valorem*?

Mr. BOWELL. $16 to $20.

Wrought iron or steel sheet or plate cuttings or clippings, as cut at the rolling mills, and fit only for re-rolling and to be used for such purpose only, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BOWELL. This is one of those explanatory clauses of which I spoke last night. Under the former item, 211, they used to import sheets of steel complete, three or four feet long. Steel plates are used in shipyards where they put very long sheets of steel upon the vessels, and, in some cases, have to cut off three or four or five feet lengths, and they contend that that was a waste and a scrap of the shipyard. The former tariff provided that the material should be of such a character as was only fit for re-manufacture. We have had a great deal of difficulty in cases of this kind, hence we have rearranged the two items, making it explicit.

Sulphuric ether, 5 cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a new item. It has been non-enumerated before. The United States duty is 50 cents a pound, prohibitory in fact.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is impossible, almost.

Mr. FOSTER. There are many things in the tariff of that country to surprise us.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Finance Minister will tell us what is the nature of it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is used in medicine and the arts. My hon. friend, probably, has an indistinct idea of what it is used for. Before we take up Schedule B, there are some items which I wish to add :

3. Resolved, That it is expedient to repeal the following items in the Schedules to the Act 49 Victoria, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled : "An Act to amend the Duties of Customs," viz. : Schedule "A," items numbered 29, 281, 417, and to make further provisions, by adding to the Schedules to the said Act as follows, viz. :—

SCHEDULE "A."

214*a*. Bird cages, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*b*. Brass and copper nails, rivets and burrs, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*c*. Boots and shoes, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*d*. All manufactures of leather, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem,*
214*e*. Barrels containing linseed oil, twenty-five cents each.
214*f*. Lime-juice, fortified with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent. of proof spirits, sixty cents per gallon.
And when containing more than twenty-five per cent. of proof spirits, two dollars per gallon.
214*g*. Lime-juice, sweetened, and fruit syrups, N.O.P., forty cents per gallon.
214*h*. Lime-juice, and other fruit juices, N.O.P., non-alcoholic, and not sweetened, ten cents per gallon.
214*i*. Granite and freestone, dressed ; all other building stone, except marble, and all manufactures of stone, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*j*. Grindstones, not mounted, and not less than twelve inches in diameter, two dollars per ton.
214*k*. Ships or vessels under Canadian register repaired abroad—on the value of such repairs, whether to hull, riggings, machinery, or fittings, except in case of an accident to the ship or vessel on an outward voyage necessitating repairs in order to enable her to return to Canada, in which case such necessary repairs only shall not be dutiable.
214*l*. India rubber clothing or clothing made waterproof with India rubber, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*m*. India rubber surfaced waterproof clothing, ten cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*n*. Biscuits of all kinds, not sweetened, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*

In the item of bird cages, which were formerly at a duty of 30 per cent., we have raised the duty, as has been explained to the Committee, and I propose to give 5 per cent. additional to the bird cage manufacturers. Brass and copper nails and rivets were formerly 25 per cent. ; I propose to place them in the list, making them 35 per cent. for the same reason. Boots and shoes, N.E.S., 25 per cent. *ad valorem.* They were before the same, except that this is meant to include a variety of shoes made from felt, which the Customs were necessarily ruling under the high duties of the material of which they were made, as cloth. They are a very cheap shoe, and we put them at 25 per cent. Wire, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, the same as at present. Now that we have made linseed oil subject to a specific duty, it is proposed to place a duty on the barrels, at 25 cents each barrel, to prevent any dispute as to value of barrels. This is less than the 20 per cent. There are three divisions of lime juice. That containing 25 per cent. of proof spirits will be dutiable at 60 cents per gallon, and when it contains more than 25 per cent. of proof spirits it will be subject to a duty of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

$2 per gallon. Lime juice, sweetened, and fruit syrups, 40 cents per gallon ; lime juice, unsweetened and non-alcoholic, 10 cents per gallon.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What was the duty before ?

Mr. FOSTER. Some varieties were unenumerable ; the alcoholic varieties were rated among the spirits.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What rate will be charged on lime juice from the West Indies ?

Mr. FOSTER. If sweetened and non-intoxicant, 10 cents per gallon. Granite and freestone, dressed, and all other building stone, except marble, 30 per cent., formerly 20 per cent. These are varieties of stone native to this country, and the duty is not placed on the raw material, but on the dressed material, so that labor may be employed on it here. Grindstones were formerly simply entered as such, and all kinds of fancy grindstones, such as are used by jewellers, were brought in at $2 a ton duty, and it is proposed to restrict the item to : Grindstones, not mounted, and not less than 12 inches in diameter, $2 a ton. India rubber clothing is at present subject to a duty of 35 per cent. In regard to the India rubber surface water-proof clothing, it is proposed to change the duty, and make it specific and *ad valorem*, 10 cents per pound and 25 per cent. That will add a little to the duty on the heavier qualities, while it will reduce the duties on the lighter qualities. Biscuits of all kinds, not sweetened, are now 20 per cent., being on the unenumerated list. The duty on lard has been raised 1 cent a pound, and a calculation shows that the addition of 5 cents will equalise, for the present, any increase that has taken from raising the duty on lard. Accordingly, biscuits will be 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, instead of 20 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have received a letter from the Caughnawaga tribe of Indians. It is as follows :—

"CAUGHNAWAGA, 5th April, 1890.

"To Hon. P. MITCHELL,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—We the undersigned Indians beg to inform you that us and our whole tribe feel that we are unjustly treated by the high duty forced on beads that we use to manufacture beadwork of which the largest number of our tribe have no other means to earn their living by — only to manufacture beadwork and the largest portion of it is sold in the United States and is admitted free of duty ; if it was not passed in the United States free a large number of our Indian people would almost starve, and now since the new tariff the Montreal merchants we have to buy from having advanced prices on their beads, these high prices we are forced to pay for beads will lead us to starvation. We have had it very hard to make a living before the new tariff (35 per cent.). We humbly beg will you please be kind enough to look down on us poor Indians and get the bead duty repealed and reduced to 25 per cent. By doing this you will deeply and greatly oblige us in need.

"We are very truly,
"Your humble and obedients servants,
"LOSE THERIWEIERE *alias* JOSEPH BARNES.
his
"RAMIS × TENATERONAKWA.
mark
his
"SEE × SASENNOWENM.
mark
his
"SORAT × KARHONRIHSON."
mark

I hope such an appeal will not be passed over without due attention being paid to it.

Mr. FOSTER. It has not been passed over; I have lowered the duty on beads.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. Minister might remove the duty altogether from that class of beads.

Mr. FOSTER. The communication I had from those Indians was to the effect that, instead of increasing the duty 5 cents, it should be allowed to remain at its original figure.

Boots and shoes, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. McMULLEN. On the question of boots and shoes, I may say that I was in the city of Montreal yesterday, and one of the largest manufacturers there told me they were prepared for free trade at any time in preference to the present system.

Salmon, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound. All other fish pickled or salted in barrels, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask my hon. friend if he thinks it is wise to put his duty on fish? We find a proposition in the United States to tax the fish coming from our ports, and while the Americans are still in throes of their arrangement of the tariff, I would ask if it is prudent to tax the fish coming from the United States? We take very little fish from them, and this is simply a provocation on our part to cause them to retaliate upon us.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how it can be retaliation, as this is merely the whole old duty which has been on the tariff for years.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is really a provocation, and the hon. gentleman would do well to take it off.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How would this apply to Newfoundland?

Mr. BOWELL. None of these apply to Newfoundland.

Mr. MITCHELL. You cannot discriminate; you must apply it to Newfoundland. The principle laid down by the British Government is that they will not sanction discriminatory tariffs as against one nation in favor of another.

Mr. KENNY. Newfoundland charges a duty on our flour and I do not see why their fish should be exempt.

Mr. CHARLTON. Our import of fish from the United States is so very insignificant that it seems to me we ought not to impose this duty, because it invites retaliation. This duty might be wiped out without any greater loss to the revenue than a few thousand dollars at most.

Mr. MITCHELL. There can be no exemption made in regard to Newfoundland, or any country outside of Canada.

Mr. KIRK. The late tariff was just the same as this. According to the old tariff, duties were charged on fish imported from Newfoundland just the same as fish coming from other countries, but by an Order in Council, and on account of some arrangement between this Government and the Government of Newfoundland, they were allowed to import fish here free of duty on the understanding that our flour was to be admitted free into Newfoundland.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a sort of reciprocal arrangement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the hon. Minister will remember that they imposed this duty against Newfoundland, and that when Newfoundland threatened to impose duties against Canada, the Government had to back down, as they will probably have to do again. I should like to know under what conditions our trade with Newfoundland is carried at the present time—whether on an Order in Council or by an enactment.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is by power given under the general Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister should be able to say more positively. Our trade with Newfoundland is very important. We import a large quantity of herrings from there, and we ought to know exactly in what position that trade stands.

Mr. FOSTER. It is under section 3 of chap. 33:

"Fish and other products of the fisheries shall be chargeable with and there shall be collected thereon the rates of duty set forth and described in schedule B to this Act and set opposite to each of them respectively: Provided that the whole or part of the duties imposed by this section may be remitted as respects either the United States or the Island of Newfoundland, or both, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of the United States and the Island of Newfoundland, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in the said countries respectively."

Mr. KIRK. Was there ever an Order in Council passed in reference to Newfoundland?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think there was.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That applies whenever Newfoundland remits the duty on herring.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not specify whether it is to be in kind or not.

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to the two items in schedule B, I find that last year we collected $199.87 on the imports of pickled salmon from the United States, the value of the imports being $713, and on the imports of all other salted fish from the United States we collected $79.95, and the value of the imports was $241. As the duty on these articles only amounts to the paltry sum of less than $300, it seems to me an act of folly almost to impose any duty under the circumstances, because while our export trade is a vast one, our import trade is almost nothing. I think it would be better to drop this duty altogether. If it is calculated to produce any effect, it will not be a beneficial one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have they not got the same duty against us?

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter. If we impose this, it is a provocation to them to retaliate.

Mr. SPROULE. We had better attend to our own affairs, and let them attend to theirs.

Mr. BOWELL. It has been there for years.

Mess pork, as defined by the General Inspection Act, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if it is the intention of the Government to continue the arrangement to allow Newfoundland fish to come in free, with the understanding that flour is to go there free, and if he thinks that is fair to the fishermen of Nova Scotia and the Dominion at large. It appears to me that if you

are going to have protection, you have no right to sacrifice the interests of one class for the interests of another class. I do not think the Government are doing justice to the fishermen of Nova Scotia by giving away their market to the fishermen of Newfoundland in order that the Canadian millers may send them flour.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to be a proper item under which to discuss that question. If my hon. friend will put that question at another time I will endeavor to answer it.

Mr. KIRK. Very well, I will put it to-morrow before the Orders of the Day are called.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We have been taking a good deal of liberty in going back and forward over these items, and I think the hon. Minister should answer the question. As my hon. friend says, herrings that come from Newfoundland go to the Montreal and Quebec markets to supply the demand which would otherwise be supplied by the herrings from Nova Scotia, to enable the millers of Canada to send a certain quantity of flour to Newfoundland for their benefit. There is a great deal in the point raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. Finance Minister has intimated his intention to answer this question to-morrow. To save time, I desire to call his attention to the fact that the Nova Scotia fishermen, when they go to the Newfoundland coast, are taxed on the salt and barrels and equipment they take there, and it seems rather extraordinary that we should let their fish in free.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That may seem hard, but there is this much to be said in explanation, though I do not approve of it. Our vessels go down with salt and other supplies and enter in their harbors and trade for fish with the traders there.

Mr. FOSTER. The Inspection Act defines mess pork as follows :—

"Mess pork shall consist of the rib pieces only of good hogs, weighing not less than 200 pounds each. The packages containing such pork shall be branded on one of the heads, mess pork,"

That takes in what is generally known as the heavy mess pork and the clear cut pork as well.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether or not what is known as clear pork will be admitted under the one and a half cent per pound duty. I object to the increase of duty at all ; but since it is to be increased, I would like to have it clearly defined whether or not clear pork is included in the tariff of one and a half cent a pound ; as I understand, at present it comes in at three cents.

Mr. FOSTER. The definition I have read confines mess pork to the rib pieces only of good hogs, weighing not less than 200 pounds each, and I think that included what my hon. friend speaks of as clear pork, provided it is from hogs weighing 200 pounds.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will the hon. gentleman insert that in the tariff ?

Mr. FOSTER. The tariff is explicit enough under the definition I have read.

Mr. MITCHELL. There should be no ambiguity left in relation to so important an item. If the hon. gentleman will add clear pork to mess pork, that will suit all purposes for which we are contending, so far as the definition is concerned.

Mr. CHARLTON. That will be necessary, because clear side is not classed as mess pork. Mess pork is barrel pork. Lumbermen, in buying their pork, buy mess pork, and barrel sometimes what is apparently clear side. It is a different way of putting up pork of the same kind. To exempt that from the duty of 3 cents per pound, it would be necessary to make this definition.

Mr. WELSH. I understand what mess pork is, and I think the definition of the Minister of Finance is clear. I would ask the hon. member for Northumberland what he means by clear pork?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mess pork is the standard pork of commerce, and the speculative article. Clear pork is not a speculative article. It is the pork in which the belly part of the pig as well as the sides, with bones taken out, is specially cured and put up. It generally averages in the Chicago market 50 cents higher than the mess pork, as there is not so much, if any, bone in it, and there is none of the back bone in it. It is very much used in the lumber camps in the place of mess pork. It is also the whole side of the clear part of the pig. Being free from bone is what constitutes clear pork. To show the hardship that may have existed during the past week, mess pork, which is the speculative article, jumped from $1 to $5 per barrel over and above the price of clear pork. This shows that our people may be mulcted by the speculative price in buying the mess pork, while if they buy the clear pork they will not have to pay the speculative price. With regard to the prime pork, that is an inferior grade of pork. I can understand a duty being put on that, because there is a great deal raised in this country. It is from the smaller hogs and the inferior parts of the larger. But our people do not grow to any great extent the mess pork, and, therefore, no duty should be imposed on it, and certainly the duty on clear pork should not be put higher than that of mess. If the hon. gentleman will put into the item clear pork, he will define more clearly what is meant.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says we do not grow that kind of pork in Canada, but the reason is the market has been so low our farmers could not grow it with profit. Give them the Canadian market, and they will grow lots of it, and they are desirous to grow it all over Canada. When a pig gets to a certain growth, it is much more profitable to feed it and so to obtain the growth of fat than it is when the pig is younger. Now, the Canadian farmers are compelled to kill the hogs when they are only half fattened, and the heavy pork is brought in from Chicago or from the State of Michigan. If you give the market to the Canadian farmers, there would be plenty of that heavy pork.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why does not the hon. gentleman go to the root of the matter? The reason why we do not raise heavy mess pork here is that in the United States they can get corn in the State of Kansas for 15 cents a bushel, and that is the food best fitted to raise heavy mess pork, so that they can afford to keep these pigs for a year or a year and a half, while in this country the farmers have to slaughter their pigs when they are seven or eight months old. They cannot keep them

longer, simply because corn is not allowed to be imported free into this country and the expense is too great. The hon. gentleman says the hogs can be fed upon coarse grains. Are there any coarse grains for the feeding of hogs to be compared to corn? He speaks of barley. Barley has been worth 60 or 70 or 80 cents a bushel, and how can that be used to feed hogs when they can be fed on the other side on corn at 15 cents a bushel? Who is to pay for this difference? The hon. gentleman is going to make the lumbermen and the fishermen pay for it. He is going to make the people in the Maritime Provinces, who consume a great deal of pork, pay this extra cost. If the Government had taken this duty off corn, the people in the Maritime Provinces could have fed the pigs so as to provide what was required for our own market at least.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In regard to the statement of the hon. gentleman, I find that the letter I have says, speaking of the difference between clear pork and mess pork, that the former consists as follows: Heavy fat shoulder butts, with blade bone left in, and California or picnic ham taken off. The clear pork is often used in preference to the mess pork, and one would imagine that it was of equal value; but, under this proposal, it will pay 3 cents per pound, while the mess pork only pays 2 cents per pound. Then there is a quality of prime mess pork, and another called prime pork, and those pay $6 a barrel. That class of pork is largely used by our fishermen—not by the bank fishermen, because, as they take it in bond, they would take the American pork in bond, and, therefore, it does not affect them—but by the people along the coast—people who are part fishermen and part farmers, but who raise neither pork nor beef for themselves. They have to buy both, and the Government will see how hard upon them will be a duty of $6 a barrel. I do not think the Government has considered how injurious this will be in regard to these fishermen, and upon the lobster fishermen, and upon those who go to sea, leaving their families ashore. It seems difficult to understand why the lumbermen, who, as a rule are better off than the fishermen, get their pork at a lower rate of duty. I was in hopes, after the representations which were made to the Government, that they would have made a considerable change before asking the Committee to pass these resolutions. The people in this country, as has been very properly stated by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), cannot raise pork as cheaply as the people of the United States, because we have no corn to feed them on. Where corn is 15 cents a bushel, pork can be raised cheaply, but we have no cheap food on which to raise pork except potatoes, and in some places not even that. In Prince Edward Island they will have the benefit of this duty, because potatoes are very cheap there, but I object to this increase, and to the inequality in the duty imposed upon the fishermen as against the lumbermen. I think the Government could not have considered the way in which this tax would affect the coast fishermen, and I now make this final appeal to them on behalf of these poor people, and ask that they should not be charged the heavy duty which the Minister of Finance proposes.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) has been building an argument on nothing in regard to the way this will bear upon the Province he represents. I find that $5,000 duty was paid on the lower class of pork, and the total amount imported was 516,000 pounds in the Province of Nova Scotia. I am informed also, the importation was largely for the lumbermen and not for the fishermen at all, so that this cannot apply so heavily to the poor fisherman as the hon. gentleman represents.

Mr. MITCHELL. Last year there was imported fifteen million pounds of pork into this country, and a duty of $152,000 was paid.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that it paid the farmer better to feed the higher class of hogs than the younger. That statement is fallacious. The younger the animal is, the greater is the amount of food required in proportion to the live weight. I will read a statement as to the increased cost of hogs in proportion to their age and weight.

"From the data given in these tables, and from conclusions safely reached by observation, I desire to point out that as a hog becomes older and heavier there is a gradual increase in the quantity of food consumed per pound of increased live weight. It is not prudent to base a scale of the per cent. of increased consumption of feed upon these few tests, but I may mention that, in the case of feeding hog upon middlings only, from 226 pounds each up to 291 pounds each they consumed 86 per cent. more feed for every pound of increased live weight than did the hogs from 90 pounds each up to 145 pounds each."

This shows positively that the farmers of Canada will not be able to feed hogs up to the weight required to produce heavy pork as long as they have a market for hogs weighing from 150 pounds to 175 pounds. While this may benefit farmers in certain localities, it will have very little effect in other localities. Taking the exports and imports of pork, beef and meats of all descriptions, and the imports and exports of animals that produce meat, we have still a balance of both amounting to $6,608,846. The great effect of this duty will be to displace one sort of meat for another, so that the benefit to the Canadian farmer will not be so great as represented, except, perhaps, in some localities. In some localities a farmer may benefit, but I hold he cannot benefit by feeding these heavy hogs, According to experiments that have been made we find that if we feed corn we can produce a pound of pork just about 1 cent a pound cheaper than we can upon either pease, barley or shorts. Now, if we received the corn into Canada without duty and left the duty upon pork at the price it was, a greater benefit would be conferred upon all the classes of the community, and the consumers would not have to pay the increased price, and the farmers, if they had free corn, could produce the pork more cheaply by 1 cent a pound than they can at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, who professess to be a practical farmer, if he finds that the rule is universal that all animals, the younger they are when he commences to fatten them, the less they consume in proportion to the increase in weight, and if that principle is correct, why he does not turn out those hundred head of cattle he is feeding to-day before they are half fattened and put younger ones in their place? Everyone knows that cattle will consume not more than one-third as much after they get pretty fat as they will when you put them up first. The longer you keep them and the fatter you make them, the less they will consume. The hon.

member for Huron said all animals—I agree with him if he confines it to pork, but I do not if he makes the sweeping statement that the same rule applies to all animals. The reason why farmers do not feed this pork is because it is not profitable. They have no market for it. We want to give to the Canadian farmer the market for this twenty-three million pounds of meat that we import. The hon. gentleman says we do not raise large hogs. I have heard a statement made by, I think, the hon. member for Hastings, the other night, that they ship hogs from Belleville just because they could not find a market at home for that heavy class of pork. If they bring in these large hogs to market, they will get half a dollar a hundred less for them than for the small ones. I saw hogs weighing 175 pounds offered in the market in my place for $5, while hogs weighing 300 pounds and over, were sold for $4.50 per cwt. There is no market for them, because they are supplied by the American farmer from the Western States. From the information I have received from the farmers lately, they are much pleased with the proposed increase of duty, and some of them fear that the Government are disposed to back down or to change the kinds of pork that is brought in so as to allow more to come in under a lower rate of duty. I believe there is no one in this country who raises pork or beef who will not approve of this increase of duty, because it will tend largely to keep out the American produce which comes directly into competition with ours.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The hon. gentleman's experience is not like the experiments made by Mr. Groff in Waterloo. He fed cattle, some of them, until they were two years old, some three years old, some four and some five. He kept an account of the amount of food consumed and the price realised, and found that he made the greatest profit from animals two years old. I find from experience that I can make one-third more profit by buying steers two years old than by buying them at a later age. It is an understood principle that the earlier you can bring an animal to market the more profit you will make out of him. But I want the hon. gentleman to understand that when he brings a young animal into the market it must be in a fat condition. In the Western part of Ontario, to-day they are feeding hogs five, six, and seven months, and selling them when they weigh 160 or 170 pounds.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say the profit is greater, or does he mean the proportion of profit? In other words, you take a young steer two years old that will weigh 600 pounds, you fatten him up to four years, and he will weigh 1,300 lbs. Does he mean to say that he will make more money on each animal selling him at two years old than by keeping him until he is four? He will make a greater proportion of profit, but he will not make nearly so many dollars per animal. I am speaking of something I know, because, probably, I have sold more thousands of cattle than he has hundreds. If you should go into the United States and tell a large stock man that he could sell his cattle at two years old for a greater profit, he would say that you did not know anything about your business. They never think of selling their cattle at two years old.

Mr. SPROULE.

The proportionate increase after they pass two years is greater, because all risk is past, you have the animal bred and well started in growth. Some of them may sell animals at three years, because at that age a thrifty steer is almost as good as he is at four years. Possibly they will sell 20 per cent. of their animals at three years old, because they are peculiarly thrifty, but 90 per cent. of all the cattle are kept until they are four years old.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the doctors and the lawyers, like the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Tisdale), had better establish a school for the farmers and the breeders like the hon. member for Huron.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The hon. gentleman spoke about a steer two years old, weighing 600 pounds. I handle no such animals. I have steers in my possession this winter that weigh 1,200 pounds at 18 months old. It would pay no farmer to raise a steer at that age, which weighs only 600 pounds. I have taken steers to the English market for several years. One year I took over steers four years old, and the highest price I got for them was £24 10s., and for two-year old steers the highest price I got was £22 10s. Last year I got £19 15s. for two-year old steers.

Mr. TISDALE. I want to make this explanation in answer to what the hon. member for West Durham says about establishing schools. In the matter of cattle I do not want to be taught by the hon. member for Huron. If hon. gentlemen will look at the Chicago markets they will find the average of beeves is 1,200 pounds for a four-year old. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) was talking about a particular class of high bred stock when he spoke of 1,200 pounds as average cattle. The hon. gentleman laid down a general proposition, that he could make more money selling cattle at two years old than when they were under that age. I can quote the markets of Chicago, where during eight months of the year from 10,000 to 15,000 head of cattle are sold every day. I am speaking not only of what I have read, but what I have seen; I am speaking of cattle in the Western States and territories, and range cattle particularly. I say that neither of these classes prefer to sell 20 per cent. of their cattle at two years old. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) was simply speaking of a few dozen or a few hundred cattle of special breeds, when he said they would go from 1,800 to 2,000 pounds when four-year olds, which no doubt is the case, and from 1,200 to 1,400 pounds as two-year olds. That particular class may pay better to kill as two-year olds, but the hon. gentleman was speaking of the general cattle market of the world.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) undoubtedly possesses a great deal of knowledge as regards the business of ranching in Montana. That, however, is not a case parallel to the raising and feeding of cattle in Canada. Montana cattle on the ranche at two years old, I admit, are not very good stock, and no doubt they are much better at four years old. I would give much more for the practical knowledge of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) than the knowledge of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and four or five others

like them with respect to the matter we are discussing. The assertion made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), that there would be relatively a larger percentage of profit on young than on old cattle, is undoubtedly true. He did not say that two-year old steers would be worth as much as four-year olds, but he claimed that, taking the first cost, the time spent, and the amount of feed, the percentage of return would be greater from young cattle than from four-year olds. His practical experience has shown him that such is the case, and no doubt he is right, and I submit the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) knows little about it. The latter hon. gentleman is interested in Montana ranches and has handled a great many cattle there, but his knowledge of the cattle business in this country is not as reliable as that of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), and he has not the practical knowledge possessed by that hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me remind the Committee that we are now on the item of mess pork.

Mr. SPROULE. We have before to-day found out that the arguments of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) were not infallible. Only a few days ago the hon. gentleman gave a long list of agricultural implements as having come into the country before 1878 duty free, and I showed that such was not the case. His present argument in regard to the interests of the farmers is as unreliable as his argument was on that occasion. If the hon. gentleman applied the number of pounds of feed to fatten cattle, as a feeder and not as a farmer, there might be more force in his argument. But farmers benefit not so much by buying food for their cattle as by using straw, chaff, turnips and food that is round the barn, which costs little. and thus keeping the cattle going for one, two or three years, and thus obtaining an increase of weight at very little cost. If cattle are fed with corn, it may, perhaps, be more profitable to fatten them as two-year olds. But farmers are only to a small extent feeders, and, therefore, it is not to their interest and benefit that they should turn out their cattle at two years old. At that age they cannot fatten them with profit; they have not money to go abroad and buy feed. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) may be a great authority and may display evidence of superior knowledge and ability on agricultural subjects, but he must not taunt hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with ignorance when they rise as representing the farming community and discuss these topics. If the hon. gentleman will go among his own farming friends he will find they do not accept him or his theories. Not one in 500 is a feeder, and it is only the feeder who can purchase American corn for feed, and to him alone is it important that American corn should come in duty free. It will not be until the farmers abandon the general principles of farming and direct their attention entirely to feeding that it will be to their interest to get in American corn free of duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Pork.

Mr. SPROULE. Are hon. gentlemen afraid of hearing an argument in regard to the farmers? Hon. gentlemen opposite will have to go back to the farmers and win their support or they will not be returned to this House. As regards cattle, it is the interest of the farmer to feed them from year to year on a class of food representing very little value, and get back his profit partially in the manure, and when the cattle have reached the proper age for feeding the farmer can then fatten them to advantage.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). What I stated was, that under the Mackenzie tariff, agricultural implements were admitted free and I can prove it. The antiquated ideas the hon. gentleman entertains in regard to feeding and breeding are those which prevailed in Canada ten, fifteen and twenty years ago, when people advocated scrub cattle and not the improved breeds of the present day.

Mr. POPE. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has said that there was a greater profit in handling cattle up to the age of two years than there was after that. If that is a fact, why is it that he confines nearly his entire dealings in cattle to those animals which are from one to two years old and upwards, instead of producing these animals from calves up to one or two years? It is the same with regard to pork. He must surely be a shrewd man, because he is apparently from old Scotland, and his countrymen are noted for their shrewdness. If his dealing in these cattle is satisfactory to him—and, he pursues his business year after year as evidence of satisfactory results—and if he finds that in exporting these cattle between the ages of two and four years he makes a greater profit than if he raised them between one and two years, why does he not say so? When he comes to the finishing of the pork, the same principle prevails. The small farmer with his limited means can grow these hogs up to a certain time, and then they can be purchased by just such a sample of a farmer as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan)—and I have no doubt he is a very good farmer. He can finish the light pork into heavy pork just the same as he can finish the light steer into the heavy steer for export.

Mr. SCRIVER. I must confess that I am not a practical farmer, but judging from what my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) says, I know as much about fattening hogs as he does; and perhaps a little more. I am the better prepared to say a few words on this question, as I am a subscriber to the New York *Weekly Tribune*, which publishes an excellent agricultural column. I have been reading some articles in that paper, interesting to me even, and written by Mr. Curtis, who is known as perhaps the most successful producer of hogs in the United States. He wrote in one of these articles which I remember, that it was a false policy on the part of the farmer to think of keeping a hog until he was more than a year old, and that more profit would be made by slaughtering hogs before they were that age than keeping them longer. I was a little surprised to hear my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) go so far as to say that the longer you keep a hog the more profitable he would become, and he repeated that observation, which would lead one to think that his idea was that the longer you keep hogs the more profitable you would make them. Perhaps, as he placed no limit, his theory is that the farmer should keep them until they were of venerable age. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) take the position he did, because I have no doubt

he has experience in this matter. I have a little experience myself, and my neighbors have had experience, and I am satisfied that they have all come to the conclusion that there is no profit for the farmer in raising what is called heavy pork.

Mr. SPROULE. I have every respect for the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), but I must confess that I have not so much respect for his argument regarding the raising of cattle and hogs. His argument would lead to the conclusion, that the younger a pig was killed the more profit there would be. Now, if that be correct, why not kill it when only a month old, and do the same with cattle. That was not what I stated. I said just as other hon. members have said: that the profit of the farmer is obtained by feeding cattle with a kind of food which represents little or no value—such as chaff, straw and turnips, and that in the meantime it grows. When the beast gets to a certain age, it takes less, in proportion, to fatten it than when the animal is younger. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) has pointed out the situation of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) who buys his stock from the farmer. Would any gentleman say that he is a fair specimen of the farmer in Western Ontario? No. They would say that he is a speculator and a feeder, and that he is not a farmer in the proper sense of the term. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) says he would rather send us to a school like that for information, than he would to the hon. member who sits beside me, or to the hon. member for East Grey. That may be the opinion of a chancery lawyer, and of a speculator, but it would not be the opinion of the practical farmers of this country.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) must remember that he is perhaps confounding things a little. He has in truth applied his experience to a condition of affairs to which it does not apply. The longer he keeps the animals by which he makes his living, the more he profits by it; for his profits cease when they die. But he must not apply to others who profit by the death, the experience of a man whose profit ceases by the death.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems there is a strange similarity between us in that line.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is a little wrong in speaking as he has done. It is true that in a certain sense my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) is a producer of the finished article, and that he does buy cattle and finish them, In doing so, he uses his own judgment. But my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) is perhaps not aware that in addition to doing so, and as a part of his business, my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) actually tills and cultivates about 450 acres of the choicest land in Western Ontario, and that he has made that the choicest land in Ontario by his skill as a farmer and cultivator, in producing the raw material which he puts into those finished cattle which he exports to England. I would like to say a word or two with regard to the feeding of hogs which was referred to by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do not think there is any doubt whatever about what the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) said, namely, that if you feed younger cattle you get a greater return for your feeding. The question of how much money you make on an animal is how much more you can get for it than your food cost you, and there is no doubt whatever, from careful experiments made in England, and, I believe, in Canada as well; that when you feed a young animal you get a larger return than when you feed an old animal. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) talks of feeding cattle on straw, and chaff, and turnips, but any gentleman who knows anything about farmers, knows that if they feed their animals on such foods as those, the return will be small indeed. It is only by using these cheaper foods in conjunction with better foods that the farmer can use them at all. The hon. gentleman is no doubt very desirous that our farmers should use only these cheap foods, such as chaff, turnips and straw, because he is anxious that the farmers should be forced to pay a larger price for the better food, but if the hon. gentleman knows anything at all about farming, he must know that the farmers must have the better kinds of foods to use with the cheaper kinds of foods in order to raise their animals to the best advantage. The hon. gentleman seems to want our farmers to go into the producing of heavy pork, such as our lumbermen want, which is the cheapest variety of pork. During the last year or two, our farmers have been specially directing their attention to the production of the dearer varieties of food, the things on which they can make the greatest profit, on which the greatest skill is displayed, and the least raw material is used. On this principle, the small animal, which produces the finest bacon and the finest hams, ranging up to 15 cents a pound, is much more profitable to the farmer than the animal for which he can only get 4 or 5 cents a pound. It is also in the interest of the Canadian dairyman, the most rapidly increasing and most prosperous class of our farmers, that they should use their skimmed milk and whey to produce the finer variety of pork, for which they will find an ample market and better prices than they could get from the lumbermen for heavy mess pork. This is the direction in which our farmers ought to go, and in this direction the present tariff does not help them at all, because it increases the price of corn, which is the cheapest and best food they can use for the production of fine pork, not when fed alone, but when fed in conjunction with the clover and skimmed milk which they have in abundance. This tariff, which keeps the duty on corn and puts a duty on heavy mess pork, does not help them at all. If they could get their corn free, they would immediately command a large export trade with England, in which this tariff does not help them, but only hurts them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose there is no part of the whole Dominion which is a greater sufferer in proportion to population from what we call the iniquitous tariff than Prince Edward Island. The fact is that of the five or six hundred articles on which taxes are imposed there is not one on which the duty is levied for the purpose of protecting anything produced in Prince Edward Island. Until we came to the articles of lard and pork, I think the taxes were purely and simply taking money out of the people without protecting anything they produced; but on these two articles there may be some protection given to the producers of Prince Edward Island. On the subject of lard, I think expectations are indulged in

which will not be realised, because the lard produced in the United States is so adulterated with cotton-seed oil and other viler greases, that the United States are able to undersell the world, and the duty will not enable the producers in Prince Edward Island to compete with them at all. Prince Edward Island is a large producer of pork supplies for the neighboring Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the increase of the duty on mess pork simply amounts to one-half a cent a pound. That pork is sold largely to the farmers and lumbermen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

An hon. MEMBER. The lumbermen and fishermen—not the farmers.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Yes; to the farmers in some parts. I happen to have letters under my hand from the three largest packers of Prince Edward Island, in which they tell me the different parts where they sell to the farmers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and I am speaking by the book. The only increase is one-half a cent a pound on mess pork. I undertood the hon. Finance Minister to say that he is going to pass an order stating that mess pork includes not what is said in the General Inspection Act, but clear pork also. If he does that, this increase of one-half a cent a pound will be no protection at all, because the lumbermen will import all their pork from the States. The Government are only dealing fallaciously with the people of Prince Edward Island, who imagine they are going to get a benefit from this duty. If clear pork was included, as I supposed it was, under the title prime mess pork as defined by the General Inspection Act, there might have been a hope of some benefit from the duty; in other words, then we would transfer some money from the pockets of the lumbermen and fishermen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the pockets of the impoverished people of Prince Edward Island, and our people who have been robbed to such an extent would have some little return made to them. But prime mess is usually used for ship stores, and on this the hon. gentleman puts a duty of $6 a barrel, or 3 cents a pound, and the ship owners buy that in bond from the States, and we will get no benefit. In Prince Edward Island, you can buy prime mess pork for $3 less than you can buy mess, and prime mess will be imported by the shipowners in bond from the United States; and on the mess, on which we supposed we were going to get a benefit, we shall receive none, because he is going to class clear pork with it, so that I do not anticipate any benefit for our people at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am surprised at the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). Why, Sir, he is just as selfish and bad as any Ontario man. He is looking entirely after the interests of his own Province. He says there is not going to be any benefit to the farmers of Prince Edward Island, by an increase of half a cent a pound on mess pork. They get $3 now, and does he want to put $3 more on the food of the lumbermen and fishermen of the country?

Mr. FOSTER. That is free trade.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is a queer free trader. The fact is the hon. gentleman is speaking to the constituency of Queen's now; he is not speaking his mind, but he is speaking from a selfish sentiment when he asks for an additional duty for his constituents, and he will fleece the lumbermen, and fishermen, and farmers of our Province out of $3 a barrel additional over and above what the Minister is prepared to say he will give. As I understand the definition given by the hon. Minister as to pork is this: Under the reading of the General Act that clear pork, being the pork between the fore-shoulder and the hip, and known as clear, is admitted and classed as mess pork. If that principle is recognised, the thing is clear that it is only liable to 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You will get your pork from the States then.

Mr. SPROULE. We will supply you.

Mr. MITCHELL. If our farmers can raise mess pork or clear pork, as defined by the Act, we will get it from them, but up to this time they have not been able to raise it. The reason we go to Chicago is because we cannot get it any place else as cheap. Surely $3 a barrel is quite enough protection on food of that character so extensively used in those two great industries to which I have referred.

Mr. WELSH. I am a free trader, and, if I had my way, I would take that tariff list and the tariff list of the United States and destroy them altogether, and raise taxes in some other way. In this whole tariff, there is not one item which is not a burden on the people especially of Prince Edward Island. The only item which has a tendency to benefit them at all is the duty on pork. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) told us that clear pork pigs weighing from 500 to 900 pounds do not bring as much money by 1½ and 2 cents per pound as the smaller pigs.

Mr. SPROULE. Not so much difference as that.

Mr. WELSH. That was the drift of his argument, and it shows the hon. gentleman did not know what he was talking about. Big pork brings larger prices than small.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not.

Mr. WELSH. We raise ten pigs to the one you do for every square mile in this Dominion. I have seen from three thousand to four thousand pigs a day selling in Charlottetown, and the large pork always commanded one to two cents a pound more than the smaller pork.

Mr. SPROULE It is not so in Ontario.

Mr. WELSH. You do not know what good pork is. Mess pork is four-pound pieces and no jowls or bones. The other mess has not a jowl. Clear pork is pork cut without the back-bone, and it goes right around the shoulder. Although I am a free-trader, I am going to support this item, because it is the only one in the whole tariff which will benefit the people who sent me here.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). With respect to the falsity which was attempted to be put on to my statement, that agricultural implements come into the country free under the Mackenzie tariff, I find on referring to it, that farm utensils and implements when imported by agricultural societies, for the encouragement of agriculture, were admitted free. I would advise the hon. gentleman not to be so ready to give to my statements the characteristic that distinguishes his own. I never made

a statement in this House that I did not believe to be perfectly true.

Mr. GILLMOR. My own impression is that the explanation given by the Government with regard to this question of pork will satisfy those who are in the habit of buying clear pork. That portion of the hog which forms mess pork will also form clear pork. Clear pork is the pork with the ribs and bone taken out, and that will be interpreted as coming under the head of mess pork.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is not all the clear pork imported from the United States ?

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman wants us to import it from the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. You can make clear pork and mess pork in the Island if you have the hogs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In other words, this is an ingenious mode of defeating the protection which the tariff was intended to give. The object of the tariff was to protect those who raise mess pork, and if you are going to admit clear pork as mess pork that object will be defeated.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you want $6 a barrel put on clear pork ?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) No ; I would like to see 2 cents a pound put on all round. These hon. gentlemen, in their own interest, are advocating that clear pork shall be imported at 1½ cents per pound, and they will buy for the lumbermen all clear pork, and the mess pork will not be bought at all.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I represent a farming constituency, and being somewhat of a farmer myself, I feel a very deep interest in this question. I must congratulate the Government on the course they have taken in protecting this class of agricultural products, for I think upon no special item in the whole three hundred in the Tariff Bill could they have taken any action that will redound so much to the advantage of this country as will their action on this item now under discussion. The hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Welsh) said that heavier pork was more valuable than slighter pork. Experience in Ontario and the market reports are against him, because the value of any article is largely made by the demand. In that connection I will just read a short extract from Bulletin XXX of the Bureau of Industries of the Ontario Government, which bears specially on this point :

"The day of the fat hog has gone by, excepting in the lumber woods and other places where large numbers of laborers are employed, and instead of carcasses of 350 to 500 pounds, 90 per cent. of which is white, the market now calls for carcasses of 110 to 160 pounds of firm meat, well streaked with lean and fat. For this quality of meat there appears to be a steadily growing demand in our towns and cities, as shown by the figures of pork packers, and an almost unlimited demand in the markets of England."

One reason why I refer to that especially is because I do not quite agree with the proposition of the hon. member for Grey regarding the profitable feeding of hogs. I have not much experience in feeding hogs, but am constantly in contact with those who have, and the pig which can be matured for market during the summer season is the most profitable hog, and that is the stamp of animal which the present tariff specially protects. Last year the returns showed we imported 15,206,172 pounds of pork, 3,658,967 pounds of hams and bacon, and 8,290,001 pounds of lard. That is 26,155,140 pounds, that came at a cost of $2,000,000 to the Canadian consumer. There is no reason why the Canadian farmer should not only supply that amount, but should also raise a large extra quantity for export at profitable rates. There are several reasons for that. One, and the chief reason, is this : The farmers in Ontario and older Provinces are drifting into the dairying business, and are finding out the injury which they suffer by making their exports all of grain, so that, I think, any means by which the surplus grain can be reduced to a smaller bulk, and exported either in the form of pork, or beef, or mutton, or dairy products, while leaving the fertilising elements on our farms, which are carried out of the country when we export grain, will do a service to the country. The report of the Ontario Agricultural farm makes this statement :

"The facts presented in these quotations indicate that there is a large demand for hogs and their products that might be and ought to be furnished to our own markets with profit by the dairy farmers of the Province. By way of further introduction of this subject, I will quote some passages from an address which I had the honor to deliver before the Dairymen's Associations in 1889.

"Dairymen neglect one of the best servants they can have in the animal creation, when they do not avail themselves of the hog to aid in making money from the by-products of milk. The attitude of farmers towards the pig has been an unfriendly one. It is a popular, though untrue, saying that the only good Indian is the dead Indian, and farmers seem to cherish a similar belief in regard to the hog. That opinion, however, is in direct opposition to the best interests of the men who keep cows for the manufacture of dairy products. If the man who keeps ten cows will fatten twenty hogs in the summer and half as many in the winter, he will find, perhaps to his amazement, that this little branch of business will bring him in more money and profit than he thought could be made from it. Whey is a valuable hog feed. There are nearly 7 lbs. in every 100 lbs. of whey which the hog can use to advantage."

Further on he says :

"These elements of food value in whey should produce at least two pounds of live weight in hogs. 100 pounds of whey, fed in the most judicious manner, should produce two pounds of pork ; it will not do it when fed alone, but fed in combination with other foods it will."

Further on he says :

"I consider that it is possible, by a judicious mixture of grain in hog feeding, to obtain one pound of increase live weight up to 200 pounds for every four pounds of grain fed."

And still further :

"I believe the hogs of this Province are an unrecognised and undeveloped source of wealth for the men who will endeavor to understand and use them well."

I have made a computation based on these authoritative and reliable figures, as I believe them to be, because they are inferences which have been drawn by competent men who have been experimenting without any view to the cost of the experiment at the Ontario Agricultural Farm. We have in Ontario to-day, as I compute, about 500,000 cows. I base my calculation in this way : The number used in the manufacture of cheese, taking that from the report of the Dairymen's Association, is 300,000, and I think 200,000 more may be added, making half a million. Upon that estimate, the refuse of the dairy industry alone would produce about fifteen million pounds of pork. Of course that would not be all a new product, because a large proportion is converted into pork to-day ; but, in conjunction with barley meal, which the same authority proves

to be the most valuable food for raising pork, we could, if the market were once secured, double the 500,000 cows in the older Provinces and thus be able to produce over seventy million pounds of pork, which, at 7 cents a pound—which is not more than half the price suggested by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—would add about five million and a half dollars to the revenue of the farmers. I have made this computation, not depending on the tariff so much for any increased price, but I look upon the tariff as designed to secure a constant, steady and reliable market, free from the fluctuations mentioned by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as to the result of "bull" and "bear" operations on the stock exchange in Chicago. I hope and believe that this tariff will protect the home market from those fluctuations, so that the farmer, when he commences operation in the spring, will be able to depend, with a considerable degree of certainty, upon the prices he will receive in the fall. I do not say that this tariff is going to enhance the price, but I do say that it is going to make the price stable. If we give the farmer of Canada that reliable market for that class of meats, he will derive great benefit, because, of the twenty-seven million pounds imported into Canada from the United States for consumption, fifteen million pounds were of light meats, and of the hogs imported into Canada in bond, a large proportion was made into hams and bacon and sent out of this country in a form which showed the great demand there is for hogs of this description, both in Canada and in England. Last year, I find that England imported over 500 million pounds of pork. Canada only sent 27 million pounds of that amount, and the United States sent a little over 300 million pounds. The hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the price of corn, and say that we cannot compete with the Kansas corn growers. Of course we could not, if you allow the Kansas corn grower to invade our territory, when corn is at 15 cents a bushel as it was two months ago——

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said it was 33 cents a bushel.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is the price at the present time, according to the quotations of the newspapers, but I am speaking of the price two months ago. I say that, in the present state of the pork market, in conjunction with our dairying business, and with the coarse grains which we can successfully grow—especially barley, for which the Americans have now refused us a market—we should not only be able to supply the home market with the whole quantity which we now import from the United States, but should be able to produce a large quantity for export; and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that, within ten years, the dairy industry of the older Provinces, instead of having 500,000 cows in the Province of Ontario, will have a million. We would be able to feed such a number of hogs, in conjunction with barley and coarse grains, that we would be able to supply fully as much of the British market for that class of pork as the Americans do now, so that we would not only be able to save that two million dollars we now pay to the Americans for feeding us, and which goes to the Kansas corn-grower, but we would be able to produce a large amount for export, the returns of which would go into the pockets of the farmers of Canada. As to the heavy pork, there is such a small amount of it required in Canada in comparison with the lighter pork, that an occasional hog here and there, one 300 pound hog in 10 that we raise in this country, indeed I may say one in 20, would furnish all the mess pork that the lumbermen of this country requires. I will go further than that, and say it is as much the duty of Parliament to legislate in the direction of preserving the health of the laboring men of this country, just as much as it is to find them opportunities of labor and cheap food. I state unhesitatingly that as a food element for restoring the strength and wasted vigor and energy to a lumberman, a hundred weight of mixed fed Canadian pork is worth one dollar more to any man than any American corn fed pork. The reason the lumbermen are so anxious to get the American pork is that it is soft and flabby, it does not contain so much muscle, is not so firm, and in boiling and in frying a larger amount of lard is procured. That is the reason given to me the other day by a New Brunswick lumberman. It saves them from buying lard. They take the lard, fried out of the American mess pork, and mix it with beans and peas for the men. Let him buy the firm, healthy, good, substantial Canadian mess pork, and buy decent Canadian lard made from the kidneys of the same hog, to mix with his beans. I remember, 25 years ago, the only food taken into the lumber camp were mess pork, flour, molasses, black tea and beans. The men ate this stuff all winter without any variety, and when they came down in the spring you would fancy 20 per cent. of them had the leprosy. To-day, perhaps their own avarice has led them to feed them vegetables, fresh beef, beans, molasses, fish, and every possible variety of food, because they have discovered that the greater the variety and the better the quality of food, the more work they can get out of their men. On that principle, I say let the lumbermen of Canada feed Canadian pork to their men, and we can do without Yankee mess pork. On this point, I said a moment ago, speaking of the dairy interest, that I was satisfied these two industries running on parallel lines, would in ten years in this country, instead of having 500,000 cows would have 1,000,000, and that would mean a product of 70,000,000 pounds of pork; the feeding of 10,000,000 bushels of barley in conjunction with the same, would mean 70,000,000 pounds more, or a total product of 140,000,000 pounds, and you can count the revenue to the farmers of this country upon that amount of pork. I believe that is just as possible as it has been to produce our present cheese product, which was only an infant industry in this country fifteen years ago. I took an interest in the second cheese factory ever constructed in Canada. I remember distinctly the statement made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), after returning from his first trip over the Canadian Pacific Railway, when he referred to the astonishing fertility of the soil of the Province of Alberta, and its peculiar and salubrious climate. He said that the friends who surrounded him, who had visited that country previously, had misled him. The statement was published in the *Globe*, and he said that country was capable of almost unlimited production, owing to the fertility of the soil, but the

great difficulty to its being settled up rapidly was the long transport of the grain. I mention this because it occurred to me the other day when listening to the hon. members from the North-West and Manitoba, asking that increased subsidies be given to promote immigration to that portion of our country. In no part of the continent of America which I ever visited, and I spent three or four months continuously in that Province, both from the character of the soil, and its topographical, and its climatic conditions, did I ever see a region so suited to pea growing as Alberta. The pea, I wish the House to understand, and as everybody having any knowledge of pork feeding knows, is the best possible food for producing firm, healthy pork. So that the conditions there for the growing of immense fields of peas which may be fed by the farmers in that country, largely in the same manner as the Kansas farmer feeds his hogs are of a very superior kind. In Kansas they send cattle into their corn fields to break down the corn so that the hogs may reach it and we may adopt the same plan in the North-West. Owing to the character of the soil and the climatic conditions of the country, we will be able to produce bacon and ham the equal of which the world has never seen. Now, we have secured a British market for cheese, as the finest element of food that enters that market. Our wheat, as I saw the other day, stands at the head of the list, and flour also. We hold the British market for grass-fed beef. We will have the butter market yet if our farmers pay attention to it, and if we get the pork, we will have secured the unlimited kitchen markets of England. Now, I suppose some of the figures I have given may appear extravagant to some hon. members, but if they will give some thought on the line that I have indicated, they will see that it is not only quite possible but very probable that we may realise the results which I have pointed out. If the tariff will bring about that result, without in any way injuring any existing industry, the Government is to be commended, and the country is to be congratulated, on the result. Some hon. gentlemen have referred to the duty of $2 a barrel on pork, as it affects the lumbering interests. It is notorious that there is scarcely a man, especially on the Upper Ottawa and the bordering portions of Quebec and Ontario, who has been handling saw logs and square timber for five years, who has not built a mansion and retired as a millionaire. The tax on pork would not amount to 5 cents a thousand on sawn lumber, and why men who are following such a lucrative calling should hesitate to give that advantage to the farmers, I cannot understand. I believe the lumbermen do not complain; they are too generous and large-hearted and the majority of them are too patriotic to make any protest in that direction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will not address an essay to this House on this subject or critisise the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I think, however, the farmers of the country will employ their time properly and direct their attention to those lines that are most profitable, if they are let alone. I rise to make a few observations in regard to the speech of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The hon. gentleman has given a description of pig-feeding in his county that was entirely novel, with a single exception. I remember many years ago, hearing John B. Gough telling about going through a country where the people were engaged in raising pigs, and he asked whether they were raising them for the purpose of placing them on the pork market. "No, not at all," they said, "we are raising them purely for the bristles." The meat was of no account whatever. Mr. Gough must have travelled through the county represented by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), where they feed pigs on straw and chaff, and I can well believe that the bristles will be a larger crop than the meat. Gough also said that in the same country in order to prevent pigs slipping through the fences they were obliged to tie knots to their tails. I think the pigs in the hon. gentleman's constituency must all have knots in their tails, or it would be utterly impossible to fence them in. A hog will be a veritable land-shark when it is fed on straw and chaff. The people told Gough that those pigs paid for their feed; and he asked how that occurred? They said they were troubled with Canadian thistles, that the snouts grew to an enormous length, and the tails constituted a sort of flag staff, and a pig could stand on his head and dig and eat a quarter of an acre of thistles in a day. I can easily understand how, in a county where they raise pigs of the sort described by the hon. gentleman, pig-feeding after all may be pretty profitable, and I am quite sure the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) knows more about this kind of feeding than any other hon. gentleman in this House. I think his description, for I had supposed Mr. Gough had drawn on his imagination when he was telling the story, was certainly worthy of the hon. gentleman, and it was most important information to communicate to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I am entitled to a chance to reply to the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), for in addition to being a philosopher his last speech shows he is bristling with new ideas. I am quite willing my language should be taken for all it was intended to imply, in regard to the subject to which it was made applicable. In speaking of the use of chaff and straw, I was speaking of feeding cattle, and the question whether it would be more profitable to feed cattle to kill at two years, or to keep them to a later age. Hon. gentlemen have a dozen times in this debate not only misrepresented me, but applied language which I used in speaking of the feeding of cattle to the feeding of hogs, and have made use of it in their facetious way. I have endeavored to show that it was in the interests of the farmer to keep stock of any kind until it arrived at maturity rather than kill it at a premature age. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that if you continue that line of argument you must feed stock until they are very old. That is carrying the argument to an absurdity. Every sensible man knows there is a time in the life of all animals during which there is an increase of growth, and that means an increase of weight, and both these may be obtained at a very small outlay to the farmer. During that time the beast is growing, but when it comes to maturity it is unprofitable for the farmer to keep the animal longer, and he should then fatten it and send it to market as soon as possible. That was the argument I wished to present to the Committee, not that pigs should be fed on straw

or chaff. I did not make use of that language in regard to feeding pigs but to feeding cattle, and I said that young cattle could be fed on those kinds of feed, and that the farmer had ample time during the winter to attend to them, and he also required the manure to improve his lands. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) said I had evidently not taken much interest in the subject, and had not read many agricultural papers and periodicals. I have read a few of them, and if my memory serves me correctly, I read something about a patent food prepared by a scientific farmer in the Eastern Townships. It was supposed to be of that peculiar nature that a very little of it would keep an animal alive; but it appeared to have been invented by the hon. gentleman who now poses as such high authority on agricultural matters, and in practice it was found to keep the animal alive to a certain stage, and about the time the farmer expected to receive a fair price for the animal it died from starvation

Mr. CHARLTON. Chestnut.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be a chesnut; but chestnuts sometimes are very applicable, and if only stories which are not chestnuts were repeated in this House, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would not be able to make such a variety of tariff speeches and on different sides of the question. With respect to the statement made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan). I said that he had stated that during the Mackenzie régime all agricultural implements were imported free, and I said that was not correct. The hon. gentleman flatly contradicted me, and read from *Hansard* to prove his statement. I find in *Hansard* his very words, at column 2969 he said:

"Just let me read a little statement to show how the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie encouraged the farmers of this country, during the time they held office. During that time, we could get all our agricultural implements into the country free; now we have to pay 35 per cent.; waggons were free, they now pay 50 per cent.; buggies were free, they now pay 41 per cent.; a hay-knife was free, it now has to pay 79½ per cent.; hoes were free, they now have to pay from the United States 45½ per cent. and from Great Britain 53 per cent.; a clothes-wringer was free of duty, now it has to pay 73½ per cent.; scythes were free, now they have to pay 79½ per cent.; picks, spades and shovels were free, now they have to pay 40½ per cent.; tiles were free, now they pay 20 per cent.; fertilisers were free, now they have to pay 20 per cent.; timothy, clover and other seeds were free, and we have had timothy and clover free only during the last two years, but now a duty of 15 per cent. is imposed on them; turnips, mangolds and beets were free and we have been paying a duty of 15 per cent. on them up to the present time, but now they have again been placed on the free list."

I read the hon. gentleman's own words, and, therefore, I was not misquoting him, and I have read them again to-night to fortify the statement I made: that he is not always reliable. It is true he went on to speak further, and in that he probably finds the quotation he has given to-night. Speaking of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, he said:

"He allowed the manufacturers to have free iron from which to manufacture agricultural implements, and he allowed agricultural implements to come in free to the agricultural societies."

It is true the hon. gentleman referred to the fact that agricultural societies could bring in their implements free, but I showed in opposition to that that they only brought in a very small number of them free, and that it was not to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie or his Government, that the farmers were indebted for this consideration, because I understand it was due to an Order in Council passed by the present Premier and his Government, in the year 1868, and which was continued by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie when in power, that the farmers got the privilege of bringing in their implements free.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman should not bore the Committee; we are talking about pork.

Mr. SPROULE. I only mentioned this to show that I have not misquoted the hon. gentleman, and in order to defend the statement I made.

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to prolong the discussion, but the hon. gentleman made some allusions to myself, which I confess I cannot quite understand. I would not pay any attention to them at all had it not been that similar insinuations were thrown out by gentlemen on the other side of the House during this Session. I confess that their insinuations are rather far fetched, and I cannot understand what they mean. I can say that I did not use any patent cattle food in my farming experience, and I can also say that I have not lost a single animal through dying a natural death in my barns. I cannot understand what story my hon. friends opposite have been stuffed with, or at what they are driving. As these insinuations are getting rather common, it is perhaps as well that I should allude to them, and give them a contradiction.

Mr. PURCELL. My experience in Canada is that it is much better to raise pork for eight months, when we can get two hundred weight, than to keep it longer. The best food we have in this country for raising pork is either pease or corn. Barley is not near so good, nor one-half so productive for fattening purposes, and sometimes the barley is dearer than either of the foods I have mentioned. Of course, if we want to get pork in this country for lumbering purposes, that young pork which I have referred to is not quite so valuable, and it is rather more expensive than the American pork. In my opinion, it would not at all be profitable for the farmers to raise heavy pork, considering our climate and that the winters are too long. The most profitable pork we can raise in Canada is the pork from six to eight months old.

Mr. BRYSON. Just one word, Mr. Chairman, before you pass that item. I do not know that I would have spoken had not the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) taken exception to the avarice of the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley. He seems to think that the lumbermen are a class of people who have been exceptionally favored by the National Policy in this country, and that we should not complain of the duty on pork. We, as a trade, use largely the beef of this country, and so far as the beef is concerned, I heartily agree with the changes in the tariff in that respect, and in regard to light pork the increased duty is quite in accord with my views. Anything that can be produced by the Canadian farmer should be protected. But when we strike at an article such as heavy pork, which in my humble opinion, cannot be

produced in Canada, owing to the climate, and the want of feeding which is necessary to raise heavy pork, I think it is a mistake to increase the duty. Of course time will settle this, and I believe that two years will show that we are right in the contention which we now make. Take the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, which imported pork very largely for the last two years, and you will find that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec alone have paid an average duty to the extent of about $100,000 in round numbers. The production of pork has not increased, and the addition of half a cent a pound on mess pork will not, I contend, foster the industry of raising pork to any profitable extent. The Ontario pork which is stamped "Windsor" was largely used for years in the Ottawa Valley, and we found that it was not a profitable pork, simply because of what has been said by the hon. member for Leeds, that I presume it had been fattened on milk and potatoes and certain other ingredients which were not calculated to make it a firm and lasting pork. It will be seen in two years whether we continue to import American pork or not, and the hon. gentlemen who have seen fit to place themselves on record this evening as stating that the farmers of this country would produce that kind of pork will be found unable to meet the statements which they have made. I am perfectly satisfied that the class of pork the lumber interest this country requires will not be produced in this country, and this duty will not encourage the farmer to raise it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman kindly tell us why the lumbermen prefer the heavy pork?

Mr. BRYSON. I think every hon. gentleman who has used pork in the woods, or in new settlements, where a farmer has to clear the land in a section of country where the roads are unfit for heavy loads, knows that the heavier class of pork is more profitable for him, because it answers the two purposes of food and lard. The heavier pork is the most profitable our lumbermen can use.

Mr. FOSTER. In item 148, referring to liquors, some changes have been made. When the resolutions were brought down, it was provided that each red case of gin of 15 bottles should be dutiable as containing four gallons, and each green case of 12 bottles should be dutiable as containing two gallons. After having looked into the matter, I think it would be unfair to charge these measurements as full measurements, and I propose that the duty shall be charged on the actual quantity. The principle upon which the duty was to be levied was that all spirits should pay so much on proof, and that no allowance should be made for any liquors under proof, and that all over proof should pay in proportion. There has been a great deal of correspondence in reference to this. It is not necessary for me to go over the arguments *pro* and *con*; I will simply say that we propose to change this so far as to make the initial rate on proof to grade down to 15 below proof, to allow nothing on what is below 15 below proof, and charge for every degree of strength above proof.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In some cases the liquors are 20 to 25 per cent. below proof.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of them run to as far as 30 below proof, but the standard liquors are about 15 below.

Mr. BRYSON.

Beans, viz: Tonquin, vanilla and nux vomica, crude only.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to strike out the words "crude only," and to insert the words "not refined."

Bells, when imported by and for the use of churches.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman should include with that those for the use of schools as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Bells are manufactured in this country, and it would not be well to interfere with their manufacture.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are interfering for the benefit of churches. The churches have been protesting against connection between church and state, and you should not give this special protection against these protests.

Mr. CHARLTON. Substitute schools for churches.

Books specially imported for the *bonâ fide* use of public free libraries, not more than two copies of any one book.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to add to this "books which have been printed and manufactured more than twenty years, bound and unbound."

Mr. SCRIVER. Does this exempt village libraries supported partly by annual contributions and fees.

Mr. FOSTER. They must be free public libraries.

Borax, ground or unground in bulk only.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to add after the words "in bulk only," "not less than twenty-five pounds."

Cabinets of coins, collections of medals and of other antiquities.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you not think these should be made dutiable. Cabinets of antiques ought to be taxed to protect the native industry.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have all we want of them.

Chalk stone china or Cornwall stone, and cliff stone, manufactured.

Mr. FOSTER. After Cornwall stone put in "feldspar" and instead of "manufactured" insert "ground or unground."

Indian corn of the varieties known as "Southern Dent corn" (Mammoth Southern Sweet) and "Western Dent Corn" (Golden Beauty), when imported to be sown for ensilage, and for no other purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Add to this the words "under regulations to be made by Governor in Council," and also after "ensilage" the words "and soiling."

Mr. BAIN. It ought to be broad enough to cover fodder, as the word "soil" would mean used in the green state, whereas it may be used in a dry condition.

Mr. FOSTER. I will add "fodder."

Mr. FISHER. Could the Minister not limit it quite so much. Instead of intimating special varieties, he might let the farmer choose the variety by saying: "such corn as will not ripen in this country" or "any corn to be used for that purpose."

Mr. FOSTER. It will be difficult to work as it is, and would be more difficult by being made wider.

Fish-hooks, nets and seines, and fishing lines and twines, but not to include sporting fishing tackle or hooks with flies or trawling spoons, or threads or twines commonly used for sewing or manufacturing purposes.

Mr. PLATT. Does the Minister, in this case, really mean what he says, that fishing lines and twines are to be free? I have brought this question up before, but, by some regulation of the Department, twines under a certain degree of fineness, were put on the list of threads, and it appears that the Department will still have the option of saying what are threads and what are twines. All the nets now used on the inland lakes are charged 20 or 25 per cent. duty, but this proposes to make them free. A good many of the poor people in my county spend their time in knitting nets for themselves or others, but it turns out that the thread is subject to a duty. It should be definitely stated here that the fishermen are permitted to use these nets. I have seen invoices on which heavy duties were charged, amounting in one case to $4 on a small quantity of twine which was charged as thread.

Mr. FOSTER. This clause is in plain English, and shows what the law means. The question of administration must be arranged with the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PLATT. Strike out all the words after "spoons."

Mr. BOWELL. The language is plain. The difficulty has been in drawing the line between fishing lines and twines, and threads. The most extraordinary arguments have been brought forward to sustain the position taken by the member for Prince Edward. I remember one person stating that the article was not a thread because it would not unravel in one particular way, forgetting that by taking the other end it would unravel. I admit there has been a great deal of difficulty, but we could not possibly rule as twine that which was neither more nor less than a coarse thread. If the hon. gentleman compares this with the old item, he will see it is much broader, and I think it will be better understood.

Mr. PLATT. So the Department will continue to charge duty on these nets?

Mr. BOWELL. The Department will continue to charge duty on threads which are brought in for purposes not contemplated by the Act.

Mr. PLATT. This is a special thread or twine which costs a large price, and is put up in balls of a very different kind from ordinary thread, and I think it is very easy for the Department to remedy this evil, and remove what is an anomaly in the National Policy, because it is really allowing the manufactured article to come in free and taxing the raw material.

Lumber and timber planks and boards of boxwood, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, sycamore, Spanish, cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satinwood and white ash, when not otherwise manufactured than rough sawn or split; and hickory billets to be used in the manufacture of axe, hatchet, hammer and other tool handles, when specially imported for such use; and the wood of the persimmon and dogwood trees, when imported in blocks for the manufacture of shuttles; and hickory lumber sawn to shape for spokes of wheels, but not further manufactured.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to add the following:

Hickory spokes rough turned, not tenoned, mitred, throated, faced, sized, cut to length, round tenoned or polished.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to call the attention of the Minister about putting pitch pine lumber on the free list. Perhaps the Minister is not aware that our own lumber would be likely to meet with serious competition from this class, which is produced in great quantities in the Southern States. We have found, from year to year, that it is crowding away further north, and it has cut off our market for coarse-grained lumber in New York, and it is even sold in Cleveland, Chicago and Detroit. If it is admitted free of duty it will compete seriously with certain grades of our own lumber in Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. I believe it is a fact that South and North Carolina pine is competing successfully with the Michigan pine in the Eastern States. Pitch pine was placed upon the free list in 1869, and has continued there ever since, because it was used largely in ship-building in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. WATSON. It is a pity that some of the other industries of Canada have not got the same privilege as the carriage manufacturers of Gananoque, because they are practically getting the manufactured spoke free of duty, and all that is to be done is simply to clean it off. These spokes are practically turned spokes, and they only require to be sand-papered.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will come over to the Department I will show him one or two of them, after which he will not make that statement again.

Mr. WATSON. I have seen several thousands of them.

Mr. BOWELL. They were not free.

Mr. WATSON. The person who had these spokes in his possession told me they were to be free, and that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had secured that great benefit to the wheel manufacturers. These spokes are practically manufactured.

Mr. BOWELL. These have already been on the free list for years. The free spoke that was admitted originally was split from the wood. Now they take the lathe into the woods, and it cuts the spoke from the rough. It is just as easily done as the splitting into shape, but they have to be put into the lathe again.

Mr. WATSON. This wheel manufacturer told me these spokes only had to be finished up on the sand-paper belt, that being the case, they are practically finished. He also told me that was one great benefit the wheel manufacturers had of having a good representative in Parliament.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman evidently does not know what he is talking about. This rough spoke, after it is received in the factory, has to go through four different machines. It has got to go through the throating machine, then the mitreing machine, then the facing machine, then the round tenoning machine, and over two sand belts. What labor is necessary to be done to the spoke, has got to be done after it arrives here.

Mr. WATSON. Except the turning.

Mr. TAYLOR. The old tariff admitted hickory lumber sawn to shape. There is no difference between sawn to shape and rough turned to shape.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is a "nigger" in the fence.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was admitted before our factory was started. All the manufacturers in the country, and there are several of them, have the same privileges. The hon. gentleman says that a wheel manufacturer told him so. I tell him that no wheel manufacturer in the country made any such statement, because if he did he stated what is absolutely false.

Mr. WATSON. The charge I made the hon. member does not deny. I say that the spoke is a turned spoke, and comes into this country manufactured, so far as turning is concerned. It has only got to be finished with sand-paper. The hon. gentleman will not say that it has to be put in a lathe and be turned again.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the theory of the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Finance, last night, was good, their conduct in this respect is not logical. They told us, with reference to some things brought in here, that it would interfere with the workingmen and reduce their employment. If we were importing turned spokes manufactured, it would be interfering with the labor market here. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us when they impose a duty that it does not increase the price, and when they remove a duty it does not affect the price. The tariff is framed on a very peculiar system.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There is a good deal of force in what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has stated. There are factories in this country engaged in turning, and if carriage builders are allowed to import their material free, an injustice is done to these factories. We have a turning factory in St. Thomas, and this tariff may prevent that factory from selling turned goods to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). There must be some influence brought to bear to induce the Government to make this arrangement of duty, and, perhaps, important services rendered to the party are to be rewarded in this way.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know whether, as the hon. member for Leeds is a free trader in his own business, we should object to it. It is a beginning made in the right direction, and I cannot find fault with the hon. gentleman getting his spokes in. It shows he is more advanced than are the Government.

General LAURIE. I should like to bring to the notice of the Committee the tropical fruits mentioned in item 312. I think the same principle should be applied that is applied in the case of molasses, and they should be free from the country of production, in order that we may encourage direct trade between the West Indies and our own ports. We have already lines of steamers running, and, instead of our purchasing these fruits in Boston and New York, we should encourage our own ports to be the *entrepots* at which these articles should be obtained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is a distinction to be made between these articles grown in the West Indies and Florida? If they were purchased in New York they would be bought in the country of production.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be very difficult to carry out the suggestion of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie).

On imported Indian corn, to be kiln-dried and ground into meal for human food, or ground into meal and kiln-dried for such use, under such regulations as may be made by the Governer in Council, there may be allowed a drawback of 90 per cent. of the duty paid.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Minister would do well to explain how the miller is to specify that the meal is only to be used for human food. A very large portion of the meal, which is vulgarly supposed to be eaten by the people of the Maritime Provinces, is used for feeding cattle, and, therefore, under this clause, it would not be entitled to a drawback. Perhaps the Minister will inform us what arrangement he proposes in this respect?

Mr. GILLMOR. We have several grist mills in the County of Charlotte and on the frontier. They have been in the habit of drying corn, but not kiln-drying it. It is not at all necessary that the corn should be kiln-dried in order to make meal for human food, and as soon as this dried corn is ground, it is disposed of for human food. Nobody can tell when a person buys this meal and takes it home, whether it is to be used for human food or the feeding of animals. I want to know if the Government cannot allow these millers to get a drawback on the meal used for human food, the same as if it was kiln-dried? If this drawback were given it would encourage the manufacture of this meal, and give these mills large employment. It would be conferring a great favor on these mills if this drawback was allowed when dried corn—not kiln-dried—is used for human food. I have several communications from persons in my county on this subject, and I would like very much if the Government would make such an arrangement as I have suggested.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter has been very carefully considered and the item as it is here provides all that the Government consider is best in the general interest to do. The corn to come under this item must be kiln-dried and ground into meal, or it must be ground and the meal kiln-dried after being ground. The latter is being done now in some of the mills of the Maritime Provinces, especially for the West India trade—a trade that my friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) thought would never be worked up.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have never heard of it.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some things, even in the Maritime Provinces, that my hon. friend has not heard of.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There are a great many more things which my hon. friend can imagine than he has ever heard of.

Mr. FOSTER. It is true that corn can be ground without being kiln-dried and used for human food, but it does not have keeping qualities when it is not kiln-dried.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is evident from the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that representations made to him by interested parties have very great weight. I venture to say that the statement made by the hon. Minister, that corn is

ground for export to the West Indies, is entirely inaccurate. There is no such thing. Whoever made that statement to the Minister intended to lead him astray, with the object, perhaps, to induce him to make this regulation. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, find out that in all these subjects he is yet in the chair of a student,

Mr. FOSTER. And before a most eminent master, who is now opposite to me.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He may have to occupy that chair a long time before he attains to the seat of a master. I desire to know what arrangement the Government can make, so as to see how the miller, who grinds the corn, may dispose of it according to the regulations of this item? Suppose a miller sells a hundred barrels of meal in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, that can never be true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman's experience never compassed a hundred barrels of meal, until he got here to manage the finances of the country, and, therefore, he cannot understand the extent of such a transaction as that. But the miller may sell his hundred barrels of cornmeal to the local merchant, and that is to be distributed to the 200 different people throughout the country. What certificate are they to give that this is all to be used for human food, and that no portion is to be used for other purposes? I think they will have a good deal of difficulty in providing for that.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is afflicted with two diseases: in the first place, he knows too much, and, in the second place, he seeks knowledge too eagerly before its time. He will get the knowledge when the Order in Council is passed and brought before the House, and not before. As to my hon. friend's assumption of superior knowledge, it goes but a very little distance. I never pretend to know more than I think I have a chance of knowing, and what I said with reference to cornmeal was not said in the way of criticism, but I was carrying out what was said by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who is always courteous when he addresses the House, and from whom the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) might take a lesson.

Mr. LOVITT. We have a couple of mills in Yarmouth, and their proprietors have written to me to say that it is a delusion and a snare to suppose that they can grind this for human food.

Mr. FOSTER. It is for human food; it is not for animal food.

Mr. LOVITT. They must grind it to fatten their hogs. I think it is more than a delusion and a snare.

Mr. GILLMOR. The mills do not put this meal in barrels; they put it in two-bushel bags, and it goes to their customers in small quantities when it is needed. This meal is as much used for human food as it would be if kiln-dried and put in barrels. I have no doubt that kiln-dried meal will keep longer for exportation than meal which is not kiln-dried; but the mills at St. Andrews, St. Stephens and other localities, are grinding thousands of bushels of corn, and I do not think the country would suffer by the change I propose, but the people would be accommodated, and I hope the hon. Minister will see his way to let them sell this meal for human as well as for animal food. After a man buys a bag of meal and takes it home, how can you find out whether he eats it or feeds it to his cow?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Charlotte to strike out "kiln-dried," ought to be adopted. As a general rule, the corn is always kiln-dried before being made into meal; but I know that a large quantity is made into meal without being kiln-dried. For instance, in August and September, when the corn is dry and hard, a great quantity is ground into meal without requiring to be kiln-dried, while at this season of the year it will need to be kiln-dried to make it keep.

Mr. FISHER. When the hon. Finance Minister, in the course of his Budget speech, expressed his intention of allowing a rebate on corn, he specially indicated it as being something given to the people of the Eastern Provinces in return for the extra duty imposed on flour. He practically said that he hoped and expected that the people of those Provinces were going to get this cornmeal for food at a cheaper rate than they had got it in the past, and might substitute it for the flour which he was going to make dearer to them by an increase of the tax upon it. I think the conditions attached to this item show clearly that the people of the Eastern Provinces are not going to get any benefit from the reduction of the duty on corn. It is evident that the words "kiln-dried" simply mean that only the corn used for export will get the rebate; in other words, the people who might buy corn in small quantities for human food will not get the advantage of it, because it would not pay the mills to kiln-dry it for the sake of the small quantity they would sell. The hon. Minister says that no doubt the cornmeal would be used for human food if it were not kept for a long time. As a rule, it is only poor people who will buy this meal in small quantities, and when they do it is not necessary that it should be kiln-dried in order to be fit for human food. The difficulties and restrictions hedged around this provision, which the hon. Finance Minister has not in any way lessened, will be such as practically to nullify the effect of the provision altogether. I am rather surprised that the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Minister of Customs have taken the expedient of a rebate. We can all remember when they refused to allow a rebate on corn that might be used for feeding cattle, in the same way as they allowed a rebate on corn used for making whiskey. On that occasion the hon. Minister of Customs explained how difficult it would be to prove that the product was really exported. I think he will find it equally difficult to manage the regulations regarding this rebate; and although the Government have decided at this late hour of the Session to do away with that rebate of the duty on corn for whiskey, I am rather surprised that the hon. Minister of Customs is now willing to undertake the difficulties which he so graphically pointed out before. He is now quite willing to face these difficulties, because he hopes thereby to turn the edge of discontent throughout the Eastern Provinces which will be occasioned by the increase in the duty on flour. It is not an expedient which is going to accomplish any good for the people in whose interests it is professedly

adopted. The Ministers clearly indicate that they expect that their increased duty on flour is going to be a hardship to the people, and they are going to compel them to eat this cheaper food.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

AYLMER BRANCH, C.P.R.

Mr. SPROULE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 141) to facilitate the purchase by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company from the Canadian Pacific Railway, of the branch line between Hull and Aylmer, and that Rules 49 and 51 be suspended as relating thereto, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VACANCY IN KENT, N.B.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to give you, Mr. Speaker, official information that Mr. P. A. Landry, member of Parliament for Kent, N.B.. has ceased to be a member of this House, having accepted an office under the Crown—Judge of a County Court, I believe—and I would ask you to issue your warrant for a new election.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), who has been called away, has received a telegram from the firm of which he is a member, in the Maritime Provinces, relating to a matter which he has asked me to bring before the House. I had better read the telegram.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be better to bring that matter up on a motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well.

SERGEANT VALIQUETTE'S CASE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the Estimates were before the House, my attention was drawn by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) to a letter which was contained in the papers I placed upon the Table in the case of Valiquette, in which some remarks were made in reference to the action of Lieut.-Col. Hughes, who, it was stated, had received the money paid on behalf of Valiquette. I think it is due to Lieut.-Col. Hughes, who occupies a very prominent position, to lay on the Table of the House a statutory declaration, which contains the facts, and explains the conduct which Colonel Hughes followed at that time, and which completely exonerates him of any charge against him for the manner in which he executed the trust placed in his hands by Valiquette. The declaration is a statutory one. It is in French, but, for the convenience of the House, I have had it translated, and I shall read the translation:

"Province of Quebec, }
"District of Montreal. }

"I, the undersigned, Antoine Valiquette, of the Village of Ste. Cunegonde, in the district of Montreal, gentleman, solemly declare:—

"1. That I am the father of Prima Valiquette, Sergeant in the 65th Battalion, who died in the service of his country, during the last campaign in the North-West, in 1885.

"2. That by power of attorney, under seal, I appointed as attorney for myself and my minor children, Lieut.-Col. George A. Hughes, at that time Brigade Major of the 6th Military District, in order that he might secure for me and my children the indemnity to which we had a claim on account of the death of my said son while on active service.

"3. That to my personal knowledge the said Colonel Hughes represented me before the authorities, and took many steps in order that I might obtain justice; and that he looked after all the necessary proceedings.

"4. That by an involuntary error on my part, I had before the Committee of Enquiry, incorrectly stated the ages of my children, and that from this there ensued some slight delay in the adjustment of my pension.

"5. That I have been paid regularly and without reduction, by the Government and my attorney, all the sums of money due to me and my children as such indemnity up to the present date;

"6. That I solemnly declare that I have received, as I have just stated, from my said attorney, Colonel Hughes, the total amount which was due to me; and that further, the said Colonel Hughes has never charged me or kept back from me one single halfpenny for his trouble and pains, or for any expenditure or disbursements which he may have made; and that I can only feel for this gentleman the most profound gratitude.

"I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and Extra-judicial Oaths; and I declare that I cannot sign my name."

I lay on the Table the declaration and the translation.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not wish to enter into any discussion of the matter now, but I do not think that what I said on that occasion has been fully answered by the declaration the hon. gentleman has read. The observation I made upon the subject I do not think has been fully answered by the hon. gentleman's declaration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I recollect correctly the remarks of the hon. gentleman, they were with reference to the fact that Colonel Hughes had been the bearer of a power of attorney for Valiquette. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that it is a debatable question whether any Government official should be the bearer of and act under a power of attorney.

Mr. BLAKE. When the matter comes up in Supply I am anxious that the hon. gentleman shall give some further information on the subject.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad to hear the words which have fallen from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, accompanying the reading of this document from Colonel Hughes. I had no doubt, when my hon. friend from West Durham made his remarks sometime ago, that there was a misunderstanding somewhere. I, like yourself, Mr. Speaker, have had the pleasure of knowing Colonel Hughes for many years, and I have always found him to be a generous-hearted citizen, a good friend, a good soldier on the battle-field, and a

man whom the Militia of this country were proud of when he belonged to that force.

THE *MODUS VIVENDI.*

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 134) respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America. He said: I am very sorry that it is not yet printed in French. I will ask the House to expedite the Bill, for the reason that the season is advancing when its provisions will be required.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Bill which the hon. gentleman asks us to read a second time practically assents to a renewal of the *modus vivendi;* that, I take it, is practically the meaning of the Bill. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that its language differs very materially from the language we adopted when we passed the *modus vivendi* on the refusal of the United States Governor ment to ratify the Treaty of Washington. This Act does not lay down the rates which were to be charged by the Government in granting these licenses; that power is transferred to the Governor in Council. Now, I submit this is a very bad principle that we are introducing into our legislation from year to year. This matter particularly affecting international arrangements, should be discussed and decided by this Parliament. The rate charged heretofore was $1.50 a ton, but under the present Act the Governor in Council is authorised to issue the licenses at such fees and on such conditions as they deem advisable. Now, even if the House should consent to the proposition to delegate this important power to the Governor in Council, a proposition which, I think, we should not assent to, still, before doing so, we should have the fullest information as to the condition in which the matter now stands, and as to what the Government propose to do, whether the intention of the Government is to adopt the same scale of fees and the same divisions which were adopted and attached to these licenses, or whether the condition of affairs now has given rise, in their minds, to the opinion that a change should be adopted with regard either to the divisions attached to the license, or the fees to be charged.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The intention is to charge the same fee, and I have no objection to put that in the Bill. It was only for another reason that appears upon the face of the Bill, that we did not state the fees.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I would like the hon. gentleman to state whether he is in a position to give the House any information as to the state of the negotiations at the present time between the respective Governments in regard to this important question. We know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been at Washington for some time past, and the general understanding is that he has been taking part in negotiations with regard to the differences with respect to the Behring Sea seizures. Now, this important question must have been brought up, or should have been brought up, and I dare say has been brought up. It is a matter on which the House is entitled to any information which the public interest justifies the hon. gentleman in giving us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All I can say about that subject is that the negotiations down to the present time have been almost exclusively with reference to the Behring Sea question, but there has been an intimation on the part of the United States authorities that when that question is disposed of, they will not be unwilling to renew negotiations for the purpose of settling any differences with regard to the fisheries on the Atlantic coast. The negotiations on that subject have been deferred until the conclusion of the negotiations with respect to the Behring Sea. I cannot speak more definitely than that, but we think that what has been done justifies us in asking for a renewal of the *modus vivendi.*

Mr. LAURIER. I must certainly take exception to the manner in which this proposed legislation is introduced to the House. I apprehend that at this moment no subject of greater importance can be brought before the attention of a Canadian Parliament. We have not received the slightest information with regard to this subject except that which has been extracted from the Minister, and even the information which he has now imparted to us is of the most meagre character. This is a subject upon which the Government have been reticent for years past. Whenever it was broached we were always told that negotiations were progressing, and the Government did not think it was advisable to give any more information. I do not, for my part, complain of any reticence that is justified by the public interest; still, I think, when such important legislation is introduced the people are anxious to know, and ought to be informed, what is the condition of the relations with the United States with regard to this pressing matter. The Government, in my estimation, will better serve the public interest by stating exactly in what position the negotiations now stand, if there is any proposition to negotiate any treaty or if new propositions are to be entered upon. This is a power which rests in the hands of the Government. This Bill will not go into law except at such time and manner as the Government think it advisable. This is not a proper method to adopt. I am glad to say, however, that the hon. Minister is to correct it to some extent; but, on the whole, I submit the Government have not given us the information which this House should possess in regard to this important matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not my fault, because I have given the hon. gentlemen all that has transpired with respect to this subject, and it is impossible for me to invent information. If the hon. gentleman desires the information respecting the working of the *modus vivendi*, the number of licenses issued and the terms, I can give him that information; but as regards other matters, I have no further information to give.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the explanation of the Minister of Justice is one that exactly meets the enquiry made and the information sought by the leader of the Opposition. We know very well, what the working of the *modus vivendi* has been in the past; certainly it has not been too satisfactory, and as the House is now approaching, we hope, the close of its labors, the Government should be prepared to give us some information as to the position of the negotiations, the progress made, and whether unreasonable demands have been made and concessions asked. The Government

should be prepared, at all events, to give us some information on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire at this stage, to bring before the House, a matter of which I spoke earlier in the day, before the Orders of the Day were called, and it is *apropos* of this Bill which we are now asked to read the second time. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) received a telegram with respect to the admission of Dominion fishing vessels into the harbors of Newfoundland. It contained information that the Newfoundland Government propose to impose a duty of $1 per registered ton on Dominion vessels every time they enter the harbors of Newfoundland for the purpose of purchasing bait. These vessels have to enter four, five or six times a year to replenish their stock of bait, and as the vessels average a tonnage of from 80 to 100 tons, each vessel will be subject to a duty of about $400 a year, which will be a most serious matter. I should like to ask the Government if they have any information on the subject, and whether the statements contained in the telegram are within their knowledge. The telegram reads:

"Newfoundland merchants wire us our fishing vessels will have to pay $1 per registered ton for every time they enter Newfoundland this year. This means about $400 each vessel."

Have the Government had any information on the subject, and, if the Government have had information, has any official action been taken with respect to the matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nothing more definite has been received by the Government than that which the hon. gentleman has read to the House. That has been communicated to a member of the Government, and telegraphic communication will be had with the Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Communication has not yet been made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that this Bill is identical with the Act on the Statute-book?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not identical. The point to which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) called my attention was, that the fee for license was not mentioned in the terms of the Bill, but was left to the discretion of the Governor in Council. I now propose to state what the fee will be. I do not know there are other material points in which the Bills differ.

Mr. BLAKE. The Bill was not distributed to me. We had no reason to suppose it would be taken to-day, and we had no opportunity of looking at it, and I can see the great importance, if there be any difference in the present proposal of the Government as compared with the old Act, that there should be an opportunity for hon. members to consider it. If the hon. gentleman is simply going to repeat the old Act, I would not raise any objection; but if the conditions are to be altered, the very circumstance that it is a grave international matter is reason rather for dilatoriness than for undue pressure on the House as to the passage of it.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to look at the Bill, I will read the original *Modus Vivendi* Act. I find the language is not precisely the same, but the effect will be the same. The old Act says:

"For the purpose of carrying into effect the protocol set forth in section *b* to this Act it is hereby enacted that ending the exchange of ratification mentioneed in article 16 of the treaty, and for a period not exceeding two years from the 15th day of February, 1888, the privilege of entering the bays and harbors of the Atlantic coast of Canada shall be granted to United States fishing vessels by annual licenses at a fee of $1.50 per ton for the following purposes; (*a*) the purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits; (*b*) transhipment of catch and shipping of crews."

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill is, in one sense, more limited, and, in another sense, more extended. The license in the old Act was limited to the Atlantic coast, but it also applied to bays, harbors and coasts; but in the present Bill it is limited to a port, but it may be a port anywhere. So while American vessels will not be allowed, under the present Bill, to enter bays and harbors, this Bill will allow American vessels to go into ports on the Pacific coast, and other ports as well.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have no objection to limit the Bill to the Atlantic coast, and it is so intended.

Mr. BLAKE. That is one restriction, but in another part there is another restriction. You have a restriction to any port in the Dominion of Canada. But the old Act covers much more than ports.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Bays and harbors.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, and they are left out in the present Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think port is a more accurate expression, as a vessel cannot buy bait or transship crews without going into port. Every harbor in the Atlantic coast is a port; it is impossible to enter a harbor there without entering a port.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman consider that the Bills are identical in meaning.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, I do. I think the term port more accurate. Bays and harbors was the expression used in the treaty.

Mr. BLAKE. There was nothing said in the Act with respect to terms and conditions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No terms and conditions were stated.

Mr. BLAKE. For what reason were they omitted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In order to enable us to spread on the face of the license what is intended. The license issued is in these terms:

"*License to United States Fishing Vessels.*

, of the United States fishing vessel , tons registered, of , having paid to the undersigned, Collector of Customs at the port of , the sum of , the privilege is hereby granted to said fishing vessel to enter the bays and harbors of the Atlantic coast of Canada and Newfoundland, and for the purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits, and the transshipment of catch, and shipping of crews.

"This license shall continue in force for one year from the date thereof, and is issued in pursuance of the Act of the Parliament of Canada of 1888, entitled 'An Act respecting a certain treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States,' and in

pursuance of agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland.

"This license, while conferring the above-mentioned privileges, does not dispense with a due observance by the holder, or any other person, of the laws of Canada and of Newfoundland.

"Dated this day of , A.D. 1888.

"*Minister of Marine and Fisheries for Canada.*

"Collector of Customs at the port of ."

We, at present, have no definite arrangement for this season with the Government of Newfoundland, and they have hesitated to give their assent to this *modus vivendi*. If they should give that assent, we want it expressed on the face of the license that it is good for Newfoundland as well as for Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are two sub-sections of the section ratifying the *modus vivendi*, which the hon. gentleman has not inserted in this Bill; one of them relates to the reciprocal trade in the following terms:—

"If during the continuance of this arrangement the United States remove the duties on fish, fish oil, whale oil, and seal oil, as well as on the necessary casks, barrels, kegs, cans and other useful and necessary coverings containing them, as in section 12 of this Act set forth, such licenses shall be issued free of charge by such officers and in such form as the Governor in Council may determine."

Of course the hon. gentleman contemplates renewing that section, and also the other section, which is as follows:—

"No United States fishing vessel entering the bays and harbors of the Atlantic coast of Canada for any of the four purposes mentioned in article one of the Convention of the twentieth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and eighteen, and not remaining therein more than twenty-four hours, shall be required to enter or clear at the Customs, provided that such vessel does not communicate with the shore."

That is a question whether it would not issue for the period mentioned in section 14. The main section provides:

"That pending the exchange of ratifications mentioned in article 16 of the treaty, and for a period not exceeding two years from the fifteenth day of February, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the privilege of entering the bays and harbors of the Atlantic coast of Canada shall be granted to the United States fishing vessels by annual licenses at a fee of one dollar and fifty cents per ton, for the following purposes:—

"(*a*) The purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits;

"(*b*) Transshipment of catch and shipping of crews.

If nothing more is said about that, it is a question whether it would not lapse, and whether it is not necessary that the hon. Minister should re-enact those provisions in this Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It strikes me otherwise. In the first place, the reason for inserting this provision was that the *modus vivendi* was to last for two years. In this case it is only for a short time, and the probability of the duty being removed is not very great. I think that sub-section 2 of section 12 of the Act of 1888, covers the case. It says:

"Upon such removal of duties, and so long as the aforesaid articles are allowed to be carried into the United States by all subjects of Her Majesty, without duty being re-imposed, and so long as privileges are continued or given to fishing vessels in Canada on the Atlantic coasts of the United States, the privilege of entering the ports, bays and harbors of the coasts of Canada aforesaid, shall be accorded to the United States fishing vessels by annual licenses, free of charge, for the following purposes:

"(*a*) The purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies and outfits;

"(*b*) Transshipment of catch for transport by any means of conveyance;

"(*c*) Shipping of crews."

The purpose being the same, I understand that still remains in the statute.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see that the section to which he calls attention has reference to the state of facts which would exist whilst the Treaty of Washington was being ratified; but then we have special legislation with regard to the treaty with respect to the refusal of the Senate to ratify, in which case we passed section 14.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman mis-recollects it to a certain extent. Section 14 was not intended to provide for the contingency of the treaty failing. It was intended to provide for the interim between the signature of the treaty and the time it would be ratified. I think it is a standing provision that the United States fishermen will have these rights whenever the duties are removed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 3 of section 14, which I have already quoted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that it is in force now, because it is a sub-section of section 14.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would it not be necessary to re-enact that?

Mr. MITCHELL. It strikes me that if the Act of two years ago, which was a very full and elaborate Act, was necessary, it is equally necessary now. This present Bill is an exceedingly brief and meagre affair, and I can quite understand, if the old Act is in force, all that we have to do is to extend the term for a calendar year, but if it is not in force, we have to re-enact these clauses of the old Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Sub-section 4 of section 14 says:

"No United States fishing vessel shall be subject to forfeiture under the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels, except for the offences of fishing or preparing to fish in the waters referred to in section 9 of this Act."

That is one of most important provisions in the Act of 1888, and that whole section is made dependent upon the action of the Senate of the United States, and it declares that the whole section shall cease to have any force if the treaty is rejected by the Senate of the United States. So that these two sub-sections I spoke of, doing away with the necessity of clearing at the Custom house, and in reference to forfeiture of a vessel which is seized by law, must be re-enacted, unless Parliament chooses to go back on the opinion they formed in 1888. To my mind, it is absolutely essential to re-enact these sections of the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the Minister of Justice if it will suit his convenience to leave this Bill over until the next sitting of the House, inasmuch as other members, as well as myself, have not had time to look into it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection.

Committee rose and reported progress.

DISCLOSURE OF OFFICIAL INFORMATION.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 122) to prevent the disclosure of official documents and information.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In moving the second reading of this Bill, I explained it; bnt there is one point to which I should like to draw the attention of the Committee. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) expressed a desire to see the dispatch which was received from the Imperial Government in reference to the measure, and I am happy now to be able to produce it for his information. It merely states that this legislation has been obtained in England, France, Germany and other countries, and requests on behalf of the English Government that we should pass it here, provided it is acceptable to the Canadian Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. The document is just about what I expected it was. It is a request from the British Government that we should pass an Act to enforce the protection of the naval and military stations against sketches and photographs being made of the defences of the country. But the hon. gentleman has engrafted on the Bill something like a slur on the Civil Service of this country. I am not aware that there is any necessity for that, unless the hon. gentleman can state that something has occurred to render it neeessary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg to state, what I did before, that I did not draft any part of the Bill, except a portion of one clause fixing the penalty. That is the sole difference between this Bill and the Imperial statute. There is no clause attacking the Civil Service. The law applies to everybody, and is for the purpose of protecting the fortresses, and preventing the disclosure of official documents or information which might be injurious to the State.

Mr. MITCHELL. So far as regards the legislation asked for by England for the protection of her military arsenals and stores, it is perfectly correct, and I do not object to it; but I want to know where he finds in the English statute which he has shown me, any provision similar to section 2, which seems to me to cast a slur on the Civil Service of this country, by providing punishment for certain offences which it has never been suggested that anybody has been guilty of. The only instance I know of in which a fellow ought to have been sent to the penitentiary, was the case of that Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who kept back our returns in the last election, but I do not find any provision in this Bill with regard to him.

Mr. BLAKE. Where was he sent?

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh! he was promoted for his iniquity. However, I have had my say in this matter. If the hon. gentleman will quote a single instance in which a civil servant has imparted information, I withdraw my objection, but unless he can do so, I do not think we should pass the second clause.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to send him the English statute, of which this Bill is a copy, he will see that they are both clause for clause exactly the same.

Mr. MITCHELL. I read over what the hon. gentleman sent me. It is true, it is a copy of the Gibraltar Act.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is the hon. gentleman's own mistake, if he did not send me the right Act. Why did he not explain this at the outset, and save all this discussion?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did explain it two or three times.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 130) to amend the Interpretation Act.

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I take this opportunity to make the explanation which I was asked to make a few days ago, in relation to the point as to how far this Bill changes the rule of construction in force in England. I wish to say, in the first place, that I may have too strongly stated the nature of the judgment given in our own courts on this question. What I did say, of course, was from information I had received, but, on asking for a copy of the judgment, I was informed that the decision was not written, but had been delivered orally, and that the opinion I referred to, was the opinion of two members of the bench and not of all the judges who rendered judgment. The judgment delivered by the Exchequer Court, however, was in writing, and I will read the passage which deals with this point. I only desire to add that, while it may not be conclusive of the matter, I am greatly confirmed in the view I have expressed by the amondment to the Customs Act made by Parliament in the Session of 1889 (52 Vic., chap. 14, sec. 7) to which my attention was directed at the hearing, by which among other things it was provided that goods which are permitted to remain unclaimed, as the teas in question were, in any country intermediate between the country of export and Canada, should not be considered as intransitive through such intermediate country, but should be treated as goods imported from such intermediate country and valued and rated for duty accordingly. The circumstances of the case were, as I pointed out the other day, that certain teas imported into the United States, and sold there as unclaimed, and then sent to Canada, were claimed as being in Canada direct from the country of growth. The question having been raised by Council, on a claim made against the Department of Customs, that goods permitted to remain unclaimed in the United States were direct importations from the country of growth, the Minister of Justice sought to remove that difficulty by introducing an amendment to the Customs law, providing that where goods are permitted to remain unclaimed, as these in question were, in any intermediate country between the country of export and Canada, they should not be considered in transit. I do not

suppose there can be a doubt that every hon. gentleman understood the original section precisely as they understood the amendment, notwithstanding which the judge was strongly influenced by the idea that Parliament intended to change the law when it passed the amendment. It does not seem from his judgment that his mind would have been free from doubt except for that presumption, which was wholly fictitious. I think I may say that the Bill will not change the rules of construction as adopted by the English courts. As I stated on a previous occasion, we are continually amending the statutes without changing the law. The necessity for this arises from the peculiar circumstances of the country, which are widely different from those of England. The Superior Courts are scattered in the different Provinces, while in England they are concentrated. It is impossible that the decisions of all these different courts can be known to every member of Parliament, and it is oftentimes wise to remove doubts which have been cast by a decision in the shape of an amendment, rather than wait until litigation has finally settled the matter by appeal in the highest courts. The Bill to amend the Act relating to lands in the North-West Territories, introduced this Session, is an instance of that. There cannot be a doubt that Parliament intended the adoption of the Torrens system to be compulsory in the original Act; but one or two judges have held that the adoption was not obligatory, but that two land systems might co-exist. The adoption of the amendment, which will be before the House in a few days, will remove the difficulty arising from those decisions, and under a forced rule of construction this amendment may be held as changing the law. I cannot adopt the remedy of declaring that the law was otherwise than the decision has made it appear to be, because that would be to change existing rights perhaps, and at any rate to make a declaration of what the law is, inconsistent with that which some courts have decided it to be. To show that the Bill will not materially change the existing rules of construction in England, I make a few citations from Endlich on the construction of statutes, his treatise being founded on Maxwell

"'A mere recital in an Act whether of fact or of law is not conclusive, but courts are at liberty to consider the fact or the law to be different from the statement in the recital; unless, indeed, it be clear that the Legislature intended the law should be, or the fact should be, regarded as recited.'—Maxwell (2nd ed.), 381.

"Maxwell recites a number of instances of the application of these rules, and adds, page 381:

"'In all these cases, no inference necessarily arose that the Legislature intended to alter the law, and to make it as it was alleged to be.

"'A different effect, however, would be given to an Act which showed whether by recital or enactment that it intended to effect a change.

"'If the mistake is manifested in words competent to make the law in future, there is no principle which can deny them this effect.'

"Whether there is any object in enacting that no declaration shall be involved as to the view taken by Parliament is another question.

"'In some States (United States) the principle has been made a statutory rule of construction, that the repeal of an Act is not to be deemed a declaration that any Act or part of an Act, expressly or impliedly so repealed, was previously in force.'—Endlich, sec. 372; Stimson's American Statute Law, page 1043."

This is in the California Political Code, sec. 4,504:

"The repeal of any statute or part of a statute heretofore repealed must not be construed as a declaration, express or by implication, that such statute or part of a statute has been in force at any time subsequent to such first repeal."

The New York Revised Statutes of 1828, chap. 21, sec. 9, contain this provision:

"The repeal by this Act of any statute or part of a statute heretofore repealed shall not be construed as a declaration or implication that such statute or part of a statute has been in force at any time subsequent to such first repeal."

Again, in the Wisconsin Revised Statutes, 1878, section 4,979 we find:

"The repeal of the Acts mentioned in the preceding section shall not * * * be construed as a declaration that any Act or part of an Act heretofore expressly or impliedly repealed was in force at any time subsequent to such first repeal."

Now, I have even a higher authority, the Imperial Interpretation Act, 1889, section 38, which provides:

"Where this Act or any Act passed after the commencement of this Act repeals any other enactment, then, unless the contrary intention appears, the repeal shall not

"(*a*) Revive anything not in force or existing at the time at which the repeal takes effect, or

"(*b*) Affect the previous operation of any enactment so repealed, or anything duly done or suffered under any enactment so repealed."

The Act 51 Victoria (Ontario), chapter 2, "An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1887," contains this provision in section 3:

"The Legislature is not, by reason of the passing of this Act or of the Act passed in the fiftieth year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1887,' to be deemed to have adopted the construction which may, by judicial construction or otherwise, have been placed upon the language of any of the statutes included among the Revised Statutes."

The proposition which I submit to the Committee is that the principle embodied in this Bill is a principle of construction which is not at variance with the existing state of English law, or with the state of law in this country, excepting in so far as doubts have been cast upon these rules of construction by the *dicta* of judges, recently delivered, and that, in so far as they may be affected by *dicta* recently delivered, it is desirable that the intention of Parliament should be made clear, and it is safer to establish a principle which should be followed unless the reasons for a different rule are apparent on the face of the Act itself, that the change of the law is intended, and does tend, to prevent an artificial presumption on the part of the courts, and prevents the construction of statutes being made on a fiction which has no foundation in fact, namely, that Parliament has desired to adopt judicial construction previously pronounced in re-enacting any statutes; but in all these respects the duty will always be cast upon the courts still to declare the real intention and meaning of Parliament. The courts should not be relieved from that duty, and under the English laws, they are not relieved from the duty of ascertaining what the intention of Parliament was, simply, because Parliament has desired to make the law more clear and not to change the law. When this Bill was in committee before, I explained the cause in reference to judicial construction. I have read the provision in the Revised Statutes of Ontario to the Committee, in order to show that this is the rule adopted in those statutes, and I think that it should be adopted here, more particularly in view of the different position of our courts, existing as they

do, in different Provinces, and their decisions being rarely subject to revision or appeal.

Mr. BLAKE. I must confess that I apprehended that the object and intention of the clauses of this Bill, as they were explained by the Minister of Justice the other day, were much more extensive than I am disposed to understand, by his explanations to-day ; not that the interpretation is inconsistent with his original statement, but from what I gathered as the discussion proceeded. I am not disposed at all to quarrel, not having looked at the matter since, with the view he takes, except in case of very special circumstances in the language, that a subsequent Act which repeals or, at any rate, amends, a former Act, is not to be taken as an absolute declaration with regard to the prior Act. That involves conclusiveness, it involves a decision of the subject, it leaves nothing to the judicial mind to consider except the determination whether there is an amendment or a repeal, and then the court is to draw its conclusions from the parliamentary declaration. I conceive that has never been the English or Canadian rule of interpretation in those courts with whose decisions I have any familiarity. Nor has the hon. gentleman, as far as I can see, justified the view that, to lay down this rule of interpretation given by this Act, is required by the judicial *dicta* or decisions to which he has made reference. He has told us of the decisions or the *dicta* of two judges of the Supreme Court in a certain case, of which *dicta*, however, he has not been able to obtain any report, and, therefore, has not been able to produce them. I, therefore, set them aside. The Minister of Justice has read us a decision of the learned judge of the Exchequer Court, by which I do not understand him to state that he adopts such a rule of interpretation as this Act condemns. As far as I could gather the language of the learned judge, I understood that he had come to a certain interpretation of the Act of Parliament which he was construing, and that he was greatly confirmed in that by the circumstances under which the amendment of the former law took place. That is not laying down the view that there was a statutory declaration, by virtue of the amendments, which precluded further discussion or deliberation, that the law as it was before was different from the present law. I do not understand the learned judge, therefore, to have enunciated any doctrine which is condemned by this statute, and, that being so, I do not understand the necessity of this declaration to be established by the decision which the hon. gentleman considers an erroneous decision. The quotations the hon. gentleman has made from other statutes have only a limited application. The statute of California is very much like his own provision, but those of Wisconsin and New York were only statutes of revision, and it is quite obvious that the principles of interpretation in cases of revision, as to their effect upon pre-existing laws and vested rights, require special rules of action. The circumstance that in statutes of revision certain precautionary principles of interpretation are adopted, which are not to be found in reference to the ordinary statutes of the land, instead of being an argument in favor of the general view that the communities which adopt, in the exceptional cases, such exceptional principles of interpretation, adopt them generally, is an argument just the other way. So the language of the Imperial Act to which the hon. gentleman alluded seemed to me hardly to bear out the view that it was a precedent for this statute. However, as I have said, my impression is that so far as the interpretation of this Act goes which the hon. gentleman gives to-day, and which I quite admit it fairly bears, namely that the amendment or repeal shall not involve an absolute declaration of the fact, which will end all consideration of it, is an interpretation which is in general accordance with the existing principles of interpretation. But I am very much afraid that the Act will be taken to mean something more, having regard to the fact that the citation which the hon. gentleman makes in support of it in this House, is rather, to my mind, an attempt by the learned judge, rightly or wrongly, to introduce what I understand are principles of interpretation which do prevail, which I think do continue, and which, whether rightly or wrongly applied to that case, seem to be sound and wholesome, namely, that you may take into consideration, though not conclusive at all, but as a circumstance in forming your judgment, the fact that the Act is an amending Act, and I do not think that the existing conditions of judicial decision demand this legislation.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Indian Advancement Act, chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes. He said : There are three amendments proposed in this Bill. The first is to give to the Indian Council power to pass regulations relative to the size and style of the sleighs used during the winter. It has been found that they use sleighs of all sizes and descriptions, which injure the winter roads, and this is to give the council power similar to that vested in the municipalities adjoining the reserves. The second amendment is to supplement clause 11 of the Act, by adding after the word " kind " the following :—

—"or who neglects or refuses, without reasonable cause, to attend meetings of the council when notified thereof in the manner required by this Act, or who refrains from taking part in the proceedings by at least voting when present at such a meeting, or who either himself obstructs or induces any other person to obstruct the business of any such meeting, shall, on proof of the fact to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General, be disqualified from acting as a member of the council, and shall, on being notified, cease forthwith so to act; and the vacancy occasioned thereby shall be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided."

The third amendment is to provide a day of nomination for candidates for election as councillors.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason for that last provision ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been asked for by the Indians themselves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the election to be by ballot ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No ; I think not.

Mr. LISTER. The Indians will hardly be satisfied with the provision giving them a nomination day, unless you go further and give them the vote by ballot. I believe the provision the hon. gentleman is introducing, arises from complaints made in my own county with reference to the last

election for councillors in that county. They had no regular nomination, their vote was an open vote, and there were many and great complaints as to the way in which the election was carried on. Influences were brought to bear, and the Indians threatened that, unless they voted in a certain way certain advantages would not be given to them. Many of the most intelligent Indians on that reserve have complained to me that they ought to have, in the election of councillors, the same safeguards and the same rights that they have in the election of members to the House of Commons. If they are qualified to vote for members of the House of Commons by ballot, they say they are equally qualified to vote for members of their own council by ballot. Whether these influences exist or not, I would say to the Minister that there is a feeling among the bands of Indians of whom I know something, that such influences are exercised. If an election has been improperly conducted there is no way by which the wrong can be rectified, there is no court that they can appeal to. The last elections for councillors in the Chippawa Band upon the Sarnia and the Kettle Point Reserves, I have no hesitation in saying, were improperly conducted, and some men were elected councillors who ought not to be there, and have taken the place of people who were really the choice of the electors of that municipality. As the Minister has gone so far as to fix the nomination day, I would urge upon him to provide that their election shall be by ballot, and in doing that I believe he will conform to the wish of a great majority of the Indians upon whom the franchise has been conferred, and many, if not all of whom, are just as well qualified to vote as the rest of the electors throughout the country. It seems to me anomalous that we should say to them that they may vote by ballot in Dominion elections, they have sufficient intelligence and education to vote for members of the House of Commons by ballot, but in the smaller matter, though a great matter to them, the election of their own councillors, they shall have neither a proper nomination of candidates, nor shall they be permitted to cast their ballot as they wish, and as the spirit of this age approves.

Mr. LAURIER. The first provision of this Bill seems to me an unobjectionable one. It is to meet the requirements of keeping up good winter roads, and to keep them in the same manner as they are kept in the adjoining neighborhood. So far, the power which is sought to be given to the council, to regulate the manner of keeping winter roads, and to place them in the same position as those in the adjoining neighborhood, is quite appropriate, and so far I endorse the view of the hon. Minister. But the second section is altogether objectionable. It is sought by this provision to give the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs the power to remove a councillor for certain offences, among others, for the alleged offence of drunkenness. I am not disposed to endorse the view of the hon. Minister on this point. If you give the Indians the right of managing their own municipal affairs, that right given to white men, they should be treated as white men are treated. If the people in any municipality select a man as councillor, it is not fair, that he should be made the subject of removal if he does not come up to the standard of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Hon. members are aware that the charge of drunkenness on the reserve is one that is very flimsily thrown at one another. The hon. Minister is aware that charges have been made within his own knowledge against men who were innocent of it. Moreover, a man has been charged on the floor of a deliberative body with being a drunkard, when he was not open to that reproach. I suppose the Indian Council is elective. The charge is made by some one that a councillor is a drunkard. That councillor may be obnoxious to the minority, who may have been unable to defeat him at the polls, and they then go to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs with this complaint of drunkenness. How is the hon. gentleman to decide? There may be a certificate signed by five or ten men that he is a drunkard; on the other hand, there may be a certificate more numerously signed, that he is not a drunkard. How is the trial to be made? It would be unfair that he should be deposed, except after a fair trial How is the trial to be arranged? Are you to compel the parties to come to Ottawa and to have a regular trial before the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, or are you going to send some officer to the reserve to try the alleged offender. Either one or the other course is not and cannot be followed with satisfactory results. Another provision in the Bill is that whoever refuses to attend meetings of the council when notified, or refrains from taking part in the proceedings by at least voting, may be removed by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. This proposal is not worded as I would wish it to be; but the idea which is here embodied is not one with which I would be disposed to find fault. If he refused to act as a councillor after a certain time I would not object to his office becoming *ipso facto* forfeited, but the power should not be given to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. The powers give the Superintendent General more control over the Indians than he should possess. For these reasons I consider the second clause is altogether objectionable, even although it contains a grain of good, and the suggestion made by an hon. friend behind me is one worthy of acceptance.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a curious commentary on the progress of the Indian and on his fitness to control the destinies of the country by voting for members of Parliament. The statute to which this is an amendment is not the statute applicable to the mass of the Indians; it is the Indian Advancement Act, it is the statute applicable only to the select Indians, to those who have advanced more in intelligence, and otherwise, than the mass, and it grants to these such special liberties, immunities and privileges, as it is considered fit to grant. By section 3, it is provided:

"Whenever any band of Indians is declared by the Governor in Council to be considered fit to have this Act applied to them, this Act shall so apply, from the time appointed in such Order in Council."

As I said, the general Indian Act is the Act for the mass, this is the Act for the elect or the select. Being the Act for the elect and the select, entitled to greater privileges, to a more advanced citizenship, to larger rights than the mass of the Indians,

it is yet hedged around in the original Act itself with precautions, with provisions for a continued tutelage on the part of the Minister, who is the great father for the time, being the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, which are very extraordinary. Section 11, which the hon. gentleman proposes to repeal, does of itself contain several of the provisions which are contained also in the substituted clause. For instance, it is provided that every member of a council elected under the provisions of this Act, who is proved to be an habitual drunkard, shall be disqualified. The council are elected annually, and, therefore, it is in the course of the year that proof is to be made and a result is to be arrived at. As to proof of his having become an habitual drunkard after he was elected, of course that is not intended, and it is hardly possible. Nor is it so limited. If the Indians choose to elect a person who may, to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, the great chief, the arbiter, the autocrat, the Czar, be held to be an habitual drunkard, —if such an Indian be chosen by the Indians, by the select Indians and the best and most advanced Indians, is he to be disqualified? In spite of the fact that he may be an habitual drunkard in such a sense as to render him liable to disqualification, they may elect him; but in this more dignified assembly there has been, not of course in these better days, but in other times still near, something very closely approaching habitual intoxication. What is habitual intoxication? I have never, however, heard the proposal that the hon. the Premier of the Government, or the Governor General, or Mr. Speaker, or any other analogous officer should be called upon to make a trial of the fact whether a condition of habitual drunkenness subsists on the part of any one so elected, or that he should determine whether the person in question should cease to be a member of this body. The next clause provides that a councillor shall be disqualified if he has been living in immorality. What does that mean, and to whom will you apply it? Will you apply a higher standard of morality to the poor Indian, whom you are declaring to be under tutelage, to be inferior, not to be entitled to all the immunities of the white man, than you choose to apply to members of Parliament? Will you say that he shall be bound by stricter laws, he shall be encompassed in the discharge of his duties by stricter provisions than we dare to apply to ourselves? Will you tell him that, although you do not hold him to be wholly fit to govern himself, you lay down for him a stricter rule than you lay down for ourselves? We are honest enough not to attempt to set up any such doctrine as this for ourselves. Why should we set it up for them? The Act further says :—

"Or to have been guilty of dishonesty."

A large phrase; not larceny; not any specific offence against the criminal law. What is the meaning of "dishonesty?" How far would the Superintendent General stretch the meaning, or within how narrow limits would he confine it? Who shall lay down the rule? Is it to be determined as in old days it is said that equitable considerations were determined—by the size of the Chancellor's foot? What is to be the size of the foot in this case? The moral temperament, and standard of the Superintendent General for the time being on the law as to whether a crime—no, not a crime, but an act of dishonesty—has been committed by the Indian, of such a sort, that though elected by the people his place has to be vacated. Again the Act says :

"Or of malfeasance of office of any kind."

That, of course, is more definite language. That indicates a crime or misdemeanor perhaps known to the law; at any rate, punishable, and except in so far as the tribunal which is to dispose of the question is concerned, in respect to which I have grave objection, it is not unreasonable, that such proof being made, vacation of the office should succeed. But, inasmuch as malfeasance of office partakes of a criminal character, it is unfortunate—and this observation applies, perhaps, to another item too—that we should provide for its trial without the formalities of a public court, without the security of a jury, without the advantages of a judicial tribunal, without the publicity which attends criminal trials. It is unfortunate that we should provide for the trial of a criminal offence of this kind by the Superintendent General, forsooth. Well, then, these are all the causes of disqualification which existed in the Indian Advancement Act; but, Sir, the hon. gentleman has found that he has not got control enough of his Indians, even so. He has found that the elect of the select Indians require still further limitations, or that he requires still further powers, and so he proposes to introduce this new provision; which says :

"Or who neglects or refuses, without reasonable cause to attend meetings of the Council, when notified thereof in manner required by the Act."

Who is to determine the reasonable cause?—the Superintendent General. There is no definition here of what reasonable cause should be, and no indication of any line of proof to establish what shall be reasonable cause. But still further, Sir, this new provision says :

"Or who refrains from taking part in the proceedings by at least voting when present at such meetings."

So that compulsory voting is to be established as the rule of the councillor. He may not understand the question, though we all know that is not disqualification, for I suppose it has happened to all of us to vote sometimes without understanding the question. He may not be satisfied to say "yea" or "nay" to a question. He may think it is a question the affirmative of which he does not like to sanction, nor yet the negative. He may be disposed to seek the convenient shelter of the lobby or the corridor, as a great many of us do occasionally; but he must not do that. He must vote. And under what penalty?—under the penalty of the Superintendent General turning him out of his office. This, Sir, is the law proposed to us in this heyday of the advancement of the Indian, after for a period of nearly two general elections he has been thought fit to elect members of the Parliament of Canada. That is the law proposed for the chosen of the most advanced; for the best men elected by the best Indians. These are the restraints which the Government think fit to impose upon the best of the best of those who are made electors of Canada.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) I cannot allow this Bill to pass without a protest. I do not know what motive the hon. Minister of the Interior has for moving this amendment to the Act other than the troubles which have existed, and which

still exist, on the Caughnawaga reserve, and which he sought to remedy, but the remedy was worse than the evil. You talk of preventing from sitting a member of the council because he indulges in drinks! But were you to prevent from taking a part in the proceedings of council all those who indulge in drinks, there are in the council of the nation persons who should be deprived of their rights, and is it to be said that more importance attaches to the matter when applied to the council of the Indians than when applied to the council of the nation? Mr. Speaker, since the Advancement Act was applied to the council of Caughnawaga, liquor was used as a pretext for many endeavors to do away with opponents who barred the way, and I think I am able to substantiate this statement. After the election of 1887, they began by removing the measurer of stones, who had been appointed by the Government now in power, and he was removed, because, so they said, he had taken a part in the contest, but, they added, that he got drunk. Well, I think, that on the election day, not only in that county, but in many other counties as well, there were people who saw the bottom of the bottle. That man was removed for getting drunk out of duty. Later on, the council of Caughnawaga wanted to appoint a substitute to the present policeman, and the substitute they proposed was a man named Louis Beauvais, who had been organist in the Catholic Church. Well, in order to decline his services, they again protested that he was a drunkard. Captain Jackson, whom the hon. Minister assailed last week, had already been assailed before. In 1882, he came to the Minister of Marine for securing a certificate as master of a steamer, intending to sail in all the Dominion waters, and before the Minister he was charged of being a drunkard. How did he clear himself of that charge? He had to write to the United States, to a man in whose employ he had been for seven or eight years, and the references he received from him was so favorable that the hon. the Minister of Marine granted him the certificate, which I am about to read and which is most contrary to what the hon. Minister of the Interior has recently stated:

"CANADA.

"BY THE HONORABLE THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES FOR THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

"*Certificate of competency as Master of a steamship in the Inland waters.*

"TO LOUIS FREDERICK JACKSON.

"Whereas it has been reported to me that you have produced satisfactory evidence of your sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship, and that you have fulfilled the duties of Master of a steamship in the Inland waters prior to the first day of January, 1882.

"I do hereby, in pursuance of the Canadian Act respecting certificates to Masters and Mates of Inland and coasting ships, 46 Vic., cap. 28, grant you this certificate of competency.

"Given under the seal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada, at Ottawa, this twenty-second day of March, 1888.

(Signed) "GEO. E. FOSTER,
"*Minister of Marine and Fisheries.*"

Here is a man who was charged, before the Minister of Marine, of being a drunkard and who had to produce evidence of the contrary. He is vindicated as to that charge by the certificate granted him by the hon. the Minister of Marine. Perhaps, will it be said, that he was acknowledged as a sober man in 1888, but that since he might have become a drunkard. For my part, I conclude that as he was unjustly charged in 1888, so he is now, and he might produce once more evidence of his sobriety. And what shows that all these charges are groundless is the fact, not only that he was elected, by a good majority, a member of the council, but even chief of the council, in spite of all the protests of his opponents; I should say, perhaps, in spite of what might have been sent from the Department to have him deposed. More than that, Mr. Speaker. Does any one wish to know how far they went? What a good mother liquor is! Here is a letter by which they sought to implicate me in a liquor case, at the time of the election, in 1887. They said: If we could have that man charged, we might easily deal with him. I will read that letter:

"MONTREAL, February 24, 1885.

"THOS. JOCKS, Esq.,

"MY DEAR SIR,—It is my intention to protest the return of Mr. Doyon if I find substantial grounds. These grounds could be found out, I think, in Caughnawaga. If I could implicate Doyon as having distributed whiskey in the locality, he would be easily disqualified. Please do your utmost, with the assistance of Moïse Lefort and other friends, to discover the illegitimate means by which our majority was reduced. Most important. I feel quite convinced that another contest would redeem Laprairie.

"You will be glad to know that Sir John Macdonald has just addressed me the following letter which I copy:

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the letter.

(Private.)

"EARNSCLIFFE,
"OTTAWA, February 24, 1887.

"MY DEAR TASSÉ,—I can't tell you how greatly I regret your defeat. I had confidently looked forward to your carrying Laprairie.

"However, you must not be discouraged. Be on the look out for a seat and I will back you to the utmost extent.

"Our majority will be between 35 and 40 when all returns are in, which ought to be a working majority.

"Are there no grounds for a protest?

"Yours sincerely,
(Signed) "JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"JOSEPH TASSÉ, Esq.

"These are the sentiments of our great chief. Please be guided by them.

"With my renewed thanks for your kind and active assistance in my election, and my best wishes for you and Mrs. Jocks, believe me,

"Faithfully yours,
(Signed) "JOSEPH TASSÉ."

So that Sir John A. Macdonald wrote, on 24th February, 1887: "Are there no grounds to protest Doyon?" And Mr. Tassé wrote, on 25th February: "Let us try to implicate Mr. Doyon as having distributed liquor; this is the only means to get rid of him, otherwise he will always be in our way * * " Well, Mr. Speaker, here is a new evidence of the liquor being used as a means of destroying not only a man's character, but also of removing him from his position and substituting for him a friend of the Government. I stated a moment ago that the hon. Minister of the Interior was led by the troubles which happened at Caughnawaga with reference to the council to amend clause 10 of the Indian Advancement Act. Why should the Indian Department seek to introduce a new restriction in the Act, when the majority of the Caughnawaga Indians are asking for more extended powers, that is to say, are asking that they might be allowed to manage their own affairs; or, in other words, that what is done by their council should not require,

to be valid, the sanction of the Department? The whole trouble lies in this: that the council wants to remove the present policeman, Mr. Lefort, to whom a sum of $383 is paid yearly, while they could have one for $165. It appears to me this resolution of the council is very fair; and the best municipal council in the Province could not do any better. The fact is the municipal council of the Indians are trying to have, at a lower cost, a municipal officer, whose duties should be as well performed as by the officer they have now. The Indians ought to be more civilised now than they were ten years ago. And ten years ago they only paid $250 for that officer. Besides, I might say that the present officer, Mr. Lefort, has, to assist him in his duties, two additional policemen who were appointed last year by the council. These two policemen receive no salary other than the fines paid by those whom they arrest and who are fined. The Government sanctioned the resolution of the council appointing these two policemen. They have not enquired, and I think there was no report against these two men, stating whether they were sober men or habitual drunkards, inasmuch as they have no salary other than what I have just stated with respect to fines. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I have just stated seems to have no connection with the question now before the House, but I hold that this is the only cause of the present troubles. I do not directly charge the Government with mismanaging the affairs of the Indians. I rather think the mismanagement is the outcome of the system, which is bad. The fact is the Government are bound to trust the reports of their agent. Now, the agent at Caughnawaga is like all human beings; and whenever an opportunity offers for him to promote his interests or serve his dislikes, or oblige his political friends, he fully avails himself of it. What was the reason given for the maintenance of Mr. Lefort as policeman? It was said that so long as he should perform his duties as he had in the past, he should be kept in his position. But are not the Government aware that that very man was summoned before the police court in Montreal, for having himself given liquor to Indians? I hold here a copy of the judgment. That judgment was reversed, but the fact still remains that there were found witnesses in Caughnawaga who incriminated him and had him pronounced guilty and sentenced by the court. Those are the facts. The council were indignant at the refusal of the Government and a portion of the councillors declined to sit, saying: We have been long enough playing the part of boys; we need no council if we are bound to wait till our resolutions, to be worth anything, are sanctioned by the Government. As well might the people on the Caughnawaga reserve write to the Department through the agent when they have resolutions to pass or improvements whatever on the reserve are asked for. It would come to the same thing, and they would not be charged with things they are not guilty of, and slandered not only in Montreal, but in this House as well. What next did they say? They said that the property holders censured the course taken by the present councillors, and the council was supported only by the scum of the people on the reserve. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are 351 voters on the Caughnawaga reserve, and of these 302 are property holders. I hold here a petition signed by 110 voters approving of the

action of the council in asking for the removal of Moïse Lefort. This petition was drawn up in October; it was not sent at that time because, I think, the hon. Minister intimated, or, at all events, the agent on the reserve had intimated, that the hon. Minister was to personally visit the reserve, if not to investigate, at all events, to ascertain whether the facts reported to him were true or false. I have even here a telegram sent by the hon. Minister, in which, answering to the invitation extended to him to visit the reserve—I think it was in the latter part of December—he states that the Session was too near at hand and he could not possibly go. That is why the petition was not forwarded. Here it is:

"CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE,
"PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

"To the Hon. EDGAR DEWDNEY,
"Minister of the Interior and Superintendent
"General of Indian Affairs.

"HONORABLE SIR,—The petition of the undersigned Indians, residing on the Caughnawaga Reserve, humbly represents:

"That on the twenty-seventh of September last, at a meeting of the Council of the Reserve, Councillor L. F. Jackson moved, and Michel Bourdeau seconded, a resolution recommending the dismissal of the constable, Moïse Lefort, and this resolution was also supported by Councillor Michel Daillebout, these three forming one-half of the Council, and recommending also that Louis Beauvais be named constable;

"That the other three Councillors supported the candidature of Joseph Stacey;

"That said Louis Beauvais is a respectable Indian and an ex-chief of the tribe:

"That no action has been taken on the recommendation by the agent, Alexander Brosseau, who states that he does not think it necessary to replace the present incumbent of the office of constable;

"That the said Councillors, to wit: L. F. Jackson, Michel Bourdeau and Michel Daillebout, are determined that the said Moïse Lefort be dismissed, and are supported by a majority of the Indians, and intend not to transact any other business as Councillors until the said Lefort is dismissed;

"That your petitioners strongly support and endorse the action and petition of the said three Councillors, and pray that the said Moïse Lefort be removed from his said office of constable.

"Signed at Caughnawaga on this 20th of October, 1889."

This petition is signed by 110 persons. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it can be seen that the action of the council was endorsed by a great many members of the tribe; and, nevertheless, the Department would not approve of this resolution. The question now before the House is not whether the council should be free to manage their own affairs, since it is a new restrictive amendment the hon. Minister seeks to introduce into the Act. I have only mentioned the above facts as accessories. Should the hon. Minister alter the law so as to allow the Indians to make charges against the councillors by denouncing them as being habitual drunkards and in this way having them disqualified, he might as well repeal the Advancement Act; for, if not reasons, at all events means of charging them, are sure to be found at any time. And this, not only as far as the present councillors are concerned, but even against those who are the friends of the hon. Minister of the Interior. That Act is bad enough as it is, we need not make it worse. It is a source of quarrels and bad feeling. One can hardly imagine the state of excitement that prevails there. Presently, charges of every kind are made against my supporters, whom it is my duty to defend here. But I do not intend to defend only those who supported me; I think it my duty to defend the others too, for I think the amendment proposed will be

injurious to all the Indians. Thus they charged one councillor—in order to prevent his being returned—with having pledged himself to the erection of a Protestant school and a Protestant chapel on the reserve. The census of 1881 shows there is not a single Protestant on the Caughnawaga reserve. By examining the report of the Department of Indian Affairs for 1889, at page 252, I find that a sum of $250 was paid to John A. Dionne, as Methodist teacher. It is surely not Mr. Jackson—against whom this charge was made—who engaged him or proposed to introduce him on the reserve, for he has been councillor only a year, the teacher already received his salary, and it is a well-known fact that the schools are under the control of the council. Moreover, the whole reserve belongs to the Catholic faith. In injuring the Indians who are now members of the council and in ruining them in the esteem of their fellow-residents, there will be no difficulty in finding accomplices, and with the amendment proposed they will all be changed. I have here another petition I received last month, asking that clause 10 of the Indian Advancement Act be amended and approving of the action taken by the Caughnawaga council. The petition reads as follows:—

"CAUGHNAWAGA, March, 1890.

"To Cyrille Doyon, Esq., member of the House of Commons of Canada for the County of Laprairie.

"The humble petition of the undersigned citizens and voters of Caughnawaga, respectfully represents:

"1. That they are informed that you have brought up in the House a Bill affecting very seriously their interests.

"2. That this Bill was held over until to-day without good reasons.

"3. That your petitioners pray that you press the adoption of this measure, which is calculated to act as a safeguard with respect to their dearest interests.

And your petitioners will ever pray."

This petition is signed by 116 Indians. Thus, while the hon. Minister of the Interior stated to me some time ago, that the Indians did not ask for more liberty than they had now, I think I am in a position to show that such is their wish since the Advancement Act was applied to them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that, in the interests of harmony and good-will and advancement of the Indians, it would be better the amendment proposed should not become law. Should it be passed, how shall the evidence be received? Will it be received before the agent, or before both the present policeman and the agent, who shall at the same time be accusers and judges? I am inclined to think my humble opinion will not weigh much in the balance, but I say that, in the interests of the inhabitants of the Caughnawaga Reserve and even in the interests of the Department, this amendment to the Act should not be proposed. Therefore, I shall vote against this Bill.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was unable to follow the hon. gentleman through his remarks and he will, therefore, have to excuse me for not answering them in detail. As to the changes proposed, there is a difference of opinion among the Indians on the reserve. I hold in my hand a petition signed by a great number of Indians asking that the powers of the Superintendent General be not taken away. I will read a portion of the petition which refers to that:

"The humble petition of Sawatis, Karoniaktatie, Saksarie, Anetenre and others of the reserve of Caughnawaga, respectfully showeth:—That the Bill which Mr. Doyon, M.P., during this Session of the Federal Parliament, has introduced in amendment to the Indian Advancement Act, whereby the council of the reserve of Caughnawaga will have complete authority without the interference of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and which he has moved for its second reading, is inimical and contrary to the welfare of the Indians of the said reserve of Caughnawaga, for the following amongst other reasons, to wit:—That the Council of the said reserve of Caughnawaga will be invested with too much power, and will be responsible to no superior authority; that the said Council of the Caughnawaga reserve will be invested with absolute powers, such as have never been granted in the Province of Quebec to any Municipal Council, which possesses limited powers, and in cases where appeal lies is answerable to the County Council. The latter is answerable to the Circuit Court when it does not remedy the injustice alleged to have been committed by any Municipal Council against individual rights. That moreover, the said Bill grants no relief whatever to any Indian when his interest may be attacked by the said Council of the reserve of Caughnawaga."

Mr. BLAKE. How many signatures?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Between fifty and sixty. I understand they represent the bulk, if not almost all the property holders on the reserve.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member behind me says there are over 300 property holders on the reserve.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are the principal ones. I dare say the hon. gentleman knows that there a number of Indians on the reserve who have no property and are worth nothing, and at present are really running the business on the reserve. There is a strong feeling on the part of those who have lived there for years and have nice homes, large farms and valuable improvements, against others who are trying to deprive them of their rights. Returning to these amendments to which I ask the support of the House, I rather expected to have the support of the hon. member for West Durham than otherwise, because, if I recollect aright, the hon. gentleman thought, when the original Act was passed, that it was an admirable clause.

Mr. BLAKE. I propose we should extend it to this House.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman thought it was an admirable clause. I will read what he said.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman had been here and heard how I said it, he would have understood.

Mr. DEWDNEY. When this question was up in 1884, the hon. gentleman said:

"Why should not this be extended to the whites. It is an admirable clause; any member of a council elected under the provisions of this Act, who shall be proved to be a habitual drunkard, or to be living in immorality, or to accept a bribe, or to have been guilty of dishonesty, or of malfeasance of office, shall be disqualified from acting as a member of the council."

To which the leader of the Government replied, it would be a very good clause for the whites.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEWDNEY. And the hon. gentleman said: "Why should we be more moral with our Indian friends than with ourselves;" and the leader of the Government retorted: "It might diminish the members of the Opposition."

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite content the hon. gentleman should read my speech again.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have merely looked through the report for the first time, as I expected to have seen the hon. gentleman taking an active part against the clause when it was introduced in 1884.

With regard to the other section, which the hon. gentleman criticises, I should have thought he would have also supported that, if, as he indicates, it would necessarily bring about compulsory voting, because I understand the hon. gentleman at one time introduced a Bill advocating compulsory voting. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton, I am not at all sure that I agree with him with regard to the ballot. That was never suggested before, or I would have given it consideration. During recess I will consider it and get an expression of opinion from the Indians as to whether they desire it or not. There are people who object to the ballot. An hon. gentleman who stands very high in the politics of Ontario, and who supports the party of my hon. friend, objects to the ballot in the case of separate schools.

Mr. LISTER. These people do not want it; the Indians do.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The question is, whether the Indians do want it, and I shall give it consideration. I need not detain the House longer on this question, except to state that there have been on the Caughnawaga reserve, some very obstructive tactics practised, which has delayed business on the reserve. I do not wish to discuss the character or habits of any of those members of the council on that reserve. It would not be fair to do so, but as the hon. gentleman knows, there are gentlemen who have very strong feelings on the subject, and who think that some of the members occupying positions on the reserve do not worthily fill them; and they think if this clause is added to the Bill, these people will not continue to carry on the same tactics in the council.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Indians I have the honor to represent in this House, have not asked to come under the Indian Advancement Act. They prefer to retain their own system of government. They are governed under the provision of the Indian Act. I do not know how many bands of Indians have asked to have this Act applied to them, but I do not think many have. This Act was introduced in 1884, as a means of inducing the Indians to advance in the direction of self-government, and the administration of their own affairs. And after the Government have told this House that, not only the more advanced bands, but that all the Indian bands in the old Provinces had advanced to such a degree of intelligence that they were not only fitted to have, but it was requisite for the welfare of the State that they should have, a voice in the affairs of the Dominion, in common with the other inhabitants of the various Provinces, it is rather strange, that now, some years later, we should find an Act introduced—not to extend the provisions of the Indian Advancement Act, not to give greater self-governing powers to the Indians, not to limit the power of the Superintendent General over the affairs of the Indian councillors elected by themselves, but we have to-day an Act retrograde in its action, an Act intended to take away powers from the Indians which they already possess, and to place greater powers in the hands of the Superintendent General in regard to these bands. It is a commentary upon our legislation which, I think, it is not pleasant to contemplate. I am unable to agree with the Superintendent General that it is desirable to enact the legislation contained in section 11 of this Bill. As to the provision for the day of nomination, I have no objection. As to the amendment in regard to determining the size and style of sleighs, in which larger power is given to the Indian, I do not take any objection. But when, in addition to the other restrictions placed upon the Indians, when, in addition to the powers vested in the Governor in Council to summarily dismiss a councillor elected by the band, they ask us to add a provision that any councillor who—

—"neglects or refuses, without reasonable cause, to attend meetings of the council when notified thereof in the manner required by this Act, or who refrains from taking part in the proceedings by at least voting when present at such a meeting, or who either himself obstructs or induces any other person to obstruct the business of any such meeting, shall, on proof of the fact to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General, be disqualified from acting as a member of the council, and shall, on being notified, cease forthwith so to act; and the vacancy occasioned thereby shall be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided."

I say that, when they ask us to sanction legislation of that kind, the House should not affirm it. What does it leave of self-governing powers in the members of the council, powers that are on the Statute-book and powers in regard to various matters which they may properly attend to? The passing of this Act is, as I understand from the remarks of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon)—though I could not completely understand all he said—supposed to be justified simply in order to meet a case which occurred in the Caughnawaga reserve. I understand that the councillors who were there elected by the Indian band thought, in their wisdom, that it would be advisable that a certain person should be removed from office, and another appointed, thereby affecting a saving in their money and accomplishing what they considered would be in the interests of the band, financially and otherwise. When that resolution, passed by a majority of the council, and clearly within their power as laid down in the Statute, came before the Superintendent General, he said: No; I do not approve of your action and will not sanction it, and it shall not become law. Then, if I understood my hon. friend aright—and, of course, I speak under correction—the councillors said that, if in a matter as simple as that, which was clearly within their right and affected their finances, any regulations they passed were to be disallowed and summarily vetoed by the Superintendent General, there was no use in their meeting in council at all; and, standing upon their proper dignity, as I would consider in that case, some of them did not take part in the proceedings of the council. If that is the reason which has induced the Superintendent General to introduce the Bill, I think it should not become law. What power does the Superintendent General retain without this additional power being given to him? It is declared in the opening section of this Indian Advancement Act that, when it 'appears to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General that a band of Indians are fit to be brought under the operation of the Act, the Governor in Council can call the Act into operation by giving certain notice; but it provides also that if it should appear to the Superintendent General at any time subsequent, that this band are not, in his opinion—in his opinion—capable of working out this Act satisfactorily, he shall have the power to issue an Order in Council declaring that fact, and saying that they

are no longer under the Indian Advancement Act at all, and sending them back to the operations of the Indian Act as before. That power the Superintendent General has retained for himself in this Act. If the Indian Council in Caughnawaga or any other Indian Council are not working the Act according to his satisfaction, he can so declare, and then the council ceases to exist as a council of Indians, and that reserve thereafter comes under the provisions of the Indian Act, and has not the benefit of the Indian Advancement Act at all. One would think that was power enough. What calls upon us to add this clause to this Act? Another clause provides that the election of councillors shall take place every year, and that four members shall constitute a quorum. The Act does not define how many councillors shall be elected on a reserve. How many councillors are there on the Caughnawaga reserve?

Mr. DOYON. Six.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then it would not be in the power of any one councillor to impede the despatch of business. It would require at least two to be of the same mind in order to do that, and, if the chief councillor had voted and the vote should be even, he has a casting vote in addition under the Act. But why should not the working of these councils be left to the operation of the laws in regard to other municipal councils in the cities and towns and other municipalities of the Provinces? It is not unknown to those who have been engaged in municipal matters that there are many times when occasions have occurred where, in the interest of their constituents, members of those councils have deliberately withdrawn in order to prevent a quorum so that a measure should not be put through which they considered contrary to the interest of their constituents. Would you place the arbitrary power in the hands of any individual, under those circumstances, to say that the councillors who withdrew should be disqualified? The remedy is provided by the fact that, at the end of the twelve months, these councillors have to go before their constituents, and if they have refused to attend meetings, if they have refused to cast their votes when present, if they have refused to form a quorum, these things will all be urged against their re-election, and if that action on their part is not approved by a majority of the electors, these men would not be sent back, but would be replaced by other men. In this matter, I ask why it should not be left in the hands of the electors on the reserves, if you are going to give them any powers at all. They will have the remedy in their own hands, and if any Indian councillor who, by refusing to attend or by abstaining from acting for a time, obstructs the business and injures the interest of the band, you may rely upon it, that when he appears before the electors, which time cannot be deferred longer than 12 months at the furthest, he will be dealt with, the remedy will be applied by them as it is applied by white citizens in any municipality in the various provinces. I say it is something that I think the Superintendent General should not ask the House to agree to, that further limitations should be placed upon the Indians whom we are endeavoring to bring forward, as was alleged in the introduction of this Act, and to take from them the powers which were given to them, and to centre more power in the hands of the Superintendent General, now, five or six years after the Act was passed, some years after they have been given the right to vote on great national and state questions, to ask that in the mere matter of the appointment of the dismissal of a pound-keeper or a constable, or the hiring of one man at a less salary than another, or the dismissal from his office of an incompetent man and putting another in his place, or, if he does not suit His Highness the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, the latter shall say: I will not consent to it. I can readily understand that a council treated in that manner, feeling their dignity insulted, should resent it, and that they should say, as has been said by the councillors of Caughnawaga: If our request upon matters affecting our own interests, affecting our own moneys only, is to be treated in this way, it is nothing less than a farce for us to meet together to transact business at all; for if we are only to transact it as approved by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, we might as well abandon the control of our own affairs altogether. This is the way that the matter strikes me, and I think it behoves the Superintendent General to give stronger reasons than he has yet given before he can ask the House to amend the Indian Advancement Act in the direction, not of giving greater powers to the Indians, but of taking from them even some of the littler powers they have under the Indian Advancement Act, and centreing more directly those powers in the hands of the Superintendent General.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman says that one of the reasons why this Bill was introduced was because the Government had refused to sanction the appointment of a certain man to a position. He was correct in stating that the party who had been nominated by them was prepared to do the work at a less figure than the gentleman who had been doing it already for some years, and it was represented very strongly by the agents, by whom we must be guided, that these parties, for there were two of them, were utterly unreliable. He gave the reasons why they were unreliable, and it was for that reason the Government refused to assent to that resolution. On the strength of that action, a portion of the councillors obstructed the business of the council until the end of their term, which has lately lapsed. They have had another election, and all the six old councillors were returned again.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the band sustained them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And you want to override that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; but we want to prevent the deadlock occurring again. I am aware that the Superintendent General is given very large power, and can withdraw this Act from any band to which it has been applied, but the Superintendent General and the Government do not wish to do that. They would rather be in a position to act as this amendment gives them power to act. However, I will ask the House to go into committee on the Bill and pass these two clauses of it, and I will reserve the other section for reconsideration to see if it can be altered in some way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this clause is a very objectionable one, and it is all the more objectionable on account of the franchise having been extended to the Indian population. The Minister of the Interior must see that after having extended the franchise to the Indians, after having given them the highest rights that belong to freemen, they do not stand in a position to be treated as minors and wards of the Government. Now the hon. gentleman has, by the provisions of this Bill, assumed that the Indians, with regard to these municipal matters, are not competent to manage their own affairs. Apart from that objection, which is an objection in principle and which, it seems to me, ought to be fatal to any provision of this sort, unless the Government are prepared to withdraw the elective franchise from the Indian population; it is also open, I think, to serious objection on account of the very arbitrary power that the Superintendent General proposes to exercise over the moral character and conduct of those who have been entrusted by their fellows of the band with certain municipal powers. Now, that election is for a very short period of time, it continues but for twelve months, and at the end of that time these parties are out of office. If they have misbehaved themselves, or have shown themselves unfit for the position which they occupy, then they will not again be elected. Unless the Minister is prepared to ask that those who are entrusted with the powers of election are not qualified for the exercise of those powers that have been conferred upon them, why should the Superintendent General take power to interfere? If it is thought that interference was necessary at all, then there ought to be some judicial proceeding, not merely an administrative proceeding, in reference to those Indians. But the whole difficulty, from my point of view, is that the Government are asking to exercise very important powers over the Indian population, powers of a coercive character, interfering with the freedom of those people, and at the same time allowing those persons to exercise the elective franchise. Now, it is scarcely a decent proceeding, to use no stronger expression, for a Minister of the Crown to assume over a certain portion of the electors of this country, the powers which the hon. gentleman had under the Bill as it before stood, and which he proposes to extend by the provisions of this Act. Why should the hon. gentleman undertake to exercise those powers? He is in a position to be suspected; a Minister occupying the position of Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as long as the Franchise Act remains in force as it now stands, is in the position of one to be suspected. How can the public for a moment suppose that he will discharge his duties fairly towards those Indians and without reference to the political complexion of the band, as long as that band continues to exercise the powers given them by the elective Franchise Act? Why, Sir, the petition presented by the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon), the speech which he has made, the petitions which have come into the hands of Ministers, the letter from the defeated candidate in that constituency, all point to the fact that the difficulties and the disputes that have arisen there have grown out of political differences amongst the Indians, and between the candidates who sought the suffrages of those Indians. If that be so, why should the Superintendent General undertake to interfere? If he interfere, can it be for a moment supposed that he is not interfering in the interest of the defeated candidate, and with a view of promoting the interest of the Government? Now, I say that a Minister of the Crown ought not to be placed in that position, and he must necessarily be in that position unless he withdraws his control over the Indians, or unless he withdraws from them the elective franchise that has been conferred upon them. The two positions are altogether inconsistent, they cannot stand together. The Indians either are qualified to exercise the electoral franchise, and, therefore, should be wholly independent of Government control, or if they are not so qualified, and they must still remain subject to Government control, it is perfectly clear they are not competent to possess the electoral franchise. This is the position of affairs with respect to the Indian population. The title to Indian lands is in the Crown, and you do not give to the Indians control over their own property or an interest in their lands; but you, nevertheless, make that a basis for granting them the electoral franchise. Why did you do it? Because you assumed that the possession of property is an indication of thrift, which should qualify a person for the exercise of that power. Yet the possession of property is no indication of thrift in the case of the Indians, because they do not control their property; and yet you propose to make them still further subject to the Government, when, if your supposition is sound, they should be independent of Government control. This Bill is objectionable on every ground. It is objectionable on account of the extraordinary powers it confers on the Minister, because it is not a power regulated by law in the ordinary sense. You cannot see how the Minister is going to ascertain the facts, or what sort of judgment he is going to exercise. Is he going to take steps to disqualify a man who has acted in support of the Administration, on account of the disqualifications mentioned in this Bill? Is he going to use that power against his friends and in favor of his opponents? I do not think so. If it was here admitted that the hon. gentleman would so use the power, would it be believed generally by the public that he would so use it? It confers upon a Minister of the Crown powers which subject him necessarily to the suspicion that he may be influenced, an objectionable condition of affairs, but one that flows from the provisions of this Bill. The hon. gentleman would not undertake to justify such control by the Attorney General or some of his officers in a Province over a Municipal Council, and why then should it be exercised over the Indian Council? If you were to provide by the Bill that the seat of a councillor who absents himself from a certain number of meetings should become vacant, that would be a vacancy created by law and under the provisions of law; but it would be a wholly different condition from the provisions existing in the Bill. No one can tell how the Minister is going to exercise his power, and the Indian is not a portion of the body politic in which abuse of power will be readily detected, he is not one that touches the sensibilities of the population of the country as a unit. This Bill affects a class of people among whom few newspapers are circulated; a class that is not brought into contact with general public sentiment, and a

class among whom abuses may be committed without being readily detected. The representation of the Indian population is not likely readily to attract attention, and an abuse of authority is not readily to be criticised or condemned by those who support the Administration, whatever that Administration may be. On every ground this provision of the Bill is objectionable, and the hon. Minister certainly ought to change this section, either by striking it out altogether or by so amending it as to allow the law to state the conditions on which a vacancy should occur, and to provide that the vacancy should absolutely arise, thus substituting the determination of the law for the will of the hon. Minister for the time being.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 125) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.

Mr. CURRAN. When we were in Committee before on this Bill, I made a motion to amend the 8th clause by adding certain words which would have given somewhat additional privileges to the company. That amendment was met by an objection from one or two hon. members of the House, and I am now about to suggest a different amendment which will meet the objection raised, and which has received the approbation of the leader of the Government, to whom the amendment I am about to suggest has been submitted. It was stated on a former occasion that this company was desirous of leasing certain lines of railway which had been chartered by the Local Legislature of the Province of Quebec, particularly, and it was then stated that the difficulty which presented itself might be got over by giving a list of the railways that were desirous of amalgamating with or leasing with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. To that the company has very strong objection, because it would give a fictitious value to the lines in question, and, perhaps, make it next to impossible to carry out the arrangement. The proposition I now make is that the clause read as follows:—

"The company may enter into working arrangements with, or enter into a lease of, or acquire running powers over, or the right to work, the line of any other company in Canada under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, which has been hitherto duly empowered to make or grant the same to or with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, or which may be at any time so empowered by the Parliament of Canada."

The balance of the section stands as before. This amendment will enable the company to carry on its business on certain lines which are now actually operated by it, but on which there is a private staff keeping the accounts, and entailing a very large expense which is altogether unnecessary. The powers of this Parliament will be safeguarded, and the policy of the Dominion Parliament which was mentioned by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and concurred in by the right hon. leader of the Government, as being endangered by the adoption of the amendment proposed at our last sitting, will be protected from invasion by the Local Legislatures. We shall be merely giving the company the right to operate such lines as have been heretofore duly empowered to make or grant leases to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; and then, in order that the company may not be restricted in its rights, we add: "Or which may be at any time so empowered by the Parliament of Canada." I do not think there will be any objection to this clause, which has met with the approval of the right hon. Premier, and which I think also meets with the approval of the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot say that I think the proposal altogether meets the difficulty, but it goes very near to meeting it, and I can well understand the observation the hon. gentleman has made, as to the injurious effect that might be produced in concluding arrangements which are under negotiation by a schedule. The phraseology, however, does not appear to me to be correct. I think the word "hitherto" ought to be "heretofore"; this is a very unusual use of the word "hitherto."

Mr. CURRAN. I have no objection.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose we may be said, in some sort, to give an approval, and to have considered what the condition of things is by using the word "heretofore," inasmuch as a credulous public may be under the impression that we have enquired what railway companies have up to the present time been empowered by the Provincial Legislatures to enter into these arrangements, and that we are thus entirely cognisant of what we are authorising; while, in truth, we know nothing whatever about it.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the person who called the attention of this Committee on a former occasion to the departure from what was agreed upon in the Railway Committee, I wish to say, that I think the alteration now proposed meets the difficulty, and I withdraw any objection I had to it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

H. H. VIVAN & COMPANY.

House again resolved itself into Committee on (Bill 124) respecting H. H. Vivian & Company (Limited).—(Mr. Dawson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAWSON. When this Bill was under consideration before, some explanations were asked for, and it was postponed. I have been looking into it since, and I find that this Bill is a mere transcript of a number of Acts empowering mining companies incorporated in England, and also American companies, to carry on their business in Canada, and it in no way interferes with provincial rights. Clause 1 follows section 1 of the Act respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, 47 Vic., chapter 74. That was a company incorporated in England under the Companies' Acts in the same way as the one now under consideration. The powers asked for in that Act were to construct a railway. Clauses 2, 3 and 4 of this Bill follow sections 1, 2 and 3 of the following Acts, except the latter part of section 1 of these Acts which is rendered unnecessary by the provisions of the

Interpretation Act and the Companies' Clauses Act of Canada, section 2; the Canada Consolidated Gold Mining Company, 44 Victoria, chapter 60; the Canadian Copper Company, 49 Victoria, chapter 99; and the Anglo-American Iron Company, 49 Victoria, chapter 97. The Canadian Consolidated Gold Mining Company was a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. The Canadian Copper Company and the Anglo-American Iron Company were companiesi ncorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, and all these were recognised as corporations by these special Acts. The powers asked for in the present Bill are exactly the same as those granted by Parliament to the three companies above mentioned. In none of these cases were the articles of association or incorporation embodied in or published with the Acts. In the case of the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, section 13 of the Act provided that a certified copy of the memorandum of association in England should be filed in the office of the Secretary of State in Canada, and a clause to that effect can be added in the House to the present Bill to meet the objection made as to the articles of association not being printed. The certified copy of the articles of association was before the Private Bills Committee when the Bill was being considered by them. The latter part of clause 1 of the Bill will prevent the company exercising any power under these articles for which special power from Parliament would otherwise be necessary. The articles of association are long and minute, consisting principally of the details for the internal government of the company. If these were printed along with the Bill they would occupy about 60 or 70 pages statute size, and the printing and translation would cost about $200. Clause 5 of the Bill is rendered necessary because the Companies Acts, England, already govern this company in matters respecting those provided for by the Companies' Clauses Act, Canada. As to the objection raised, that Parliament has no jurisdiction to recognise or authorise this company as a mining company, because its objects are only provincial in their character, reference should be made to the British North America Act, ss. 91, 92, and to Citizens *vs.* Parsons, 7 Appeal Cases, 96, Colonial Building and Investment Association *vs.* Attorney-General Quebec, 9 Appeal Cases 167, showing the view taken by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on this point. Also to the following Acts of the Parliament of Canada incorporating Companies for exactly similar purposes as those intended to be served by the present Bill: 1st. The Acts respecting the three companies I have mentioned; 2nd. The Acts respecting the Dominion Phosphate and Mining Company, 46 Vic., c. 91; the Dominion Mineral Company, 52 Vic., c. 102, and the Canadian Superphosphate Company 52 Vic., c. 101. In some of these Acts powers are given to mine in only one Province, and in others of them power is given to mine in any Province or territory of Canada. In order to enable the company to mine in each of the several Provinces, it surely cannot be necessary to go to each Province and obtain a Provincial Act of incorporation.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Mr. DAWSON.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 138) respecting Grants of Public Lands (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 140) to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled "An Act respecting Interest" (from the Senate).—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Emily Walker (from the Senate)—on a division.—(Mr. Brown.)

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a paragraph in to-day's *Empire*, being a despatch from Niagara Falls, as follows:—

"Three Chinamen, two of whom had attempted to cross the frontier with Mun Lee, of Toronto, a couple of weeks ago, the other a stranger, presented themselves for admission to Canada this morning, having been hustled over to this side by United States Customs officers. The two belonging to Mun Lee's party were allowed admission, having Canadian Customs certificates in their possession. The stranger, not having the necessary document and only ten dollars to pay the Canadian tax of fifty dollars, was denied the privilege given to his almond-eyed companions, and was sent back to the American side of the bridge. He was there stopped, and the gates of the bridge closed on him. The only place for the poor heathen is to remain on the bridge, where he has been since and is likely to remain for some time. Collector of Customs Flynn communicated with the Commissioner of Customs at Ottawa for instructions. The Commissioner replied to have him sent back whence he came. Further communication has been sent, and, no doubt, the matter will be brought up with the Washington authorities. Meanwhile the Celestial remains on the middle of the bridge."

If that statement be true, I think the facts are a disgrace to the civilisation of two Christian countries. If the Customs authorities at Ottawa were communicated with, and did not interfere and exercise the discretion within the power of that Department or of the Treasury Board, it is a crying shame; and I am sure I have only to call the attention of the Government to this matter to have it enquired into. To compel a human being to remain on the bridge, scorned and spurned by the civilised communities on both sides, and treated as a mad dog, is setting a poor example to the heathen Chinee of the civilisation of two Christian countries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject has been brought to the notice of the Minister of Customs to-day only, and from the information he has received, the paragraph just read is substantially correct. The two Chinamen who accompanied this man were duly certificated, and had a right to come into Canada, but it appears the third had no certificate and no money to buy one. The Customs officer of Canada made an attempt to send him back into the United States, but that was refused, and he had no alternative but to refuse him admission into Canada.

Mr. BOYLE. The *Mail* has a following paragraph on this subject, showing that the Chinamen were expelled from the United States. So that the charge against the Canadian Government is without foundation, and the responsibility lies with the American Government.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT.

Bill (No. 132) to amend the Indian Advancement Act, chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee).

On section 3,

Mr. LAURIER. I would submit to the Minister that the third clause should be dropped. The law now provides that the election shall take place on the same day as the nomination of candidates, if there be more than one candidate. The proposed amendment is to adopt something like our parliamentary system, and to have the nomination on one day, and, if there be more than one candidate, to allow a week to elapse before the polling. What reason can there be, on an Indian reserve, to prolong the excitement for a week? In matters of this small importance, if you have the excitement of an election prolonged for a whole week, it is much to be feared that certain means of influence which were referred to this afternoon by my hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Doyon) might be resorted to, and the questions are not so important as to require a week to debate them. I do not think it can lead to any good result to allow a week to elapse between the nomination and the voting.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I can see no reason why the Minister should not adopt the rule which is adopted in the election of school trustees in Ontario, to have the nomination and the election on the same day. It is not as if it were a constituency extending over a large area, and where a large vote had to be polled. The people on these reserves are all together, and the nomination might be made and the election might conveniently take place immediately.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am hardly able to agree with the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) on this subject. Of course you might get up an excitement in a reserve, but that is exactly what we may do in other municipalities, where we have the poll taken a week after the nomination. The object of that is, I suppose, to allow the different candidates to pronounce their views and allow the electors to make up their minds as to whom they will select. If we do away with section 2, as we propose, in a case where a difficulty occurs such as that which has been alluded to, where councillors do not attend meetings, or matters of that kind, if we desire to curtail the power of the Superintendent General, there should be power left with the people to deal with such questions, and the councillor should have time to give reasons why he did not attend the meetings of the council or did not vote at them. The *pros* and *cons* should be debated and the reasons should be considered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Could not that be done at the nomination?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose it might, as it might in any of our municipalities, but if the Indians are to be educated to our modes, I am not inclined to restrict them, and I thought this was a very good provision.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Indians themselves who have had experience on the Caughnawaga reserve, to which allusion has been made, were the very parties who pressed this very strongly on the Government. They had some difficulty—I believe it was at the election before the last—and they thought, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) says, that it would not give them a fair opportunity of judging of the candidates if the election were sprung on them immediately. The Government thought this was reasonable, and that is the reason for this proposed amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the Indians of Caughnawaga have asked for this change?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that there is any objection to the nomination. The only question is as to the interval of time between the nomination and the election. I do not myself know, in regard to the reserves of advanced Indians, what the extent of territory is, and whether the Indians are close together or not; but, if the territory is small and the Indians are easily assembled, it might be well that the time between the nomination and the polling should be short. The hon. gentleman is aware that in the borough elections in England, even in very large boroughs, the time allowed to elapse is, I think, about three days. In the counties it is longer, because the area is greater. I can see, however, that, in regard to these people, who are exposed to certain temptations which have been referred to, the interval of a week might be a week of excitement and possibly of drunkenness, which might affect them, according to what we are told, more than it does the whites. While consideration has to be given to the merits of the candidates, I think that might be done in a less time. While I am on my feet, I may call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this is a Bill to amend the Indian Advancement Act, and I may call the attention of certain members of this House, who take a deep interest in a certain class of questions, to the fact that this Act provides amongst the powers given to the council:

"The religious denomination to which the teacher or teachers of the school or schools established on the reserve shall belong, as being that of the majority of the Indians resident on the reserve; but the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority on the reserve may also have a separate school or schools, with the approval of and under regulations made by the Governor in Council."

I do not observe that my hon. friends of the Equal Rights party in this House pay much attention to the regulations affecting their brethren of a red color as compared with the interest they take in those affecting men of their own color.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that is from the Indian Act.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it is from the Indian Advancement Act, 10th section, sub-section (*a.*)

Mr. DEWDNEY. I suppose the hon. gentleman makes that reference in consequence of the remarks made by the hon. member for Laprairie this afternoon.

Mr. BLAKE. In part.

Committee rose and reported progress.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 133) further to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue, chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that the Government are not dealing fairly with the House in postponing Bills of this kind until

this present period. These Inland Revenue Bills occupy a good deal of time. If they were necessary to be considered they ought to be brought down earlier. All the time occupied now is taken from vastly more important legislation.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I explained in introducing the Bill, this section provides for ascertaining the quantity by weight as well as by measure.

On section 12,

Mr. MITCHELL. I made a suggestion the other day, when one of these Inland Revenue Bills was up, that, I think, might be repeated now. We spend, every Session, a good deal of time upon Bills of this sort, of which we have five or six every Session, and they keep people watching to see that they are not passed through without discussion. There is one Bill in relation to the stamping of leather, which it is necessary for me to watch to see that it is not brought in and passed when I am out of the House. Some of these Bills have been on the paper ever since the first week of the Session; every year there are half a dozen of this class of Bills, and I think it would be better that they should be consolidated altogether, making the thing simple, and not having amendments made to them every year. They are complicated in such a way that it would require a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The section under discussion has nothing at all to do with the Bill the hon. gentleman refers to. The House is not dealing with the Inspection Act. The hon. member was kind enough to say that every Session we are tinkering with legislation in connection with the Inland Revenue Department. I do not know that there is any particular reason the hon. gentleman has for paying such a left-handed compliment to me. I hold that we do not tinker with legislation in the Inland Revenue Department. The hon. gentleman must remember that the Inland Revenue Department is composed of seven different branches, and he says they ought to be consolidated. The Inland Revenue Act is consolidated like other Acts, but he does not expect that the Inland Revenue Act, the General Inspection Act, of which he complains, the Inspection of Gas, the Weights and Measures Act, the Prevention of Adulteration of Foods and Drugs, the Fertilizers Act, the Cullers Act,—that all these should be consolidated in one Act. It would be very inconvenient. When the hon. gentleman considers that we have seven different laws to administer, he will see that amendments are neither frequent or numerous.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not remember having seen the resolutions on which, I think, a Bill of this kind ought to be introduced. May I ask the Minister of Inland Revenue whether resolutions were brought forward covering various changes herein proposed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They appear to change the duty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no increase of duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am inclined to think there is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman perfectly certain there is no increase in the duty?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is aware that if there is an increase, we cannot go on.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Knowing that, of course, I was advised it was not necessary to proceed by resolution, as no increase was proposed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Judging by the Act we have been discussing for the last few days, for which the Finance Minister is responsible, it is difficult to tell whether there is an increase or a decrease. If the hon. gentleman follows the example of his financial leader, it is more likely that there will be more increases in his Bills than decreases.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has jumped to a conclusion too quickly. There is a decrease effected by this Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I jumped at no conclusion, for I offered none. It is possible, there may be a decrease; but I said, if the hon. gentleman follows the course of his financial leader in regard to matters we have had under discussion for three days, the chances are very largely in favor of an increase, and of the introduction of so much ambiguity as would make it difficult to ascertain whether there was an increase or not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am of the opinion that this Bill should have been introduced by resolution, for there is an increase in the duties. I observe that $7 per thousand is charged on cigars, when put up in a certain shape. The present law does not charge that duty on any cigars, however put up.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the paragraph, which states:

"On all cigars, whether the product of foreign or of domestic raw leaf tobacco, when put up in packages containing less than ten cigars each, $7 per thousand."

The change was made in the Inland Revenue Act last Session. No increase is made this year; I can assure the hon. gentleman of that. I agree that if there was any increase the Bill should be introduced by resolution. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) complained that the Bill has been introduced at a late period of the Session. This Bill, however, has been announced for some time. The hon. gentleman asked when my estimates were under discussion if I was not aware that complaints were made in the country against the administration of the law as it now stands. I told him that I was quite familiar with the complaints. There was trouble with respect to the breaking of packages, and we were endeavoring to ascertain if we could not find some remedy which would meet the wishes of the people and at the same time protect the revenue, and it was considered that this result would be obtained by the present Bill. Some time was necessary to bring about such a change as would, while protecting the revenue, remove as far as possible the cause of the complaints at the present time. I think we have succeeded in doing so. The great cause of the trouble was the necessity of breaking packages, because the manu-

facturers, with the exception of two, who put up packages of five pounds, used large packages. This Bill contains provisions by which a manufacturer can put up tobacco and obtain stamps for packages as small as one pound packages. On four pounds and under we make a reduction of 1 cent per pound, for additional cost imposed on the manufacturers in putting up small packages, and in that way we encourage and secure that tobacco will be put up in small packages to meet the wants of the smallest retail trade in the country. In order to make that change of 1 cent per pound in favor of these small packages, we had to take up that section and deal with the whole tobacco duties, dividing the paragraphs according to the class of tobacco and cigars. We take up the whole section and re-enact it all in this Bill, changing that portion referring to packages of four pounds and under, so as to place the duties at 19 cents instead of 20 cents.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the necessity for enacting section 2 ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I explained the object on introducing the Bill. Under the law provision has been made by which liquors can be bottled at the distilleries under the supervision of an officer, with the label of the Department that the liquor has been matured, is of a certain age and is pure. Then people know what they buy. It has been found that large quantities of liquor are being put up of inferior qualities, and a label has been devised closely imitating the label provided by the Department, and they state in some instances on these labels that the liquor has been bottled in accordance with the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act. Although it does not violate any provision of the Act, it is misleading, and we propose to provide against that abuse by enacting this clause. That is the reason for submitting it.

On section 4,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object of this change ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have abolished the drawback on Customs duties on corn imported by distillers, and of course the Excise duties are always refunded in case of export.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the effect of the change you are making ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

On section 6,

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I explained on introducing the Bill, we made a change some two or three years ago with regard to methylated spirits. We had reason to believe that abuses occurred, and the Department made the mixture of these spirits and distributed it to the trade. Besides the mixture of wood alcohol and spirits, we introduced some oil or essence which, while it discolored the spirits, increased the offensive odor to such an extent that there was no danger of its being used for potable purposes. We find now that by a chemical process they can extract the offensive odor from this mixture and reduce it to a state of pure wood alcohol again. We, therefore, make it an offence for any person who deodorises or redistils these spirits or uses them in medicinal preparations for internal use. They are used largely for outward application, but it is certainly objectionable that they should be used inwardly as medicine.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are there different qualities of methylated spirits produced by the Department ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The best quality, I suppose, is pure, and not dangerous to use internally ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is none of it free from wood alcohol. The hon. gentleman asked me, when the Estimates were under consideration whether this branch of the Department was carried as self-sustaining, or whether it involved a loss to the revenue of the country. The facts are, that after paying all expenses in connection with it, besides the duty of 15 cents a gallon, we have a balance of several thousand dollars in favor of the Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I presume my mistake arose from the fact that the accounts do not seem to be kept in the same manner as the other accounts.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman in hastily looking at the accounts thought they showed $25,000 to the debit of the Department, whereas it was to the credit of the Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I took it the other way.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Naturally any person might do the same thing.

Mr. WALDIE. I would like to enquire whether any of this alcohol is imported from the United States or from France ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have already stated that the Department manufacture the methylated spirits, which are a mixture of wood alcohol and the spirits manufactured in the country. We import the wood alcohol from foreign countries ; we have imported a small quantity from the United States. But we expect to be able to obtain nearly all we require in Canada before very long, and at a cheaper rate than we are paying for it now. It is already manufactured to some extent in the country, and what is produced is of a very high quality.

On section 7,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This section is to amend section 258 of the Act, which deals with the whole question of the duty on tobacco and cigars. My object was to make a reduction of one cent a pound in the duty on a particular class of tobacco. I thought the object might be attained by fixing the duty on that class of tobacco at 19 cents a pound, while it is 20 cents a pound on the other classes ; but I find that if the duty is reduced in that way, it will be necessary to change our books in all the manufacturing establishments in the country, which would be quite inconvenient. Therefore, I would prefer that the House should give me authority to make the reduction by granting a rebate of 1 cent a pound, instead of fixing the duty at 19 cents a pound. In place of section 7, as it stands, I would suggest the following :—

"Section 259 is hereby amended by adding thereto the following sub-section :

"A drawback of 5 per cent. on the value of the stamps used shall be allowed to manufacturers of foreign leaf tobacco licensed under this Act, in respect of uncut plug or

cavendish tobacco manufactured by them and put up in packages containing four pounds and under, to be paid under such regulations as the Governor in Council may establish in that behalf."

On section 8,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The change made by this section is simply to reduce the weight of the smaller packages. Formerly it read from five pounds upwards, and now we propose to make it read from one pound upwards.

On section 9,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does this require, in addition to what was provided for before?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Just the destruction of the box. We have considered this for some time, and have arrived at a well-founded conviction that it is in the interest of the revenue, the consumer and the honest trader that an empty and used cigar box should be destroyed. It is of no commercial value, and it is the means of a good deal of fraud amongst dealers of a certain class, while it subjects the consumer to be imposed upon by making him liable to buy a 5-cent cigar out of a 15-cent box.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the penalty imposed if any empty box is found with a person and not destroyed? I think there is no penalty, and perhaps it is just as well that there should not be any beyond the destruction of the box.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. gentleman may be satisfied that the law, as it stands, imposes a penalty. Section 102 of the Inland Revenue Act provides that every person who violates any of its provisions, for which violation no penalty is other wise specially provided, shall incur a penalty of $200.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will that apply to the holder of an empty cigar box? It is a very stringent provision.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the law were administered by sending an officer into the private rooms of gentlemen to look after empty cigar boxes, it would be very stringent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You cannot tell what may happen. Any gentlemen having an empty cigar box may be compelled to pay $200.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It need not necessarily be $200. It can be made as low as the circumstances require.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think this change in the law allowing the doing up of tobacco in small packages is to be recommended. It was hard on retail dealers that they should be liable to be fined if they had less than five pounds in their possession, not in the original package. I know of instances of widow women, doing a small retail trade, who had only two or three pounds of tobacco in their possession, which could not be in the original package, and whose stock was seized by Customs officers. I am glad the Minister has changed the law so as to allow package of tobacco to be done up in smaller quantities. I notice by the amendment that a rebate of duty is allowed to all persons who put up packages under four pounds. Is this limited to any quantity, and does the hon. gentleman think that this rebate will be sufficient to encourage the manufacturers to put up the tobacco in small packages of one pound each, so that small dealers will be able to buy as cheaply as the large dealers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do. I was very anxious indeed to find some way of relieving the Department of a very unpleasant task. The reduction of 5 per cent. in favor of packages of four pounds and under will be sufficient, coupled with the interest of the manufacturers to supply the trade. In fact two large manufacturing establishments in the country have begun already, without this law, to put up their tobacco in smaller packages, and they say their trade is growing; and after a little while those who say that the present rebate is not sufficient encouragement, will be forced by the requirements of the trade to do the same. Mr. McDonald, of Montreal, said he was quite prepared to make smaller packages in order to suit the retail trade, although of course that would add to the cost.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With respect to the empty cigar boxes, for having which in possession a penalty of $200 is provided, the Act does not say "or under $200." Is that penalty absolute?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a general statute relating to punishments which provides that when it is enacted in any statute that a person shall incur a penalty, the penalty, unless a minimum is provided, may be anything less than what is proposed. It might be 50 cents unless a larger minimum were provided.

Mr. TROW. What is the object of the penalty at all? You cannot open a box without breaking the seal. I have seen them in country places kept all the summer. I have seen them around this House. I have some myself here, and I hope the Minister will not send his menials into my room, because I might have some trouble in consequence. This regulation is not understood.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Department has taken a good deal of trouble to acquaint the public, that is, those who might be affected by any changes in the law, of those changes. In the first place, information is sent to every collector in every division, with instructions that a copy should be given to those in the retail trade who are affected. The same course will be followed in any changes made now. No advantage has been taken by the Department either in regard to the first offence or in regard to ignorance of the law, but, in the interests of the revenue and for other reasons, as well as in the interest of the consumer, this provision should be made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is quite proper to enact that no cigar manufacturer or dealer should be found with a second-hand box in his possession, but it is going a long way to say that a punishment should be inflicted on the thousands of purchasers who have these boxes. The manufacturer is aware of the provision of the law, but the people of the country become liable to the penalty without having thought about it for one moment. When the stamp is destroyed, I do not very well see how the box can be made use of again. Many people use these boxes to put flower seeds in, and for various other purposes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have never known any great hardship that has been suffered by innocent parties. The hon. gentleman might use the same

argument in regard to any penalties which are imposed by law. The public cannot be acquainted with all the laws which are passed here imposing penalties. This is not intended for the punishment or the inconvenience of innocent parties, and I do not think there is any danger of that taking place.

Mr. TROW. Any malicious person may enter a private dwelling or a private office and convict innocent parties under this provision. You may find in the country districts the boxes, with the top taken off, used for planting seeds, and you may find them placed in the windows. I suppose those people would be liable to a penalty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister says there has been no prosecution under this Act against innocent parties, but is it advisable that we should have to congratulate ourselves upon having a law upon the Statute-book which is, day after day, persistently defied and disregarded? That is the position we are now in, taking the view of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has changed his course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; because you have changed yours.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say it was desirable to have a law on the Statute-book which might be evaded day after day, but the hon. gentleman was referring to men who might be open to prosecution by some malicious person for having these articles innocently in his possession. I think the danger is very small. But, if any class of the people, will persist in the violation of the law, they must be fined, no matter who they are. It is very different from the difficulty which the hon. gentleman suggests. He may have empty cigar boxes which are not being used, and he says it is contrary to the law for him to possess them, and that is true, but I think it would be a great hardship that he should be prosecuted.

Mr. TROW. Those boxes are used by merchants to send their customers' groceries home in.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Why do they not use paper packages?

Bill reported and read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you leave the Chair, I want to enquire of the Minister of Finance what is the exact effect of the alteration proposed to be made by him last night in clause 148 of the tariff affecting spirits or alcoholic liquors? I was not present when the hon. gentleman explained the nature of the alterations he proposed to make, but I have since obtained, from the books of the House, a copy of the alterations proposed, and if they are as I understand them to be, the effect is of a very important character, and would require very much more serious consideration at the hands of the House than could possibly be given them at one o'clock in the morning. Now, I desire, in the first place, to enquire whether the Government propose to alter that clause, as I am informed they have done, by making the duty to be:

"For every gallon thereof, of any strength not exceeding 15 degrees below the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than 15 degrees below the strength of proof, at the same rate on the quantity there would be if that were reduced to 15 degrees below the strength of proof, that is, $2 per gallon."

I would enquire whether it is the intention of the Minister to carry on those changes as I have read them?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not. At one o'clock this morning, I found that the amendment to that resolution was not as I had intended it, and it is not, I think, as I explained it to the House. The proposition which I intend to move in Committee again is this: Our first proposition was, to commence at proof strength and to levy a duty of $1.75 a gallon on proof strength. The proposition that I desired the House to consider last night, was to move that point down to 15 degrees under proof, and to change the duty to $2 instead of $1.75, so that would allow for under proof down as far as 15 degrees below proof, and charge on over proof.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Possibly under the circumstances, as it is a complicated matter, it may be as well to defer it until on. gentleman goes into Committee again.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a clause written out which, I think, will make the meaning perfectly clear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a matter of importance to the trade, and also to the country. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, had better place on paper what he proposes to do, so that we may have time to consider it. I do not suppose any injury to the revenue can accrue from that.

Mr. FOSTER. On the contrary, there would be an increase, I think, on the whole.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is great difficulty in changing any of these things at all until we get the clause before us, but I may say to the hon. gentleman that if I follow him correctly, the altering of the unit, so to speak, on which the duty is levied, from proof to 85 degrees, that is 15 degrees below proof, will involve a large addition to the spirit duties, so far as I can see. However, as the hon. gentleman states that the clause as actually amended is not the clause he proposes to introduce, I will let the matter stand at present.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Penitentiary.....$155,263.23

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have estimated for the maintenance of the same number of convicts as last year, we have no particular reason to expect an increase. The increases are all statutory down to the tailor assistant instructor. That will be a new officer. The tailor instructor, of course, is engaged principally in making clothing for the convicts, and in addition to the men who are under his charge, there are about ten convicts in charge of the clothing. Their duty is to attend to keeping the clothing in the storeroom, the changing of the suits of the prisoners from time to time, the put-

ting away and delivering at due time of the clothing which the convicts bring in with them, and mending and repairing the clothing. It is an important position, and we thought it proper that the convicts employed should be under the charge of an instructor. We have, therefore, taken one of the keepers for that place, and give him $600 increase. The other items do not involve any material increase or decrease. They are simply the changing of guards to keepers, in place of keepers who have been retired on gratuity in consequence of advancing age and long service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the Ministry to the circumstances connected with an old officer who filled the position of hospital steward, by the name of Haliday. I am informed by this man's family that he had actually tendered his resignation before his death, which resignation, if accepted, would have entitled him to a considerable sum of money as a grant. But he died before the resignation was accepted. I desire to know if the case has been brought to the attention of the Minister, and whether he thinks any allowance can be allowed to the family other than the ordinary two months' salary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. His resignation was tendered, but tendered too late, and it was tendered to the warden and not to the Department. It is out of my power, under the statute, to make better provision than the two months' grant. I will, however, consider whether any special provision can be asked for in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not pretend to say that such cases can be avoided, but I suppose that had his resignation been forwarded and accepted, the family would have been entitled to something like $2,000, as he had been in the employ for 30 years. I am not disposed to advise any extravagance, but the House, I think, would be very willing to consider the proposition if the Government chose to recommend it, to make some allowance to the family of the deceased under the peculiar circumstances. However, I leave it with the hon. Minister, and he will no doubt consider it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I observe there are decreases in the salaries of the chaplains at all the penitentaries, while the salaries of other officers have been increased.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is owing to new chaplains coming in, and they commence at the minimum salary.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.. $100,740 74

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a large increase in this vote. I specially want information as to the very large increase under the heading of maintenance, which has increased from $29,647 to $38,143.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a considerable increase in the number of convicts expected. The number is estimated by the warden, who knows the number of prisoners committed for trial, and he estimates what the usual percentage will reach him. Among the increases is $1,200 for heating. An amount is required for a small organ and for payment of an organist. Additional expenses are estimated for the kitchen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of additional convicts estimated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Twenty-five. I will give some of the details: Convicts' clothing, $1,234.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister will note that the items amount collectively to about $4,300, so that the charge for the additional 25 convicts would be out of proportion to the cost in other places, or to the cost we have previously paid in Dorchester.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The increases are based on the contract prices. It is expected that the increase for beef will be $2,583.15; for flour, $1,946, together with increases on oatmeal, butter, molasses, sugar, bread, tobacco, vegetables and some other similar items, amounting altogether to $5,184.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total number of convicts estimated for there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 350.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And how many in Kingston?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 580.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see that in Kingston the total maintenance of 580 convicts is about $41,000, and in St. Vincent de Paul the cost of maintenance of 350 convicts is as high as $38,143. Allowing for the expenses that the hon. gentleman enumerated, for chapels and such matters, the disproportion would still be very large for St. Vincent de Paul as against Kingston. I do not think there has been any increase in the cost of flour or beef to warrant such an increase of price as indicated, unless, indeed, the prisoners of St. Vincent de Paul were underfed before, and I hardly think that can be the case, on comparing the estimates for Kingston. *Prima facie*, I suppose that the cost of these chief articles of food would be nearly as great in Kingston as in St. Vincent de Paul?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expense of maintenance has always been greater there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not in that ratio.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I expected that the hon. gentleman would call attention to the cost of maintenance at the different penitentiaries, and if he has no objection I will, in the end, give such explanation as I can, with reference to the comparative cost of maintenance in the different institutions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I intended to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the discrepancy which I think will require some explanation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We must consider the stock on hand at the beginning of the year and the stock on hand at the close. I have given the figures of that. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has taken that into account.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know whether I was able to do that, as the Deputy Minister declined to give the Auditor General the figures he wanted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I gave him the figures of the stock on hand at the beginning of the year and at the close. He wanted a statement of the number of convicts from day to day. That was being prepared in my report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see at page 16—B of the Auditor General's Report that the actual maintenance of 325 convicts for the year 1889 was $25,563. What he asks for here is $38,000 for the maintenance of 350. Deducting $4,000 for the special items to which the hon. gentleman refers, there would still be an increase of $9,000 over the actual expenditure in 1889. That is a very large increase, unless there is some very special cause for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will endeavor to discuss that when we come to the last resolution.

Dorchester Penitentiary..... $44,156 30

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a statutory increase to the warden of $50, and an increase to the deputy warden and chief keeper of $150. By a mistake made last year the latter's salary was placed at that of the deputy warden at his appointment, the fact having been overlooked that when he was appointed the offices of deputy warden and chief keeper were amalgamated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I forgot to ask the hon. Minister what sort of employment he has found for the prisoners at St. Vincent de Paul and at Kingston?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At Kingston we are transforming the workshop occupied by the locksmith work, which will occupy the whole of this year and probably part of next year. The next thing to be taken in hand will be the remodelling and reconstruction of the old-fashioned cells. The cells in the old part of the building are only the width of the bed, which is made to fold against the wall. The effect is apparent to anybody who visits the penitentiary, that the cell is a very unfit place of abode for a man, especially between Saturday night and Monday morning, and in winter, when there are long hours of confinement. These cells have been condemned by all visitors acquainted with prison affairs, and we thought it desirable that they should be enlarged. The work will occupy a considerable length of time. These, with the ordinary occupations of the prisoners, are ample to employ nearly the whole of the population there for the present year and the next. At St. Vincent de Paul the prisoners are engaged in building a boundary wall, and in finishing the new wing, which will supply them with ample work for at least a year ahead. I am not able to say what means of employment will be provided after that. I shall have to ask a good deal of advice on that subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a troublesome question, no doubt, particularly if the honest laborers object to these prisoners being employed in useful work. I think they push the objection too far, however. In the vote for the Kingston penitentiary there are two distinct sums of $15,000 for the electric light. Is one of these a revote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. The cost of the work will be under $10,000. The work is nearly finished.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... $50,904 48

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is an extraordinary difference in the maintenance of the convicts in the different penitentiaries. The cost of maintaining 100 convicts at the Manitoba penitentiary appears to have been $9,216 as against $7,699 for 175 convicts at Dorchester.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the Manitoba penitentiary there is an addition of a warden's clerk. The warden has heretofore had the assistance of one of the guards as a clerk, and I believe a clerk is necessary. I propose, instead of using the services of a guard, that we shall take a vote for a clerk and dispense with the guard. There is the addition of a carpenter instructor also. We had none there before. The number of trade instructors there has been very small, and we propose to increase it according as we get convicts employed in trades.

Mr. WATSON. I see a gratuity to H. Hall of $687.06, what is that for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Hall, who was guard at the Manitoba penitentiary, had to resign on account of ill-health. He was in the service fifteen years, his salary was $650, and he was allowed the usual gratuity on retiring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Warden Bedson was stated in this House to have been the recipient of some furs concerning which an investigation is going on. I do not know whether it is the duty of the Department to obtain explanations from him, but he has not been brought before the Committee yet.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not sure whether the Committee intend to send for him or not. Perhaps the hon. member for Marquette can tell us?

Mr. WATSON. I think not, for the simple reason that the Committee have not the power or instructions to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not wish to interfere with the investigation of the Committee, but I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that it was stated on the floor of this House that this officer was the recipient of a large portion of the insurgent's furs.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In several previous years when that item was up, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) mentioned the fact that an order had been given for the delivery of these furs, some to the General, and some to other officers, including Mr. Bedson; and I had from him a very strong statement denying that he had received any furs at all. Of course, I have had no opportunity of calling his attention to the particular evidence before the Committee, as it was only distributed within the past few days.

Mr. WATSON. He was also charged with possessing himself of a pool table while at Batoche. Did he make any explanation with regard to that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have only seen that in the evidence, and did not draw his attention to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman explain the extraordinary discrepancy in the cost of maintenance of the penitentiary in Manitoba compared with the cost elsewhere? Every year for years past, in Committee of Supply, we have brought up the case of the Manitoba penitentiary, where there appears to be a greater waste of money than anywhere else. Why is it that Mr. Bedson, the warden of the smallest penitentiary in the

Dominion, receives the largest pay? The salary of the warden of the British Columbia penitentiary is $2,000; of the Dorchester penitentiary, $2,050; and of the Manitoba penitentiary, $2,800; and Mr. Bedson appears to have received last year, in addition to his salary, $400 for travelling expenses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The salaries of the wardens are graded according to their length of service. The warden at Kingston began at $2,600 and has reached his maximum of $3,000. At St. Vincent de Paul the warden's salary runs from $2,400 to $2,800, and he has reached his maximum. The warden at Dorchester begins at $2,000 and goes to $2,400, and he has been recently appointed—not more than two or three years in office. The warden in Manitoba begins at $2,000 and goes to $2,400. He is receiving $2,800 because he was appointed before the present Act came into force, and his salary remains at $2,800. Last year, in the Committee, when the estimates of Manitoba were up, I expressed the opinion, and have since no reason to change it, that I thought the place was altogether too expensive; but I was unable, for want of information, to give the Committee as full explanation as I would have been glad to give. The vote passed the Committee of Supply, but was challenged on concurrence, when the House divided, and I consequently felt it incumbent on me to have an investigation made into the expenditure. In the month of December last, that investigation was begun by the accountant of my Department, assisted by counsel, in order that the enquiry might be as searching as possible. The enquiry lasted some six or eight weeks and extended to every branch of the management of the penitentiary. That investigation has been concluded and a very elaborate report made, but as the Session was in progress I have not had an opportunity of dealing with the report yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Could the hon. gentleman give us a summary or explanation of the contents of the report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I really could not. I have gone through it as carefully as I could, but have not been able to come to a conclusion as to what should be done, and feel I must further enquire into it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I notice a charge in the Auditor General's Report, on page C-103, of $18 for one pair of pants. That seems a very high figure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to the unusual expense for heating *per capita*, it appears to be very large, but I am informed that it is impossible to reduce the cost of heating without shutting off one part of the penitentiary from the other. The cost of fuel will not be increased, but in British Columbia they have timber limits from which they get their fuel and they cut their own wood. Coal oil costs 12 cents per gallon more than it does in Kingston. The winter is severe and long. I have made every effort to get the amount of the contract reduced, but without effect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The transportation of coal oil would not be more than 2 or 3 cents.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have invited the widest competition without succeeding in reducing the price.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. LISTER. Have you asked for tenders in Petrolea?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; and in London and in other places in the West.

Mr. WATSON. The price of 27½ cents a gallon does not appear to be excessive.

Mr. LISTER. It must be American oil.

Sir JOHN THQMPSON. No; it is not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am afraid there is a colored man somewhere there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to the fuel, the practice heretofore has been to lay in a large stock of wood, but it is intended to dispense with that and use coal almost exclusively.

Mr. WATSON. Is the wood asked for by tender in Manitoba?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is given by contract.

Mr. WATSON. I think Mr. Bedson, in making his report, might have congratulated the Government on the health of the convicts. I see that only $306 was charged for drugs as against $1,300 two years ago. I observe, however, that these 100 convicts have eaten three barrels of flour each per annum, but I suppose this large consumption of flour is due to the health of the convicts which has resulted in the reduction of the cost of drugs. I also see that the quantity of tobacco consumed has decreased, and no doubt the criticisms of the expenditure in that penitentiary which have been made in this House have had some effect in causing Mr. Bedson to retrench his expenditure. As to the heating of the Manitoba penitentiary, I think the charge is exorbitant. I see it costs nearly $7,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I did not get any explanation from the Minister as to the charge of $18 for a pair of pants. Can you account for that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I cannot.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Last year or the year before a large amount was asked to lay in a supply of medical instruments for the Manitoba penitentiary. I am afraid those instruments could not have been very good, because I find in the report of the Auditor General that you have purchased additional instruments such as these—Aspirator, $75; dental forceps, one set and case, $35; ditto, 3 pair, $8.50; ear speculum, $1.75; opthalmoscope, $25. Why do they require an opthalmoscope? That is not required in Manitoba. Then there is a tonsillitine, $15. There are very many similar items to these, and many of the same kind were furnished to that institution two years ago. Then, we have a charge of Dr. Lynch, three visits at $20 a visit. I do not know who this Dr. Lynch is, or where he resides, or what he is doing there. It must have been either a serious case that he was called to attend, or it is a serious charge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go thou and do likewise.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I should hate to do a thing of that kind and call myself honest. Here is a man who charges $60 for three visits. Then I find that the warden has a horse charged for. I am surprised that Bedson needed a horse, because I thought he had a white horse which he obtained from Batoche. No, I am wrong, it turned out to

be a grey horse. This may be the old white horse, but here $225 is charged for the old animal. There was an item which we disputed last year of $450.-12½, and we find that this year it amounts to over $700 paid to Mr. Bedson for fuel and light. According to the Auditor General's Report, there is a question as to the propriety of that account. We have him credited for travelling expenses "S. L. Bedson, travelling in Canada, $176.35. S. L. Bedson, travelling in England, $136.58." I would like to know what he was travelling in England for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has asked me a variety of questions, I will answer from memory as well as I can. With regard to the surgical instruments, I am sorry that my medical education was neglected and I cannot explain the use of those instruments he has named. The discussion which the hon. gentleman raised in the House last year was on the item which I proposed to take for the hospital, and which I expended, including a purchase of instruments. We have taken charge, in the Manitoba Penitentiary within the last year, of a number of insane patients as well, who are attended by the physician, and it is necessary to have for them a complete outfit. I am not able to say whether he sent a requisition for surgical instruments, or whether they are absolutely necessary; he is qualified to know far better than I am, and he has assured me that the outfit of instruments which he procured is all that he expects to be necessary for some time to come. The hon. gentleman will find a list of them all in my report, and likewise a list of the entire stock of dry goods on hand, for which an expenditure has been made. The item which appears in the Auditor General's Report as paid to the account of S. L. Bedson, appears to be this: He was allowed fuel and light, and last Session the Auditor General required that I should get the amount charged to him for fuel and light voted, and accordingly, in the Supplementary Estimates, the amount of $450 was voted. The other $200 consisted of sundries for what is known as officers' quarters, which consists of a reading and recreation room for the officers of the prison. The hon. gentleman will remember that that was fully discussed last year on the item for the penitentiary, and my attention was called to the various items then in the Auditor General's Report. The Auditor General has added this to the amount of $450 which was voted for his fuel and light, and that would make the $700 odd. As regards Dr. Lynch, the circumstances are these: When the insane patients were taken to the penitentiary from the asylum, the surgeon requested, in view of his increased charge, that he should be permitted to visit the larger penitentiaries at Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul, and likewise some institutions of the insane, if I remember right. I thought it was a proper request, and, I think, he derived considerable advantage from doing so. The only expense involved was the expense of providing a substitute for him. Dr. Lynch paid the visits, which are charged there, at $20 per visit. As regards the travelling expenses in England, the circumstances are these: The warden about 18 months ago, obtained leave of absence to go to England, and he asked me, on his way thither, whether I would be willing that he should visit some of the larger prisons in England. He received, of course, no travelling expenses for his visit to that country, but I agreed that, in visiting the prisons in England where he could get information as to prison management which would be useful to us, I would pay his simple travelling expenses for that purpose.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I asked, also, in reference to his travelling expenses in Canada. I see, also, that Dr. Sutherland, whom I did not mention before, receives $210.10 for travelling expenses for examining the various institutions, besides the $60 paid to Mr. Lynch. It is customary, I think, when an individual goes off on a travelling tour, to pay his substitute during his absence. I do not know why Dr. Sutherland should be paid his full salary and allowed his travelling expenses in visiting the different institutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The travelling expenses are probably his expenses going to and from Winnipeg in relation to the purchase of supplies, payment of accounts, and the necessary business of the prison. I do not remember any other travelling expenses which he would incur in Canada. It consisted principally of livery hire. As regards the doctor paying his substitute, if it was simply a question of a holiday I would have required him to pay the substitute as well as to pay his own expenses, but he has taken additional charge of all these insane patients without any extra remuneration, and I thought I might reasonably give him his travelling expenses and not require him to pay a substitute. His salary is small, and he gives his whole time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am inclined to ask the hon. gentleman to allow this item to stand until he is able to digest the report of the gentleman he appointed to examine this warden's expenditure. For the past four or five years there have been items in the Public Accounts that have struck hon. members on this side of the House as unjustifiable extravagance on the part of this warden of the Manitoba penitentiary. Last year the hon. gentleman appointed a commission to report upon it, that commission has reported, and the hon. gentleman has no doubt had time to submit to the House the result of that investigation. We find last year in the Auditor General's Report, that whereas it cost us $44 per head to maintain convicts in Dorchester, it cost $92 a head to maintain them in Manitoba. We find accounts amounted to $500 or $600 for coal oil, which is charged 12 cents per gallon more for the Manitoba penitentiary than for Kingston penitentiary, while the cost of transport could not reach more than 2 cents or 3 cents per gallon. That alone is evidence that there is something wrong in the management of the Manitoba penitentiary. The warden, Mr. Bedson, charges for army lists $15. Why should the country pay for army lists for the warden? From the beginning to the end, there is extravagance permeating that penitentiary management, and I should very much like the Minister of Justice to read the report of the investigation before he asks the vote this year. The amount asked is $50,904, but the previous year the expenditure was only $38,960.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the effect of the report on this vote it is impossible I can comply with the hon. gentleman's request. My view of the report, so far as I have been able to form one, is that very important changes will have to

be made in that institution. I cannot pretend to undertake to effect the changes, or pretend to do justice to the report when we are so near the end of the session, and I must have the vote in order to carry on the business. In due time I will arrive at an opinion with regard to the action that is necessary, and I hope to be able to satisfy the hon. gentleman in regard to the changes made when the House considers the question next session. While I admit, as I have done, that I am dissatisfied with the large expenditure in Manitoba penitentiary under the present system, there are some items which hon. gentlemen opposite have attributed to the extravagance of the warden which are not due to his conduct at all. The army lists are not for him, as was explained last year. The penitentiary being some distance from Winnipeg, it has been found reasonable and proper to have a recreation room where the officers have amusements and reading material. The army lists are of interest to the officers, for a number of them are old army men. The amount paid is not for four copies of the same list, but for four of the series. As regards the oil, the warden has nothing to do with that. Tenders were advertised for and samples received here. Hon. members from Manitoba and the North-West will bear me out in saying that the price we have been paying is not in excess of the price in Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who has the contract for the oil ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A firm in London; I do not remember the name, but I can give the name to the hon. gentleman later. Tenders for the oil contract were called for in July. I was dissatisfied with the prices as compared with the prices in the Eastern Provinces, and I declined to make a contract, and it was not until December or January that a contract was made. As regards the vote we asked being in excess of the expenditure last year, that is a mistake ; we are estimating for a reduction. The amount of expenditure last year appears to be small in comparison with the vote, but it is due to the fact that there were refunds for maintenance and clothing and other matters, including accounts with officers of the prison. The quantity of provisions and supplies per head of the staff seems large as compared with other penitentiaries, but the peculiar circumstances of Manitoba penitentiary must be remembered. It is situated fifteen miles from settlement, and we had to make arrangements by which the officers can receive, at contract prices, stores, coal oil, and all their provisions. They pay their accounts out of their monthly salaries, and the money is placed in the banks to the credit of the Receiver General.

Mr. LISTER. No doubt there is something wrong about the coal oil contract. If the Department is paying 26½ cents a gallon, they are paying enormously more than it can be bought for. Sunlight oil is, no doubt, the best quality, but it can be bought in Petrolea at 12 cents a gallon, and shipment to Winnipeg would not cost more than 2 cents per gallon; and on no account should it be charged more than 15 cents in Winnipeg. The Dominion Coal and Coke Company appears to be the company which furnishes oil to the Manitoba penitentiary. There is no such concern doing business in the oil region, but it is one whose business must be confined to Winnipeg. There are very many oil refiners in Petrolea who would be glad to supply this oil, unless all the refiners of oil have united for the purpose of forming the Dominion Coal and Coke Company. So far as the warden of the penitentiary is concerned, I may say, that the Minister, who has been in Ontario only during the last few years, is not aware of what is the comment throughout the western country, namely, that Manitoba penitentiary has been most extravagantly, if not most corruptly managed by Mr. Bedson, the warden. That is reported throughout the whole country. Every person who knows anything about the North-West and Manitoba, is aware that there has been the grossest extravagance, if not corruption, in the management of this penitentiary, and that Mr. Bedson is not the man for the position. He is a pleasant fellow, who makes himself agreeable with every person, and he trades upon that agreeable manner. Now, so far as this man Bedson is concerned, he has been charged, practically, in this House, with having taken the property of half-breeds in the North-West; and he has not deigned to answer these charges here, although an investigation has been pending. He has been charged with taking, not one horse, but many horses, belonging to the half-breeds, and he has not appeared before the Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was he summoned ?

Mr. LISTER. No. The investigation which the Minister has ordered, and upon which a report has been made, will doubtless give a good deal of insight into the management of this Manitoba penitentiary. I believe that the scrutiny should be a very close one; and, I believe, that many changes involving large sums of money can be made in the management of that penitentiary. It seems to me ridiculous that the cost of maintaining the Manitoba penitentiary should be so enormously greater than the cost of maintaining the other penitentiaries.

Mr. WATSON. As far as the coal oil is concerned, I cannot find much fault with the price paid for it; and I would just remind these hon. gentlemen that we have not got an Intercolonial railway carrying our frieght at a loss to the country, and that in the west our freights are exceedingly high. The Minister stated that these travelling expenses in Canada would, no doubt, be Mr. Bedson's expenses from Winnipeg to the penitentiary. I see that Mr. Bedson bought for himself a horse for $250, and I also see that he paid O'Connell & Burke, livery-stable keepers in Winnipeg, $214.50, and 221 trips of teams, $123.50, and cab hire, $4.50. It appears to me that on the amount for feed, Mr. Bedson could keep sufficient horse flesh to do his own driving, and that he should not be allowed such excessive travelling expenses. I am sure that the House is pleased to hear that the Minister has made an investigation into Mr. Bedson's accounts. I do not know whether it was taken into consideration that while in the North-West he appropriated the goods and chattels of several people to his own use, while acting as an officer under the Militia Department, if not an officer of the Department of Justice. I think these should have been taken into consideration in the enquiry; and if Mr.

Bedson is found guilty of the charges made on the floor of this House, that he should be dismissed. There is no doubt whatever that he is a very extravagant official.

Mr. MACDOWALL. In the first place, I think it is perfectly contrary to British justice to try and bring this case of Mr. Bedson before the House now. A committee is trying his case at present.

Mr. WATSON. What committee?

Mr. MACDOWALL. You say he is charged before a committee.

Mr. WATSON. I said he was charged in this House.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think the charge about the furs was made simultaneously before the committee against General Middleton, Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. Bedson. I may say that it is rather a curious course that has been adopted. I believe that a parliamentary committee is a most unfair way of trying charges, and I believe that a departmental enquiry, such as the Minister has instituted, is by far the fairest way. I think it is contrary to all sense of justice that the jury, the judge, and the counsel for the prosecution and defence should be all one and the same. It reminds me of some of the stories I have heard told of western life in the United States.

Mr. WATSON. I am surprised at the ignorance of the hon. gentleman. He ought to know, if he does not, that Bedson's case has not been referred to that committee. I am also surprised at his charging that committee with being an unfair tribunal. It appears to me that it is a great reflection on the selection of gentlemen made by the First Minister, that they should be charged with being unfair and unjust. There could be no better means of trying General Middleton, or Bedson if he were before it, than a committee of this House.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I did not say the committee was unfair, and I have nothing to say against the formation of the committee. But I say that the system of trying men before a committee is an unfair system.

Mr. WATSON. I have no doubt that it is better for some of the friends of the hon. gentleman who are in the service of the Government that they should be tried by a departmental commission. I believe and I hope, that as a result of this enquiry, which the Minister of Justice has made, the chances are that Bedson will get his just deserts—which are dismissal. I see that Bedson has travelled in England and Canada during the last year, and I would ask the Minister of Justice what time this official has been absent from the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He has had three months' leave to go to England, and no leave except that. Any other absence would be in Winnipeg, I suppose.

Mr. WATSON. Is any of his time taken up by his military duties? He is major of a battalion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He had no leave for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After the explanation made by the Minister of Justice, and the promise he has given, that he will present the report of the enquiry he has made at the beginning of next Session, I shall await the presentation of that report, and shall feel myself charged to make a special examination of the accounts of this penitentiary next year. I am satisfied, after listening to the discussion—and the Minister himself is satisfied from the fact that he appointed a commission—that something was wrong in that penitentiary. In fact, we have a straight and fair admission from the hon. gentleman that it is so. I shall deem myself charged with the responsibility of looking closely into that expenditure next year, and if it is not improved, I shall take up more time discussing it than I did this year or last. Anybody who looks at the accounts of this peniteniary with an unbiassed mind must come to the conclusion that the administration is rotten. Either there is gross extravagance, or, as my hon. friend says, there is something worse than extravagance.

British Columbia Penitentiary..... $44,434.29

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The increases are statutory down to the hospital overseer. The warden vacated his quarters in the prison and a house was built for him outside, and his quarters are now used as a hospital. We had no hospital there before and a hospital overseer is appointed at the minimum salary. There is to be appointed an additional guard. There is an estimated increase of 30 in the number of the convicts. There is also an estimated increase for working expenses: heating, $200; light, $450; maintenance of buildings, $80; armory, $30; kitchen, $40; stationery, $40; farm, $80; and stables $80. In the industries there is an estimated increase of $2,000. The warden states that the working expenses for the fiscal year 1888-89 exceeded the appropriation owing to the necessity of having works completed as soon as possible which were charged to working expenses. He estimates that there will be required for works which he is now carring on in connection with prison repairs and for the purchase of new tools, &c., for the farm and the workshops, $1,400.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister why he needs so much more than was expended? Last year $56,000 were voted, and only $36,000 expended in the British Columbia penitentiary; and yet, you ask for $47,000 for 1890-91, although the increases in the salaries amount to only $3,000. For maintenance alone, $6,000 were voted more than was required. There is no use of the Committe going on voting a great deal more than is necessary. In a case like that of the Manitoba penitentiary, where the warden spends all he can lay his hands on, I object to voting more than is actually required.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will take the risk of reducing the vote for maintenance and for working expenses $3,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In the expenditure for the maintenance of the stables, I see you charge for bran four tons and 1,974 pounds, $147.61. That would be about $29.50 per ton. I find also, for shorts, two tons and 1,154 pounds, $90.19. That would be $36 a ton. Then, you have chairs at $11 and ten at $3. All these appear to me to be excessive.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot tell the prices, but, if the hon. gentleman knows that any are wrong, I will have an enquiry.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When the Minister makes an estimate, he ought to have a reason for the estimate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the warden estimates that he wants that quantity of bran and has to pay that much for it, I have no means of knowing that his statement is not correct. If the hon. gentleman says it is not, I will look into the item. I have to take the opinion and advice of my officers, as I have no personal knowledge in the matter. If the hon. gentleman says I am paying more than the current prices, I will make an enquiry and find if they are wrong.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is certainly not my place to point out the prices of the articles. When the warden presents a requisition to the Minister, it is the duty of him to carefully examine into it and see that the charges are reasonable. If the warden represented to him that he wanted to pay $29.50 a ton for bran, the natural question would be was that too much. If $30 to $40 a ton for shorts strikes his mind as being extravagant, he should make enquiries into it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very well; I will ask that this item stand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are one or two other items that require explanation. On page C—109, there is 3,002 pounds of coal at $45. That may be a clerical error because $45 for a ton and a half is a very high figure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find that the price the coal cost is $8.50 for 166½ tons, and I presume this is a clerical error, but I will have it enquired into.

Regina Jail..... ..... $900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the theory of this? Is it simply that we pay the warden and the community pay the rest of the expenditure, for the warden stands out here in solitary glory at $900, and no charge for anything else?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The jail has not yet been completed, but will be by the close of the present year, and it is intended that the prisoners confined in the police barracks in the various stations in the North-West shall occupy the Regina jail.

Towards immigration and immigration expenses.....$55,000

Mr. WATSON. We were to have some explanation in regard to the working of the agencies in the old country.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) will remember that we were waiting for the report of the High Commissioner. I think he now has that report in his hands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Agriculture might as well give us a résumé of this report, the lack of which kept the House in session for twenty-two hours.

Mr. CARLING. This item is for the general expenses of immigration outside of the salaries of officers. It is for the general expenses of immigration and the printing of pamphlets, the employment of agents, and all that class of expenditure which the hon. gentleman will see stated in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But what was specially under discussion when item 75½ was created was the salaries of the agents in Europe, and we reserved this item of $55,000 on the express understanding that the salary of agents in Europe would be discussed under this item. I want to know what were the particulars given in Sir Charles Tupper's report, which the hon. gentleman had not printed at that time.

Mr. CARLING. There are no further particulars in detail. One of the items objected to, I think, was in reference to some travelling expenses of Mr. Colmer, and another was in reference to some expenses of Mr. Chipman. Mr. Colmer had to go to Glasgow on one occasion in connection with the exhibition there, and at another time, he went to Antwerp to close up matters in connection with that exhibition.

Mr. WATSON. After reading that report, does the Minister consider it advisable to maintain these officers in their present positions or to make any change? I do not think the results of this system have been satisfactory to the people of Canada, and especially to the people of the North West. We have not had the immigration we should have had, and I think some other means should be adopted in preference to the present system. I desire to know if the Minister intends to change the present system.

Mr. CARLING. There is no present intention to make any change in regard to the agencies in the old country. Mr. Dyke, who is the agent at Liverpool, is an excellent officer, and I think no man has done better service to his country than Mr. Dyke has in regard to immigration and other matters which have come before him. Then we have Mr. Grahame at Glasgow, who is a very efficient man also; we have Mr. Connolly at Dublin, Mr. Merrick at Belfast, and Mr. Down at Bristol. We do not at present intend to make any change.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see that Mr. Dyke gets a very fine salary, and no doubt he is a very good agent. We find that he receives $2,100 as agent. Then he has a *per diem* allowance of $4 a day for the whole 365 days, amounting to $1,460. Then he charges telegrams, $24.45, and fare—whatever that may be—$9.16. Then his income tax is paid to the amount of $52.44. That amounts to close on $4,000. Then we find Mr. Dyke cropping up in various other places, and drawing heavily on the amount voted for European immigration. I do not understand how he is allowed to charge $4 a day for every one of the 365 days charged here; he is also paid a fare of $9.16. Is he stationary or does he travel around?

Mr. CARLING. Out of that amount, Mr. Dyke pays an assistant some $300 or $400. He has to travel to different parts of the country—in fact he is a most active man. I do not think there is any place in which he can foster immigration to which he does not go, and any one who has come in contact with him will know that he is a very active and energetic officer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see that Mr. Dyke's assistants are paid also. The Rev. J. Bridger, clerk's assistant, received $87.60; W. Edwards,

junior clerk, gets $126.53 ; E. Forrest, office boy, receives $75.92 ; G. H. Mitchell, correspondent and book-keeper, gets $292 ; R. Paulson, foreign corresponding clerk, gets $379.60, and the Rev. R. F. Winter, for locating immigrants, receives $115.50. That is the whole staff in the Liverpool office. I do not see how it is that he gets $4 a day for living expenses for 365 days. I think it would be better, perhaps, to send one of the members of this House over there ; they might be more useful in the service there than they are in the House. I would like some further explanation with regard to this item.

Mr. CARLING. What further information does the hon. gentleman ask ?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Are all these permanent ? Is Mr. Dyke permanently employed at a salary of $2,100 ? Does he got $4 a day for 365 days for living allowance, and is he living constantly at Liverpool, or is it living allowance only when travelling ?

Mr. CARLING. The living allowance is when he is travelling.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is not stated.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke has been an officer of the Government for a great many years, and he has received that amount of money for travelling expenses.

Mr. CASEY. No ; it is not the travelling expenses. It is not so put down.

Mr. CARLING. Yes ; he receives that, travelling or no travelling. He has received that for the last twelve or fifteen years, and during the time that the friends of the hon. gentleman were in power.

Mr. CASEY. He gets $3,560 whether he travels or not. That is the amount of the two items put together.

Mr. CARLING. That is an allowance for travelling in addition to his salary.

Mr. CASEY. He gets $2,100 as salary and $1,460 as a per diem allowance, whether he is travelling or not. That makes $3,560 a year, and it would be just as well to put that all down as his salary. It does seem to me an excessive salary. I am well aware of Mr. Dyke's services for the country and his worth as an individual. I know him personally.

Mr. CARLING. I dare say it would be better if it were arranged that the salary should be increased. That has been going on for a number of years, and it is my intention to enquire into the travelling expenses and salaries, and to revise the salaries of the officers in the same way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to contradict the hon. gentleman, speaking from memory, but I do not recollect that we allowed a per diem allowance in the time that Mr. Letellier was Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CARLING. I am told it is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is an unusual mode of arranging the matter, and I think had better be altered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that if we are going to pay this man $3,500 a year salary, it ought to be so stated. I see Mr. Dyke is put down for $2,100 a year and his living allowance is $1,400 more, which, as appears now, is given to him as salary. Then I suppose the same arrangement is made with the agent at Glasgow, Mr. Graham, who is put down for $1,300 salary, and he gets for living allowance $1,460 more. I suppose that is another way of giving him an increased salary. Then the agent at Dublin, Mr. Connolly, is in the same position ; he has a salary of $1,000 and $730 for living allowance. Then the agent at Belfast, Mr. H. Merrick, also gets $1,000, and $1,460 for living allowance. I think in all these cases if it is proposed to give gentlemen $3,000 or $4,000 a year salary, it ought to be so stated.

Mr. HESSON. The question is, whether his services are worth as much to this country as we are paying ; whether it is divided over a per diem allowance or a fixed salary without such allowance. My impression is, that if he is required to go to Antwerp, or Belgium, or across to Ireland, or to visit any of the distant counties of England, he would probably charge his allowance without any salary. The question is, whether we would be further advanced than we are. If his services are worth $3,500 a year to the country, it is immaterial in which way he gets it. If he is required by his duties to go out there, he is supposed to go, and he gets his day allowance, and there is no reason to complain.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That shows the unreasonable course the Government is taking in reference to this matter. Mr. Dyke may be a very efficient agent, but I would ask : Has the Minister any information that he could give to this House stating what number of days Mr. Dyke has been travelling, the places he has visited in the performance of his duty, what number of days he has been out ? We have no means of knowing. For ought we know Mr. Dyke stays at home in his office in Liverpool constantly, and is receiving, as it has been stated, somewhere near $4,000 for staying at home. If there were any report stating that he had been travelling fifty days, or a 100 days, we could understand it. But we have no means of knowing this ; we have no information given to us what Mr. Dyke has been doing, further than that he has received $2,100 as salary and $4 a day for 365 days for living expenses, and for ought we know he has been living constantly in Liverpool —I know nothing to the contrary. It would be better if we knew that Mr. Dyke was performing some service. As the Minister says he is going to investigate this matter and look carefully into it, and come to some conclusion whereby he will be in a position to know what these men are doing. I think, under these circumstances, I will not pursue the item any further.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Dyke did not travel in England much, for his expenses are placed at only $9.16. His duty is certainly not to travel in Belgium, or Ireland, or other places, but to look after his office in Liverpool. As to the question where Mr. Dyke is worth $3,560 a year, that is for the Minister to determine. I desire to say a few words in regard to agencies in Europe. To what extent has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company fulfilled the pledges given to Parliament by them and by the Government at the time their contract was entered into? They promised to relieve the

country from the greater part of the burdens of soliciting emigrants in Europe, and settling immigrants on the land in the North-West. I have yet to hear of any great success attending the company's efforts. No doubt they have distributed a large number of pamphlets in Europe, but I am not aware they have made special efforts to place immigrants on Government lands in the North-West. I, therefore, ask the Minister what has been accomplished by the Canadian Pacific Railway in this connection, and how far have their promises been realised.

Mr. CARLING. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have expended a large amount of money in distributing literature, which they had prepared at their own expense, in Europe and in the United States. They have also done much to reduce the fare for emigrants going to the North-West, and they now only charge something like $12 from Quebec to Winnipeg, and in proportion to stations further on. I believe they are doing valuable service and are encouraging immigration to the North-West. They have agents in the western cities and in Europe urging those who desire to make a change to go to the North-West, and I think their efforts are being attended with some success.

Mr. CASEY. We know they have been distributing literature, and have given cheap fares to immigrants; but how much of the emigration is due to the efforts of agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Europe, which is almost a Government institution?

Mr. CARLING. It is quite independent of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. The question is whether the Government is independent of the company. I understand the Minister cannot give us the exact results of the Canadian Pacific Railway immigration policy.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the results of their efforts, but I know they are most liberal in the expenditure and most active in their efforts to secure emigrants.

Mr. CASEY. How much has been saved to the country in the way of immigration expenditure in consequence of the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. CARLING. The Estimates have been cut down for the last three or four years by something like $100,000, and as compared with previous years by three or four hundred dollars, in great part, in consequence of exertions which have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway to promote immigration. These exertions are active. There is much greater competition in Great Britain and Europe now than there was some years ago. This is due to the fact that Australia and the Argentine Republic are offering large inducements to emigrants. The wages paid in Great Britain and on the continent are also greater than they were a few years ago. Notwithstanding all the discouragements, we are getting a fair share of emigration, due to the exertion, not only to the efforts of the Government, but to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The whole system of immigration should be entirely swept away, for it is a perfect waste of public money. All political favorites provided for in that Department and throughout Ontario should be dismissed. This country has certainly been advertised sufficiently for a number of years, and a great many of the immigrants we think we have secured simply pass through the country to the United States. It is time the whole of this business should cease. Another objectionable feature is this, that all through Ontario we have agents appointed who are simply distributors of literature, which seeks to induce men to leave Ontario and go to the North-West. A political friend to the Minister of Justice in my own town has been paid $65 for distributing literature last year.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that in the county of Kent, and in the town of Chatham, the Americans are more active than elsewhere in the country. We have distributed in that particular section pamphlets showing the advantages of the North-West, as we think, over the Western States, and I think the small amount of $65, for the distribution of this literature, might not be objected to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the hon. Minister is mistaken as to the amount of his literature distributed to the people of the United States.

Mr. CARLING. You will find them posted in railway stations, post offices and other public places.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the Postmaster General allows literature to be posted up in the post offices, advising the people of this country to move to the North-West, I think it is time the matter should be brought to his notice.

Mr. CARLING. Perhaps they are not in the Chatham post office, but they are in other post offices.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is my candid opinion that all this money is wasted. I would like to know if he has any knowledge as to the extent of the services rendered by Mr. Williams, of Chatham, in this direction? Although I have lived there all my life, I have never heard of his distributing pamphlets, nor do I know any man who has ever heard of his doing so. I think this item is an illustration of how this money is being wasted generally.

Mr. WATSON. I had hoped that the Minister would have some changes to suggest with regard to these agents in Europe. I am strongly under the impression that it would be much better if this large amount of money spent in maintaining offices, was expended on agents who would travel around in different sections of the country to see the people who intended to emigrate. Gentlemen who have had considerable experience in this matter advise that this course should be adopted. These agents take up a very large percentage of the total vote, and so far as I can learn, they do little or nothing outside of their offices. With regard to the expenses of Mr. Dyke, of $4 a day for 365 days, the hon. gentleman does not appear to know whether this is for travelling expenses or not.

Mr. CARLING. I have explained that $1 a day is paid to an assistant in the office out of Mr. Dyke's allowance, and $3 is really what he gets.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Dyke has several assistants besides, and I suppose that dollar a day man relieves him of some work he ought to do himself, or no doubt he would not pay it out of his salary.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke acts as a consular agent. We have no consular agent in fact, but the Americans have consular agents at these different points, and they pay them very large salaries. Mr. Dyke is there as a representative of Canada, and is very attentive to all matters relating to the Government. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has been in Liverpool, but everyone who has visited that place finds that Mr. Dyke is most attentive, most active, and most energetic and that he is doing his work admirably. We owe a great deal to Mr. Dyke, in conjunction with Sir Charles Tupper, for preventing our cattle being scheduled at the time the American cattle were scheduled. That advantage to Canada is worth a million dollars a year as compared with the position of the Americans with the same number of cattle. I do not think that we should begrudge this to an energetic and active gentleman like Mr. Dyke.

Mr. WATSON. What about J. G. Colmer, who draws a salary in the London office ?

Mr. CARLING. He is Sir Charles Tupper's secretary, and he is not under the Agriculture Department now.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman's reasoning is very good, for he stated that it was very much harder to secure immigrants now than it was a few years ago, while at the same time he says that he is reducing the vote for immigration. Is it because he cannot get the money voted by his Department, or is it on account of the labor organisations, that this very small amount is voted for immigration purposes ? It appears to me, considering the importance of settling up the North-West, that we should have a larger vote for immigration purposes. I believe that the Agriculture Department should be the most active of all the Departments of the Government, and I am sorry to see that it is practically falling off altogether. As was stated by the member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) a great number of the immigrants who settle in Manitoba are from the Eastern Provinces, and I venture to say that we get twenty people from these Provinces for the one we get from the old country. Of course, these are the very best settlers we can have and we cordially welcome them, but still we should have some immigration from the old country. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, whether Mr. Grahame, who had done good work for the Department at Winnipeg, and who had always treated the immigrants with courtesy, sympathy and kindness, was dismissed from the service of the Department ?

Mr. CARLING. The chief reason for Mr. Grahame leaving the service was because he desired to. He wrote a letter to the Department saying that his health was not good, and that he wanted to change his mode of living, and would like to get leave of absence with a view of retiring.

Mr. WATSON. Was that the only reason, or was not his resignation asked for ?

Mr. CARLING. Not by me. I did not ask him.

Mr. WATSON. Do you know if he was asked by the Department?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Was he allowed a gratuity?

Mr. CARLING. He was allowed six months' leave of absence and retired at the end.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if that active agent whom he praised so much the last time we were discussing this item, Mr. Metcalfe, has been re-engaged ?

Mr. CARLING. No ; Mr. Metcalfe is not in the service of the Government at the present time.

Mr. WATSON. Do you expect to secure his services this year ?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know. I have not spoken to him on that subject.

Quarantine, Grosse Isle.., ... $18,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you want an increase of $4,636 ?

Mr. CARLING. It has been necessary to increase the steamboat accommodation, as every vessel that comes up the St. Lawrence, night or day, is now inspected by the medical superintendent or by his assistant.

Tracadie Lazaretto..... $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an increase. What is that for ?

Mr. CARLING. We have employed the medical superintendent of that establishment permanently to give more attention to the establishment and to visit different parts of the country where lepers may be found. We have already found one or two cases in Cape Breton, and it was necessary to have them removed to the establishment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to quarrel with any reasonable expenditure under this head. The House is, perhaps, aware that there have been symptoms of an outbreak of leprosy in a good many quarters of Europe of late, and we can hardly be too particular to stamp it out as soon as it appears. Is there any reason to believe that the number of these unfortunate afflicted persons is increasing ? I was sorry to hear that the symptoms of the disease were found in places outside of Tracadie.

Mr. CARLING. We had reason to belive that there were some cases in Cape Breton, and we sent the medical officer there to make an investigation, and we had the afflicted persons brought to Tracadie. I think that now there are none outside of the institution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Were those persons natives or foreigners ?

Mr. CARLING. Natives.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What power has the Department to deal with these cases ? Are you able by summary process to arrest the persons afflicted and bring them to the Lazaretto, or do they come voluntarily ?

Mr. CARLING. The only power we used last season was the persuasive power of the medical officer, and the good treatment the patients have received at the institution. I hardly think we have legal power to arrest them, but it may possibly be necessary to take power.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If even one or two cases have been found in such place as Cape

Breton, it is for the hon. Minister and his Department to consider seriously whether legal power should not be obtained for the isolation of any person so afflicted. In these northern countries we are free at present from the scourge of leprosy, but everybody knows that it is a highly contagious disease, and any negligence on our part in allowing these people to go at large might result in very grave consequences.

Precautionary measures for the Public Health..... $5,000

Mr. CASEY. What does the hon. Minister intend to do with this item?

Mr. CARLING. This item has been reduced by $5,000. Some part of that money has been used in giving support to the health journals and it is voted to be ready for any emergency.

Mr. CASEY. The accounts of last year in regard to this item are sadly mixed, and I suppose it is the fault of the Department, because the Auditor General must take the accounts in the shape in which they are handed in to him. I find charges for investigating pig disease, attending plasterer at Brandon, caulking steamers, and so forth—all sorts of items jumbled up together. There is no means of telling what is due to the public health, and what is not. There is a separate vote for cattle diseases and sheep scab, but I find under the charges for public health last year any number of items relating to cattle diseases. I do not think that is the right way to arrange the accounts or to spend the money. In regard to the *Sanitary Journal* at Montreal and the *Sanitary Journal* at Ottawa, I do not know the former, but I do know the latter. It has been sent to me for years, and once in a while I get a bill for it, which I pay with the request to discontinue it. I have not had a bill for a year or two back. I do not know what the Government get for the $1,200 they pay. I know it is a worthless little publication. Do the Government get a certain number of copies?

Mr. CARLING. This paper is sent to representatives of this House and Senators, to the head officers and all our immigration officers, and has been very favorably noticed by the press of the country. I have had many communications from medical men in different parts highly approving of it.

Mr. CASEY. I know the journal quite well and read it once in a while, and am satisfied it is a little speculation. For the price paid, the Government could get a fine compilation on sanitary questions and have something for their money, instead of this little ephemeral sheet. I think it is a job in the full sense of the term. I notice that Mr. John Dyke, the agent at Liverpool, has spent considerable money in travelling. Under this item of public health, he received for travelling expenses $486.56, although he is allowed $4 a day for expenses. He thus charges both amounts.

Mr. CARLING. That was a special allowance for looking after cattle in the docks, and the money, although paid to Mr. Dyke, went to some man by the name of Mitchell, employed to go to the docks at Liverpool, and give information to the men shipping cattle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CASEY. Why, in the name of the Immigration Department—for I can think of no stronger phrase—is this charged to Mr. Dyke, when paid to somebody else? And what has this item to do with cattle? This shows the utter and fatuous jumble in which the accounts of the Department are kept. Here is $486 under the head of quarantine and public health paid to Mr. Dyke, and the hon. gentleman says it was not for Mr. Dyke, nor for quarantine or public health, but to enable Mr. Dyke to send somebody to the docks to look after cattle.

Mr. CARLING. Cattle disease is a matter which comes under this heading, as it is important diseased cattle should not go into the country.

Mr. CASEY. I am complaining that this should be charged to that account, and the hon. gentleman explains that the public health includes the health of cattle. It appears now that the duties of this man, whom Mr. Dyke employed, were not to give advice and information to exporters when they landed, but to see that the cattle were healthy before being landed. No cattle can be exposed for sale in Liverpool until they have been inspected by the English authorities, and, therefore, there is no necessity for this charge being made by Mr. Dyke.

Mr. WATSON. It would be better in future to have the name of the person employed inserted, because this leaves one to imagine that Mr. Dyke receives all this money for his own services, and if he is receiving $4,000, I think he is receiving too much.

Mr. CARLING. I admit that the item does not seem to be properly charged. There is no doubt the money was expended for that purpose, and was not paid to Mr. Dyke, but to Mr. Mitchell, who was employed by Mr. Dyke. The charges are made in a different manner this year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What are the duties performed by Mr. Mitchell? How many visits did he make? The Minister ought to be able to explain this item.

Mr. CARLING. I believe that this payment is for nearly the whole of his time. The hon. gentleman knows that last year we shipped to Great Britain something like 85,000 cattle, and this sum of $400 or $500 is very small for that service.

Mr. CASEY. What did he do in reference to the cattle?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the exact statement, but for visiting the wharves on arrival of vessels with cattle I do not think the amount paid to him is extravagant.

Mr. CASEY. I see two steamers mentioned here, the *Hygeia* and the *Challenger*. Are these employed in connection with the quarantine at Grosse Isle?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. CASEY. No, Sir; I have been on my feet all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has gone back to another item. We are endeavoring to keep as nearly as possible to the item under discussion.

Mr. CASEY. The items are the same in the Auditor General's Report; they are under the same

heading on page D—43. I also find here charges of this kind—brushes, brooms and soap, burying child, cleaning sheds, and so on. I am a little confused by these items appearing under the head of public health.

Cattle Quarantines and possible Expenses for Cattle Diseases and Sheep Scab..... $18,000

Mr. CASEY. Is there any expectation of sheep scab this year?

Mr. CARLING. I hope not, but it may break out.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to know if that one sheep that was imported into Ontario last year was thoroughly examined.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think, under the present system of criticism which is being adopted by one or two hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is necessary we should injure our health by remaining here any longer to-night. I do not object to fair or decent criticism, but it seems to be the idea of these gentlemen to keep us here the whole night by asking facetious questions. If we are to go through this kind of criticism, we might as well do it in better hours. If we cannot do work fairly, I think the Committee had better rise, and come back to the question another day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Go on.

Mr. WATSON. I think the remarks of the Finance Minister are uncalled for.

Mr. FOSTER. There never was a more absurd question put than that which the hon. gentleman put a minute ago.

Mr. WATSON. I think the criticisms on this side have been very fair, and have resulted in obtaining information from the Government, and also admissions that certain items were not in proper shape. In fact, the Minister of Agriculture stated that he would charge some of them in another way in future.

Miscellaneous Printing.....$30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you ask for $10,000 addional?

Mr. FOSTER. It was under-estimated last year.

Survey of Georgian Bay.....$18,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it not time this survey should be closed?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how it is at present. When I was Minister of Marine we thought that about four years would probably finish what was most necessary to be done. As my hon. friend knows, these waters are very extensive, and the extent that is got over each summer, although they work very faithfully, is not very large.

Mr. DENISON. The work ought to be continued until it is finished properly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many parties are employed?

Mr. FOSTER. There is one large boat, and last year there were two or three parties in small boats, off from the large boat.

Mr. SPROULE. They are still in the Georgian Bay.

Salary and contingencies of office of Mr. Fabre.....$3,500

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think we ought to have some explanation of what he is doing, whether he is succeeding in sending us out any immigrants.

Mr. FOSTER. He is sowing the seed for future results. It takes time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We ought to have some report from this gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I acknowledge there ought to be a report. I think there is a report, but the Secretary of State is not present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By the report of last year he was instrumental in bringing one immigrant, and that immigrant was never placed anywhere. I move that the item be struck out. It is utterly indefensible.

Committee divided: Yeas, 6; Nays, 18.

To assist in the publication of the 4th volume of Cartwright's Cases..... $250

Mr. FOSTER. I think the words "Sir Richard" ought to be inserted before the name "Cartwright."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would heartily support that if the Government would publish Sir Richard's speeches.

Commercial Agencies.....$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do we get for this?

Mr. FOSTER. I reduced that. It has not been expended this year.

Survey, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary work in connection with the Hot Springs Reservation near Banff Station.....$17,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Have we any Governor General's warrants in connection with the Banff Springs?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is all there is. The expenditure this year is all within the mark.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that to be a continuous thing? Is there no end to it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are decreasing the expenditure every year, and I think there will be a further decrease next year. All the heavy work on the roads is about completed. There is one bridge to be built to complete the circuit of the carriage road, and after that there will be no heavy work. But it is proposed to make a few bridle trails into some of the most interesting portions of the park.

Collection of Orders in Council..... $8,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that is a piece of extravagance altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote, I think, will complete the work which has been undertaken and been going on for about two years. The Orders are all collocated that have been passed by the Council. This is to cover the remainder of the cost of printing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think myself that has been a perfect job. It ought to have been done for

about $1,000. I have examined the report and know it well; every lawyer has looked through it. There is no work about it at all. The expenditure is simply outrageous, and no defence can be offered for it. I have talked with a lot of gentlemen who understand that kind of work, and they agree that it was simply disgraceful and unpardonable. The revising officer in the district of the Minister of Justice is the gentleman who collocates these Orders in Council and publishes them. He is in the employ of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not in the employ of the Government at present. It was necessary that the work should be done, and if the gentleman who did the work was capable, what did it matter whether he was revising officer for the county or not?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am surprised that the hon. gentleman does not see that a wrong was committed. The revising officer is supposed to be independent of the Government and of the Opposition; but this officer, who filled the position, was in the employ and under the dictation of the hon. Minister of Justice. It is an outrage on the face of it. Moreover, the gentleman was paid three or four prices.

Publication of proceedings of Royal Society..... $5,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Here is another amount of $5,000, from which we do not receive any benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the only contribution we give to general science.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not object to a contribution to science, but I doubt whether the work is worth the money we spend on it. Occasionally there is a very nice article in the collection, but, on looking through the volume published last year, it seemed to me that many of the articles were essays which were hardly worth embalming in the historical records of the country.

Dictionnaire Généalogique de l'Abbé Tanguay..... $1,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. What amount has been spent on this work?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the sixth volume at $1,000 each. I am solemnly assured that the end of it has come.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am surprised that the Equal Righters should not and do not raise the question involved here as the families of one Province only are described. In looking through the Parliamentary Companion I find that almost every member of the Senate is descended from an ancient king. I object to money being spent on genealogical trees, going back to the time of Jacques Cartier. It is an outrage and it is indefensible.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If supporters of Equal Rights objected, the cry would be raised that they were prejudiced. I agree that it is a most preposterous expenditure.

Dominion Lands..... $172,243

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have had under consideration what changes may be made to reduce the expenditure, and I have come to the conclusion that there is a certain amount of duplicating of work, and that during the recess I will see what changes can be made. It was understood by some persons that I had indicated in the early part of the Session that I proposed moving the Land Commission Office from Winnipeg. That was not the case; but I think there can be some material reduction made, and shortly after the Session I propose to go to Winnipeg for a few days in order to go to the Commissioner's office and see where reductions can be effected.

Mr. WATSON. The remarks of the hon. Minister in the early part of the Session in regard to moving the Land Board from Winnipeg caused considerable alarm in Manitoba and the North-West. While it may be admitted that it is rather extravagant, still the people of Manitoba do not want the Land Board removed from Winnipeg, because it is much more convenient for the people to do business at Winnipeg than at Ottawa. Although there is extra expenses, still the people favor the retention of the Land Board at Winnipeg. I believe there should be something more done in Winnipeg in connection with the lands in Manitoba and the North-West, than there is to-day, and less done in Ottawa.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister would see his way to reduce this vote by transferring the whole Ottawa establishment to Winnipeg. I am not at all certain but that my hon. friend is perfectly correct, that a very small force at Ottawa could do the work. I have very great doubts as to the policy of governing that country from this point.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the hon. Minister will consider well the suggestion of my hon. friend Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A certain amount of the work has to be done here and a certain amount in Winnipeg. If the whole of the Department could be moved to Winnipeg, myself included, I would not at all object.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the sooner we remove the Land Board from Winnipeg the better it will be, for we have any number of clerks there who are practically doing nothing. I might ask the Minister who is the inspector of colonisation companies now? Is Mr. Stephenson still in the employment of the Government, and drawing a salary for doing nothing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Rufus Stephenson has not been in the employ of the Government for over a year. There are only one or two companies in existence and we have no inspector.

Mr. WATSON. With regard to this item for the salary of forest rangers, I would suggest to the Minister that it would be much better to pay those officers a fixed salary, than to pay them the present salary and allow them to participate in a share of the fines imposed. In some cases these agents are over-zealous in attempting to increase their salaries by seizing timber which, under ordinary circumstances, they would not seize at all.

Mr DEWDNEY. There are some few who are temporarily employed in some localities who receive fees, but I do not think the permanent officers receive fees and salaries.

Mr. WATSON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in that. Some of the forest rangers in

Manitoba receive $700 a year salary, and they increase that to $1,000 by participating in fines.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the first time the matter is brought to my notice, and will give it my attention.

Mr. WATSON. Does the hon. Minister consider it unnecessary to have a forestry commissioner any longer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the Supplementary Estimates of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, there will be a vote for the purpose of establishing some Forestry Experimental Farms for the planting of trees. The Experimental Farm Act provides for eight of these farms to be established throughout the Territories, and I believe it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to establish four this year. It is intended to give more attention to forestry matters, and this is the commencement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an interesting matter, and the House might profitably spend some time in discussing it, but we cannot do so just now. I have myself time and again in the House advocated the formation of Crown forests, and although it would not pay us, I believe that in twenty or thirty years they would be a great profit to the people of this country. Speaking for myself alone, and in no way pledging any one else, if the hon. gentleman has any project of that kind to propose, I will be prepared to give it every possible consideration. I believe that we have in our hands the means of creating a very profitable source of revenue.

Mr. WATSON. It is very important that attention should be paid to forestry in Manitoba and the North-West, and it is to be regretted that a large quantity of the timber land of that country was burned over last fall in consequence of the carelessness either of some Indians or persons going into the country. The whole country between Strathclair and Lake Dauphin, and I believe almost up to the big Saskatchewan, was burnt over. That is to be regretted, and the officers of the Department should notify all people that they will be severely punished if they make fires in the forests.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister gives us any information as to the time when he will take up the Banking Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to take it up on Tuesday, provided we do not on that day go into concurrence on the tariff resolutions; and if the Banking Bill is not taken up on Tuesday, it will be on the day after.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LABOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) (for Mr. LÉPINE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, the measures respecting labor promised in the Speech from the Throne?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The promise of the Government will be fulfilled.

JAMES GREER.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Whether James Greer has been appointed a fishery overseer in the Province of Ontario? If so, what was the date of his appointment, and what amount of salary does he receive?

Mr. HAGGART. The late James Greer was appointed fishery overseer on April 1, 1879, for a certain district in the County of Leeds, Province of Ontario, at a salary of $40 per year.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. PLATT asked, 1. Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the effect of the changes proposed to be made in the Royal Military College, Kingston, as per report of Major General Cameron? And is it the case, that the proposed changes, if carried out, will have the effect of reducing the number of responsible professorships, which must be held by military men, from five to two? 2. Is not part of the scheme to make one officer (himself fully employed in instructional work) responsible for the instruction in the following large range of subjects, viz.: Military history, strategy, tactics, fortifications, descriptive geometry, geometrical drawing, military topography, civil engineering, practical astronomy, and reconnaissance, which have heretofore been divided between three responsible heads? 3. Is not one of the proposals of the scheme to double (from $1,000 to $2,000) the salaries of the professors of French and English, whose work need, and does not require anything like their full time (one of them being actually in charge of a parish)? 4. Having regard to the facts, do the Government now intend to carry out the whole or any part of the extraordinary changes proposed by the Commandant in his last report? And if so, what part?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that a report has been submitted, suggesting certain changes in the Royal Military College. The report was submitted only quite lately, and during the recess it will receive the consideration of the Government.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. DENISON asked, Whether the Government intend appointing a Board of Visitors to the Royal Military College? And if so, when?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is a Board of Visitors which has been in existence almost since the College was started.

REBATE ON SAW LOGS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether Richard Power, formerly of Victoria Harbor, received a rebate on saw logs cut on Parry Island, in the Georgian Bay, during the years 1885, 1886 and 1887? If so, what amount each year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In February, 1886, Richard Power received a rebate of $1,078.64 on account of

lumber dues overpaid by him on saw logs in the seasons of 1884 and 1885, on the Parry Sound limit. He received no other rebate.

RAILWAY STATISTICS.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to the fact that the railway statistics for 1889 has not yet been issued. It is a valuable compilation, and it is most desirable to have it distributed. I understand the delay is occasioned by one or two companies failing to make the return required by law. I think some measure should be taken by the Government to hasten the returns in order that the publication may be issued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There must be some mode of compelling the railway companies to send in their statements. The neglect to issue the report is due to the failure on the part of some companies to send in their statements, and perhaps I may call attention subsequently to the best means of enforcing the statutory order.

SUBSIDIES TO THE CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BERGERON moved for :

Statement of the amount of subsidies voted to the Canada Atlantic Railway Company for the construction of their bridge over the St. Lawrence River, between Coteau and Valleyfield, the amount paid by the Government up to date, and the amount unearned or still to be paid.

He said : I desire to explain why this motion has been put upon the Order paper, and my object in asking for a statement of the amount of subsidies voted by Parliament for the construction of a bridge by the Canada Atlantic Railway at Coteau. I see that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) has a question on the paper to-day, asking what steps were taken in the construction of another railway, with the view of arriving at the same object which I wish to attain, that is, to secure the payment of the laborers and others who had claims against the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, out of the subsides voted by Parliament. In the construction of the bridge at Coteau it appears that the laborers, poor men from Valleyfield, worked a part of last summer and have not yet been paid. Whether the money is due by the sub-contractor, or the contractor, or by the company themselves, no one can find out. The Parliament of Canada voted, last winter, $180,000 as a subsidy to help the company in constructing that bridge. I need not say to the House that the men do not understand whether they should go to law, which they have not got the means to do, or whether they should attack the company, or the sub-contractor, or the contractor himself; in fact, no one knows what to do. They have taken legal proceedings against one of the sub-contractors, but they have not succeeded. They have had a good deal of trouble, and have been subscribing among themselves to take legal proceedings against the company, but the sub-contractor being the only person who formed the line of law between the company and the laborers, refused to go and give his testimony, and consequently the laborers lost. My object in making this motion is to put before the House this very queer state of things. The people naturally say that, if this money is taken out of the public chest, a guarantee should be given to the laborers who do the work that they should be paid. I may say, *en passant*, that I am not opposed to subsidies being granted; on the contrary, I think it is a good policy on the part of the Government, but there is something lacking in the law in this respect, which might be remedied by an amendment of the Railway Act, or some kind of legislation by which it can be secured that the poor laborers working on these public works shall receive pay for the hard work they perform. It may be said that the company will say they have paid the full amount to the contractor; and the contractor may say that he has paid the full amount to the sub-contractor; but there is one thing sure, that the laborers have not been paid. Many hon. gentlemen have working people in their counties. They know that their working people are often very poor. Mine were nearly starving all winter, because they cannot secure just payment for their labor, although public money has been paid to the contractor of that bridge. I repeat once more, that the statement of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) that, on some other occasion, the Government, acting in a paternal way I may say, appointed Mr. McGee, of the Privy Council, if I understand it aright, to be a kind of arbitrator between the Pontiac Pacific Railway Company and the laborers, which ought to form a precedent in this case. If anything of that kind could be done in this instance, I would be very glad indeed if the Government should come to such a conclusion. These poor laborers have *bons* in their possession which may not be very good for money, but, at all events, they prove that the work was performed by them, and I do not see why they should not succeed. If you have a stipulation that there will be supervision on the moneys which are paid by Parliament, to secure that justice is done to the working people, and if everything possible to relieve these poor people from the unfortunate position in which they are to-day can be done, it will be a step in the right direction. I, therefore, beg to move this resolution, seconded by Mr. Geoffrion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion being carried. The subject which the hon, gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) speaks of is one of very considerable difficulty, and the question arises very frequently when either the contractor or sub-contractors fail to pay the workingmen. The Department tries in every possible way to induce the companies to see that the men are paid, sometimes with success and sometimes unsuccessfully. The contract, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a contract between the Government and railway company. The company agrees to build the railway, and upon that agreement the Government covenant to pay them a certain subsidy. If they perform the work and build the railway they have a right to the money; and the Government cannot intervene between the company and the contractor if they have done the work and if they ask payment of the money, which is pledged to them on the performance of that work. However, we find generally that the companies do all they can to compel their contractors to pay the men, but there are contractors and sub-contractors and sub-sub-contractors, and it is quite impossible

to follow these various private arrangements which are made during the construction of a railway. The Government cannot pay the subsidy to the company and, at the same time, pay the laborers who have not been paid by their employers. We have met with very considerable success, however, in obtaining payment in whole or in part for the laborers where the contractors or sub-contractors have failed to pay them.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no doubt of what the right hon. gentleman says, that this subject is one of great difficulty. But it seems to me that it would be possible to obviate these difficulties if it were known beforehand that the Government would not pay any subsidy unless all the liabilities on the road were discharged. This would ensure that the company would see that the contractors and sub-contractors paid their men. Of course, at present, the moment a section of a road has been built the Government is bound to pay the subsidy according to their promise, and according to the grant made. At the same time, if the Government gave due notice in advance to the company, that it would be part of their duty to see that all the liabilities of that road were properly discharged by all parties concerned, the company would see that it was to their advantage that the sub-contractors paid the men. If it were known, therefore, that the money would not be forthcoming, unless the liabilities were discharged, it seems to me that a good many of the difficulties now brought forward—in this instance by my friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron)—would be obviated. These cases of contractors not paying their laborers are becoming altogether too numerous. At present there are four or five such examples; but, I must say, in all fairness to the companies, that they have paid their contractors, while at the same time the sub-contractors have failed to pay their men. When it is known that the company has only discharged a part of its contract by simply paying their contractors, that they must take care that the money is properly applied, and that they will not receive the Government subsidy unless they exercise surveillance over the contractors and sub-contractors, a good deal of this difficulty would be obviated. I understand, that when my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was Prime Minister and Minister of Public Works, he took precautions to see that the laborers were properly paid by the contractors on the Lachine Canal. This, perhaps, would be a precedent for the Government to follow.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I am glad that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has brought this matter before the House. In the county which I have the honor to represent, as far back as some fifteen or sixteen years ago, we had a number of men unpaid for labor performed in connection with work on the St. Peter's Canal. That work was done at the time and under contract with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when Premier and Minister of Public Works. Since then these laborers have been asking for their wages from the Government, or requesting that the Government should take some steps to have them paid, but without any success. Within the last two years contracts were let to several contractors for the building of a railway through the Island of Cape Breton, and, it so happened that although the contractors were paid by the Government for the work performed, they and a number of sub-contractors abandoned the work, leaving a number of men unpaid, who have not yet received their money. There is a clause, I believe, on the general form of agreement between the contractors and the Government, which to my mind is very objectionable. The clause to which I refer is that which gives a lien to the Government on the plant and property belonging to the contractor who may do the work. I do not think there is any necessity on the part of the Government for inserting such a clause as that, which interferes so much with the privilege of laborers in getting at the contractors under the law of the country. The amount of money deposited as security by contractors should be sufficient security to the Government for the performance of the work, and persons performing work could get at contractors under the law of the country for their pay themselves, as in dealing with any other person with respect to any other kind of work. That is one clause which the Government should have removed from the general form of agreement they have with contractors undertaking work, and that would protect a great many workingmen whose claims remain unpaid, and it would enable them to get at the contractors and get their pay, the same as they would in law for any other work they performed. Under these circumstances, I hope the Government will see that those men will get their pay, and in future, arrangements will be made by which the people will be better protected than they have been in the past.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA AND TREATIES OF COMMERCE.

General LAURIE moved for :

Copies of any and all communications that may have passed between the Imperial and Dominion Governments with reference to the abrogation of such articles in the various Treaties of Commerce between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments of foreign nations as preclude preferential fiscal treatment of goods of British and Colonial production by the Government of the Dominion.

He said : Mr. Speaker, on the 24th of April, 1883, a return was brought down to the House of Commons, in reply to an Address, for

"Copies of all despatches, telegrams and correspondence between the Government of the United Kingdom and Canada, and between the Government of Canada and the High Commissioner touching negotiations for commercial arrangements with France, Spain, or other countries, and all reports of the High Commissioner on the subject."

This report came down only to the year 1883. At that time there were still unsettled several questions connected with commercial treaties of great moment to the Dominion, and since that date nothing official has been placed before Parliament and the country showing in what position we stand with regard to this matter; and with the view of having our position defined, I have placed this motion on the Notice paper. I shall briefly outline the history of our diplomatic positions. I find that there do not appear in this return, one or two papers antecedent to the question that then arose, but of vital importance to us, as showing the position in which we stand in relation to the mother country. Up to the year 1878 it was the practice

of the mother country to negotiate such treaties and to make such arrangements for her colonies as she considered advisable, without apparently in any way consulting them, except on special occasions. But, in 1878, Lord Carnarvon, who, though a Tory of the Tories in England and opposed to changes there which he did not consider necessary, was certainly most progressive in regard to colonial matters, communicated to the Governor General a draft article which he proposed to apply to all treaties with foreign nations. The wording of that article was as follows :—

"The stipulations of the present treaty shall be applicable to the colonies and foreign possessions of the two high contracting parties named in this article.

"The stipulations of the present treaty shall be also applicable to any colony or foreign possession of either of the two high contracting parties, of a supplementary convention to that effect.

"In the latter case, the stipulations of the present treaty shall, subject to such modifications as may be agreed upon by the high contracting parties, from and after a date to be agreed upon, not later than six months from the date of the ratification of such supplementary convention, become as fully applicable to such colony or foreign possession as if it had been mentioned by name in the present article."

Practically that is a charter to us, authorising us to have a voice in the negotiation of all treaties made with foreign powers, in which our interests are concerned. But, within three months after that date, it appears that the Colonial Office had forgotten that such a dispatch had been sent ; for in June of the same year, the Colonial Office forwarded a communication to the Governor General, stating that they were negotiating a treaty with Roumania, and asking whether the conditions of the treaty would be acceptable to us. There is no necessity of my wearying the House by reading these communications. Two years afterwards, the Liberals having in the meantime succeeded to power in England, Lord Kimberley, the Colonial Secretary, wrote to the Governor General to say, that the British Government proposed to negotiate a treaty with Roumania, the same country as was formerly mentioned, and they asked the Government of Canada to state, whether they wished to take part in that treaty or to be excluded from it. He went on to say, that if the Government of Canada desired, the British Government would obtain exemption for Canada from the provisions of that treaty. In 1881, Sir Alexander Galt, who seems to have exercised a very close supervision over what was going on in England, called the attention, first, of Lord Kimberley, and then of the Government of Canada, which he represented as High Commissioner, to the fact that the Government of Canada were bound under certain treaties negotiated by the British Government prior to 1878, which precluded us from making any arrangements with sister colonies or with the mother country that we might desire, because any arrangements we might so make with them would inure to the benefit of the two countries therein named, namely, Belgium and the Zollverein of Germany. Sir Alexander Galt called the attention of Lord Kimberley to the request of the Government of Canada to be relieved, as soon as convenient, from the obligations imposed by such treaties, limiting the freedom of action of the Dominion Parliament, and stipulating that neither Great Britain nor any of her possessions should admit their respective productions at lower rates of duty than those imposed upon the goods of the countries named in the treaties, and requested that such action be taken as might be deemed necessary to meet the wishes of the Canadian Government. The Government instructed Sir Alexander Galt to place their views on this point before the Secretary of State for the colonies, and to urge that such a step should be taken as would relieve us from the obligation of those treaties. Sir Alexander Galt accordingly placed this view before the Colonial Secretary, who placed it before the Foreign Secretary, through whom all foreign correspondence is conducted. I find (see page 10 of the Sessional Papers) that application was accordingly made by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to Belgium and the German Zollverein, asking that we should be relieved, as soon as convenient, from the obligations connected with any treaties of commerce now in existence with foreign countries, so far as such treaties limit the freedom of action of the Dominion Parliament. Sir Richard Herbert, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, wrote as follows to this Government, giving the result of such proceedings :—

"SIR,—With reference to my letter of the 7th January last, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to acquaint you that His Lordship is informed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that Her Majesty's Minister at Brussels and Her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin, in accordance with their instructions, placed themselves informally in communication with the Belgian and German Governments as to the exemption of the Dominion of Canada from the stipulations of Article 15 of the Anglo-Belgian Treaty of 1862, and of Article 7 of the Commercial Treaty of 1865 with Germany.

"Her Majesty's Minister at Brussels has now reported, that in the opinion of the Belgian Government the exemption desired by the Dominion of Canada would necessitate the denunciation of the Treaty of 1862, and the negotiation of a fresh treaty to replace it, and Her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin has learned that in the opinion of the competent German authorities, it would not be either convenient or desirable to abrogate single articles of the Treaty of 1865 apart from a general revision of the whole instrument, for which, however, there did not appear to be any immediate necessity."

And so the matter was allowed to stand by the British Foreign Office. Sir Alexander Galt again brought the subject to the attention of the Dominion Government, and a further application was made by the Dominion Government, urging our position on the home authorities and pointing out the necessity of relief being given. Nothing further, however, appears to have been done by the Imperial Government, according to these returns, which only come down to 1882. In the meantime unofficial communications passed between the Jamaica Government and the Canadian Government, and the Governor of Jamaica submitted to the home authorities the question, in view of those unofficial communications, whether it was within the powers of the Governments of Jamaica and Canada to make special commercial arrangements with each other and the British West Indies generally, in the direction of reciprocal concessions in reduction of import duties. Lord Kimberley replied as follows :—

"I need scarcely say that Sir A. Musgrave is entirely right in his assumption that Her Majesty's Government could not sanction any arrangement which would involve the creation of differential duties in favor of Canada."

This reply, which was sent to the Marquis of Lorne, the Governor General of the Dominion, was by him submitted to the Privy Council here, who fully considered the matter, and sent a report thereon to the Earl of Kimberley. In this report, I find it stated :

"The Minister of Finance, to whom the confidential dispatch was referred, observes that although the Canadian Government are not at present prepared to propose any plan for a commercial convention with Jamaica or the West Indies generally, they feel it necessary to record their dissent from the principle laid down, that as between portions of the said Empire, no duties discriminating in favor of British as against foreign industry can be sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government."

The report then refers to the proposal made by Canada, prior to Confederation, for free interchange of products with the Maritime Provinces, while maintaining duties on the same article against the rest of the world, which proposal was agreed to, and proceeds to state:

"That in accordance with this precedent the Canadian Government claim that it is competent for any of the colonies possessing representative and responsible Government to enter into mutual agreement for either partial or absolute free trade with the mother country or with each other, or with both, discriminating against other countries."

The report adds:

"Trade should be rendered as free as practicable between the various portions of the Empire, having regard solely to their own interests, and unfettered by any obligation to treat others with equal favor."

One would suppose that, as the result of this discussion, some further action would have been taken, but we find that a report was brought down to the British House of Commons, on a motion of Colonel Howard Vincent, dated 27th of April, 1888, asking for:

"Return of the treaties of commerce in force between the United Kingdom and foreign powers which preclude preferential fiscal treatment of British goods in the colonies and dependencies of the British Crown, showing when such treaties were concluded, what notice is necessary for their termination, and whether the clauses placing the export trade of Great Britain and Ireland within the Empire upon the same conditions as the export trade to British colonies of foreign countries which deny a like advantage to the production of British industry, can be abrogated without prejudice to the rest of the treaties in question, and what advantage such treaties secure to British trade."

The answer to that is this return I hold in my hand. Sir Edward Hertslet stated, in preparing the return, that there are two treaties between Great Britain and foreign powers, which expressly preclude preferential fiscal treatment of British goods in the colonies and dependencies of the British Crown. These treaties are: Treaty with Belgium, 23rd July, 1862. Treaty with the Zollverein 30th May, 1865. The treaty with Belgium contains this stipulation:

"The produce or manufacture of Belgium, shall not be subject in the British Colonies to other or higher duties than those which are or may be imposed upon similar articles of British origin."

The treaty with the Zollverein has this article;

"In those colonies and possessions—that is, the colonies and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty—the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

Unfortunately, by the application of those two treaties we come under the obligation of the most-favored-nation clause. I find, on examining a return to the British House of Commons made in August, 1888, that there are no less than thirty-four treaties entered into by the mother country with foreign nations in which the most-favored-nation clause is embodied. Therefore, so long as these treaties stand in force, we are bound to give the most-favored-nation terms to thirty-four other nations. While these treaties are in force, we are thus prevented from making any arrangements with our sister colonies, from which those other nations would be excluded, and are prevented from taking any action whatever which would give differential advantages to any other nation or community. But I shall return to this presently. In the meantime, we are all aware that large concessions have been made to the colonies, especially Canada. In 1878, Sir Alexander Galt, then our High Commissioner, was authorised to conduct negotiations with Spain in the interest of Canada. In 1883, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed co-plenipotentiary with Sir Richard Morier, also to conduct negotiations with Spain, and the negotiations were to be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper but signed by both. In 1888, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed co-plenipotentiary with Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Lionel Sackville-West in the negotiations with the United States; in 1888, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed co-plenipotentiary with Sir Clare Ford to conduct negotiations with Spain, the negotiations to be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper, but to be signed by both plenipotentiaries, thus binding the power of England to support those treaties. The same question has been raised in Australia. As long ago as 1871, a desire was shown by Australia to enter into closer trade relations with some of the French colonies on the Pacific, and the matter was submitted to the home authorities. Lord Kimberley pointed out that it was utterly impracticable to give differential trade relations to a foreign power and to discriminate against the mother country or against the British colonies. From a portion of his dispatch, I read:

"The imposition of differential duty on British goods compared with foreign will, it can hardly be doubted, have a tendency to weaken connection."

That summarises the position we occupy in regard to making fiscal arrangements with communities outside of our own. I am aware that this question has been brought up in this House by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in 1882, and by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1889. There was this difference between the motions made by two hon. gentlemen and the position which I advocate. In the case of the hon. member for West Durham, it was urged that permission should be obtained from the Imperial Government to negotiate with other British possessions or with foreign states, but the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was simply to deal with foreign states. The hon. member for West Durham has stated that he is inclined to the view that it is desirable to increase our export trade. He said:

"There are many classes of manufactured commodities capable of being produced in this country, which require for their economical production a large market. There is nothing clearer as to numerous classes of commodities, that within certain limits which far transcend our population, the larger the market the cheaper the goods can be produced, and long ago, in some particular cases, we had supplied to the full the home market, created to some extent a foreign trade, and were dependent for the further extension and growth of our manufacturing interest upon the facilities that one might obtain by cheap productions and reasonable arrangements with foreign nations, in sending forward our goods into their countries. That development of manufacturing to which I have referred is one not interesting to the manufacturer alone, but of interest and importance to the whole community, to the consumer as well as the producer, because it is based upon the theory that economy of production will ensue from the largeness of the production, and from that economised production, the consumer will obtain a portion of the benefit."

The rest bears on the same subject, and is as well expressed as the hon. member always expresses what he has to say. Then I find that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has not hesitated in the same way to declare that he does not limit his desires—though possibly some people might have inferred so — to closer commercial relations with the country to the south of us, for last October, in declaring his political programme, he said in a public address :

"I would be in favor of a more close commercial alliance of Canada with Great Britain. I would favor it with all my soul."

I am sure he would. I desire simply to declare that I think we should put ourselves in closer commercial union with those countries with whom we are more allied. While the hon. gentleman and his friends desire that we should have closer relations with the country to the south of us, we have the assurance of the Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, that he will not listen to that except on terms which would not be acceptable to us ; that is, that with a change of financial policy, we must also change our allegiance. So I think we need not enter into the question of our trade relations with the United States any further. I will be glad to discuss that question with my hon. friends on some other occasion, but, as I read the present political state of affairs, we cannot do much more in the way of expanding our trade with them. But I say that there are countries scattered over the world with which we can expand our trade. These countries, which extend the world over under the British flag, may be induced to trade with us without our being asked to change our allegiance, or without our asking other countries to change theirs. We find three great groups of colonies under the British flag, which are desirous of extending their commercial relations, and are willing to complement our trade resources by furnishing what we want from them and taking from us what they want. I should be very much inclined to group with Canada, in the first place, the West Indies, and I hope that, sooner or later, we shall have better relations with them. Although I have heard hon. gentlemen speak of the West Indies as offering us no prospects from increased trade, I find that up to 1845, the West Indies took one-fifth of all the export of British goods to British possessions. With that fact before us, it must be evident that they have vast consuming powers and possibilities for great prosperity, although, according to the present financial policy of the mother country, they have been sadly prostrated. But, though they do not take the same position as they formerly did, their custom is not a small one. In 1888, the imports of three of the West Indies, Jamaica, Barbadoes and Trinidad, amounted to £4,734,386. In 1874, the imports of those three colonies amounted to £4,137,058, showing an increase in 1888 of £597,328. The revenue of the West Indies is over two million pounds sterling. It is true that the revenue decreased, owing to various causes, but improved education has brought increased energy and aptitude for business, and as one of the best proofs of this I find that concurrently with decrease of revenue there has been an increase in the post office revenue from £62,370 in 1882 to £76,922 in 1886, a sure sign of growing prosperity. In 1884, the export from Great Britain, of all classes of goods, to the West Indies, amounted to £3,394,736. In order to show that others than European nations set a great value on the trade with the West Indies, I will read from Isham's book on the Fishery Question, of which it gives a historical summary. Speaking of the state of affairs in 1873 he says :

"In July of the same year that the treaty was signed, an Order in Council prohibited the importation of American fish to the markets of the English West Indies. Congress wished to meet the emergency, and asked of the States permission to retaliate. This was not given. In the constitutional convention Pickering said, that the New England States had lost everything by the war. In the first Congress, Fisher Ames declared that West India molasses had been counted upon in exchange for the fish that could not be disposed of elsewhere. He concluded that, if the West Indian demand for fish were injured, 'we cannot maintain the fisheries.' Extraordinary measures were presently adopted to sustain the failing industry."

And that these were necessary is proved by the fact that, although in 1764 the exports of fish from the United States amounted to £155,000 sterling, in 1814, after the loss of the United States trade with the West Indies, and in spite of the great development of the country, trade retrograded until it had fallen to $128,000, showing that the West India trade is one that can be developed very largely, and become an important trade to us, if proper steps are taken. But we are told : "Oh, New York has such an immense advantage ; the ports of the United States are so much nearer to the West Indies that they can furnish all the goods required in the West Indies, and distance is against us." Now, in regard to distance, I take St. Thomas as a central point, and I find that New York is 1,430 miles distant, while Halifax is 1,564 miles distant, a difference of only 130 miles. Really the difference is not so great that an enterprising merchant cannot get over it. New Orleans is somewhat nearer ; but New Orleans can hardly be considered as a depot for the export of manufactured goods. I will not weary the House by reading the West Indies trade statistics, but I may say that there is very little supplied to the West Indies that we are not able to supply from Canada. I associate the West Indies, to a certain extent, with the North American group of colonies. Passing to the group of colonies in the southern hemisphere, I will consider the trade returns of Australia, and I find that Australia imported goods, that we are perfectly able to supply, to the amount of £28,000,000 sterling. That seems to me far too large a trade for us to sacrifice.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why do we not supply it now ?

General LAURIE. Because other nations have already taken possession of that trade, and we would require certain facilities to win it from them. Why do we not send trade there now ?—because we have not developed it ; trade has gone there from other countries. We have within the last few years only begun to develop our manufactures. To show how trade is rapidly growing, I will read to the House——

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is the National Policy that makes goods high.

General LAURIE. Very well, I will read an extract from a manufacturer in Canada, under the National Policy which has made goods high, which letter shows that during the existence of the National Policy this trade has been developed. I have

a letter from Mr. Massey, of Toronto, in which he says:

"The writer had the privilege of an extensive trip through Australia and of opening our branch there, which is now doing a flourishing business throughout the Australian colonies. To be brief, we believe that the steps to be taken to further Canadian trade with Australia are these: First. A treaty in reciprocity in general trade. It is argued against this that the productions of the two countries are so similar that this could not be done to advantage, but anyone who would care to look fully into the matter, will, nevertheless, discover that there are productions of several characters which could be mutually exchanged to great advantage to both countries. Australian wool, for instance, is everywhere known to be the finest produced, and it is well known that the finest goods can only be made from Australian wool. These goods are largely manufactured in England, the United States having abandoned their manufacture from the fact that the Government of that country has imposed so heavy a duty on the raw material coming from Australia that manufacturers of well-known goods have confined themselves to the cheaper lines of woollens; and it has occurred to the writer that this is an industry, which, if taken up in Canada, could be well developed and made a profitable trade. There are other commodities, which I have not the time to mention, that could be imported from Australia with great advantage to ourselves. Of course, in return we could send them manufactured goods of all kinds which they now get largely from the United States or Great Britain. As an instance of what Canadians can do in Australia, we would refer you to our own trade in the Colony of Victoria alone. In the harvest of 1887-88 we entered the Victorian harvest field with something like a dozen machines, which were easily disposed of, and which was the foundation of our trade there. The year following we sold in that same colony over 200 machines, and in the harvest that has just passed we sold 572 self-binding harvesters—a growth of trade which is almost unprecedented; and this in the face of the keenest competition on the part of American and British manufacturers long established in Australian colonies. There are several other things which should be considered by our country in developing an Australian trade. A steamship line is certainly a necessity, and it would seem from our limited experience that it could be conducted with profit. We regret exceedingly that so little has been done by our Government in this direction heretofore, and we hope that the eyes of our officials will soon be opened to the necessity of giving our manufacturers greater facilities for disposing of their goods in foreign markets. While it is a small matter, at the same time it goes to show how dilatory our Government is. The postage between the two countries is at an absurd price, and considerably in excess of the United States postage with Australia. This is a small matter to be sure, but it is only an illustration."

Then again he goes on to say:

"We only yesterday received the Australian mail, which gives most flattering reports of our success there during the past season, and also of the good work our machines have done in New Zealand, where we sold in the neighborhood of seventy-five self-binders during the season just passed. We also have a small mower trade in New Zealand. You ask us in which of the colonies we have the largest trade. Victoria is the one in which we have done the most work. Next to this comes New Zealand. Third upon the list is New South Wales, and fourth Tasmania, in which latter we have no mean trade. We have also proceeded to open up trade in the other colonies. Our traveller who has just finished up the business in Tasmania, and who was proceeding to Melbourne with the settlement of the year's business, said that he had with him cash and notes to the value of over £4,000 sterling as the result of our first season's business in Tasmania."

Then again he writes:

"There are two points which I did not mention specially in my letter, that would materially facilitate the practical side of business relations between Canada and Australia. In the first place, a more efficient and cheaper mail service. As it is now, we only hear from there once a month. There should be a mail every two weeks. This could be accomplished very nicely, if the proposed Canadian line from Vancouver to Sydney could be started up. Then again, the rates are absurdly high. The postage on our monthly Australian mails, ranges from $4 to $5 each way and sometimes more. Of course, this is a small matter, but it is one of the many details which should be looked into, in connection with this enterprise. In the second place, we should have better cable facilities, more especially as regards price. Our cable messages frequently range from $25 to $30 each, and we have had them cost as high as $70, and this, too, notwithstanding the use of a good code. Both of these points, however, would doubtless soon right themselves, if sufficient interest in the matter could be awakened."

I have answered my hon. friend's question, why we do not do business with them now. It is because facilities were not offered, and Mr. Massey is showing what facilities are required in order to improve the business. I hold in my hand some statistics from the Trade Returns, showing the amount of imports into the Australian colonies in 1888, and I find that of articles that we ourselves can send to Australia, no less than £28,000,000 worth were imported. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, I think, in a speech he made at Toronto last year, that:

"We are wasting our time in trying to encourage trade with insignificant communities, comparatively speaking, ten thousand miles away from you on the other side of the globe."

England has not found it very difficult to trade with communities ten thousand miles away from her. Let us compare the distances from London and Halifax to Melbourne and Sydney, and I find that we stand at an advantage as compared with London. From London to Melbourne *viâ* the Suez Canal, with all the heavy duties charged on vessels, the distance is 11,250 miles; from Halifax to Melbourne, *viâ* the Cape of Good Hope, is only 12,000 miles, so we are really nearer to Melbourne *viâ* the Cape of Good Hope than England is *viâ* the Cape; whilst, of course, in going through the Suez Canal, very heavy dues are imposed, which must act as a check on trade, and more than compensates for increased distance. Again, from London to Sydney the distance is 10,840 miles; from Vancouver to Sydney the distance is 7,434 miles; from London to Auckland, New Zealand, the distance is 11,840 miles, whilst from Vancouver to Auckland the distance is only 6,934 miles. These communities may have been at one time insignificant, but they are fast passing from the stage of insignificance. I find the following in a Halifax paper published last week:—

"Is there any country in the wide world that has made such progress as New Zealand, in the past thirty years? Look at these figures: Since 1858 the population has increased from 32,554 to 607,380; the public revenue from £146,855 to £3,859,000; the savings bank deposits from £7,862 to £7,407,776; the exports from £458,023 to £7,867,525; the wool exports from £254,025 to £3,115,008; imports from £1,141,273 to £5,941,900."

And this is but one of the insignificant communities that form the magnificent group of Australasia. These may be insignificant communities, but their trade is well worth looking after, especially as I have shown it amounts to £28,000,000 a year. When we come to examine the relative values of the trade of these so-called insignificant communities on the other side of the world with the trade of other countries, we will find their trade is not so insignificant as has been asserted. I do not desire to read all the statistics from the blue-books, but I seek rather to give a general view of the importance of the trade. I will now refer to another community, which is being developed even more rapidly than the Australasian community, that is South Africa. Hon. members are well aware that a large quantity of wool is imported

into Canada. I find that the imports of wool reached 10,500,000 pounds yearly, and of that we imported direct from Australia and the Cape only 2,500,000 pounds, the remainder coming through other channels, largely from Great Britain or *viâ* New York. Surely it is desirable that we should obtain that wool direct. It could not fail to prove advantageous, as we must obtain our wool cheaper, which would enable us to manufacture cheaper and to export cheaper; and if we imported directly, it would create an export trade, which would enable us to place our manufactures on the Cape market. Hides form another article of which we imported largely, to the value of $1,500,000 yearly. We imported all these hides, except to the value of $66,000, from the United States, and yet scarcely one of them is the product of the United States. Most of them are dried hides imported from southern countries and brought to Boston or New York and thence shipped to this country. That should not be the course of trade. No wonder our Trade Returns show a large trade with the United States, compared with that of other countries, when we purchase and sell our goods in the markets of the United States instead of purchasing the goods in the countries of production and selling them in our own markets. I can speak from personal knowledge with respect to the Cape, because I have visited there, because I have seen their warehouses and have examined the goods they import; and with respect to the class of goods they import, I am able to say that our Canadian products should be in great demand there and that the goods manufactured on this continent suit them better than English goods, and accordingly the export trade of England to the Cape has diminished while the export trade of the United States to the Cape has increased. Of course, the Cape has been looked upon in the past as a benighted community, because they had no ports at which their products could be shipped, except at very great loss to the producer or the shipper. As much as $10 a ton was paid at the time I was there for lightering goods, such as wool and hides, from Port Elizabeth and Algoa Bay, at East London, to vessels lying outside to be carried to the markets of the world. This House will realise that raw material cannot bear such an enormous charge for carriage from the shore to vessels two miles away, besides insurance, for the lighters may capsize and the cargoes may be lost. That is one difficulty which retarded the progress of Cape Colony. But latterly docks have been built, greater facilities have been afforded for getting goods from the interior to ports at which vessels call, and larger vessels are now able to wharf at Cape Town and Durban, and the trade of South Africa has consequently enormously increased. I repeat that we are importing yearly 10,500,000 pounds of wool, raised either at the Cape or Australia, and that quantity can be almost indefinitely increased, because they furnish much larger exports, and we could make up much larger quantities if we could obtain it at more reasonable rates, and obtain a market for the manufactured products. A very large quantity of this wool arrives in the United States. A trade journal in Boston states that half the clip of Cape wool that enters Boston is reshipped to Canada. We should obtain this wool direct. In order to show how rapidly the Cape Colony is being developed, I may state that at the present moment north of Delagoa Bay a railway, 1,200 miles long, is being built by the South African Company from the ocean to the head waters of the Zambesi, with the idea of developing the magnificent trade that can be opened out, and it is only right that we should secure our share of that trade, for which European nations are keenly competing. I am told that some of our manufacturers are already realising the opening that exists at the Cape. I hear that the Bell Organ Company have opened a branch in Cape Town; and, although this may be a small matter in itself, it shows that our people are awakening to the value of the Cape market. In view of the fact that we exported of cottons to China in 1887 1,742,000 yards, which quantity we increased in 1888 to 6,500,000 yards, we should be able to build up an export trade with the Cape Colony and the interior of Africa in that class of goods. The Cape is no further from Canada than it is from England. From London to Cape Town the distance is 6,065 miles; from Halifax to Cape Town the distance is 5,931 miles; Canada thus being nearer than England, which has hitherto largely supplied that market. And in order to show that the distance is not considered excessive, I may mention, that within the last few months, owing to the dearth of mackerel on our shores, a schooner sailed from Gloucester, and was only fifty-two days in reaching the Cape, and after prosecuting a fishing voyage on that coast she brought mackerel back to the Gloucester market. I have taken from the British trade statistics, statements showing the imports of South Africa in 1888, and although the trade may be termed insignificant by some, it is one in which we would willingly share. The imports into South Africa reached the value of nearly £5,000,000 sterling. Of these—and I can speak from experience—a large quantity consists of goods which can be well supplied from Canada, and they included butter, agricultural implements, candles, hardware of all kinds, clothing, harness, boots and shoes, vehicles of all kinds, all of which we can supply of the description that will suit the South African colonies very well. I mentioned in a report I made some years since:

"Every warehouse in Durban appeared to be filled with American agricultural implements and vehicles, 'spiders' being the favorite carriage in Natal; and whilst imports from the United Kingdom increased 12 per cent., the increase from the United States, in the same year, was 40 per cent. Throughout the South African colonies the consumption of preserved provisions is something beyond belief. Rich as the country is in pasture and cattle, it is most unusual to see anything but preserved milk used at the breakfast table in the towns, and this suggests a new and profitable development of our dairy farming."

They do not use cattle as we use them. They are mainly used for trekking, for doing transportation work. Cattle are rarely killed for consumption, except in the towns, nor are cows often milked on the farms in the interior. In regard to Australia, I desire to say a few more words. The Government of Victoria, in 1871, proposed to negotiate a commercial treaty with the French colonies in the Pacific, for Victoria being a protectionist community, they supposed they would be able to secure control of those markets and supply them with manufactures. Lord Kimberley wrote very strongly in regard to this proposal. He said that the imposition of such duty would have a tendency to weaken the connection with Great Britain. The matter was brought up in the Victoria Legislative

Council, and the Hon. J. O'Shaughnessy moved in accordance with notice:

"That after mature consideration, this House adopts the following declaratory resolutions:

"1. That the power to make international treaties is an inherent and indispensable right possessed by supreme authority, the Sovereign of the British Empire, and that this power, in the opinion of this House, has always been exercised with due regard for the interests of all Her Majesty's subjects.

"2. This House considers that no advantage would result from the claim set up on behalf of the Australasian Colonies, to make treaties with foreign states that would compensate them politically or commercially, for the risk thereby involved, or of endangering the connection now happily subsisting between all parts of the Empire.

"The colonies of the same group as those of Australasia, should be enabled, with proper safeguards, to conclude agreements amongst themselves for the regulation of their commerce, subject to such conditions as may be found necessary to preserve intact the authority of the Crown to make treaties binding on all parts of the Empire.

"That the thanks of this House are due to the Right Hon. the Earl of Kimberley, for the consideration which he has shown to Her Majesty's subjects in Australasia, in having afforded them an opportunity of discussing the grave questions raised by His Lordship's circular despatches before coming to a final decision upon them."

I only mention that, Sir, to show that after they considered the matter fully, they realised that Lord Kimberley had exercised a wise discretion in forbidding them to impose differential duties on foreign products as against those of foreign nations.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that resolution carried?

General LAURIE. That resolution was carried. That was some years ago, and since then the question has not been raised; but, as you are aware, the Prince of Wales thought proper to invite the various colonies and possessions of the Empire, to have an Imperial Exhibition in London, in 1886, and the British public before whom the products of the colonies were more especially brought, were more than surprised at the capacity for production of the British Colonies. This has produced a great change in public sentiment in England, from that which formerly existed. At one time there was an idea, especially among Liberal statesmen—with the one marked exception of Lord Rosebery, who has shown a great desire to maintain intact connection between the mother country and the colonies—that the colonies should be allowed to go adrift. But the ideas that Liberal statesmen formerly exploited, because that is all I can really say of them, the ideas they openly expressed and advocated, that it might be well to let the colonies go adrift, have been entirely dropped. This change of opinion is largely due to the creditable exhibition made by the different colonies, and which taught the mother country that leaning on the colonies she can obtain all the supplies which she needs for her trade and manufactures. This conclusion had led to the consideration—I will not say in the form of leagues, because I will not touch on that point—but it has led to the consideration of how the mother country and her colonies may be bound more closely together. It has led to the examination of the question of what obstacles prevent the mother country and the colonies, drawing together more closely than they have done, and it led to the action of Colonel Howard Vincent, calling for, and obtaining, this return, showing that so many countries had treaties of commerce with the mother country, which precluded the colonies making intercolonial arrangements among themselves. Protest has been made, and most properly made by our Government, but up to 1888, it is quite evident that protest has been without results, or else these treaties would not have been still extant. I do think it is desirable that some action should be pressed before Parliament, to enable us, as a self-governing community, to take such steps as may be desirable to negotiate with the mother country, and with our sister colonies, for closer trade relations. I may be told, Sir, as I have heard over and over again stated, that if we were united with the United States and had commercial union with them, we should have the greatest system of free trade the world ever knew, and that was practically possible. What is the trade of Great Britain and her colonies? The imports and exports of Great Britain and her colonies, amounts to £1,093,000,000 annually.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hardly, I think.

General LAURIE. My hon. friend seems to dispute that, but I am prepared to stake my reputation upon it, and I will give the figures in detail to show that I am correct:

	Imports and Exports.
Great Britain and Ireland.....	£686,000,000
Indian Possessions.....	161,000,000
Other Eastern Possessions.....	50,000,000
Australasia, &c.....	124,000,000
America.....	42,000,000
Guiana, &c.....	3,000,000
Africa.....	14,000,000
West Indies, &c.....	11,000,000
European Possessions.....	2,000,000
Total.....	£1,093,000,000

I have given this in detail in order to set at rest any question as to whether I am right or not. But, Sir, I want to go further than that, I want to show what great importance these comparatively insignificant communities are in their trade with the mother country, and of the importance they are, therefore, to the general trade of the world. I find that while the United States was *facile princeps* the largest importer from Great Britain, and that her imports amounted to £41,000,000 annually; Australasia, that insignificant community, is actually second on the list, and imports £28,500,000 annually, and actually takes a larger import of British goods than any country in Europe. I find that whilst Australasia imports British goods to the value of £28,500,000 sterling, annually, Germany imports only £27,000,000; France imports only £24,000,000 annually, and then we make a big drop until we come to Belgium, which imports £12,000,000, annually, from the United Kingdom. Next to Belgium, in the matter of British imports, is the other so-called insignificant community of South Africa. Before all these large countries of Europe, to which we are accustomed to look at, as carrying on a large trade, these insignificant countries to which I referred, offer greater facilities for increasing our trade with them, and of which we ought to take advantage. I think it is a great misfortune that commercial treaties still exist which preclude our taking advantage of the facilities for trade. I say, that compared with our dropping in with the commercial system of the United States, a general customs union for the British Empire would be undoubtedly the system to which could well be applied the term "of the greatest system of free trade the world ever saw." A comparison of that

trade with the Empire, which would accrue to us, as compared with our trade with the United States, will show how much more desirable a trade with the British Colonies is. Of course, I shall be taunted with the remark that this is nothing but an Imperial Federation idea. Very good, Sir, I am prepared to accept it, even on these terms, although Imperial Federation has nothing to do with my motion. I am prepared to accept it on these terms for the reason, that I do believe that closer commercial union leads to closer political union. It is for that reason I have no desire to see commercial union with the United States come into active operation, and that I do desire to see commercial union with the sister colonies under the British Crown. We have had Gladstone quoted to us in this House as the ablest man living, but even Mr. Gladstone makes mistakes sometimes. Mr. Gladstone, on the 4th December, 1889, discussing the Brazilian Revolution at Manchester, said:

"The Brazilian Revolution showed that the sympathies of the whole American continent were unfavorable to royalty."

And yet here we stand with one foot on the Atlantic, and one on the Pacific, owning and governing one-half of the North American continent, and I do not think the sympathies of this half are unfavorable to royalty or British connection. If they are, then there could be very little force in the resolution passed by this House early in the present Session, and spoken to and supported not merely by men favorable to the Government, or by men who wished through the Government to promote a particular idea or play into the hands of the Government at home. We have been told that there are influences which will prevent the British Empire ever being linked together, in the dissimilarity of the races of which it is composed; but my hon. friend who seconded that resolution in this House belongs to the French Canadian race, which we have been falsely told is a bar to any closer union of the British Empire. The same remark has been made of the Dutch of South Africa, and yet Mr. Hofmeyer, a leader of the Dutch party at the Cape, moved a resolution at the Conference of Colonial Delegates in London, in 1887, in favor of an Imperial tariff being imposed throughout the Empire in order that Imperial objects might be obtained. We have been told, again, falsely, that the Irish of Australia are an element fighting against closer union, and yet I have read to you to-day a resolution moved by Mr. O'Shaughnessy, whose name indicates the nationality to which he belongs, in favor of that object. The obstacles based on race are purely imaginary and are only raised for mischievous purposes. I believe that closer commercial union would lead to closer political union, and, therefore, I desire that we should promote such steps as would bring about commercial union. To that end I think that any obstacle that stands in our way, such as the obstacles contained in these treaties, should be removed, in order that we may have a free hand to take such action as we deem proper with regard to our sister colonies. It is a matter of common report that we are shortly to send a commission to Australia to discuss with the Governments there the possibilities of closer trade relations between those colonies and this country; but with these clauses standing as obstacles in the way of closer trade relations, what end could that commission serve? The British Government have stated that, as long as those treaties are in force, we are prevented from negotiating any closer trade relations with other colonies or offering any advantages to them or to the mother country that will not be claimed by Belgium and the Zollverein, as well as by the other thirty-four countries which are enjoying a favored-nation clause in their treaties with Great Britain. Any preferential treatment which we offered to those colonies, would be preferential treatment with regard to all those countries, and, therefore, would be no preferential treatment at all. I think we have learned from Mr. Cobden, in his negotiation of his treaty with France in 1860, that if we want advantages from other countries we must offer them something in return. Nations do not offer commercial advantages from feelings of benevolence, but they offer them because they expect commercial advantages in return; and we must be able to offer preferential advantages to other colonies if we expect them to grant preferential advantages to us. I attended a meeting of the Imperial Federation League in England, at the Mansion House, last summer. Among those who had in the past sneered at and belittled the proposals of the founders and active workers of the league were the London newspapers, and notably the London *Globe*; but, after the idea had been ventilated at that meeting, and it had been shown that a considerable amount of work had been done in England, and that the sentiment was growing, the *Globe* wound up an article discussing the question by saying:

"The Imperial Federationists may be dreaming a dream, but it is a noble dream at worst, and from such come the grandest benefits to mankind."

Sir, I am satisfied that we can inaugurate a system of free trade among the various possessions of the British Empire which will be of the greatest benefit to ourselves, to the mother country, and the Empire at large.

Mr. SKINNER. As the seconder of this resolution, I do not wish to address the House, because I have a motion cognate to it, and I intend to speak on that.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) has brought up this matter. He has given us a great deal of useful information and a great deal of sound commercial doctrine; but, unfortunately, when he is asked to apply to other countries the logic which he has brought forward in support of trade with the other colonies, he refused to do it. He is like a horse in a steeplechase, who approaches the hurdle at a tremendous pace, and shows every sign of an intention to clear it in magnificent style, but at the last moment refuses to leap, and swerves off so suddenly as to be in danger of throwing his rider and bringing him to grief. I am afraid that the hon. gentlemen's colonial policy will treat him in the same way—that his half-hearted policy of extended trade will amount to nothing except to dislodge the hon. member himself from his seat. The hon. gentleman lays down, to begin with, the very sound principle that what we need in Canada is extended markets—that there are a great many things which could be cheaply and profitably manufactured in this country if we had only a sufficiently large market. That is very true: there are a great many things which could be

manufactured here very profitably if the sale were very large; but they cannot be manufactured profitably so long as the sale is confined to Canada. This is one of the strongest arguments that have been urged in favor of reciprocity with the United States, and it is very much stronger with regard to reciprocity with the United States than with regard to reciprocity with the colonies to which my hon. friend applies it. Not to quote all that he says with regard to markets, it may all be boiled down to a few words by saying that you cannot sell in a market where you cannot or will not buy; that trade has always two sides to it, and that if you want to increase your export trade you must increase your import trade at the same time, except in the case of a few exceptional commodities which can be got in no other country. For this reason, the hon. member appears to think, I believe properly, that, in order to increase our trade with other colonies, we must make treaties of reciprocity with them. He is quite sound on that point, and so are the Messrs. Massey, of Toronto, who wrote the letter he read in regard to our trade in agricultural implements with the Australian colonies. If we are to trade with them, mutual concessions must be made, although one of the Australian colonies has gone as far as it can in the direction of free trade—I mean New South Wales—and is reaping the benefits of it by largely increased trade. But when the hon. gentleman is asked to apply these sound doctrines of his to the case of trade with the United States, what does he say? Does he say that it would be inadvisable to have extended trade relations with the United States? By no means. He merely says that Mr. Blaine has told us we cannot have those extended trade relations except on the condition of the closest political relations. Well, Mr. Blaine is not the United States.

General LAURIE. He is the Secretary of State.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, but he does not dictate the financial policy of the United States for all the future, or even for the immediate future. We know that already a resolution has passed the Finance Committee of Congress, asking the President to appoint commissioners to confer with commissioners from this country regarding extended trade relations, without mentioning anything about political relations; and yet, the hon. and gallant member for Shelburne insists that we cannot have extended trade relations without political relations, because Mr. Blaine, who, for the time being, is Secretary of State, has said we cannot. But the Secretary of State in the United States has not the control of the finance policy of that country which our Finance Minister has of ours. In the United States Congress, financial schemes are considered and formulated by a large Committee, composed of members of the House, and are not proposed on the responsibility of a Minister as here. When a responsible Minister makes a statement here you may be pretty sure it expresses the policy of the Government as long as he remains a member of it; but it does not follow in the United States, that the *obiter dictum*, the casual expression of opinion of the Secretary of State, embodies the financial policy of that country even for the time being, as he may not be able to carry his ideas through the House. Even if that were the present financial policy of the United States, the question for us to consider is whether it is worth our while, in carrying out the idea so ably presented by my hon. friend, to try and induce the American people to adopt a financial policy which will give extended trade relations to the two countries otherwise than on the basis of political union. I do not intend to go into this question at length on a motion of this kind, but I would call attention to the fact that our trade with the United States is many times greater than our trade with all the British possessions together, and is in many respects greater than our trade with Great Britain; and our trade with the United States goes on increasing at a much greater ratio than that with England. In agricultural products our trade with Great Britain from 1884 to 1888 only increased from $3,990,000 to $4,292,000, a little over $200,000. Our trade with the United States in the same class of products increased from $7,500,000 in 1884 to $10,706,000 in 1888, or over $3,000,000. In animal products our trade with Great Britain remained almost stationary, rising from $16,000,000 to $16,571,000 only, while with the United States it rose from $3,167,000 in 1884 to $7,595,000 in 1888. In other respects, while our trade with the United States has increased, our trade with Great Britain has decreased. My hon. friend says it is not worth while to consider the question of reciprocal trade with the United States, while it is with the British possessions. Just let me give an instance of the comparative amount of trade done by us with the United States and with the British possessions. Of the products of the fisheries, we sent to the United States over $3,000,000 worth in 1888, and to Australia $130,000 worth, and the export to Australia is the largest of our exports to the British colonies except that to the West Indies, $1,130,090. Of the products of our forests, we sent to the British West Indies $197,000 worth; to Australia, $180,000 worth, and to the United States, $10,622,000 worth. Of animals and their products, we sent to the United States $7,595,000 worth; to the West Indies $1,297,700 worth; and to no other British possession, except Newfoundland, as much as $1,000, and to Newfoundland we shipped only to the value of $373,000. Of agricultural products, we sent to the United States $10,306,000; to Newfoundland, $576,000; to the British West Indies, $76,000; to Guiana, $46,000. Of manufactures, we sent to the United States, $1,632,000 worth; to Newfoundland, $242,000 worth; to Australia $132,000 worth; and to no other British possession as much as $50,000 worth. Now, when we compare these figures, we see the absurdity of striving to obtain a trade with those colonies while we refuse to trade with the market close at hand, which is willing to trade with us. To pretend that the importance of fostering trade with the British colonies is greater than the importance of fostering trade with the United States is absurd, more especially with regard to the Province to which the hon. gentleman belongs. If he applies in its full sense the doctrine that a large market promotes manufacturing and prosperity he ought to apply that doctrine with special force to his own Province. There is no part of the Dominion better fitted to do a large manufacturing trade and a large carrying trade than the Province of Nova

Scotia. Its population are accustomed to seafaring ; they have a great deal more shipping than any other Province. They have every facility for manufacturing. They have natural products of various kinds eminently adapted for export. Take the article of coal alone. The hon. gentleman must understand that the markets of the United States would give a great impetus to the coal mining industry, and not only to the export of coal, but to the export of manufactures in which coal would be used. We were told by Sir Charles Tupper, when Minister of Finance a few years ago, that the facilities for the manufacture of iron in Nova Scotia were unequalled, as coal and iron are found absolutely in the same neighborhood, and close to the sea, so that these products could be exported readily. If we had reciprocal trade relations with the United States, Nova Scotia would manufacture iron for the rest of the continent. Again, look at their shipping trade. The hon. gentleman must be aware that ship-building has declined during the last few years, taking the Dominion as a whole, and taking the Maritime Provinces particularly. The report shows that the tonnage in 1873 amounted to 1,073,718 tons. The tonnage gradually grew until in 1877, under a revenue tariff, it amounted to 1,310,468 tons. It remained at about that figure until 1881, but we find that in 1888 it had again dropped to 1,089,642, only a trifle over what it was seventeen years before. That was the case, notwithstandingth at many new vessels had been built. The actual amount of shipping has not increased, but has absolutely decreased in the last few years. It may be said that this is due to the substitution of iron vessels for wooden vessels. That may be true to a certain extent, but there is still a great demand for wooden ships. The true reason is that there is a lack of employment for our vessels in consequence of our not trading as we ought with foreign countries. It has been possible to build iron vessels in Ontario, though we are at so great a distance from the markets, and still more could iron vessels be built in Nova Scotia, where they have iron and coal, if those vessels could be built cheap enough to be sold abroad, or if they could be employed in trading with foreign countries. I hope the hon. gentleman who has gone so far towards free trade with the colonies will go a little further and apply it to the Dominion at large.

Mr. SKINNER. The motion which I have on the paper is so similar to this of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) that, with the consent of the House I will move mine now, so that they may both be disposed of together.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that cannot be done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The speech of my hon. friend from Shelburne (General Laurie) is exceedingly interesting, and it is well for us to be able to consider it when we have an opportunity of examining the details of the speech as published in *Hansard*. The only thing I was afraid of was that his speech might bring on another debate on the subjects of free trade and protection, foreign relations, the tariff, and all the rest of it. I shall, therefore, only refer to the subject of the motion itself. Of course, there is no objection that all communications between the Imperial Government and the Dominion Government in regard to this subject shall be brought down. As to the two treaties which the hon. gentleman has quoted, with Belgium and Germany, made, I think, in 1865, they contained that unfortunate clause including the colonies. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Canadian remonstrance against those treaties, and to the action of Her Majesty's Government, which was to urge upon Belgium and Germany the expediency of amending those treaties so far as they affected the freedom of the colonies. The hon. gentleman also read the answer which was given by both Belgium and Germany, who desired to hold those treaties unaltered. They desired to have access to the British colonies, as well as the mother country, under the "most favored nation" clause. Those clauses cannot be altered without the consent of both parties to the treaty. I do not think that, in practice, Canada has been injured by that refusal, as there is little or no chance of Belgium or Germany agreeing to a separate arrangement or reciprocal treaty with Canada. If, however, Canada could by any means induce Germany or Belgium to make a treaty, reciprocal or otherwise, as to the commerce of Canada, I have not the slightest doubt that Her Majesty's Government would authorise such negotiations to go on, would assist such negotiations with those two nations, and would allow Canada to be represented in any such negotiations, as was done in the case of Spain and the United States, so that the Canadian representative would have equal authority with the English ambassador and it would be a joint commission, so that, if any arrangement were come to, the treaty would be signed both by the British ambassador and the Canadian commissioner. Thus the treaty would be assented to by Canada and at the same time would be enforced and upheld as an Imperial treaty. With regard to the intercolonial arrangement, notwithstanding the dictum of Lord Kimberley, I have no doubt that any arrangement between the colonies would be assented to by Great Britain. There has been a great change since Lord Kimberley wrote that rather imperious dispatch. Though he is supposed to be a great Liberal in England, Lord Kimberley was a decided autocrat as a colonial Minister. I have no doubt whatever that Her Majesty's Government would agree to any such arrangement. Lord Kimberley is rather behind the age in regard to colonial matters. You may remember that some few years ago, when Lord Kimberley was Colonial Secretary, this House passed a very respectful and loyal Address to Her Majesty on the subject of home rule for Ireland, but Lord Kimberley took it upon himself to tell us in polite language to mind our own business, just as in this dispatch he took it upon himself to say there should be no arrangements made to give special preference to the colonies in regard to arrangements amongs themselves. That, I am sure, is an exploded doctrine, and if we were able to make arrangements, for instance, with the West Indies for an interchange of commodities under certain tariff arrangements, I am sure that Her Majesty's Government would consent to it, although Australia or the Cape of Good Hope, or any other portion of Her Majesty's dominion, were excluded from that arrangement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the hon. gentleman will go beyond the colonies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In what way?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Carrying that doctrine further than the colonies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am talking about interprovincial trade just now. I have not any doubt that Her Majesty's Government would assist any arrangement we might make with one or more colonies to have a reciprocal trade between themselves, although that would have the effect of excluding other colonies who did not agree to the same terms. With respect to trade with the West Indies, Canada has tried again and again to see whether she could not take some steps towards developing such a trade. Before the hon. gentleman's time a commission was sent to the West Indies, years ago, to make an arrangement with the principal colonies, but it was found that we could make no arrangement. They would come to no agreement among themselves; they were quite willing that Canada should spend money, that Canada should give a large subsidy for steamers or other modes of marine communication, but they would not come to any terms in the way of making contributions to the means of forwarding that trade.

Mr. BLAKE. They were willing to take, but not to give.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. We are doing a little in the way of giving a subsidy to show our earnest desire to foster and develop trade. Since that time we have had some gentlemen of considerable importance here from Jamaica. The whole question of reciprocal trade between Jamaica was considered, but it was found that Jamaica, so far as these gentlemen represented that colony, would only agree to an arrangement which would exclude the sugar of the other colonies and give Jamaica the sole and exclusive shipment of sugar; because they said: "If British Guiana comes in, they will undersell us in the Canadian market, and it will be no advantage to us to have a reciprocal arrangement, unless it be exclusive, between Canada and Jamaica."

Mr. BLAKE. That sounds almost as if they were protectionists.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does sound a little as if they were protectionists. As to Australia, my hon. friend may remember that Canada had made arrangements to send a commission to Australia for the purpose of negotiating a treaty or treaties for reciprocal trade, and also for the purpose of arranging for a line of steamers running between Australasia, including New Zealand and Canada. That commission would have gone to Australia had it not been represented to us from Australia that the period that was selected would not satisfy the various colonies there, inasmuch as most likely some, if not all, of the Legislatures would be in session when our commission arrived there, and it would be useless for the commission to go to Australia unless in the conference each of the Australasian colonies should be represented by a member of their Government, which could not be expected during the sessions of their several Parliaments. Of course, it would be of little use if one or more of the colonies were unrepresented in any such conference. Since that time there has been an attempt to federate the various colonies in some system like ours, and it has been represented to us that until that question had its solution one way or the other, it would be well for Canada to defer sending commissioners there. Thus the matter stands. All the colonies have expressed their desire to meet Canada in conference, but they have, as I say, expressed their conviction that such a conference would fail unless all the Governments were represented, and that it would be well to postpone our commission until a confederation should be finally settled. I think, therefore, that everything has been done by Canada that can be done in the way of trying to induce our sister colonies to enter into a scheme or schemes for developing trade. The only two treaties which affect the colonies are, as has been mentioned, those with Germany and Belgium; those can only be altered by agreement between the two powers which made those treaties; but with the exception of these, no attempt has been made to combine the colonies in any commercial treaty made by England. On the contrary, in consequence of our remonstrances, which remonstrances have been re-echoed from Australia, whenever England has made a commercial treaty, there has always been a clause in those treaties stating that the colonies shall not be included in those treaties unless within a certain period named in the treaty, or the assent of the colony is given. Consequently, we have had again and again treaties communicated to Canada, and we have given answer that we did not desire to be included in those treaties, so that we might have a free land, should it at any time be found expedient for Canada to enter into direct communication with any foreign power for the purpose of making a separate treaty. In such cases, as I have already stated, whenever any one of those nations express a desire to enter into reciprocal arrangements with Canada, or to make a treaty, I have no doubt that we will be assisted in every possible way by Her Majesty's Government.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMS HOUSE BUILDING AT ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

Correspondence and all other papers relating to the purchase of a site for the Post Office and Custom House building at Annapolis, N.S.; any reports relating to such purchase, and any offers for other sites made by other parties to the Government.

He said: Some time ago the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) brought up this question, and in reply to a statement made by me, that he had been interested in certain properties until 20th June, 1888, he stated that assertion was not true. Strictly speaking, as regards that particular date, the hon. gentleman may have been correct; but I propose to call the attention of the House to the facts connected with the purchase of the property on which the Annapolis Post Office and Inland Revenue building now stands. It would appear that some years ago, I think in 1887, the first vote for a Government building at Annapolis, N.S., appeared in the Estimates. At that time, or prior to 1888, several lots of land, I believe, were offered to the Government. I stated on a previous occasion that the Government own a property which was equally adapted, and even better adapted, as I am informed, for a public building than the site where the public building

now stands. I speak from hearsay and not from personal knowledge. I stated at that time that two lots of land were owned by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), one being in the name of Pickels & Mills, and the other owned by himself. I stated on a previous occasion that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) had been at one time owner of these properties, and I stated that I understood he was so up to 20th June, 1888. I am not quite correct as to the date, but in order to show that I was practically and substantially correct, I will read a certificate from the registrar of deeds of the County of Annapolis. It is as follows:

"PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA,
"COUNTY OF ANNAPOLIS.
"REGISTRY OFFICE.
"BRIDGETOWN, 11th March, 1890.

"I, Edmund Bent, Registrar of Deeds for the County of Annapolis, do hereby certify that in libro 88, folios 586 and 587, I find a deed John B. Mills and wife, to Pickels & Mills, of a property in Annapolis Royal, dated 14th of June, A.D. 1888, recorded 16th June, A.D. 1888. The foregoing is John B. Mills' interest in the property deeded by Pickels & Mills to Her Majesty.

"I also find a deed John B. Mills and wife to John Buckler, of a property in Annapolis Royal, adjoining the above lot, dated 16th June, 1888, recorded 22nd June, 1888. A portion of the last lot has since been deeded to Her Majesty by John Buckler and wife.

"E. BENT,
"*Registrar.*"

As I understand the matter, these properties were conveyed to the Crown on the following March by the parties mentioned in the certificate of the registrar of deeds. So much with respect to the titles to the property. As I understand it, the lot of land, being part of the Pickels & Mills lot, was something like 48 by 50 feet, for which $3,300 was ever paid, which anyone possessing a knowledge of Annapolis must know is a most extraordinary sum to pay for such a quantity of land. Then we find about the same time, a portion of the Buckler lot, 50 by 44 feet, was sold for $700, and I venture to say that no sale of any other property in Annapolis was ever made at such figures. I believe even in large cities very little more than $4,000 would have been paid for a site equal to that on which the Government building in Annapolis is placed. I am informed, and I know myself personally, that according to prices paid some years ago these properties must have been very largely overvalued. I understand the properties originally were bought for a very much smaller sum, and with respect to the property owned by Pickels & Mills, it had, when it was purchased for a much smaller sum, a house on it which was afterwards burnt. So much with respect to the sale of the lands. As I stated when the subject was up on a previous occasion, I understood the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) was interested in that property up to June, 1888. I find that on 14th June he conveyed that property to Pickels and Mills or a portion of, and another portion to John Buckler, that a small portion of the lots was afterwards sold for the enormous sum I have mentioned, I say an enormous sum for Annapolis, and for the position of the lots. Lots perhaps not exactly equal to, but what would have been practically as beneficial to the public could have been obtained by the Government for a far less sum. Then we have the fact that the Government had a property of their own there which was fully suitable for the purpose, and would have fully met the convenience of the inhabitants, on which property a light was erected which could have been easily fixed on the building erected. The two lots offered were both on opposite sides of the railway, and in order to approach them it was necessary to cross the railway track, and either of those lots could have been obtained for a very much less sum than the amount paid for the property on which the Government was erected. The lot on which the building is erected is nearly covered by the building itself, and to the southern part of it there is a right of way which is given by Pickles & Mills to the Government, but which, I am informed, and I speak subject to correction, was conveyed to another person, the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), three years previously, and the Government have no right in regard to it. So much with respect to the land and the sale. Then, again, with respect to the building itself. A return has been brought down, and I find the only justification for the change of material from grey granite to red sandstone is a report from Mr. Fuller, the Government Engineer. The report is a very short document, and I will read it:

"*Re* STONE USED IN THE PUBLIC BUILDING, ANNAPOLIS, N. S.

"The specification states that 'the whole of external stone-work and dressings above ground line are to be of approved grey granite from Lawrencetown, or other approved granite of equal quality.' The contractors (Rhodes &Currei, of Amherst, N.S.) submitted a sample of a red sandstone from quarries at Northport, N.S., which they guaranteed could be obtained in any quantity and of any dimensions required. This stone being in every way equal in quality and durability, and far more pleasing in colour, and better adapted for use in conjunction with red brick—its adoption was authorized. This stone, both from its pleasing colour and durable qualities, must be considered one of the finest sandstones on this continent. And as the greater portion of the exposed surface is to be quarry faced (that is without dressing) its pleasing tone of color will add very much to the effect of the building when completed. The grey granite was specified because at the time the specifications were prepared it was stated that it was the only stone that could be obtained. The only difference would be in the labor of dressing, but as there is so little required, the saving would not be much, and can be arranged at the final settlement, but the contract price would not be increased.

(Signed) "THOS. FULLER,
"*Chief Architect.*"

As to the question of durability between grey granite and red sandstone, I question the accuracy of the architect's opinion. But assuming he is correct, the alteration was made because the sandstone was of a more pleasing color and would add to the effect of the building, would add to its beauty, but not give any substantial benefit whatever. Then, the architect points out that the only difference in cost will be for the labor of dressing, and as there is so little dressing required the saving could not be much, and at all events, the contract price would not be increased. What do we find? We know there is a great difference in cost as between dressing grey granite and red sandstone. As I pointed out on a former occasion, and showed by figures, the difference was $1,856, of which the contractors received the benefit by having obtained red sandstone from their own quarries instead of purchasing grey granite at Lawrencetown. They obtained the contract for $750 less than the next lowest tenderer, but they have secured $1,856 as the difference between using the two different kinds of stone, and that difference they will be able to place in their pockets. That statement made by me was not answered.

I find the universal statement that there would certainly be that difference, which is an extremely large difference. That amount is not an over-estimate, as I am told by persons of experience of what was gained by the change made in getting the stone from their own quarry instead of purchasing it, and by putting in gray granite in accordance with the specifications upon which all other tenders for the building were based and submitted to the Government. We are told that on this contract, it was understood by the Chief Architect, that some arrangement should be made for a final settlement, but the contract price would not be increased. Even in the face of that, the Government was not justified in not enabling other parties to tender, and in allowing these parties to get the contract at a price which enabled them to have a great advantage over other parties, and to reap a benefit to the extent I have named. So far as regards this building, I am afraid that it is only a specimen of many similar transactions throughout the Dominion. We find here that, year after year, we are putting more taxes upon the country, and upon the food and necessaries of life of the people, and here we are throwing away money or expending it uselessly, in giving enormous prices for lots for public buildings, and then enabling favorite contractors to reap an enormous benefit by changing the contract after the terms have been submitted, and thus enabling these parties to put money in their pockets. I, therefore, move this resolution, seconded by Mr. Jones, of Halifax.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When this matter was before the House on a previons day, I informed the hon. gentleman about the purchase of this property. It was a property which, according to the Chief Architect, was the best under the circumstances. Each lot being too small for the purpose for which we wanted it, the two lots were purchased. The price that had been asked in the first instance for these two lots was $6,000, but after negotiating with the parties, we obtained them for $4,000, and they were considered the best that could be selected. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that I must be responsible for the action taken under the circumstances, but I have neither seen the lots nor the place itself. I also explained, the other day, about the vicinity of the railway, and its crossing. With reference to the quality of the stone, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, he has read just now the statement which I brought down, and in which it is set forth that in the contract the stone that was mentioned was granite, because we thought that was the only stone which could be found in the locality. Afterwards it was shown, in the report made by the engineer, that instead of the granite, which was not a desirable stone, we could obtain a stone which was much better in appearance, was as durable, and which would assimilate much better with the brickwork. It was reported that we could obtain this stone in large quantities, and that the price of the contract would not be increased by using it. This did not mean that it would not be decreased afterwards, when the final estimate was made up, but it was ascertained from the contractor that if that stone was adopted the price would not be increased. Of course, I am only a layman and I cannot speak as to the working of the stone, but I was informed by my officers that while in one case the stone was harder and would require more labor, yet in the other case there was more work than there would be necessary with the other stone, and therefore this stone was adopted. I have seen the two samples of stone, and there is no doubt that the sandstone which has been adopted is far superior to the other. The appearance of the building will be better, the durability of one stone is as good as the other, and if I had known at first that such stone could be had at a reasonable distance where the building was being constructed, we would certainly have adopted it at once. We did not know then that that stone existed, and therefore the specifications only spoke of the granite which was on the spot. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will show him, this afternoon, specimens of the granite and the sandstone, and he will see himself that if he had to select between the two he would have chosen the sandstone and not the granite. Of course, the correspondence, and the other papers to which the hon. gentleman refers, will be brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have been awaiting this opportunity for some time, to say something with reference to the purchase of the lot for the erection of a public building in Annapolis, and as I intimated some time ago, when I brought the question up as a matter of privilege, I should have liked to have been here the afternoon that this matter first arose in the House. However, being then upon a bed of sickness I was prevented from attending. As regards the imputation cast upon myself, that I was the owner of the property at Annapolis upon which this property was erected, it was perfectly true to say that I had owned in the property at one time, but I hold in my hand a deed by which I sold my part of that property on 3rd January, 1887, which shows that the money was paid for it, and the property transferred to a party who died a short while afterwards. The deed that eventually was recorded upon the registry of deeds was in fulfilment of the deed thats old the property on 3rd January, 1887. I have already stated to this House that I had no interest in any shape or form in that property at the time it was sold to the Government, and if any hon. gentleman wishes any further investigation upon that I invite the enquiry. There is no doubt whatever that hon. gentlemen opposite can very easily get at the truth in reference to this matter, as the property was sold to the Government by a firm of gentlemen who support the Opposition in this House, who have always supported the Opposition, and for aught I know, will always continue to do so. The lot was selected because it was the most desirable property in the town, and I advocated its selection for that reason. The only objection that any persons in Annapolis had to its selection was that it was too good for a public building. That was the only objection anyone in Annapolis had to it, with the exception of the informant of the hon. member for St. John, a man named T. S. Whitman, who had a lot on the opposite side of the railway which he desired to sell, and which he offered to the Government for $2,000. I would not have advocated the Government selecting that lot, even if Mr. Whitman had been willing to give it away. In order to show the respective values of the properties, I

have only to mention the rentals obtained from them at the time I owned in the one. I was one of those who bought that property for the purpose of making money out of it. After we bought it the rentals amounted to $610 a year, and the building on it was only a two-story building. The building on the property of Mr. Whitman at that time was a large three-story building, and yet Mr. Whitman's rentals from it amounted to only about $306. That is the true test of the value of the properties, what they would bring in the market. If my hon. friend knew the real facts of this matter as I know them he would not have spoken on this subject as he has done. I know where he got his information; he got it from a man in whom, if he knew him as well as I do, he would not place the least reliance. I say this boldly, knowing that the people of Annapolis agree with me, and knowing that I have stated the same thing before the man himself; consequently, I am not trying to cloak myself by my position as a member of Parliament. If it is desired to have this matter investigated in any shape, I am willing. If it is a crime to own property in the town of Annapolis, I have been guilty of that crime; but, as for attempting to influence the Government to put money into my pocket, I utterly repudiate any such accusation. As regards the lot on which the Government building is being erected, the Government own that lot down to what was called the "town pump." It has a frontage of 25 feet more than is being actually covered by the building; but the town is deriving a great benefit from the fact of the Government being in possession of that property, whereas if a private person had got possession of it it would be different. I have been told, time and again, that the owners of it, Messrs. Pickles & Mills, had determined to take advantage of everything that the law gave them on the street.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the size of Pickles & Mills' lot?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I do not know just now, but I can tell you that it is large enough to give them a right of way of 10 feet around the whole building; and the Government occupying the whole of the lot, they give 11 feet more on the south side, which gives them an absolute right of way around the south side of 21 feet, on the west side of 10 feet, and the two streets are on the other two sides; so that it is one of the most desirable sites that could be obtained in the town of Annapolis. As regards the site on the military property, although that might have been utilised for a public building, yet, having been handed over to this Government by the Imperial authorities as military property, it is held that it should not be touched for any other purpose. Besides, there is this objection to the building being located on that site, that it would give the rear of the building to the river, which would not be desirable in the case of a public building. I consider that a public building in a town is placed there, not for a year, but for all time; and that is the consideration I had in view when I asked the Government to make an appropriation for it. Consequently, a few hundred dollars difference in the matter of the site should not be allowed to come into the balance. It is in a very prominent and most desirable position. The hon. member for St. John has never seen that spot, or if he has, he has never taken any notice of it; but when he goes there this summer, and sees the building on it, and compares it with the corner opposite, I know that he will retract all he has said, and will set down Mr. Whitman, his informant, as a man who does not always tell the truth. As regards the stone used in the building, I know something about that. Mr. Fuller, the Chief Architect, when preparing the specifications, consulted me as to what stone should be used. He wanted to know if there were any stone quarries near, from which stone could be taken to the building. I told him I did not think so—that the only stone there was granite, and that I did not think it was the best that could be used, because when it got wet and afterwards became heated it was apt to crack, and I thought it would not be as durable as sandstone. However, that granite being a mile or half a mile from the building, I recommended that it should be put into the specifications, and it was. It was not my wish that Rhodes & Currie should get the contract. I did all I could to have the contract given to a local man, Mr. Burton. Mr. Burton has been a contractor in Annapolis for years and is a first-class workman. He has built large public edifices, including the Union Bank building, and understands his work most thoroughly; and I was extremely anxious, on his account, for the sake of the town of Annapolis, that he should have had that contract. But his figures were higher by something like $750 than those of Rhodes & Currie, and they got the contract. When the contract was given, the first thing I knew about it was that it was asserted in some of the newspapers that sandstone was to be used. That was not the first time I heard of sandstone being taken in place of granite, because Mr. Burton had spoken to me about it, and wanted to know whether it would not be possible to put in sandstone in the place of granite. I told him if sandstone did not cost any more, I thought it was quite possible. If the Chief Architect was pleased with the stone, it was altogether likely that sandstone could be used. But, of course, all this was before the tenders were put in, or before any one knew of Rhodes & Currie. Then Mr. Rhodes came to Annapolis and made arrangements with Mr. Goucher, a friend of mine, to have that granite quarried and brought to the site of the building. He was to bring that granite for $1.75 a ton and place it at the site of the building, as it was but a short distance from the building, about a mile to a mile and a-half, where this granite was quarried. The sandstone was highly recommended, and a specimen of it was sent by the quarrymen, to the Chief Architect, who was very much pleased with it. Other men who understand this business thoroughly, who understand the different kinds of sandstone, were exceedingly pleased with it; and when the stone itself appeared upon the ground the contrast it made with the brick was exceedingly pleasant, and everybody was satisfied with the idea that the red sandstone was to be used in place of granite. With regard to the difference in cost, I think it my duty to give a careful estimate made by Rhodes & Currie, who got a man outside their firm entirely, to estimate the difference in the cutting between the sandstone and the granite, which shows that the man whose figures the hon. member for St. John

(Mr. Weldon) quoted the other day must have been entirely astray, when he says that $1,500 was the difference between the cost of the two kinds of stone.

Mr. WELDON. $1,856.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The whole thing would not cost more than that. Here is the difference in cutting. The cutting of granite trimming is estimated to cost $972, the cutting of the sandstone actually cost $599—hardly $400 between the two stones. Now, where does this sandstone come from? When this matter first came up I manifested my ignorance of the geography of Nova Scotia to a certain extent, but Northport has only lately come into prominence. I have just discovered that instead of its being on the Bay of Fundy side of Nova Scotia, it is on the Northumberland Straits side, so that a vessel coming from Northport to go to Annapolis has to come down Northumberland Straits, through the Gut of Canso, around Cape Sable, past Yarmouth, to Annapolis. That brings the cost of sandstone landed at Annapolis to $10.60 a ton. Those figures show a little difference from those of my hon. friend, and I invite an investigation of the matter. Here are the actual figures showing the difference between these two stones: 120 tons of granite at $1.75 a ton makes $210; 120 tons, required to put up the building of red sandstone, at $10.60, amounts to $1,272. The cost of cutting the granite was $972. The cost of the granite is $210; making a total of $1,182. The cost of cutting the freestone is $599, the cost of the freestone is $1,272; making a total of $1,871 for the whole of the freestone. Messrs. Rhodes & Currie are to-day actual losers by the transaction to the extent of $689.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement of the amount of subsidies voted by Parliament to the Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, the amount paid by the Government up to date, and the amount still due or unearned.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all petitions and other documents relating to the building of the proposed branch railway to Matane.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Copies of all Orders in Council making appointments, promotions and changes in the Department of Militia and Defence, for the year ending 31st December, 1889.—(Mr. Lister.)

Return giving the names of all those who have been appointed to the different Departments of the public service without examination, since 1880, to perform professional duties, such as architects, engineers, draughtsmen, etc., as provided for under the Civil Service Act, and who have since such an appointment been assigned clerical duties not requiring the technical knowledge for which they were originally appointed, and showing whether those since transferred to clerical work have since passed the Civil Service examination, and giving the names of those who have so passed.—(Mr. Lister.)

Return showing: 1st. The number of acres of pasture land now under lease in the North-West Territories. 2nd. The amount paid the Government for rental of grazing leases during the past year. 3rd. The amount due the Government for arrears on pasture leases, and the names of the lessees in arrears for pasture lease rental. 4th. The names of the lessees holding leases of territory upon which settlers are not allowed to take up land without the consent of the lease-holder, with the total area of such leases, and the location of each.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return of the quantity and value of eggs imported into and exported from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec since 1st January last; also, the countries they have been imported from and exported to.—(Mr. Guillet.)

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

RELIEF OF H. F. KEEFER.

Mr. PRIOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 119) for the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Mara,
Barnard,	Marshall,
Blake,	Masson,
Bowell,	Meigs,
Bowman,	Mills (Annapolis),
Brien,	Mills (Bothwell),
Brown,	Moncrieff,
Campbell,	Paterson (Brant),
Cargill,	Porter,
Carling,	Prior,
Cockburn,	Putnam,
Davies,	Roome,
Denison,	Rowand,
Dewdney,	Rykert,
Dickey,	Scriver,
Dickinson,	Semple,
Earle,	Skinner,
Ellis,	Scarth,
Hall,	Smith (Ontario),
Hickey,	Somerville
Innes,	Sutherland,
Jamieson,	Temple,
Kirk,	Tisdale,
Landerkin,	Trow,
Lang,	Tyrwhitt,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),	Watson,
Lister,	Weldon (Albert),
Livingston,	Weldon (St. John),
Lovitt,	White (Cardwell),
McDonald (Victoria),	Wilson (Elgin),
McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Lennox),
Madill,	Wood (Brockville).—64.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Gigault,
Béchard,	Grandbois,
Bergeron,	Joncas,
Bernier,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Boisvert,	LaRivière,
Bourassa,	Laurier,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cimon,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Doyon,	Montplaisir,
Dupont,	Thompson (Sir John).—21.
Geoffrion,	

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RELIEF OF C. F. GLOVER.

Mr. MONCREIFF moved second reading of Bill (No. 120) for the relief of Christiana Filman Glover.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time on the same division.

RELIEF OF EMILY WALKER.

Mr. BROWN moved second reading of Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Emily Walker.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must call the attention of the House to the peculiar character of this Bill. So far as I am able to understand the precedents which exist on the subject of divorce, this is an entirely new departure. The practice of this Parliament in granting divorces has been confined to the one cause which is the most prominent cause, and which is recognised by most Protestants to be a sufficient one, though it is not so recognised by those of the opposite faith. In some of the cases which have prevailed it has perhaps been difficult to ascertain the truth in that matter, but some proof has never been wanting. In one case,

which is relied upon by the counsel supporting this Bill, it is contended that there was an analogous case in which the element of adultery was not established. As one who was present when that case was considered, I venture to dissent from that view, as I think the offence of adultery was established. But, whether it was or was not, the case was as widely different from this as it was possible to be. The case of Lavelle was one in which, whether the parties intended to marry or not I do not know, but they were married under fictitious names, and afterwards there was a bigamous marriage contracted in the United States by the female, which was considered in Canada to be adultery. The present is a very simple case. This case is put forward on the ground that the woman was not of age, that is, that she was not twenty-one years of age when the marriage was solemnised. She was twenty years and five months old. It is admitted by those who have supported this Bill, both as counsel, and as members of Parliament in another place, that that formed no legal ground for declaring the marriage to be invalid. In point of fact, then, it may be assumed that, as far as legal validity was concerned, the marriage was as valid, the woman being twenty years and five months old, as if she had been twenty-five years old. We must look for another reason for the dissolution of this marriage, and the reason put forward is that, it was not consummated. Its validity is not questioned. The perfect capacity of the woman to understand the agreement she was entering into, her deliberate intention to be married, are as plain from the evidence as any matter of evidence can be. Therefore, she was not only capable of making a marriage contract, but she understood the marriage contract, she intended to be married, and she understood herself to be married. It is true that the marriage was celebrated without the consent of her parents. It is true that her father died soon afterwards, and that her mother, when she was acquainted with the marriage about ten months afterwards, was much afflicted by it; but even as to the annoyance and grief of the mother at the marriage having been celebrated, all these facts existed five years before there was any application made to any tribunal, even to this Parliament, to dissolve the marriage. The only reason the woman alleges why she has changed her mind and desires a dissolution of the marriage is that she was led to believe before the marriage took place that her husband was earning more than she found subsequently he was earning. She stated that if she had understood that he was not able to earn more than she subsequently found he was earning, she would not have consented to marry him. The proposition then is that we shall dissolve the marriage simply because she found that she was married to a person not able to support her as well as she hoped he would be. I cannot imagine a ground of divorce which would be more stigmatised in those countries where laxity of principles, as regards divorce, are prevalent; I cannot imagine an application for divorce the granting of which would do more dishonor to this Parliament than the passage of this Bill would do. I shall, therefore, apart from my objection to divorce on general principles, oppose this Bill from every point of view, and I move that it be not now read the second time, but that it be read this day six months.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have read over the testimony in that case with a great deal of attention, as I have in all these divorce cases.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Ha, ha!

Mr. MITCHELL. Some hon. gentlemen laugh; perhaps they cannot all say that. Having given attention to the evidence, I must say that I think there is a clear case for the woman getting a divorce. I believe the circumstances were such that if ever a divorce was warranted it is in this case; and I shall, therefore, vote against the amendment of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. TISDALE. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and I will give some reasons why it strikes me that the woman is entitled to a divorce, and why, if we should refuse it, it would create a very strong feeling in this country in favor of establishing a divorce court, and would have the opposite effect from that desired by those hon. gentlemen in this House who are so strongly opposed to all divorces. I myself do not wish to see a divorce court established, if people can get relief in proper cases without its assistance; but I say that if the Parliament of Canada refuse relief in cases like this, where, in my opinion, relief should be granted, it would be what I consider a legal outrage, and it would start an agitation that, I think, would probably end, and should end, in the establishment of a divorce court. Now, in this case, the young woman was under age, and our laws declare that she is incompetent to make any contract. It is true that in ancient times, and even in times as modern as that of George II, which is a long time in one way, minors could not contract a legal marriage without the consent of the parents. The necessity, to use that expression, of the circumstances, eventually led marriages, even of minors, when they had been consummated without the consent of the parents, to be recognised. Now, what do we find here? Under our law this young woman could have made no contract. If she had sold a horse and had not wished to fulfil the bargain she could not have been compelled to do so; but here, in the most solemn and highest sort of contract that is possible for a woman to make, she made a mistake and desires to withdraw from it. It has not been consummated. The old definition and the proper definition of marriage is: first, a civil contract; second, the consummation; otherwise the marriage remains inchoate. Now, here there is no consummation, and there is no legal marriage in that sense, and yet the result of refusing this divorce would be to compel this woman to remain in a perpetual state of celibacy, or to contract a bigamous marriage. I disagree with the Minister of Justice in the case quoted by him, which is not precedent to this case. In the case he cited, though the woman was not of tender years when she made a bigamous marriage, she got her divorce.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The husband did.

Mr. TISDALE. The husband got a divorce on that ground, but the Senate refused to put into the Bill that it was on account of adultery. There is just the one case, but there the Senate recognised a distinction under the circumstances that no consummation had taken place, and they refused to put in the Bill on that ground, the only cause which,

they say, is justifiable. Now, I say further, that the Minister of Justice did not understand the evidence in this case as I read it, or he would not have said that the young woman refused, as he says, to consummate the marriage, because the young man was not earning as much as he told her. What she did say was, that if she had not believed he was able to support her she would not have consented. Those, I believe, are her words.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what I said.

Mr. TISDALE. No; I understood the hon. gentleman to say what would lead the House to infer that, so far as she was concerned, it was a matter of money—that the man was not earning as much as she supposed. That is quite a different thing, although I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman meant to misrepresent her reasons. I read the evidence carefully, desiring to see what her reasons were, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that the reason she gave was that she would not have married him had she not believed he was able to support her. Well, that would be the very best reason why parents should object. Love is all right; it is a necessary incident of the marriage, but prudent people and the parents of young women are not willing that their daughters should be married to husbands who are not able to support them. So it was a sensible and practicable reason that she gave; it was not simply because she found out that he was less wealthy than he had represented himself to be. Her parents were against it, and it is further disclosed in the evidence that he very soon after went away, and letters are in evidence to show that he went to another country, and he never asked her to go and live with him, never showed any inclination to have her live with him. The result then would be that this young woman, who had not arrived at the legal age of discretion where any other contract would be binding upon her, asks to be relieved from this contract, and if we compel her to abide by it she will either have to live in a perpetual state of celibacy or to commit a bigamous marriage. There are two things necessary to constitute marriage, and one of them is absent in this case. I think it would be very unjust and very unfair to refuse the relief asked for, and I think the result of any such decision would be to raise a strong feeling for a divorce court which would have much greater powers for granting divorces than are now exercised by the two Houses. I would regret very much to see such a decision. This precedent will be a very narrow one; it will be only a precedent where the party was under age. I am not at present saying that I am prepared to go any further. The Senate have considered this case very fully; they are a body that is very difficult to move, especially in violation of precedent. The young woman was under 21 years of age, she could legally perform no contract against the will of her parents, and she performed a contract with a man who was not in a position to provide for her, and he afterwards abandoned her, and unless we are prepared to dissolve that contract, we will say that she shall for all time to come remain without a husband, or contract a bigamous marriage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry I cannot agree at all with my hon. friend with respect to the line of argument he has taken in this case. Ever since divorce cases have come before Parliament I have steadily voted in favor of divorce Bills when adultery was proven beyond a doubt; and I think it would be a great misfortune for this country, it would redound to its discredit, it would promote demoralisation to an enormous extent, it would bring on the evils we see on the other side of the line, if we did not adhere to the law of the land, and the law of the Scriptures as well, that marriage can only be dissolved for the cause of adultery. There is a great deal to be said for the position taken by the Catholic Church against divorce in any case; but looking at the statement we find in the Scriptures that for the cause of adultery divorce should be allowed, I have always voted in that direction. But I will steadily oppose in every possible way any further extension of the rule. My hon. friend says that if a Bill of this kind is refused it would cause an excitement in the country for the establishment of divorce courts. I am opposed to the establishment of divorce courts; I think it has had a bad effect in England; and I am well satisfied that our practice should continue. But if we had a divorce court established to-morrow it would decide according to law, and according to the law of England; and according to the law of divorce as known in England, and as it exists, therefore, in this country, there would under that court be no relaxation of the rule as known and established both in England and in the British Empire generally. On the other hand, if there is to be any laxity, if this Legislature is going to adopt the course taken by too many of the State Legislatures in the United States, I would go in immediately for the establishment of a divorce court, a court of Judges learned in the law, who would decide according to the law of England. My hon. friend drew a strange inference from the fact that the legal age of discretion is by law 21 years. This young lady actually was seven months from the age of a woman of discretion, with all the responsibilities of a woman. But the hon. gentleman says he does not mean to say she was not capable of making this contract of marriage; he does not seem to say there was any mode of entrapping her used; he does not mean to say that she did not act with a full knowledge of the responsibilities she was going to enter upon. The hon. gentleman says: That may be so; she may have understood the whole thing; but she wanted seven months of 21 years of age, and therefore we must hold her to be absolutely without discretion. He says she could not be bound by contract to buy or sell a horse. The same law which says she shall not be responsible for purchasing a horse says she is quite old enough, if she chooses, to enter into a contract of marriage. The law draws the distinction, and says a woman who could not make a contract in other matters by law, could make a contract by which she was bound for life. I say that I look with horror at the idea of anything like the laxity that is produced by the relaxation of the rule that marriage shall be indissoluble except for the one cause—the cause of adultery.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it would be very unfortunate indeed if the argument addressed by the hon. gentleman for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) should prevail before this Assembly. The hon. gentleman has laid down a proposition which, if carried out, will create a court of divorce

in this country, wider, broader and looser than anything that exists in any part of the United States. The ground on which he based his view of the case is one that I can hardly understand, because the proposition he advanced is one, I hesitate not to say, which would be held untenable before any court in the land. This woman is of sufficient age to enter into a contract of marriage, being twenty years and five months old, and she is perfectly competent, therefore, to enter into a legal and binding contract. This is not a case in which there is any element, so far as I can see from the evidence, that would justify this House in assisting her to dissolve the marriage. The woman was acquainted with the man for fifteen months, she was engaged to be married during twelve months, and they agreed upon their marriage two or three weeks before it occurred; she went deliberately with her eyes open, fully knowing the consequences, to church, was married by a priest and afterwards returned home. She stated deliberately and distinctly that it was a solemn contract of marriage, which is the most solemn contract into which a woman can enter, and he visited her then and for several weeks after. There is not a scintilla of evidence or suggestion to show that she was entrapped into the marriage, that duress, force, fraud or anything wrong was used to induce her to enter into the contract; and the sole possible ground on which, so far as I can find in reading the debate in the other House, the divorce is sought, is that this legal, binding, solemn marriage had not been consummated. If this House is going to adopt that as a cause of divorce, it is leaving the door wider open than in most of the United States. I desire to quote briefly from the evidence as to events after the marriage was over. Here is an extract from her evidence:

"Q. You did not see him afterwards?—A. He came up that evening.

"Q. And other evenings?—A. Yes; he kept coming up occasionally until he went away.

"Q. Did he talk to you about what he had done?—A. No; he did not seem to mention anything of that kind.

"Q. Or you either?—A. No.

"Q. You never mentioned about the marriage?—A. Oh, yes, we mentioned it, but he never spoke about providing a home for me.

"Q. Did he ever speak of your relations as husband and wife?—A. Yes.

"Q. In what way?—A. Nothing particular. He said as soon as my mother was aware of it she would be agreeable."

When she was asked as to whether she thoroughly understood the import of the contract entered into, she gave evidence as follows:—

"Q. At that time, did you consider you were going to be married, or was it simply some little lark on your part?—A. It was not any lark. We both understood we wanted to be married.

"Q. And you went there with a serious intention of being married?—A. Yes.

"Q. And living as man and wife?—A. Yes.

"Q. Was there any understanding beforehand that you were not to live together as man and wife?—A. Nothing of that kind. Of course, I should never have married him had I known his circumstances—had I known that he was not in a position to keep a wife.

"Q. Was it understood you were to go back home and not live with him as your husband?—A. I understood I was going home for a while. He gave me to understand he was getting a good salary, and he told me the figures. Had I known he was not in such a position I would never have consented to this."

So the sum and substance is this—that a man and woman enter into a contract of marriage, that it was solemnly gone through, with a clear understanding on both sides of the solemn nature of the contract entered into, and after a time one of the parties finds out that the other is not quite as well off as was expected, and so the petitioners come to this Parliament for relief. I hold that this House should by a very strong vote declare that it will not countenance such an application, and the more emphatically this declaration is made the better it will be for Canada.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I cordially endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), and by the right hon. the First Minister. In the Province of New Brunswick we have a divorce court, and such cases as this come occasionally under cognisance. I have no hesitation in saying that this petition would have been dismissed almost without delay by that court.

Mr. MITCHELL. How do you know?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A few years ago I was professionally engaged in a case precisely similar to this, which I argued before the court. It must be remembered that we are sitting here as a judicial tribunal guided by the principles of the law of England, and the cases put forward in the brief addresses to this House do not seem to be applicable to the present case, and, in fact, when they are examined, they prove to be opposed to the contention of the petitioner. In the case referred to—a most peculiar case and one of the latest decided in England—Scott *vs.* Sebright—anyone who reads that case will see that Mr. Justice Butt, the eminent judge who presided, would have refused relief under similar circumstances to these. In that case the circumstances were precisely the same as these. Nothing beyond the ceremony of marriage took place, and the question was whether it was under duress. The decision laid down by Justice Butt in that case was as follows:—

"It is that long before the ceremony was gone through the feelings of this young lady towards the respondent were such that of her free and unconstrained will she never would have married him; that she had been reduced by mental and bodily suffering to a state in which she was incapable of offering resistance to coercion and threats which in her normal condition she would have treated with the contempt she must have felt for the man who made use of them; and that, therefore, there never was any such consent on her part as the law requires for the making a contract of marriage. Such being the case, I know of no consideration consistent with justice or with common sense which should induce me to hold this marriage binding."

This is the principle laid down by Mr. Justice Butt, and any person who examines that case—although it is denied by the petitioner's counsel in this case—would see, that if the circumstances were similar to those now before us, Mr. Justice Butt would not have dissolved the marriage. The strong point which Mr. Justice Butt made in that case was that there never was such consent on her part as the law requires for making a contract of marriage. As pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Davies), it is clear that there was no attempt of duress in this case. This girl was of an age when she was perfectly capable of understanding the nature of the obligation she was entering into, and with full knowledge of the facts she deliberately got married, and, as she stated, afterwards fully realised the position. It seems to me that we would be establishing a very dangerous precedent if, under these circumstances, we would allow

this Bill to become law. In the case of Lavelle, it will be recollected that the marriage was under similar circumstances to these. The wife afterwards went to the States, and married a Mr. Fralick, and the fact of that bigamous marriage was the only justifiable ground upon which the Act was passed allowing the divorce.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would my hon. friend answer one question? After having listened to the decision of the House the other night—that a woman was not able to take care of herself until she was thirty years of age—how can he reconcile that with his present position?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I did not quite endorse the views of the majority in that, but I do not think the law laid down there has anything to do with this case.

Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to lay down the doctrine that a divorce court will not grant relief to the husband who deserts his wife after the consummation of a marriage?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Not according to the marriage law in England.

Mr. TISDALE. If that is good law I would say there is no case here, but I fail to find any case which goes that length, or anything like it, because it is a monstrous doctrine.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the case which I recollect in the New Brunswick courts it was precisely similar to this. They separated at the church door, and on that occasion I could find no case in justifying me to come before the court to ask for a divorce. I adopted the same course as in the case of Lavelle, and obtained a divorce.

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to say only a few words in reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). There is no doubt, and there can be no doubt that this marriage was as good, and valid, and as binding a marriage as ever was contracted in Canada. The hon. gentleman says the divorce courts, under similar circumstances as these now before us, would have dissolved this marriage. I challenge the hon. gentleman or any hon. gentleman in this House to cite one single precedent where the divorce court dissolved a marriage under such circumstances. The argument was made before the Committee of the Senate by able counsel on behalf of the plaintiff, and every case that could be brought to bear on the question was cited from the English, the American and the Ontario reports. The trouble was taken not only to deliver that argument to the Senate Committee, but to print it and put it in the hands of every member of Parliament, and there is not a pretence that there was ever a precedent for the granting of divorce under any such circumstances. After a thorough examination of the subject myself, I find that there is no such decision to be found in the law books. There is in this case a marriage clear and distinct. The consent of the parents has nothing to do with it whatever, and the consummation has equally nothing whatever to do with it. All you want is a clear consent to make the contract, and the contract was made and consent given in this case. The husband, it is true, has gone to the States, and it is said that this woman has no remedy, but that is an entire mistake. Does any hon. gentleman mean to say, that if any husband in this country leaves his family and goes to the United States the wife has any right to come here and ask for a divorce, and that if she does not get it there is danger of wrong being done her? This woman can go to the United States; she can follow her husband and institute a suit for the restitution of marital rights. He is bound to support her, and to give her that marital comfort which a wife has a right to expect. I submit that there has not yet been given the slightest reason whatever to this House to induce them to vote this Bill.

House divided on amendment of Sir John Thompson (6 m. h.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Guillet,
Audet,	Hall,
Bain (Soulanges),	Hesson,
Baird,	Hickey,
Béchard,	Holton,
Bergeron,	Hudspeth,
Bernier,	Ives,
Boisvert,	Joncas,
Bourassa,	Jones (Halifax),
Cameron,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Carling,	LaRivière,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Lépine,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Lovitt,
Chapleau,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Chouinard,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cimon,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cochrane,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Cockburn,	McNeill,
Coughlin,	Montplaisir,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Denison,	Pattersen (Essex),
De St. Georges,	Perry,
Desjardins,	Porter,
Dewdney,	Purcell,
Dickey,	Rykert,
Doyon,	Scriver,
Dupont,	Sproule,
Earle,	Temple,
Fiset,	Thérien,
Fisher,	Thompson (Sir John),
Flynn,	Vanasse,
Geoffrion,	Weldon (Albert),
Gigault,	Weldon (St. John),
Godbout,	Wood (Brockville),
Grandbois,	Wood (Westmoreland).—70.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	McMillan (Huron),
Barron,	Masson,
Bowman,	Meigs,
Brown,	Mitchell,
Campbell,	Moncrieff,
Davis,	Prior,
Ellis,	Robertson,
Hale,	Ross,
Innes,	Semple,
Jamieson,	Skinner,
Kirk,	Small,
Landerkin,	Somerville,
Lang,	Tisdale,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),	Trow,
Livingston,	Tyrwhitt,
Macdonald (Huron),	Wallace,
Macdowall,	Watson.—35.
McKeen,	

Amendment agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 141) to facilitate the purchase by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the branch line between Hull and Aylmer.—(Mr. Bryson.)

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BARRON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to state to the hon. the First Minister that I have recently received a rather important letter from my riding, regarding the bridge across the Fenelon River. It is important that that bridge should be attended to, for the sake of navigation from the upper lakes to the lower lakes, and some of the people in that part of the country are anxious that the work should be gone on with as soon as possible. I should like also to know from the First Minister whether, in case the Trent Valley Commissioners do not report before the close of the Session, it will be possible to have their report, together with the evidence taken, printed and distributed to the members of this House during the recess, in order that they may prepare themselves to discuss it intelligently next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I can inform my hon. friend that the report will be printed and distributed as suggested. As regards the evidence, I suppose that will follow, but I do not like to say positively that it will be printed. As to the first part of his question, if he will give me a memorandum of what he requires I will attend to it.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 44) in further amendment of the Revised Statutes, chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise, read,

Mr. BARRON. I should be willing to allow this to stand if the hon. the Secretary of State would consent to consider my proposal, or at all events to bring it up for discussion when he brings up his Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I intend to put in the Bill which the Government has before the House one part of the hon. gentleman's Bill, that is to say, the provision that the qualification shall be stated in the body of the declaration. That is the only part I can add

Mr. BARRON. Do I understand, then, that the hon. Minister proposes to do away with the schedule, and insist on the qualification being mentioned in the declaration itself?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. BARRON. That is satisfactory, and I move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to, order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. WALLACE moved second reading of Bill (No. 77) to amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade. He said: Last year we passed a Bill on this subject, in which some changes were made in the Senate, and the Bill was sent back here in order to have the changes ratified. This was during the last days of the Session; and had we refused to accept those changes the Bill would not have passed at all. Under these circumstances, it was considered better to adopt the Bill in its emasculated form, rather than have it fall through. In the Bill I now present I propose to restore the provisions which we adopted in the House of Commons last year. I might mention that the Senate weakened the effect of the Bill last Session by inserting the words "unduly and unreasonably" in certain paragraphs, and they also changed the last clause, which has reference to this Act not interfering with the regular and legitimate trades unions of the country, but will have the effect of preventing wholesale dealers from forming what they would call trade unions, which, we are advised, they would have the power to do under the Trades Unions Act. These are the two objects proposed. To restore the provisions, as it was in the House of Commons, by striking out the words "unduly and unreasonably," and to make it more clear what the intention of the House is with regard to trade unions. The intention is not to interfere in any respect with the action of trades unions in carrying out the objects of trades union associations.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is it liable to punish any combination?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The word "unlawful" will still remain in the first section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand this Bill as merely declaratory? Anybody who unlawfully designs to do an unlawful act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. That was the law before, and is the law still.

Mr. WALLACE. We want to make a declaration of what the law is. The lawyers may understand what the law is; the general public do not.

On section 2.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). Does the second clause exempt trades unions from the operation of the Act? Can they unlawfully combine to do unlawful acts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. By the Trades Unions Act combines in restraint of trade are permitted, both as to workmen and employers. The effect of the clause will be to permit combines by workmen but not by employers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even if it is unlawful?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Even if it is in restraint of trade.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Trades Unions Act exempts in a particular way and to a particular extent, but this Act goes further.

Bill reported.

RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING.

Mr. CHARLTON. As the First Minister has expressed his wish that this Bill should be discharged from the Order Paper with the other Wrecking Bills I have no objection, and I move:

That the third Order for second reading of Bill (No. 2) to permit Reciprocity in Wrecking and the Towing of Vessels and Rafts, be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY LABORERS.

Mr. PURCELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 52) for the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of railways

under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada. He said: This is the same Bill which I introduced last year, to provide for the payment of money due to laborers on railways authorised and subsidised by the Government. I think that men who work on railways should receive their pay. There have been a great many instances lately where men have had a great deal of difficulty in getting their pay, though this condition of affairs has not been so bad of late as it was in years gone by. I could not give the details of these cases without mentioning the names of the parties, which I do not desire to do; but I think the Government, who claim to be the friends of the workingmen, should favor this Bill. On the Intercolonial Railway several contractors burst and left the men without their pay. They stayed on the road as long as they could, but many of them left the country and went to the States, and have not received their pay to this day. I have been on railways, canals and other public works for thirty years, and I have seen enough in matters of this kind to make the hair stand on one's head. These cases are very little known. Since I introduced this Bill I went down to my own place and found that my paymaster had got a number of men from Lower Canada employed there. The man by whom they were engaged was paid $400 or $500, but you could not get a $2 bill out of him with a search warrant, and he did not pay the men. The result was that I had to pay them over again. I said I had introduced this Bill, and I was not going to be the first to break it. I believe that will be a lesson to that man, as it was a lesson to myself. I hope that we will see that any municipality which gives contracts for works will be obliged to see that the men who labor on them are paid. In every country, defrauding laborers of their wages is a crime which is heinous to society. I hope the Minister of Justice will favor this Bill, and, if it is passed now, the evil will be wiped out. In Maine, Kentucky, Michigan and Texas, the magistrate settles this difficulty. If the laborers are not paid, the magistrate will sell an engine off the road, or, if there is no engine there, he will sell a piece of the road in order to pay the men. That is done by the magistrates without any necessity of bringing the case to a higher court. How can one or two, or ten laboring men go to a higher court in contest with a rich contractor, or a rich company? We have been sometimes a hundred miles away from a regular magistrate, but the Government always sends a stipendiary magistrate on these works, and, in the States to which I have referred, the stipendiary magistrate has power to settle these matters. There is not one case out of a thousand in which laboring men will sue a company. Their $5, $10, $15 or $20 are not sufficient to enable them to employ a lawyer and bring these cases to a higher court, and so they go without their pay. I hope the Government will agree to the passage of this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill is prepared by my hon. friend (Mr. Purcell) for a very beneficial purpose—the protection of the workingmen; but it may be doubted whether, under the terms of the Bill, adequate protection will be given, whether the clauses of the Bill will fully effect the purpose for which the hon. gentleman has introduced it. I have no objection that the Bill should be read a second time, and referred to the Committee on Railways, which will sit on Friday to consider another measure, and there the railway interests can also be heard, because, perhaps, some of these clauses might be oppressive on them. In that Committee the Bill can be considered clause by clause.

Mr. BOISVERT (Translation.) With the permission of the House I will say a few words with respect to this Bill. As is well known, it is calculated to benefit the laborers, who are unfortunately so often taken advantage of by some sub-contractors who do not scruple to badly pay, and even sometimes to never pay at all the poor men they employ. I hope the greater part of the members of this House, to whatever political party they may belong, will deem it their duty to support this Bill, which is intended to safeguard the interests of a class of the community so necessary and at the same time so worthy of our sympathies. I also hope the Government will manifest no hostility to this Bill, for they have shown themselves to be the sincere and devoted friends of the workingmen of this country. I may quote as an illustration of this the fact that, in 1886, regardless of the expenditure, they appointed a royal commission, whose duty it was to make enquiries in various parts of the country in order to ascertain the social condition of the Canadian workingmen. I am sorry the members of this commission had no opportunity to make their enquiries in the various places where railways were under construction, for they would have obtained a greater sum of information for the benefit of the members of this House as to the unjust dealings of certain railway contractors. For, as I said before, if among them there are men who pay rather well their laborers, there are others, unfortunately, who are far from discharging their duties to them. A glance on that part of the reports of the royal commission which has reference to the relations between work and capital will be sufficient to force conviction on that point; and, at page 63, we find that when the commission was sitting at Sherbrooke a witness stated that a great many laborers who had worked for sub-contractors had been losing from $15 to $16 each. Unfortunately, Sherbrooke is not the only place where this has happened. It has happened at many places. For my part, I know of a place where laborers have not been paid for more than two years now, and that, it goes without saying, is the cause of serious injury to every class of that community. In the first place, everyone knows that the laborer is a man who has very little capital, a man who lives from hand to mouth and whose credit is very limited. Well, if that man is not paid regularly he is exposed, as well as the members of his family, to be wanting the necessaries of life. Another class, Mr. Speaker, which have had much to suffer, is that of the farmers. Every one knows that when a railway is built through the country the greater half of the laborers who work on it are farmers and sons of farmers, who come from rather distant places in order to earn some money to improve their farms, and who, while thus working far from their homes, contract debts for the maintenance of their families. Now, if these men are not paid, far from having improved their condition, they will have made it only more criti-

cal, and sooner or later they will have to bear the disastrous consequences. Then, as to the merchant of the locality, who advanced his goods rather liberally, should he, moreover, as is often the case, have taken from these laborers orders for several hundred dollars, and should, on the other hand, the laborers not be paid, he cannot receive his money back, his trade is seriously affected, so much so that, in order to prevent being run in financial ruin, he will be compelled to sue them. So that it can be seen at a glance what a miserable condition will befall these poor people. I will mention, in connection with this state of things, a fact which occurred barely a few months ago. A laborer who had worked on a railway under construction for several weeks, and in the meantime had contracted debts for the maintenance of his family, not having been paid himself was unable to pay his own debts. His creditors sued him and had all his things sold by order of the court; he was almost turned out of his home. He told me quite recently that had caused him damages amounting to $200. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it will be said that the law is there to protect the laborers working on railways the same as any other members of the community. Well, I say it is not always an easy thing to have justice done. In the first place, the railway companies very seldom carry on the works by themselves. In the majority of cases they let them to a contractor, who, himself, lets them to a sub-contractor, and so on, and it sometimes happens that this sub-contractor is a man of no financial standing, a kind of stop-gap behind which others hide themselves so as not to pay the laborers. Sometimes this sub-contractor comes and visits the works once or twice and then he is no more to be seen, like those meteors which pass through the immensity of space and leave no traces behind them. At other times it is a representative of the company who comes and engages a foreman. This foreman engages laborers and these latter do not know for whom they work. As an instance of this I will mention a fact which occurred a few weeks ago. An honest laborer who had earned a few dollars by working on a railway under construction, annoyed at being put off from week to week, from month to month, I might rather say from year to year, finally resolved to take legal proceedings against the company for which he had worked. Well, what was the result? The company pleaded first that they had never engaged the plaintiff; and, what is still worse, they pleaded prescription, and everyone knows that in the Province of Quebec the wages of a laborer are prescribed by the lapse of one year. Well, the poor man had to pay the legal costs and lose the money they owed him. Must it not be inferred from all this that there is a great deficiency in our statutes and that it is absolutely necessary that a law should be passed to protect the laborers working on railways under construction. I am not the only one who is asking for such a legislation. There are on the Table of this House many petitions asking that a law be passed to protect the laborers working on railways nnder construction. Does it not seem that the signers of these petitions are crying out to us: We beseech you, at all events, who are our representatives, to grant us that greater sum of protection to which we are entitled; we beseech you to grant us that protection which you grant so easily to every other class of the

community, and especially to the wealthiest class of this country! We beseech you to protect us against that class of men eager to enrich themselves with the money we have so painfully earned and which so legitimately belongs to us! I ask, Mr. Speaker, is there a single member who would decline to aid in the passing of this Bill in favor of the laborers, in the fortunes of which we take a deeper interest in election times than in this House. Some time ago an hon. member rose in this House to ask for the appointment of a commission of enquiry on the causes of the emigration of Canadians to the United States. I think one of the principal causes of this emigration—and there is no necessity for making investigations on that point—I have no hesitation in saying that one of the principal causes of emigration is the want of protection to the laborers, to the poor farmers and to the settlers. Yes, I repeat it, to the settler in this country, to the man who, poor but courageous, did not hesitate to part with his native parish where he had spent the best days of his youth, to go with his family in the thickest part of the virgin forest and engage with it in a struggle that will last until one of the two succumbs. And while engaged in clearing his ground he will be compelled sometimes to leave in order to earn some money to provide for the more pressing wants of his family; and then, if an opportunity offers, he will go and work for a railway contractor. Should he not be paid for his work, one can see in what a painful position his family will be; he will go back to his place, his heart saddened, saying the position is untenable; he will sell, as soon as he can, all that he owns; he will direct his steps towards the nearest railway station; but, on leaving, he will cast a last look at the piece of ground he toiled upon and where he should have been so much delighted to live with his family. But, alas! that happiness not being allowed him, he will go, with downcast eyes, like an outcast, banished from his country, to the nearest station and take the train that will soon take him to that American Republic, made up of every nation on earth, each speaking his own language, and which it is commonly agreed to call the United States Republic. After that one shall see editors inveighing, in long and numerous columns of their papers, against the emigration of Canadians to the United States, and at certain days in the year, on the St. Jean Baptiste day, for instance, one shall see young men just let loose from the lyceums, their imagination full of flowers of rhetoric, appear on the platform and deliver patriotic speeches, in which they recall the brilliant military achievements of our fathers and bitterly deplore the emigration of Canadians to the United States, of these poor compatriots who are often wrongfully charged with a want of patriotism when leaving their country. I am not in favor of the emigration of Canadians to the United States, but I think a great many of those who emigrate are just as patriotic men as those who remain in the country. One thing sure, Mr. Speaker, they have more patriotism than the railway contractors who do not pay their men. Each man appreciates patriotism in this world after his own ideas. Ask the soldier what a patriot is. He will proudly answer: It is he who gives his life in the defence of his country. Ask the farmer who is the greatest patriot. He will proudly answer: It is he who causes two blades of grass to grow

where only one grew. Ask a laborer what a patriot is, and he will frankly tell you: It is he who has heart, courage and energy enough to earn the livelihood of his family, and if he does not find means of doing it in this country, his duty is to seek for it elsewhere. Of course, in doing this, he is actuated by patriotism, for should he remain in his country and cause his family to suffer he would not be a true patriot. Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more. It appears to me no lengthy arguments are required to show the necessity of passing a Bill to protect the poor laborer working on railways. The Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) has that object in view. If it is not found perfect, let it be amended; but I pray that it be passed, for the effect of this Bill, if it becomes law, will be to give every one his due, and so the devil will have none.

Mr. LEPINE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a Bill worthy of the consideration of this House, it is this very Bill brought up by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) for the protection of laborers employed in the construction of railways. For several years past complaints were made by laborers employed on railways. A good many of them have lost part or the whole of their salary, and it is time this class should be protected by some such special legislation as this measure now submitted to our consideration. A few months ago the newspapers have been advocating the claims of many persons employed on railways under construction in the Eastern Townships, and on another railway under construction in the Baie des Chaleurs. Extensive strikes have occurred at these places, and they were caused and warranted by the conduct of contractors, who declined to pay the honest salary due to their laborers. By this Bill the Government will prevent the making of illegitimate profits out of the laborers employed on those works, and, as pointed out by the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Boisvert), who has vigorously advocated to-night the rights of the persons employed on railways, this Bill, if passed by Parliament, as I have no doubt it will be, will greatly benefit the laboring classes. I do not wish to detain the House any longer, but I hope that this Bill, which no doubt will be referred to the Committee on Railways, in order that it may be more thoroughly considered, shall soon be brought back with the suggestion that the House should pass it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) is entitled to credit from the workingmen of the country for bringing in a Bill of this kind. It is a fact that cannot be denied, that from time to time we have instances of hardship, instances of poverty, that are the result of ill-considered contracts, or of dishonesty on the part of contractors. In every part of the country, and at all times in the history of the country, we have brought to our notice large numbers of laborers who have faithfully discharged their duty to contractors and sub-contractors, who have worked hard for the money that was needed to support themselves and their dependent families, and yet after that labor has been performed, after their time has been wasted, after many of them have gone into debt for necessaries to support themselves in the meantime, they wake up to realise that an unprincipled contractor has cleared out and left them without their well-earned money. This being the case, they have little or no redress. A private individual, a laboring man, who has got to contend with a railway corporation, has little or no redress. He is unable to collect his wages; he may sue for them, and perhaps he finds that he has not the power to carry on the suit against the contractor, or he may find other disabilities which prevent him from collecting that which he has lawfully earned. Now, a Bill of this kind, if it could be crystallised into law—while I confess that I think this falls short of the object aimed at—still, I say, if a Bill of this nature could be crystallised into law it would be a warning to railway corporations, and would compel them to take the trouble to ascertain the financial standing of contractors, their honesty, and their means of carrying out the contract before they would allow them to enter into such contracts. Unfortunately, as it is to-day, it is a matter of little concern to railway corporations or to big contractors when they sub-let contracts, whether the sub-contractors are able to do the work; the result is, that we find that Governments are applied to—as this Government has been, not only during the present Session, but during many previous Sessions—to furnish money to pay these men who have done the work for which the public are receiving a benefit afterwards, and for which the contractors have failed to pay them. We had such an instance in the building of the North-West Central Railway, or of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. Year after year that stood, until only a short time ago the labor that was expended in the completion of these contracts was paid for at something like 50 cents on the dollar; but it was paid at a time when these poor unfortunate men who did the work realised very little for it, because they were in such a state of hardship that many of them were compelled to sell their claims, believing that these claims would never be realised upon, and many were compelled to sell their claims for 25 cents on the dollar. When the claims were paid it was others who profited by their labor and not themselves; they received scarcely 25 cents on the dollar. In this case I regret to say the original company was more at fault than the contractors; but no matter who was in fault, at any rate the poor laborer who did the heavy part of the work received little or nothing in return for his labor. Now, I say that, if this Bill becomes law, it would be a standing advertisement to the world, that men would not be allowed to make a contract with a company without proving first, to the satisfaction of the company, or the first contractor, that they had some financial standing in the country, or something to back them up, which would enable them to complete their contract. It may be said by some that if this Bill becomes law it will prevent railway corporations from carrying on their operations as successfully as they otherwise would do, because the percentage held back by the company will be so great that it will require all the financial skill and manœuvring that a sub-contractor can do to enable him to complete his contract with the limited means at his disposal. But I think it would rather result in the making of better arrangements between the companies and sub-contractors; they would not only make provisions for the work being

carried on—because it would be in their interest that it should be done—but they would also make provisions for ascertaining from time to time how much, if any, remained behind unpaid, how many of these poor unfortunate laborers were lying out of their money. These are the poorer classes of the community, they are the least able to bear the loss of their wages, and they are the least able to fight for them when they are cheated out of them ; therefore, I say this Bill is a very important one. Now, the first clause says :

"Any railway company now or hereafter incorporated under the authority of any Act of the Parliament of Canada may stipulate and provide in any contract."

I think there ought to be a change in the phraseology, and that the word "may" should be "shall stipulate and provide ;" because it leaves it optional ; they may do it, or can do it, whereas I believe the aim of the hon. member is to make a law by which they are compelled to do it. I have no doubt that when this Bill comes before the Committee on Railways and Canals, where each clause is considered separately, the wisdom of that Committee, provided they see fit to pass this Bill, will so modify it as to make it compulsory on railway companies and on the first contractor to make such a provision. I can only say that the object of the Bill is a good one ; it aims at remedying an evil that has been felt from time to time in this country ; it aims at giving the poor laborer what he is richly entitled to, after he has worked hard for days, it may be, in the sun, or it may be when the inclemency of the weather is such that it is scarcely fit for a man to be out, and when he has faithfully discharged his duty, laboring from eight hours a day to ten, twelve and perhaps sixteen hours a day, and still he may receive no reward for that labor unless we have some such a Bill as this to compel the contractor to consider his case and make proper provisions with the sub-contractor for his payment, otherwise some unprincipled, dishonest man may avail himself of the laxity of the law and clear out of the country and leave these poor men without paying for their labor. As I said before, I think the hon. member is entitled to credit for bringing in this Bill He knows the need of it himself by experience as a contractor, and while saying so I must admit, from all the information I have been able to get on this subject, that he is entitled to credit for another thing also ; that he has shown a disposition during his whole life to look after the interests of the laboring men, and, as I am told, in some instances he has even paid the second time laborers who have been deprived of their money by sub-contractors, to whom he had let contracts. Now, I say it comes with good grace from that hon. gentleman, because he has been a railway contractor for years, and he knows the evils that have grown up, he knows the injustices that have been perpetrated, times without number, against poor laborers. Therefore, he feels himself that it is his duty, as a member of this Parliament, to introduce a Bill which many would say would be against his own interests as a large contractor, but which will protect the poor laborers of the country. I trust that this Parliament will see fit to pass the Bill, at least in some shape, so that it may accomplish the object the hon. gentleman has in view, and while doing that I think it may also be framed so as not, in any way, to retard the progress of public works in this country, because it is important that contractors should have every facility for carrying them on.

Mr. BERGIN. I desire to add a word to what has fallen from hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in support of this Bill. There can be no doubt that very great suffering and great hardship have been caused, and very great wrong has been practiced upon poor laboring men in the past, and will be in the future, unless prevented by legislation such as this. It has come to my notice frequently during years past that sub-contractors have failed to pay the wages of the laborers employed by them upon railways and other public works. It is not always the fault of the contractor, but very often it is. I mention this especially because the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sproule) has said that it was in the interest of the contractor always to see the work properly done by the sub-contractor, and the payments to the laborers promptly made. Now, we know that, so far from this being the case, frequently contractors employ sub-contractors without sufficient capital to carry on the contracts ; indeed, they go so far as to induce men to take sub-contracts at a price less than that for which they can fairly do the work. As a consequence, after several weeks they find they are unable to pay their laborers ; the men are obliged to cease work, and the damage is not confined entirely to the laborers, but it is pretty widely spread in the neighborhood where the work is being carried on. The sub-contractors obtain credit from the boarding house keepers, and from the merchants who furnish them with supplies. The boarding house keepers get in debt to the merchants, as do the sub-contractors, and the sub-contractor in a little while is obliged to cease work ; he clears out; he leaves his laborers unpaid. The merchants who trusted the laborers and who trusted the sub-contractor lose their debts also, and the contractor induces some other foolish man to take the place of the sub-contractor who has gone away. My hon. friend who has introduced this Bill can give many instances of this kind, where three or four sub-contractors in succession have failed, owing to the false representations made to them by the contractor, and three, or four, or five sets of laborers have lost their wages. I think that this Bill would do away with that evil, that it would amply protect the laborers ; at all events, as amended, as I am sure it will be in the sense implied by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), it will make it imperative upon contractors who sub-let any portion of their works to see that their laborers are paid ; and if they are not paid the Government will have it in its power to deduct from the sums payable to them by the Government the amount necessary to pay the wages of the laborers. So great has been the loss to the laboring community through the sub-letting of portions of railways and other public works to men without sufficient capital to carry on their sub-contracts that the attention of the great labor organisations has been called to it, and numerous petitions have been presented to this House asking Parliament to pass the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) into law. There can be no question, I think, from all we have heard in connection with this Bill, that the hon. member

for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) deserves the gratitude of the laboring community of this country. No one has moved in this matter before, or, at all events, has so earnestly pushed it as has the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell); and when we find that the great labor organisations have called upon us to adopt his Bill, we are in duty bound to pay attention to those representations, because, as the hon. Minister of Justice said the other night, in speaking of another matter recommended to this House by the labor organisations, we should take it, to a certain extent, for granted that they have fuller information on these matters, and must know more about them than we do who are not engaged in matters of this kind. We know, too, that the sub-contractors not only impose upon laborers and deprive them of their earnings, but they do mischief all round. When a man is employed as a contractor on a Government railway, the people in the neighborhood naturally think he is representing the Government. They think any contract entered into with the sub-contractor will be ratified by the Government; they look upon him as part and parcel of the Public Works or Railway Department, and they are certain, when they deliver the property, they will be paid by the Railway Department or Public Works Department. They little know that these people are merely tools in the hands of an astute contractor; and I could, if necessary, point to more than one case where the community in the neighborhood have been fleeced by such unscrupulous and incompetent men. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House longer, because it must be patent to every hon. member that, as our attention has been called to a great evil, it is our duty to remedy it. There is no portion of the community less able to enforce a claim against the dishonest sub-contractor than are the laborers; in fact, the sub-contractors leave them in a position that they are unable to prosecute any claim against them, and to pay the fees in the division court necessary to be paid before they can enter suit against them, but they even leave the poor laborers and their families without bread. It is a crying evil, and it is one which should be terminated if possible, and I feel quite convinced that this Bill, after it has been considered by the Committee on Railways and Canals, will be so framed that the laborers of the country may feel assured in future that when they are employed on Government railways or public works their wages will be secured, and that they need not fear being robbed by any dishonest sub-contractor.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), who has brought forward this measure, has on several occasions requested me to read his Bill and consider it. The question is one with which he, as a public contractor—having carried out some of the most important works in the Dominion—is thoroughly acquainted, at all events in so far as the great hardships to which men are exposed who may have the misfortune to fall into the hands of persons who are unscrupulous and anxious to defraud; and he also knows how difficult it is, under existing circumstances, for poor men to enforce their rights against persons who are evilly disposed. The hon. the First Minister has suggested that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals, and that reference, of course, will enable that Committee to take cognisance of the various provisions of the Bill, and consider exactly how far those provisions come within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The great object of the Bill is, of course, to afford ample protection to the laborer who has earned his money by hard work upon the public enterprises of the country. But we must be very careful not to overstep the marks that are traced for us with respect to our powers, and while some of the provisions of this Bill may possibly come within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, especially if the Government themselves were undertaking the construction of a public work, then it might make certain provisions in its contract that those who had charge of men or received contracts from the Government should be forced to carry out certain terms of payment with respect to those employed. Still it is difficult for me, at all events, to see how we could intervene in most cases without usurping the powers now in the hands of the Local Legislatures of the various Provinces of the Dominion. These questions will naturally present themselves to hon. members who are well versed in such matters on the Railway Committee, and I will, therefore, merely say that I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having brought this matter to the notice of Parliament; and as regards the provisions of the Bill with which we cannot ourselves deal, they being *ultra vires*, the matter will have been brought to the notice of those who have that power, and the hon. gentleman will have had the satisfaction of having made known the state of things which exists, so that those who are competent to apply the remedy will, no doubt, discharge their duty at the proper time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand it to be the wish of the House that this Bill be read the second time and go to the Committee on Railways. I will not oppose the motion, and I could hardly do so when the leader of the House has requested that that course should be followed. But I hope the hon. gentleman and those in favor of the Bill will not understand us all as committing ourselves at all to the principle of the Bill in so assenting. So far as I am able to judge there is nothing in it which we have power to pass, except the title and possibly the preamble; but I have no objection to the Bill going to the Committee, so that it may be thoroughly examined for the purpose of ascertaining whether any provisions of like character can be enacted within the powers of this Parliament.

Mr. BRIEN. The hon. member for Glengarry is a large contractor, and on that ground alone, I am in favor of the Bill. The hon. gentleman deserves the thanks of the laboring men of this country for having brought it before the House, for if there is any class that is unable to protect itself it is the laboring class. If this Bill should become law, it would do justice to those who otherwise would not receive justice. I heartily support the Bill, and I hope it will go before the Railway Committee.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. The Bill is more important than it would, perhaps, seem to be at first sight. We have through the Dominion several railways being constructed, and we know that in my own Province, as well as in other Provinces, we have had a great deal of trouble on account of some of the railway contractors and sub-contractors not paying

their laborers. In a great many instances—in almost in every case I may say—some contracts have been let to irresponsible sub-contractors, and the poor laborers after working for weeks, and for several months in many cases, have not been paid for their labor. This, as has been said by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin), is from the fact that the people who were working for railway companies, are under the belief that the Government is responsible for their wages, and that, therefore, they go on working for weeks and weeks without being paid, because they believe the payment is sure to come. Unfortunately their mistake has led them to trust these sub-contractors, who have taken contracts at a much lower price than they ought to, and who are unable to pay the poor laborers. I hope this measure will be well examined by the Railway Committee, and that such legislation as is required under the circumstances, will be adopted in order to relieve, in future, the poorer classes from the recurrence of the losses they have sustained in the past. I believe, that some means can be adopted whereby these laborers can be protected as well as men working on ordinary buildings, because we have the lien law to protect the mechanics who work on, as well as those who supply building material for ordinary buildings. I do not see why we should not have also a provision in the Railway Act, whereby those who earn their wages by hard toil, should also be protected. I hope that when this Bill is brought before the Railway Committee, legislation will be adopted to protect these poor workingmen. In itself, the Bill may not appear to be very important, but when we consider the consequences of what has taken place, the measure is much more important than it may appear. The losses may be small, but they are numerous, and the whole taken together, amount to a large sum which falls directly on the class of the community least able to sustain these losses. Men in ordinary business in life may sometimes lose very large amounts without affecting their position; but poor people, who depend upon their wages to maintain themselves and their families, cannot afford to lose even a small amount. As we are here to legislate to protect all classes of the community, the rich as well as the poor, and the poor as well as the rich, I believe we ought to adopt such means that, in every case, these poor people who give their labor should be protected against unscrupulous contractors, or against contractors who make mistakes in tendering for contracts at too low a figure.

Mr. DENISON. The class which it is proposed to legislate in favor of, by this Bill, are a class of the community who can least afford to sustain a loss. They are the lowest paid, I suppose, of all the working classes. The Bill refers mostly to the class known as navvies, who work on the railways, and that being the case, it is the duty of this House to protect them, and to see that they obtain their hard-earned wages. As we know, it very often occurs that the men employed on railroad construction are foreigners, and not understanding our language, they may be induced to delay collecting their wages, and may be imposed upon through their ignorance of our tongue. On that account, I believe, legislation should step in to insure that these people who are more or less ignorant should be protected—the word "ignorant" I use in

the sense of their being ignorant of the usages, laws and often language of the country. Recently, in Toronto, a move has been made, something in the same line as this Bill, by the corporation passing an ordinance of the council that no wages less than a certain sum per hour should be paid to men working on the sewers, and I think the block pavements of the city as well. By this means the corporation are enabled to see that the workingmen shall be paid a fair wage, and that they get it. I fancy that if a law of that sort is good in Toronto, in connection with contractors for city work, it also ought apply with equal force to men employed as navvies on railways. I see no reason why legislation should not be adopted on the lines of this Bill, and I believe we should pass a law which should protect the navvies and at the same time compel the railway companies to see that justice is done to the men who really build the line. I know many cases where men have lost their whole pay, or a large portion of their pay through the sub-contractors failing, and for this reason I think we should protect the workmen. I heartily endorse the principle of this Bill.

General LAURIE. It occurred to me at first sight that the provisions of this Bill apply more particularly to counties and localities in which public works are being carried on. But I believe, on second thoughts, that districts, at a distance from where these works are, are even more affected than the actual localities. A large number of workingmen leave their homes and go to the districts in which these works are being carried out, in the hope of obtaining regular employment. But, if through dishonesty, or the failure of the contractors, the work is not carried on these men are thrown on their own resources. They have not their homes near the works; they cannot wait to obtain their wages through any process of law, even if they could obtain them by this means, and they must return whence they came, or seek work elsewhere. Without going into the details of the Bill, it seems most desirable that some money should be retained to pay these poor workingmen for the work they have actually done. I hope that some such Bill, as the one now before us, may become law.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am very glad, indeed, that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) has been kind enough to embody in this Bill the result of the long experience of forty years which he has had as a contractor. While I am anxious to see provision made for the due protection of the workingmen — and especially the workingmen belonging to the class mentioned by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), namely, the navvies—who require that protection perhaps more than any other laborer, yet, at the same time, I must say this is a Bill which must be entered upon and have its provisions viewed most carefully by the Committee on Railways and Canals. I find that section 3 of the Bill says:

"Every railway company, incorporated by Parliament and contracting as aforesaid, shall ascertain from time to time, by agent or otherwise, that all arrears due to laborers and workmen have been paid by their contractors, before making final payment to or settlement with them."

It occurs to me that under these provisions a railway company might stir up some innocent laborer to make a claim which might be well founded or

might be unfounded, and the sub-contractor would be left in the position of being unable to get any money from the railway company to pay his workmen—however willing he might be to do so.

Mr. PURCELL. I intend to have that amended. It was a mistake to put that part in the Bill.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am very glad of that, because it would open the door to any amount of chicanery and cheating. I hope while the hon. gentleman is taking up the protection of the workingmen, that he will not forget also the poor working woman, who often supplies the workingman with the necessaries of life, and who occasionally happens to be left unpaid, and that he will not omit even the Chinese washerwoman. I should like to see the provisions of the Bill extended to the fullest extent, so that not only the workingmen will be protected, but all connected with the contract. When the Bill goes before the Railway Committee, I hope it will be thoroughly investigated, and we shall have there the great experience of the hon. member for Glengarry to guide us. No Bill has come before the House which is more important in some of its ramifications than this, and no Bill requires to be more carefully guarded, because a Bill of this character, with proper restraints, may be of great benefit, and if allowed to extend beyond due limitations, it may do incalculable harm. I hope that whatever may be done with the Bill, the discussion will have this effect, that if we find it to be beyond our powers to deal with the question, so much attention will have been drawn to it that the Local Legislatures will take the matter under their wing, and accomplish the objects sought to be attained in this Bill.

Mr. WATSON. I have just a word to say before this Bill is passed. I am sure the House will almost unanimously agree to this Bill, and I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will give it such attention as to crystallise it into a law that will benefit the class for whom it is intended, the working class on railways. The case which has been mentioned came under my notice five or six years ago—the case of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. There were unpaid claims for labor on that road to the amount of $80,000, and the House practically admitted the principle of the Bill by inserting a clause for the incorporation of the North-West Central Railway Company, which took over the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, providing that one of the first claims against that company should be the old claim of the workingmen on the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. That claim of $80,000 was settled for, I believe, for $25,000, and I think I am safe in saying that not $10,000 of that amount went into the hands of the working people to whom it was due, because it was not paid for three or four years, and those people could not afford to wait, and sold their claims for what they could get. I think that case shows how important it is that such a Bill as this should be crystallised into working shape, and that the original contractor should be held responsible for the labor performed under sub-contractors.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. DICKEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 103) in further amendment of the Canada Temperance Act. He said: I think it proper that I should explain to the House as shortly as possible the necessity that exists for this Bill. I would first draw the attention of the House to the original section of the Canada Temperance Act, which is the same as section 95 in the Act of the Revised Statutes, the part of which material to my argument reads as follows:—

"When any petition has been adopted, the Governor in Council may by Order in Council, published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the second part of this Act shall be in force and take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses will expire."

By an oversight, when the Act was originally passed—I believe those in charge of it having more in view the circumstances that existed in Ontario—the fact was overlooked that there are a large number of counties in Nova Scotia in which no licenses were in force at all. Therefore, after the Act was voted on in some ten or twelve counties, the question was raised whether or not this Act had come into force, because the Order in Council which purported to bring it into force followed in all cases the terms of the Act, saying that it should come into force after the day of the *expiré* of the annual or the semi-annual licenses. That point was decided against the counties by some of the courts, and the result was that an appeal was made to this Parliament in 1884, when chapter 31 was passed to remedy that difficulty. The first section of that Act provided for future cases of counties which had no licenses in force, and the second section was retroactive, declaring:—

"If any Order in Council has been published in the *Canada Gazette* declaring that the second part of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, shall be in force and take effect in any county or city upon, from, and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire; and if in fact there were, at the date of such publication, no such licenses then in force in such county or city, then the second part of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, shall be deemed to have been in force and taken effect in such county or city at the expiration of thirty days from the date of such Order in Council."

That had the retroactive effect of bringing into effect in these counties in Nova Scotia the prohibitory clauses of the Canada Temperance Act. That in the year 1884 made matters perfectly satisfactory, and brought the law into operation, as it had been asked by the majority of peeple in those counties. In the consolidation of the statutes, by the repealing schedule, this statute of 1884, 47 Vic., chapter 31, to amend the Canada Temperance Act, was repealed. It was not observed in time by any body interested in the matter that this Act had been repealed, but as time went on the point was raised—I think about a year ago—that the Act which brought the Canada Temperance Act into force in those counties had been repealed, and that the effect was to do away with the Act in those counties. I do not think that argument will commend itself as a sound one to any of the legal element in this House. I think that looking to the Consolidated Statutes and the Act of 1884, to which I have just referred, and looking particularly to the Interpretation Act contained in the Consolidated Statutes, which provides what shall be the effect of the repeal of any statute, it must be clear to any lawyer that the opinion I have referred to is a mistake. But we have to deal with matters as we find them, and a county court judge in Nova Scotia thought the Act, owing to the repeal

of the statute of 1884, is no longer in force in Nova Scotia. It will be seen at once that by an error in the work of the revisors of the statutes, an effect has been produced which never could have been contemplated by this House. The Canada Temperance Act was brought into force in ten or twelve counties in Nova Scotia by the deliberate and almost overwhelming voice of the people. There has been no intention on the part of Parliament ever to override that decision, and I do not think there will be any intention now to do anything in that direction; and the Act I propose is the following:—

For the removal of doubts as to the application of the Act hereinafter mentioned in certain counties and cities in Canada: Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

Notwithstanding the repeal of section 2 of the Act 47 Vic., chapter 31, it is hereby declared that the second part of the Canada Temperance Act was and still is in force in any county or city to which such section applies, and shall remain in force in such county and city as if no repeal had taken place.

The Bill proposes simply to put those counties where they would be if this repeal had not taken place. As that repeal was not intended by the House to work any such effect as it has been made to work in the opinion of one judge, I feel I cannot look for any serious objection in any quarter to the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to oppose the second reading. I have been unable to comprehend by what process of reasoning the county court judge arrived at the conclusion he did. It is an extraordinary decision; however the hon. gentleman is dealing with facts as he finds them. No doubt if the case be appealed to a higher court, that court will take a different view. I would suggest that the proviso in the Act of 1884 be renewed in this Bill, namely, that existing rights be reserved and not prejudiced by the passing of this declaratory law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only hesitation I feel in supporting the Bill is that I think the law so perfectly clear that there is no cause for the least doubt. As to the decision which the hon. gentleman has referred, I find it impossible to have any respect whatever for it. My hon. friend is mistaken in supposing that the Act of 1884 was repealed by error, and that its repeal was not noticed. Like all Acts which have served their purpose, and which were temporary in their character, it was properly repealed on the revision of the statutes. That Act performed its purpose in fixing the date when the Canada Temperance Act came into force, and nothing but an Act of Parliament could make it cease. But a judge has been found to actually take the view that an Act repealing errors and ambiguities provides of itself errors and ambiguities. I would oppose the passage of the Bill were it not that in four or five counties a great deal of confusion exists, one appeal having been taken and a suit standing for judgment, and in the meantime the Act being interfered with.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved that clause 2 be added to the Bill as follows:—

Nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to affect any suit, action, prosecution or proceeding, now pending.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DICKEY.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. DICKEY moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIS (P.E.I.) As my hon. friend from King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Borden), takes an interest in this measure, and as he is unable to be present to-night in consequence of sickness, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the third reading to stand until to-morrow.

Mr. DICKEY. This will, probably, be the last day on which I will have an opportunity of proceeding with the Bill, and, probably, any proposals the hon. gentleman may have to make may be made in another place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Secretary of State has incorporated the provisions of Bill (No. 108) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, in his general amendment to that Act. I, therefore, move that the Order be discharged.

Motion agreed to, Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Probably it is too late to proceed now with (Bill No. 110) to secure the better observance of the Lord's day, as it may create considerable discussion, and it might be better to proceed with the next Order, which I do not think will occupy much time.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BRIEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 114) in further amendment of the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: I am very glad we have at last arrived at this Bill. I think no better argument can be adduced to show the necessity of the Bill than the measure which has been discussed to-night on the proposition of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell). So far as we can gather from the utterances of those who introduced and supported the Electoral Franchise Act, it is based on the ground of giving representation to industry. If that be the view, I believe every industrious laboring man should have a vote. The Minister of Inland Revenue said, when the Bill was first introduced:

"This Bill widens the franchise so as to bring in the laboring classes. It brings in every industrious mechanic and every industrious laborer in the country."

Last year, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in moving the Address, said:

"It confers the franchise on all citizens who are not confirmed paupers, upon every one who has a stake in the country."

If we examine the statistics as reported by the Ontario Bureau, we find that the average wages paid to farm laborers amount to $250, and many of them work for wages under that amount. I am sure that no one will declare that these men are tramps, or are not citizens who have an interest and a stake in the country. I think the House

should favor this Bill. There is no party purpose to be gained by it. It is simply intended to do justice to this class. I do not wish it to be understood that I favor the principle of the original Bill, which I cannot find a parliamentary term to characterise by its right name, but, as we are compelled to accept it willingly or unwillingly, we should make it as workable as possible. I have seen workingmen on the stand hour after hour trying to figure up cent by cent what they had received, with a view of getting the right to vote. The ordinary payment of laboring men in this country is not more than one dollar a day, and it is not possible for them to work more than 313 days in the year. I find that the average amount which they receive is only $250, and it is useless to pretend, in that case, that the application of this Bill gives the franchise to the laboring class. In comparing the Provincial franchise and the Dominion franchise in the constituency which I have the honor to represent, I find there is a difference altogether of about 200 voters who are disfranchised as between the $250 and $300 income. I do not care so much about the other clauses of the Bill as the first clause. The third clause is simply to substitute an advertisement in the paper instead of posting up these lists. I speak from experience in this matter, and I think the Government will find that it will be much cheaper to advertise in the newspapers the time of the meeting of the court, instead of posting it up. I know that lists that have been posted up have been torn down, either by some one who wanted to appropriate the list for himself, or through mischief. I do not deem it necessary for me to say any more in regard to this Bill, considering the full discussion it has had, along with the franchise question in general, and I hope the Government will allow the Bill to become law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman must see that it is quite impossible for this Bill to get through this Session. It alters, in fact, the elective franchise as it is now constituted, and it opens the door for a discussion which would, perhaps, last a week. I think my hon. friend must be satisfied in having introduced this Bill, and having called the attention of the House to it, and through the House, the attention of the country. Therefore, in order not to waste the time of the House, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This is certainly a very summary way of disposing of a very important measure. It may be the more convenient way to get rid of it; but, certainly, I think, there is a good deal in what has been stated by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Brien). I must say, further, that I think the First Minister can hardly claim that this Bill materially alters the franchise. All it does is to place many of the honest laboring farm hands in a position that they may be entitled to record their votes for a representative to the House of Commons, as well as for a representative for the Local Legislature. Now, if the First Minister will consent to allow this clause to be added to the Government Bill, to attach it to the Bill of the Secretary of State, I will not take up a minute more of the time of the House on this Bill. All I desire is that the measure shall become law, so that the laborers may be placed in the same position for the House of Commons as they are for the Local Legislature.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a very simple matter to dispose of the principle of this Bill by either admitting it or denying it. It is a simple proposition to lower the franchise from $300 to $250 earned per annum. My own experience in Ontario is that the limit of $300 excludes a large proportion of the rural farm laborers. It is somewhat above the usual scale of wages paid to the workingmen, and I think the proposition of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien) is well worthy the consideration of the Secretary of State, and that it will place the franchise on a more just basis than it is at present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not see that although it is made to assimilate the vote to the Province of Ontario, that is not the only Province; it does not assimilate it to the other Provinces. The hon. gentleman looks at it in regard to his own Province.

Mr. BRIEN. There is another feature that strikes me, and that is the reduction of value. An income of $250 now is really worth as much as an income of $300 was when the Franchise Act was passed. It does not appear to me that the Bill would require to change the basis of the franchise. If the Prime Minister will promise us that he will let it go through next Session, we will not push it any further.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will consider it next Session.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a communication notifying him that a vacancy had occurred in the representation of the Electoral District of Kent, N.B., by the acceptance by the sitting member, Pierre Armand Landry, of an office of emolument under the Crown. He also informed the House that he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a writ of election for said electoral district.

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, What steps were taken by the Government to secure the payment of laborers and others having claims against the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, out of the subsidies voted by Parliament in aid of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway? Is it true that Charles Magee, of Ottawa, was appointed to examine and report upon the claims in question? If

so, upon whose recommendation was he appointed? Did he receive one thousand dollars for his services in that connection? If not, how much did he receive, and was his remuneration paid out of the subsidies voted for the railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the subsidy was granted it was with the understanding that the wages of the men, &c., then owing by the company, should be paid before any payment of the subsidy was made, and that any expenses in connection with ensuring having this done should be borne by the company out of the subsidy to carry on this undertaking. A commissioner was appointed to undertake this service. Mr. Charles Magee, of Ottawa, was appointed by the company to examine and to pay the just claims, reporting progress. His appointment was approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals of that day. He did receive $1,000 for his remuneration from the company, which was, I believe, paid out of the subsidy.

CARAQUET RAILWAY.

Mr. ELLIS asked, Whether the Government has been asked to take over the Caraquet Railway, or to give that railway further financial aid? If so, has any determination been reached in the matter, and what is the nature of that determination?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. F. S. A. Hanbury Tracey, George B. Crow, trustees for the bondholders of the Caraquet Railway; General Alex. Fraser, Hon. A. Cadogan and George Brook Mee, English directors named in the prospectus, by letter dated 26th November, 1889, offered to transfer to the Dominion Government the Caraquet Railway, taking the bonds at the price of issue thereof. No further action appears to have been taken, except that I caused the offer to be referred to the Committee of the Privy Council.

OFFICIAL DEBATES—ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. BARRON. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the insufficiency of the *Hansard* room for the purposes of the reporters. I had occasion quite recently to do some private work in that room, and I then ascertained that the accommodation was such as should not be permitted to continue by the Minister of Public Works. We must all admit the great usefulness of those gentlemen, and I think it is the duty of the House to give them every possible accommodation. I ascertained that there are regularly no fewer than eighteen souls in that room from the opening of the House until its close, at all hours of the night and morning. The heat is something intolerable, and the atmosphere is most impure. I found, on enquiry, that the only means of ventilating the room is through an open window, and the moment that window is opened a draft sweeps through the room, which is most dangerous to the health of these gentlemen. I am told there is a room immediately to the west which might possibly be taken, but by taking it the rights of some other official of the House might be curtailed. Something, however, certainly should be done on behalf of those gentlemen, for, according to my personal observation and experience, after being a few hours in the room the other day, I am satisfied the present accommodation is most dangerous to the lives of the official reporters. It is a great misfortune that the official reporters have been allowed to remain so long in that room, cooped up in the way they are, and I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works, before we meet next Session, will take some means to provide those gentlemen with proper accommodation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand there are eighteen persons in one small room? I think, in that case, my hon. friend has made out a strong case for the purification of the atmosphere. If eighteen gentlemen are cooped together in one room, the atmosphere must be very unwholesome; and really the *Hansard* reporters have done their work, on the whole, so well, they deserve consideration from the House and from the parties in charge.

Mr. MITCHELL. There seems to be a very spacious room immediately opposite the entrance to this Chamber, which might be very properly appropriated for these gentlemen. This room certainly cannot be of very much use now, because the Government do not seem to need it for caucuses, or anything of that kind, and if it is merely for smoking or lounging purposes, a room could be got elsewhere. I think the Minister should consider the suggestion, to provide further accommodation for the *Hansard* reporters.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After having heard what the hon. gentlemen say about this room, of course I will take care that we will provide these gentlemen with a larger room. If there are eighteen persons in the *Hansard* room, and 140 in the other room, the latter cannot be considered too large.

Mr. MITCHELL. I don't think I ever saw my hon. friend going in there smoking.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The third party is jealous of the first, and wants to get a bigger room.

Mr. MITCHELL. The third party is quite satisfied with the room they have. They had hard work trying to retain it.

THE VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to enquire of the hon. Minister about what time we may expect to receive the voters' lists? I called at the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery this morning for the voters' lists for South Grey, and was informed that he had not yet received them. It appears to me that these lists should be issued before this, and I would like to know when it is likely we will have them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The voters' lists are getting ready as quickly as possible, and whenever a member enquires about the list of a certain county, I am always willing to give him an answer. It depends, to a certain extent, upon the revising officers to whom these lists, after being printed, are returned to be certified as being correctly printed, according to the minute which has been kept after revision. We expect that the whole of the lists will be printed during the next three or four weeks.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. There are two or three trifling amendations which I wish to make. Before doing so, I wish to say that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has given notice that he would move a certain motion upon going into Committee of Ways and Means. I asked him to-day if he would have the kindness to let it stand over until I move to go into Supply, as I was very anxious to get a few items through in the Committee of Ways and Means, and to get concurrence on the resolutions, so as to leave me free for other work. The hon. gentleman very kindly consented to this, on the understanding that he would have an opportunity to bring up his resolution when the House again is moved into Committee of Supply. I wish to amend item 314 on the free list, by striking out the words "of cotton and woollen goods," and causing it to read: "blood albumen, tannic acid, antimony salts, tartar emetic, and grey tartar, when imported by manufacturers for use in their factories only." By leaving out the words "of cotton and woollen goods," we put these articles on the free list absolutely for all manufactures, whether for the manufacture of cotton or woollen goods or not. In item 214*i*, I wish to add the word "dressed" after the words "all other building stone," which bear 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. In item 148, I wish to strike out the words "ginger wine" in paragraph *e*, and insert the words "ginger wine" after the word "Vermouth" in paragraph *g* of the same item. I find that ginger wine is imported in varying strength, some of it being very weak, and some having a great deal of spirit in it. I wish to make this change so that there will not be so heavy a duty on the light article, and the alcoholic duty will be imposed on the article which is strongly alcoholic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to ask the hon. Minister if this clause, contained in the notice of motion which he has given, embodies the proposition he is about to make:

"Spirituous or alcoholic liquors distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water."

Is that the proposition the hon. gentleman is now going to make?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, this change seems to involve a considerable alteration in our whole system of levying duties on spirits, and it will be well for the hon. gentleman to explain in detail the full effects of it. As I understand, the hon. gentleman proposes to raise the duty on all spirits, except brandy—which at present pays $2 a gallon—from $1.75 to $2 a gallon; and he also proposes, as regards all alcoholic liquors of less than 85 degrees, that no reduction shall be allowed. He proposes to allow a reduction for any diminution of strength below proof down to 85 degrees, but below that he does not propose to allow any reduction, I suppose the hon. Minister is in a position to state to the Committee what the effect of that alteration will be. A large quantity of these articles have been brought in hitherto at degrees considerably below 85, and the effect of this change will be largely to increase the duty on them, wholly independent of the increase. The increase of 25 cents a gallon, I suppose, will bring about $150,000 of increased revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I estimate that about $120,000 will be the total increase all around.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, only some one conversant with the details of the trade can say how the change will effect importations below 85 degrees. The 25 cents per gallon, I should think, would be worth somewhat more than the calculation the hon. gentleman makes. What is the quantity collectively of all spirits except brandy?

Mr. FOSTER. I had a memorandum of the whole matter, but cannot find it just now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I can tell from recollection pretty accurately. I think the hon. gentleman will find that, apart from the brandy, the other liquors affected are about 800,000 gallons, so that the addition of 25 cents per gallon would amount to $200,000 *per se*, without taking into account what might be gained by abolishing the difference between the reduction down to any strength and the reduction down to 85. So that, *primâ facie*, the amount will be nearer $250,000 than $120,000, unless the importation be largely diminished, which I do not think will be the case.

Mr. BOWELL. There will be a large reduction on the brandies, no matter what their proof. Now they are permitted to reduce to the extent of 15 per cent. below proof, which would be equal to 15 per cent. of the total importation, and Old Tom will show the same proportion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that will be the case. Supposing they did, all brandy you levy duty upon is computed as if it were proof.

Mr. BOWELL. Before, but not now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You may be sure if it is brought in in proof, it is watered to suit the consumers just afterwards, and as a matter of course there will be no practical difference in the importation.

Mr. BOWELL. In Hennessy's and Martel's brandies they all range 15 and some a little lower below proof. Formerly they paid $2 upon each gallon for their proof, over proof or under proof. Now, with the 15 per cent. reduction, that would be equal to $1.70 instead of $2. That is the brandy brought in in bottles. The bulk brandy generally ranges from 1 to 4 per cent. above proof, and in all cases that has been admitted also at $2 per gallon, but now they will pay a proportionate increase in proportion to their strength. The proportions are very small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even so, 15 per cent. reduction on brandy would be, at the outside, balanced by the abolition of the reduction in the case of the other liquors.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. Allowing for the loss to the revenue from the change in the rates on brandy and Old Tom generally, the increase on the other will more than compensate to the extent of about $120,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should say it will compensate to the extent of $200,000.

There are 800,000 gallons at an increased duty of 25 cents, apart from the brandy. Then you have the advantage of the abolition of the reduction below 85. It is a matter of calculation, which the trade alone would answer.

Mr. FOSTER. The calculation was carefully made by the officers of the Department, estimated upon the amount brought in last year ; and taking in that which will give a decrease and that which will give an increase of duty, and balancing them, it gave about $120,000 or $125,000 as being the net increase. That statement I will bring over.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have received a communication giving the opinion of houses dealing in wines and liquors in Montreal, and also a private letter from a leading house on the same subject. With the permission of the Committee I will read the correspondence, in order that the Finance Minister may show to what extent he has met the difficulties complained of :

"DEAR SIR,—I, with others, have just been discussing the duty question on spirits in Messrs. Henry Chapman & Co.'s office, and Mr. Wonham read to us his letter to you of the 8th inst., which is all right as far as it goes, and I write this as a supplement to be attached to it.'

'Domestic Spirits.—The Government allowed the Canadian distillers to bottle spirits in excise bonds, in bottles of any size and of any strength, the distillers only paying the excise duty on the actual quantity of spirits used, and at the actual strength ; for instance, a case of rye whiskey will contain one dozen bottles, containing 1¼, 2 or 2½ gallons of spirits, at 25 per cent. under proof ; for instance, we will take a case of say 2 gallons, this pays duty on 1½ gallons of spirits, the 25 per cent. under proof being allowed. Therefore, why should not we as importers, paying a much higher tax, be allowed for the actual under proof and actual measurement of any spirits in bottles that we may import? What we want is the same measure of justice that is given to the Canadian distillers. I learn that no points have been given to any Opposition members but yourself, and would thank you to get the Hon. Mr. Cartwright to take notes from yours.

The memo., which was the result of a meeting of the liquor dealers, is as follows :—

"MEMO. *re* PROPOSED CHANGE IN DUTIES.

"The old duty, for years in force in Canada, was $1.75 per proof gallon on all spirits (except brandy), any additional strength was charged for and any lower strength below proof allowed proportionately ; duty was also levied upon actual measurement of a case. This mode of collecting duty worked well, without friction and was quite satisfactory to the trade of the country. Cases contain from 1½ to 2 gallons, but the Government now propose to enforce payment of duty upon 3 gallons, while the largest case only contains 2 gallons."

Mr. FOSTER. That is remedied.

"Then again, it is sought to make us pay on the proof strength, allowing nothing for under proof, but taking care to collect for a single degree over proof."

Mr. FOSTER. That also is remedied.

"Brandy was for years charged $2 upon the proof strength, consideration being had for a lesser or higher strength, and actual measurement of cases. When on 20th February, 1889, the Government discovered that in accordance with their printed tariff they had made a mistake in their interpretation of it, and that brandy in cases in future must pay upon contents of cases, as if at proof, without any allowance for under proof.

"The new tariff proposes to exact a duty upon a gallon more than a possible measurement, which is two gallons.

"Examples of proposed change showing the enormous and inconsistent duties upon an article like gin.

"Say case of Red, containing 3½ gallons : first cost, f.o.b. Rotterdam, 6s. 8d.; duty $7.16.

"Say case of Green, containing 1¾ gallons : first cost in Rotterdam, 3s. 7d.; duty $3.62.

"The practice of levying duty upon spirits upon a basis of proof is, we believe, universal in almost every country where duties are imposed, the principle is just and equitable. Why should Government impose additional duty for over proof, where a duty for proof is fixed, and not permit a corresponding deduction when spirits are imported under proof either in wood or bottle? If a dealer or consumer desires to purchase, say, a case of gin containing 1, 1½ or 1¾ gallons, why should he be compelled to buy a case containing 2 gallons, which he would have to do if the Government provide that all cases of spirits must pay duty upon 2 gallons? Consumers do not in any way suffer, and are not imposed upon by the seller of a weak spirit in small bottles, as the price of the article is regulated upon cost according to the strength and size of the bottle. Brandy is manufactured at a strength of 30 and 50 per cent. over proof, and there is no standard for shipment in cases, the shippers reducing the strength to suit the different markets of the world ; therefore any fixed standard of proof at which brandy must be imported in cases would be arbitrary and not equitable."

Mr. BOWELL. When was this written ?

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the change in the brandy tariff. As I understand, the two points raised are that, in the first place, they are charged for cases containing three gallons when they only contain two gallons.

Mr. FOSTER. That is remedied.

Mr. MITCHELL. You propose to charge them for proof when the spirit is under proof, though, if it is over proof, you make them pay for the amount that is over proof. I understand that, to a certain extent, that has also been remedied by the percentage being allowed down to 85. The other point is, that you allow the domestic manufacturer of whiskeys the right to put his whiskeys up in any bottles he desires, though you will not permit that in the case of the imported article.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the Minister of Finance is hardly disposed to apply the extreme doctrine of protection to the domestic manufacture of spirits. I think, however, by this tariff, he will considerably alter the ratio of duties on the domestic and the imported article. He has not stated that it is his intention to add to the excise duties on whiskey manufactured in Canada, which, I think, now amount to about $1.30 per gallon. What is he going to do in that respect ? Is he going to specially protect the distiller or the whiskey manufacturer of Canada, or is he going to add an amount to the duty paid by the manufacturer at home in order to make that equal with the amount which he proposes to levy on imports? There is a question of policy, as well as a question of revenue, involved in that matter.

Mr. FOSTER. So far, we do not propose any change in the inland revenue tax. The manufacture of spirits in this country is hedged around with very considerable safeguards, and is consequently put to very considerable expenses by the regulations which were introduced a year or two ago by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, whom I do not now see in his place. Manufacturers of whiskey in this country are compelled to keep their liquors for two years in order to age them properly and to eliminate from them, as I am informed, the more poisonous and deleterious elements. This necessity of keeping the liquors for two years is, of course, attended with large expense, and I suppose, as I am informed—for I know nothing of these matters myself,—it involves keeping three years' stock on hand in order to be ready for any demands that may take place. If you take that into consideration, and put the duties side by side, I think you will find that there is very little advantage given to the article manufactured in Canada. It is not

proposed to change the duty upon that article. Taken altogether, the present solution of this question which I propose to the Committee is one which is agreeable all around, and is one which, at the same time, has the merit—if it be a merit—of bringing a considerable addition to the revenue from that source. When we proposed to charge the duty on the bottles, whether they contained the amount specified or not, with the effect of charging the duty upon three gallons of liquor when only two gallons were contained, the importers made very strong representations against that proposal, and their representations appeared to the Government to be so just that we have conceded that point, and the present proposal is entirely satisfactory to the trade. With reference to the question of proof, there was a very strong case made out against our charging upon proof. Various arguments were brought against that proposition, against our charging for what was over proof and not allowing for what was under proof, and I understand that various liquors, in order to be at their best, must be somewhat under proof. The Minister of Customs and myself, after considering the matter and the strong representations made, decided to allow the limit to go down 15 per cent. below proof. It is almost impossible to grade all the way down, and there must be a certain amount of arbitrariness about any regulation of this kind. Even to grade down to 30 or 40 per cent. would be an interminable bother, so we thought that 15 per cent. below proof was a fair compromise, and the other matters contained in the regulations were not objected to by the trade.

Mr. MITCHELL. You still charge the over proof?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not express any opinion as to the present mode of levying the excise duties, but I certainly did not expect to find the Minister of Finance appearing in the guise of a full-blown protectionist of the liquor manufacture in this country. Now, that is the rôle in which he appears at present. It may be for good financial reasons, but still it is a curious rôle to find him filling. As I understand, this two years' retention of whiskey in bond, of which he speaks as if it were an injury to the distillers, has really been, to all intents and purposes, an enormous protection to the existing distillers. By means of that rule you have practically given a monopoly, and entrenched a monopoly, to four or five great houses who alone manufacture whiskey in Canada, and you also give them a reduction of 10 per cent., I think——

Mr. FOSTER. 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. More than that, I think. There is a very considerable reduction given for the ageing, and everybody knows that whiskey increases in value by being kept, and I think it is also improved in quality.

Mr. MITCHELL. It diminishes in quantity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but probably the quality is better. Now, I do not think the distillers at present in Canada are at all entitled to be exempted from the increased excise by reason of whiskey being kept in bond for two years, as at present; therefore, to my judgment, that argument fails. I do not think it is at all an industry that deserves special protection at our hands. While we reduce, as far as we can, the taxes on necessaries of life, I think it is our bounden duty to get all that we can out of the whiskey duties; and I put it to the hon. gentleman, whether he himself will not appear in a very curious light before the country when he is shown by this tariff to have increased the duty on a great many necessaries of life—on pork, on flour, on fruit and a variety of other things—but he leaves the duty on whiskey untouched? I wonder how his temperance supporters on the other side can reconcile themselves to supporting increases in the tariff, all of which might be avoided by increasing the duty on manufactured whiskey in this country. I cannot say that the argument the hon. gentleman has addressed to the Committee seems to me convincing, but I do say that it is an extraordinary policy to abstain from increasing the duty on whiskey manufactured in this country, and at the same time go on increasing the duty on articles of prime necessity.

Mr. LAURIER. If I am correctly informed—I speak under correction—the protection now given to the Canadian manufacturer of whiskey is 75 cents a gallon, against imported whiskey, and it would appear, from what the hon. gentleman has stated, that this infant industry of whiskey manufacture requires still more protection, that the Canadian manufacturer, being already hedged in on all sides, and having to keep his merchandise in a warehouse two years, still requires more protection than he now receives; and this, I understand, is the cause of the increased duty which is now suggested to the House. The proposition cannot have been made with a view of increasing the revenue, because the Finance Minister has already a surplus, and he expects a surplus next year. Therefore, if the reason is not for the purpose of increasing the revenue, then it must be for the purpose of giving more protection to this infant industry.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a pretty sturdy industry.

Mr. LAURIER. I call these protected industries infant industries, because they always require protection, and the more protection you give them the more protection they want. This particular industry is as old, almost, as the colony itself. I am informed that the Canadian manufacturer is also protected in another way, or rather the importer is hampered in another way. A letter has been placed in my hand by a firm in New York, who wanted to import some 5,000 gallons of spirit for the manufacture of perfumes in Montreal, but they are prevented from doing so by an order of the Customs Department, requiring that no importation should take place except in packages of 100 gallons. Is that the law?

Mr. BOWELL. That is the law.

Mr. LAURIER. May I enquire what is the reason?

Mr. BOWELL. The reason that clause was placed upon the Statute-book was to prevent the smuggling of goods in small packages across the line. I may inform the hon. gentleman that this law was on the Statute-book long before I had anything to do with Customs matters, and has never been changed. When the application to which the hon. gentleman refers was made by the

firm of Lyman & Kemp, of New York, the only answer I could give, was, that the provision of the law prevented the importation of liquor otherwise than as described by the hon. gentleman, that is, in hogsheads of 100 gallons. Some years ago I made enquiry in the Department as to the reason why this restriction was made, and why that clause was introduced in the Act which was consolidated by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, and I found the reason to be that which I have just stated to the House, that if you allowed whiskey to come over in small kegs it would be much more easily smuggled.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand at present this regulation is practically almost prohibitory, because I understand the ordinary packages of commerce contain from 45 to 50 gallons, a size which seems to me quite sufficient to prevent smuggling. I think it would be almost as difficult to smuggle a barrel of 50 gallons as to smuggle a barrel of 100 gallons.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is a pity the hon. Finance Minister lost his memorandum with regard to the importation of liquors, otherwise I think he would have been able to give us statements that would correspond more nearly with the returns which are in the hands of the House. If the hon. Finance Minister will refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that last year we imported 484,000 gallons of gin, 99,570 gallons of rum, and 154,700 gallons of whiskey, making in all 738,270 gallons.

Mr. BOWELL. And 196,416 gallons of brandy.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Brandy is not affected.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, yes, it is materially affected.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is not affected for the purpose of my argument, because I am taking only these three items of gin, rum and whiskey. The hon. Minister of Finance said that the increase under this proposition would only show a gain to the revenue of $120,000. Now take the 25 cents alone on the 738,000 gallons of these three liquors, and you will have $184,000 of itself; besides whatever may be the effect of the change in the mode of levying the duty as between the proof gallon and the 15 per cent. under proof. Now, on certain articles affected by this resolution, there will not be much change, but on other articles, of course, it will count very largely in favor of the revenue. On rum, for instance, which is 40 per cent. over proof, the old tariff was $1.75 on the proof gallon; now I understand that the duty to be levied is $2 on 15 per cent. under proof; consequently, all that is gained between the 15 under proof and the proof of the old tariff, would be so much gain to the revenue from the present system. And that, according to my calculation, may be estimated at very nearly 20 cents a gallon more. If that is the case, it will give about 40 or 50 cents on the whole 738,000 gallons, making over $400,000 which will accrue to the revenue by this change in the system of levying the duties. The hon. gentleman, I think, will see at once that the 25 cents will give $184,000, and the 15 per cent. between the proof and 15 under proof will also form a very large item of itself, and I think the hon. gentleman by this change will obtain over $400,000 increase of revenue. If the hon. gentleman can show how it will be otherwise, I shall be very glad to listen to him; but if the hon. gentleman will apply the specific advance of 25 cents and take the difference between the proof gallon and 15 per cent. under proof, he will see it will give quite the amount I have mentioned. It is a matter of sufficient importance to be more thoroughly explained than it has yet been explained to the Committee. This is a question that can only be worked out by taking the figures for proof and under proof and arriving at the result in that way. The specific advance is clear enough. Whatever may be the imports there is 25 per cent. on the quantity, and that will give about $180,000. The question as to the liquor below proof is not so certain, I admit, because there is an element of uncertainty with respect to those liquors; but the average of them being established, the 15 per cent. under proof will give, in my judgment, 20 cents more. With respect to the other point raised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I think that is deserving of attention, particularly at a time like this when we are told the Government are bringing forward these increases in the tariff, as has been stated again and again, for the purpose of protecting manufacturing industries. This is a part of the system, and it is well to understand that the Minister of Finance, as the apostle of a great cause, is bringing forward this change to further protect the manufactures in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, oh.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman may laugh, but that is the object of it. He may attempt to disguise it as he pleases. He is placing an increased duty on the foreign article, and is allowing the domestic article to remain at the old duty. There can be no doubt, the evident object is to keep out the foreign article and throw all the trade into the hands of the favorite whiskey manufacturers, who now supply and control the markets of the Dominion. That is the most obvious effect it will have, whatever may be the object in view. It is, however, only carrying out the policy which the Minister of Finance and his colleagues have announced frequently, in reply to enquiries made by hon. members on this side of the House, that their whole object and purpose was to carry out a little further the principle of protection, the National Policy, to domestic manufactures. They have applied it to almost everything, and in order to be consistent—I do not mean that they are inconsistent in carrying out the principles—they are applying it to the manufacture of whiskey. The country will understand that under the present Finance Minister the favored class, the whiskey manufacturers in this country, are placed in a more favored position than they have occupied heretofore. It is well the country should realise this, and understand it thoroughly. Going back to the difference of duty: if the Minister of Finance will refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find the quantity I have given is accurate, and by the change in the tariff he proposes, he is going to get at least $400,000 more out of the taxpayers of the country to add to what, he says, is already an overflowing revenue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I may congratulate the hon. gentlemen who favor prohibition in this House, and who sat on that side of the

House during the last two or three years, on the altered sentiment they seem to entertain at the present time, especially the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman). It is rather a remarkable circumstance that these hon. gentlemen should favor a high tax on breadstuffs and on the necessaries of life, and they should also favor a tariff which encourages this infant industry, the manufacturing of spirits in Canada. I am quite sure the constituents of those hon. gentlemen will appreciate the earnestness with which they have hitherto supported the cause of prohibition. Those hon. gentlemen were loud in their declarations in favor of prohibiting the use of ardent spirits in this country. They recognise with as much clearness and with as much force as did the hon. gentleman who is now Finance Minister, the importance of carrying into effect the principle of prohibition. But I should like to ask those hon. gentlemen what new light they have had, for we on this side of the House have had no new light.

Mr. FOSTER. You never get any there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says we will never get it. No. We do not expect to get our spirits up by pouring spirits down. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman expects to do so or not. A marked change has, however, taken place in the sentiments of the hon. Minister of Finance. The tariff he now proposes is hardly in the line he advocated from the platform and from his place in this House a few years ago. It is a new departure on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have thought necessary to adopt a policy to encourage the manufacture of spirits in Canada. I had supposed those hon. gentlemen would rather have been disposed to discourage its manufacture everywhere, as far as it could possibly be done; but I was mistaken. Other hon. gentlemen are mistaken who formed an opinion of that sort, for we see hon. gentlemen opposite are now prepared to tax breadstuffs, meat, the ordinary necessaries of life, and yet encourage the production of old rye and John Barleycorn in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would expect that I should take seriously this small contribution to the debate which he has just got off for the benefit of the country, if not for the benefit of the House. I do not intend to impose upon the Committee any serious reply thereto. I am quite willing to take the consequences of anything that has been done in the matter. When I have, on the one hand, the knowledge that the country has its breadstuffs and the necessaries of life very slightly taxed, and, on the other hand, the knowledge that there is no article in Canada that bears a higher tax than intoxicating liquors, and when, with respect to the items under discussion to-day, I have the very weighty authority of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that I have placed $400,000 extra taxes upon alcoholic liquor in this country, I do not think the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), which was certainly not a serious argument, will weigh very much against such facts and statements.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No portion of that tax falls on what is produced in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I think myself that the matter of temperance or intemperance is very closely connected with the consumption of alcoholic liquor, but I am not aware that it is so closely connected with the manufacture.

Mr. FREEMAN. I think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) who has referred to the supporters of prohibition on this side of the House, has a greater desire to attack us than he has to promote the principle of total abstinence. Pretty much everything he says on this subject is directed on that line, and I can assure him that the total abstainers, of my own Province at least, give him very little credit for his presumed support of temperance principles. He refers to the views that our constituents take of our conduct here. Let me assure him that our conduct is highly approved of, and especially that portion of it where we would not allow him to make political capital out of the temperance question in this House, a few sessions ago. He is very clearly seen through by all the supporters of prohibition in my own Province, and, I presume, in the other Provinces also. If he wishes to support us in this matter, let him come boldly out and bring his friends with him and support a prohibitory measure in this House, and we will go with him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, you will not. I have tried you and you would not do it.

Mr. FREEMAN. But, while he supports the manufacturers of liquor in this country, while he supports the manufacture of that deadly poison in this country, and throw his influence wherever he can in favor of the manufacture, and sale, and use of that article, I would advise him not to attack those who are opposing that traffic, and are doing what they can to destroy the manufacture, and sale, and use of liquor.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the Committee understands that the section I laid on the Table the other night, is to be substituted ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister has, no doubt, taken into consideration that if his former views prevail, he is largely increasing the value of the vested interests of the manufacturers of this country, or he will do so, by putting this additional tax on imported liquor and leaving the liquor manufacturers in this country alone. No doubt, since this tariff has passed, every manufacturer of liquor in Canada has a more valuable franchise by a large sum of money, than he had before, and if the question that was raised by his hon. supporter just now, and if abolition should come, and compensation is to be paid, the hon. gentleman having made the manufacture of liquor very much more profitable than it was before, will, no doubt, be prepared to consider this.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe in compensation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a great deal said just now about syndicates coming here to buy up the distilleries and breweries in this country, and I should not wonder if the prices were put up, many hundreds of thousands of dollars, just by virtue of the increased protection which the hon. gentleman, if this measure passes as at present, will give to these manufacturers. My own opinion is, that he is making a grave mistake in departing from the practice of his predecessors, who invariably caused a rise in the excise, when

they added to the duty on imported liquors. I must say that I disapprove extremely—although not a fanatic prohibitionist—of encouraging in any way the manufacture of what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) called "deadly poison," and I think the hon. Minister is committing a serious error in encouraging it as he is now doing.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, there is a difference of opinion between the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) upon this subject, because, while the hon. member for Queen's, as a temperance advocate, declared that he was opposed to the manufacture of what he called a deadly poison, the hon. Minister of Finance, as I understand him, declares that temperance and prohibition principles are concerned with the consumption but not with the manufacture. He is, therefore, consistent in his views.

Mr. FOSTER. To change the subject, I propose to change item 411, schedule A. The Committee will remember that we changed the basis of this duty from an *ad valorem* on stereotypes to a square inch basis. That change was instituted in items 412 and 413 of the old tariff; but item 411 was overlooked. The proposition I have to make here is to change this duty exactly on the same principle as the other items, but to add nothing at all to the protection. This proposition is simply to place on the square inch basis, instead of *ad valorem*, the duty on stereotypes and electrotypes of standard books of two-thirds of one cent per square inch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman may make it the same for the present moment, but he must observe that should any improvement be made in the manufacture of these, by which the price is reduced, the specific duty would become an extremely oppressive *ad valorem* duty. It is a matter of constant occurrence, that where you change an *ad valorem* to a specific duty, and the price becomes cheaper, the specific duty is very much greater than the present *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before proceeding to the other items in which the Finance Minister proposes to make changes, I beg to call the attention of the Committee to an item in yesterday's *Empire*, which I will read for their information :

"A wealthy American syndicate, with a capital of $1,000,000, has just effected a huge deal in Canada by purchasing a controlling interest in all rope and binding twine factories in the Dominion, except one in Ontario, which still holds out. The factories purchased, are the old Converse factory in Montreal, J. Brown & Co.'s, Quebec; one in Halifax, one in St. John, N.B., and three in the West. Large fortunes have already been made here in this business, and there is a high protective tariff on the product, but latterly, the increase in the factories has led to considerable competition and cuts in prices. Now, it is believed prices will advance, and perhaps some factories will be closed, as it will only pay to manufacture for Canadian requirements, which is two or three millions annually."

Now, Sir, I consider that this is a very important announcement. We are about closing our changes in the tariff. The attention of the Committee has already been drawn to the fact of the enormous drain on the resources of the farmers which exists from the duty of 25 per cent. on binding twine, and they have been asked to put it on the free list, but they have refused to do so. I thought it well to bring this item before the Committee, in order to give the Government an opportunity of making the necessary change, and not being placed in a position to call their followers to support them by their votes. The hon. Finance Minister has now an opportunity of taking a note of this item, and placing on the free list binding twine and other cordage which farmers use so largely, and which is going to be ruled by a syndicate. Unless he does so, or makes a change that will release the farmers from the imposition to which they have been subjected for the last few years, I will take the opportunity, when the Committee rises, or on the third reading of the Bill, of moving a resolution on this point. Then the supporters of the Government will not have the excuse of saying that they had not a chance of urging this change on the Minister in the Committee. It is clear that this syndicate will have in its hands every factory in the Dominion, and that the price of binding twine, and other cordage used by the farmers, will not be reduced, but will be increased; and as it requires two or three million dollars worth of binding twine to supply the farmers of this country, I would urge the Minister to place them on the free list, and prevent the formation of a monopoly to control them which will otherwise be formed.

Mr. COOK. I wish to give an illustration of what the hon. gentleman has stated. Only Saturday last my manager told me that we were very fortunate in having purchased our supply of rope for the season, because he said the rope factories had evidently gone into the combination, and prices had increased enormously.

Mr. FOSTER. I find, in order to make the ginger wine item all right, I have to move to strike out of item 399 in the old tariff, the word "ginger" in the second line. I wish, also, to move that the following be added to section 7 of chapter 33, 49 Victoria :—

Provided that this section shall not apply to the export of any carcass or part thereof of any deer which shall have been raised or bred by any person, company or association of persons upon his or their own land.

The section of the Act at present is :

"The export of deer, wild turkeys, quail, partridge, prairie fowl and woodcock, in the carcass or parts thereof, is hereby declared unlawful and prohibited; and any person exporting, or attempting to export any such article, shall, for each such offence, incur a penalty of $100, and the article so attempted to be exported shall be forfeited, and may, on reasonable cause of suspicion or intention to export the same, be seized by any officer of the Customs, and if such intention is proved, shall be dealt with as for breach of the Customs Act."

That provision was, of course, adopted to protect our game; but there are parties who have preserves in this country in which they keep their own game, which is as much their own as cattle in their yard would be. If they attempt to take any of these out of the country in the carcass, they are liable to all the penalties under the Act, and it is believed that this addition to the clause will not militate against the due protection of the game, and will remove a hardship which at present exists in a few cases.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the practical result would be the export of a great many deer or parts of deer under the pretence of their having been bred or raised on somebody's land.

Mr. FOSTER. But it must be on his own land.

Mr. BLAKE. How much of the deer's breeding or raising would have to be on the person's own land? It is very vague and indefinite. I very heartily approve of the proposal of the hon. gentleman's predecessor, because it is very certain that an immense deal of butchering was going on, and our game preserves were being rapidly depleted. If we could limit the effect to the ostensible purposes of the exception, I would not object to the change, but I very much fear that under it there will be a revival of those abuses which led to the original provision in the law.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to say that in some of the American States, especially in the State of Michigan, which is a game State, they prohibit the export of game, but they allow exports to take place under circumstances more liberal than those proposed by the hon. Finance Minister. A gentleman going there to shoot wild game, under certain circumstances, and the authorities being satisfied he wishes it for himself to a limited extent and not for the market, is allowed to bring it out. This is much more limited. This is a reciprocal arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE. Perfectly unobjectionable, if it is kept within the limits.

Mr. TISDALE. I would suggest, if there is any doubt, that the onus should be put upon the party, and I presume the Minister of Customs will see the proper regulations are enforced.

Mr. MULOCK. What regulations does the hon. gentleman propose to make to prevent this clause from being abused?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose, in point of fact, there is really nobody except the proprietors of what is known as the Long Point Company who possess any herd of deer of any magnitude.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not know of any other, but I know of others commencing to raise them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would rather give you the permission to export a certain number in gross and no more, than open this door in the law which might give a good deal of trouble and lead to a good deal of abuse. I suppose there are several hundred deer on that Long Point property.

Mr. TISDALE. In the Ontario game law, there s a provision that anyone belonging to an organised company may export ducks, but no others. I am heartily in accord with the prohibition of the export of game, but do not think it should be carried to such an extent that gentlemen from the United States who become interested, as they have the right under our law, in the protection of game, should not be allowed to take home what they shoot. In the Ontario game law, there is a special exception that gentlemen who belong to companies which protect game shall be allowed to take ducks home with them. It may be true that the Long Point Company is the only company which breeds deer of its own; but this provision is, all the same, a great hardship. Two gentlemen from New York, who have been members of that club for twenty years, were prevented last year from taking home two saddles of deer. One of the employés of the company, who had been discharged, telegraphed to the Customs officer at the bridge, and he confiscated the deer, and these gentlemen had to pay, besides, a penalty of $100. I applied to the Customs authorities to have that fine remitted, as being a breach of the intention of the law at all events, but they declined. The Minister of Customs said he had no authority, as he was governed by an express statute and not by an Order in Council. I contended that the law did not apply to this case: but probably the Minister of Customs was right. Probably it does apply technically, but surely not in spirit. The law was intended to prevent pot-hunting and the slaughter of wild animals for a foreign market. But if a man raises them, he ought to have the right to send them out of the country. Raising or breeding on the lands of the parties does not mean that they grow in a state of nature.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This provision of the old Act has been very beneficial in preventing the depletion of the forests of deer in my own locality, and since the adoption of this prohibition of the export of deer, that class of game has multiplied very considerably. I think, therefore, the Minister of Customs ought to be very careful about introducing any provision which would allow the exportation of those carcasses or parts of carcasses from the country under any circumstances. If he is determined to put through this clause which has been submitted to the Committee, he ought to be very careful in guarding, in the most complete manner, the exportation of the carcasses or parts of carcasses of these animals. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Customs whether the Department has fully determined whether live deer can be exported from the country under the provisions of this statute, or whether they cannot. My hon. friend will remember I brought a case under his notice once, in which a person desired to export two live deer to the United States. The ruling of the Commissioner of Customs was that under this clause prohibiting the exportation of carcasses or parts of carcasses, those live animals could not be exported, but subsequently the hon. Minister himself came to a different conclusion, in which I thought he was correct. I should like to know now whether the Department still holds that live animals constitute carcasses or do not.

Mr. BOWELL. The Department has come to the conclusion that a carcass is not a live deer, or a live deer a carcass, and, consequently, has given a decision that live deer can be exported. There is nothing under the provisions of this clause, or any other, to prevent the exportation of live deer. With reference to the difficulties which have been suggested by many gentlemen, I do not anticipate that the exportation of carcasses, or parts of carcasses, by gentlemen who hold stock in these reserves, will give any particular trouble to the Department. We can, with little trouble, ascertain who the stockholders are, and if the gentlemen who have spoken will read this amendment carefully, they will see that it is well guarded. But, in order to provide against any difficulty, and to give full power to make regulations, I would suggest that the words "under such regulations as may be adopted by the Governor in Council" be added. This will enable us to pass an Order in Council, providing that parties who desire to export these carcasses, or parts of carcasses, from reserves in which they are stockholders, shall prove

under oath that the animals were raised upon their reserve. I think that will meet the objection, and give the necessary protection. The case my hon. friend has drawn attention to is a very hard one. A gentleman from New York, who holds stock in the Long Point Company, was about taking home a saddle or two of venison, when one of the servants informed the Customs officer, who had to perform his duty. The gentleman paid the penalty, and there is no authority to refund it, as the law makes special provision that the goods shall be forfeited and a penalty of $100 imposed.

Mr. FOSTER. In regard to item 309, in the free list, wire when imported by manufacturers of toilet pins for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories only, I intended that to be out of the free list. It follows the general arrangement of the wire duty, that the article being now made in this country, we do not propose that the manufacturers of these pins shall import their material free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is evident that women have no votes.

Mr. FOSTER. It was proposed to make ships' repairs dutiable at 25 per cent., but it is now proposed to drop that item (214*k*).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that restore it to the free list?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it will go under the unenumerated class, but I doubt whether there is any authority to tax these repairs.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What will be the duty?

Mr. FOSTER. If it came under the unenumerated list it would be 20 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I think we are entitled to know whether these repairs are to be dutiable or free, and, if they are dutiable, at what rate the duty will be charged?

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I can learn, the custom has been to collect a duty on repairs to ships. This has not taken place in regard to sea-going vessels, for the obvious reason that they may be away for years and years, and may come back to this country almost entirely new.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would it not be better to provide that these repairs shall be free by a special section.

Mr. BLAKE. I know, as a matter of fact, because a constituent of mine was concerned in a matter of that sort, that it is the custom to collect duty on certain classes of repairs, and I presume this will apply to all classes of repairs. The result of this, I presume, would be to leave the duty at a higher rate than was intended by the proposal of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. No; at a lower rate. The proposal was 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it would be desirable to leave this in a state of doubt or ambiguity.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does the Minister propose to leave the question in this way, or is it an open question to be decided by the Government on the particular cases? There are two classes of repairs. A vessel may go to a foreign port to be repaired, or a vessel may be in distress, and may have to be repaired before she can come home. Surely, under the latter circumstances, the Government would not exact a duty on the repairs necessary to bring her home? It should be distinctly understood under what circumstances this is to apply. I think it is an erroneous principle altogether, but, if the Government do not intend to levy a duty on repairs at all, they should say so, or, if they do intend to levy a duty on certain repairs, they should say what repairs they are going to levy upon. Of course, a vessel might go across to an American port for ordinary repairs, and that would be different from a vessel which requires repairs to enable her to return home.

Mr. BLAKE. The case which called my attention to this subject was one which illustrates this point. I was informed that the Customs Department did not levy a duty on repairs when a vessel was forced into a foreign port for repairs, and the repairs made were not in excess of the damage caused by stress of weather. Of course, as long as you keep up your system, if no duty is levied on repairs made under other circumstances, a master of a ship who desires to get a new sail bent, or some other repair made, can choose whether he will have it done in Oswego or in Toronto. The only question for him would be which was the cheapest market. Consequently, if the American lake port is the cheapest, the business would be done there, instead of in our own ports. Still, it would be indefensible to charge any duty on repairs which were rendered necessary by stress of weather.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In our case, when our vessels are repaired abroad, it is entirely in consequence of stress of weather, sails blown away or other damages, and these repairs should not be dutiable. This is very important to our coasting trade. There are a number of small vessels that meet with disaster and have to refit in New York or Boston, and certainly no duty should be charged on these repairs.

Mr. BOWELL. The example given by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), has been the practice ever since I have had anything to do with the Department, and upon enquiry from the Commissioner he tells me it has been the practice ever since Confederation. In no case have vessels been charged a duty upon repairs which were necessary to enable them to complete their voyage or to return home, nor have they been charged a duty upon sails which have been purchased in a foreign country to replace those lost while upon a voyage. But if they leave a port in this country and go, say from Kingston to Oswego, for the purpose of repairing a vessel and to purchase a new sail, or ropes, or an anchor, or any other article which is dutiable, then, upon their return, duties have been levied upon the articles so purchased. The intention, in defining the rate of duty, at first, was to prevent the difficulties which have arisen as to the rate of duty which should be imposed upon the different articles which are purchased. For instance, a repair to an engine would pay a higher duty than a repair to a hull, because the one under the law is 10 per cent. while the other might be 30 per cent. At first it was thought better to make a uniform rate of duty of 25 per cent., but upon consideration it has been deemed advisable to drop the item altogether and leave the Department to judge as to the rate of duty to be imposed upon repairs to vessels according to

the circumstances in which the repairs had taken place. The principle has never been applied to ocean-going vessels; it is only applied to those upon inland waters, where they leave a Canadian port and cross to an American port and have work done to the vessel and purchase the different articles that might be required to complete the equipment, in such cases the principle is applied in order that the repairs may be confined to our own shipyards. In reference to repairs of foreign vessels in our own country we have been much more liberal than our neighbors in that respect. If a vessel lost her sail, or received damage of any kind while in a canal, or upon the high seas, or while on the inland waters, and she ran into a maritime port, we allowed the owner to send to the United States and bring into the country free of duty any article that might be required in order to repair the vessel, and put upon her a new sail, or a hawser, or an anchor, or anything of that kind. The Americans, however, unless they have lately changed their policy, have not followed that course, because my attention was called to a case a short time ago in which a Canadian vessel lost her mainsail in a storm in Lake Michigan. She made a port on that lake, and telegraphed to her owners at Port Dalhousie for a mainsail; the mainsail was forwarded *viâ* Detroit, and upon arriving at the border the owner had to pay some $75 upon that sail as duty, before it could be forwarded to the port where the vessel had sought shelter and put upon the vessel to enable her to complete her voyage, her destination being Kingston. Now, we never have exacted from the United States shipowners any duty under those circumstances.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Might not those articles be bonded?

Mr. BOWELL. No; they would not allow it to be forwarded in bond. That case I brought under the notice of the authorities in Washington, and although it is over twelve months ago, up to this time we have never received any answer. I may add that while I was drafting that dispatch to the Secretary of the Treasury, in Washington, an application of a somewhat similar character was made to the Department for a remission of duties which had been paid upon some articles that were required to repair a vessel that had put into Yarmouth, if I recollect the port aright. I at once attached a copy of that application to the dispatch as an evidence of the practice in this country, and asked whether some reciprocal arrangements of that character could not be made, but the Government has never received any answer to that dispatch. I can inform the House that since that time I have carried out the principle of reciprocity, and that when articles are imported, even for the repair of ships, they have had, since that time, to pay the duty. While this Government is quite prepared to extend and continue the privilege which we conceded to American vessels in the past, we think it is only fair and right that the same privileges should be conceded to Canadian vessel owners; and as soon as an intimation is given that that practice will be extended to us, we will revert to the old practice of what is termed the constructive bonding of goods that are required for the completion of and repairs to foreign vessels. The result of the dropping of this resolution will leave us precisely in the position in which we were before it was introduced. It is my own opinion from the reading of the law, that the repairs that have been made to a vessel taken out of the country, as indicated by the hon. member for West Durham, would be dutiable. If, however, the Minister of Justice considers that I am wrong in that interpretation, then we shall not enforce it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Government acted quite right in the course they have adopted in reference to this case to which the hon. member has referred. There is a great difference between charging duty on repairs to a vessel that has been in a foreign port, and charging duty on the articles which are required to repair a vessel in our own port. I think it is not at all unreasonable that if the materials, unless such materials can be produced in this country—there might be some sticks, or spars, or something of that kind which cannot be produced in this country—but I think that if the materials required to repair a foreign vessel in our own country can be procured in our own country, the duty should not be remitted on them when going into a foreign port. But, of course, that is different from applying the duty to repairs of a temporary character which have been made in a foreign port. I suppose the Minister has referred more to the lake ports than maritime ports.

Mr. BOWELL. It has never been enforced in the maritime ports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is a new idea to me, and I was not aware of it until the hon. gentleman brought it up. But now that the subject has been raised, I thought it would be better to understand the ground upon which the Government will act in the future.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A gentleman from Queen's, N. B., told me in St. John, that where repairs or sails were thrown away in case of disaster to a ship, no duty is charged.

Mr. BOWELL. In such cases no duty is charged even on the lake ports, and never in the maritime ports.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to move:

That it is expedient further to amend the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by striking out from item 4 these words: "Skelp iron, sheared or rolled in grooves;" and to add a new item: "Skelp iron, sheared and rolled in grooves not wider than eight inches nor thinner than twenty gauge, until such time as it is manufactured in Canada, to bear a duty of 30 per cent."

The duty at the present time is $13 per ton, which is, at the present rate, about 34 or 35 per cent. It is not made in Canada. I propose that the duty shall be lowered to 30 per cent., until it is manufactured in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to any lowering of duty on iron; but what is the reason?

Mr. FOSTER. This material is used in the manufacture of iron pipe. The Committee will remember I proposed to increase the duty upon that pipe; but after having made that proposal, I found it would interfere with so many other interests that I asked the Committee to allow me to go back to the old duty upon it; and instead of increasing the duty, I now propose to lower the

duty about 4 per cent. on the raw material, skelp iron, which is not made in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The duty on the pipe is about as objectionable as any duty can be. This pipe is very largely used for the supplying of our towns and villages with waterworks and gasworks and similar conveniences, and this is a duty which the hon. gentleman ought to abolish altogether. However, I shall not object to the lowering of duty on iron, but I object altogether to this duty on the pipe.

Mr. BLAKE. Will this lowering of the duty reduce the price of the finished article?

Mr. FOSTER. The proposition is to strike out the articles which appear under item 217 on the old tariff, which bore a duty of $13 per ton, or equivalent to 34 or 35 per cent., and to insert a new item placing the duty at 30 per cent., this being the raw material for the manufacture of iron pipe, on which I proposed to increase the duty, but from which position I afterwards receded.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg to enquire whether it is the anticipation of the Finance Minister that this change will affect the price of the finished article, the pipe?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it will much affect the price of the pipe, but it will enable it to be manufactured in larger quantities.

Mr. BLAKE. It will give a larger market to the manufacturers, of course.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Two years ago the city of Charlottetown entered into a contract with a Glasgow firm, to buy from them the necessary pipe to lay waterworks; and under the duties imposed by Sir Charles Tupper, the city was compelled to pay $14,000 increased duty. Although the contract was made before the tariff was passed, the Government did not make any remission.

Mr. BOWELL. Is the hon. gentleman certain that remission was not made?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly. The commissioners for the construction of the waterworks in Charlottetown bitterly complained in their last report that although they had made application, no remission of duties had been made. I hope the hon. Minister of Customs is in a position to say that this should have been done, because I think he would be doing a simple act of justice in making that remission. The contract was made before the increased duties were imposed, and the commissioner represented those facts; but the commissioners in their report next year stated that they were unable to succeed in getting a remission made. It strikes the hon. Minister evidently that they should have succeeded, and he is evidently under the impression that they did succeed, but there is time yet for this remission to be made. I ask the hon. gentleman only to do that which his good judgment will prompt him to do, and what is evidently the course that should be adopted.

Mr. BOWELL. I am under the impression the hon. gentleman is in error. There was a special provision in the Tariff Act of 1887, providing that pipe and all iron which had been purchased under contract prior to the introduction of the tariff, should be admitted at the old rate of duty; and in all cases that came under my notice the permission was granted, or if the increased duty had been paid, a remission of duty was made. I know in one case, by Order in Council, it was extended, in the case of British Columbia, to two or three months afterwards, for the reason that a vessel containing a cargo of pipe was sunk off the Horn, and it was impossible to raise it and get the pipe into the country, and so the privilege was extended a sufficient time to enable the people of British Columbia to import another cargo of pipe. If it has not been applied to the town of Charlottetown it ought to have been, and the people of that city certainly have a good claim; I will make enquiry to-morrow, when I go to my office, to see whether the statements made by him are correct. Perhaps an application was not made because the case was such as indicated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), for in all cases where applications were made and the facts were sustained, permission was granted to enter at the old rate of duty, or a remission of duties made in case the increased duties had been paid.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it the intention to make a similar provision on this occasion?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it is not the intention so far, whatever the Government may decide hereafter. I need scarcely say that the concession made in 1887, when the duties on iron were increased, was an unusual one, and I am not aware that such course was ever followed before, except in the case of tea some years ago, when tea was placed on the free list.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The tea case was a vastly greater concession than the concession made in 1887, because in that case a sum of money was paid out of the public treasury to those who had previously obtained, presumably, the benefit of the increased duty on tea.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a very dangerous principle to adopt; and, from what has come under my observation, I am satisfied that the statement made by the hon. gentleman is correct, and there were numerous frauds perpetrated under that concession, as I am confident there were under the concession given in regard to iron.

Mr. WATSON. By admitting strips of iron, up to eight inches in width, at a reduced rate of duty, does the Finance Minister expect that tubes will be manufactured here of two and a quarter inches diameter?

Mr. FOSTER. I think they will.

Mr. WATSON. All this is being done for one manufacturer in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two manufactories there.

Mr. WATSON. Would it not be better to assess the large number of manufacturers who are using tubing, and give it to them at a reduced rate, rather than give these two manufacturers in Montreal the raw material at a low rate. We are going to lose 4 or 5 per cent. on the raw material for the purpose of bolstering up some manufacturers in Montreal who have already sufficient protection. There are more men employed in using pipe for other work than in manufacturing pipe in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. The Committee will remember that the other evening the question was raised about a possible arrangement between our country, and Newfoundland and the United States, regarding duties on fish and the products of the fisheries; and the items in the old Customs law with respect to fish were subjected to the provisions of section 3, of chapter 33, 49 Vic. These two items respecting fish duties were repealed in order to add the words "or salted," and the question arose whether or not such repeal and the substitution of other items slightly changed, although the duty was not changed in the new, would not take these from under the provisions of section 3. We propose to add to items 215 and 216, the clause in each: "subject to the provisions of section 3, 49 Victoria, chapter 33," so as to prevent any doubt on that matter. I wish to make another change in item 22, so as to make it read: "buttons of hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, 5 cents per gross and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*," instead of 10 cents per gross and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is an item which we passed the other day, and on which I would like to have a little more definite information from the Minister. There seems to be some misapprehension with regard to the two classes of pork, namely, the mess pork and the clear cut pork. The Minister said, in replying to the enquiry I made, that the Inspection Act defined the mess pork, and that it took in what is generally known as heavy mess pork, and clear cut pork as well. Is it to be understood from that, that the clear cut pork will be admitted at the same rate of duty as the mess pork?

Mr. FOSTER. Clear cut pork, made from heavy hogs over 200 pounds in weight, will be admitted at 1½ cents, just the same as the mess pork.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under what provision of the tariff does the hon. gentleman come to that conclusion?

Mr. FOSTER. On the item of the tariff which gives a definition of what constitutes mess pork.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The mess pork as defined by the General Inspection Act does not include clear pork; and if the hon. gentleman does include clear pork, certainly a large number of members of this House have been deceived in the passing of this tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. The law says, if I recollect, that mess pork shall be the rib pieces only.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is precisely the same portion of the hog they make mess pork of, with the ribs taken out.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Then the fact of the matter is, that if the hon. gentleman admits clear pork under the description of mess pork, at 1½ cents, the protection which he supposes he gives to the farmers is gone, because the lumber camps will all be supplied with the clear pork, introduced at 1½ cents, and the mess pork will not be purchased by them. It was supposed that the clear pork came under the $6 a barrel or 3 cents per pound duty, and that it would offer a living protection to the farmers who produce the mess pork, or, in other words, the lumbermen would be obliged to buy the mess pork from the farmers. Now, the hon. gentleman is going to admit the clear pork under the 1½ cents duty, and the result will be that there will be no protection for the farmers. The thing is a delusion.

Mr. GILLMOR. The lumbermen can buy my hon. friend's pork, and the farmers will get a protection on it of 1½ cents a pound, that is $3 a barrel. The mess pork comes from the same part of the hog as the clear pork.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was not to ascertain who would get the protection that I raised this question, but simply that the House might clearly understand what class of pork is to be admitted at the low rate of duty. I hope the hon. Minister will make it clear.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it will be found to be clear enough.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If it is understood by those who administer the law, I suppose it is all right, but at present it is not clear enough.

Mr. WELSH. I understood that the duty on clear pork would be 3 cents a pound; but I do not understand this new explanation the Minister has given. I want to know what class of pork will pay 3 cents a pound, and what class 1½ cents?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I should like to enquire from the hon. Minister of Customs whether any decision has been arrived at regarding the introduction of what is technically known as back pork, that is, pork taken from the back of the animal, in the case of hogs of 200 pounds or over. It has been contended by some people that the pork known as back pork, being part of what forms mess pork, ought to be admitted at the same rate as mess pork. I should like to know whether the Department have come to a decision on that point, and if so, what that decision is?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have the Inspection Act before me now, and the mess pork is defined thus: "shall consist of the rib pieces only." The hon. gentleman says that it may be the rib pieces only, or it may be the same with the ribs taken out. That was not the meaning which the Committee or the country understood. It was understood that these duties were to be for the purpose of protection to home-grown pork; but you class clear pork used by the lumbermen under the title of mess pork, which may be imported under a duty of 1½ cents a pound. Where is the protection to the farmer?

Mr. EDWARDS. He does not want any.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He does want it. If any class of the community wants protection, it is that class. As I pointed out the other day, among the whole four or five hundred articles mentioned in this tariff, the farmers do not get protection on any, while they are taxed for everything they use; and here is an article on which it was supposed they were going to get a *quid pro quo*, but it appears that, at the dictation of the lumbermen, clear pork will be admitted at the low rate of duty, and the farmers will get no benefit.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should like to know what is the difference whether pork cut from a certain part of the animal is in small pieces or in large pieces? It is the same pork, only it is handled in a different way.

Mr. WELSH. I always understood that mess pork and prime mess was from animals of 200 pounds and under, and that clear pork was fat pork from animals above 200 pounds, which is the pork the lumbermen use. This was the only item in this tariff which would benefit the farmers of Prince Edward Island, but I find that the interests of the lumbermen and other interests are going to swamp them, as they have always done in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred. I would advise the hon. Finance Minister to stick to his first programme.

Mr. BÉCHARD. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down speaks for the farmers of Prince Edward Island, and it is equally well that some one should speak for the farmers of Quebec. This article of pork is the only article on which the farmers of Quebec can get any protection. The Province of Quebec is loaded with taxation. It is shown, by the official report placed in the hands of the members, that the Province of Quebec bears the largest part of the taxation on flour; of the whole importation of flour for consumption, Quebec consumes about four-fifths, yet there is no article produced by the farmers of Quebec on which they receive protection. The duty of 3 cents a pound on pork, as proposed by the hon. Finance Minister, would have stimulated the production of that article by the farmers of Quebec; but the duty of 1½ cents a pound on what is called mess pork, is no encouragement to them. What is the reason for this difference? I can understand why: it is to follow the general practice of this Government, namely, to protect the manufacturers only. The hon. Finance Minister has in view in this case the interest only of the wealthy lumbermen, who realise large fortunes and become millionaires in a few years at the expense of the public domain. I think they are a class who, amongst all others, should pay taxes in this country. You should not, in this instance, sacrifice the interests of the farmers for the interests of that class of manufacturers.

Mr. IVES. I have not taken any active part in the discussion of this question, but I have had an opportunity of judging how the tariff, as it is understood in the country, has been received by the people. I had extensive opportunities of feeling the pulse of my section of the country with regard to the pork duties; and no feature of the protective tariff which has been introduced since 1879 has been received with greater popularity or favor among the farmers of the Eastern Townships, and the southern part of the Province of Quebec, than the proposed duty on pork. The farmers of that section of the country are largely engaged in dairying enterprises; they raise pork to a considerable extent in connection with the manufacture of cheese, and they have congratulated themselves that a protection of 3 cents a pound would enable them to furnish the lumbermen of that section with the clear pork which they require to use. Beef is used now as well as pork. Clear pork we must have, and we made up our minds that we must pay the increased duty on pork, unpleasant as it is, for the sake of the farmers. I am very much surprised that a different construction has been put upon this item, and that under the tariff, as now explained by the Minister of Finance, we shall not import any but what will come under the 1½ cents duty.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. COOK. The hon. gentleman contradicts himself. He states he must have clear pork for his shanty under any circumstances. Therefore, it does not come into competition with the farmers' pork, and has not the effect of increasing its value. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the lumbermen must use the heavy pork which is grown in the United States. They must use Chicago pork, no matter what it costs, as the Canadian pork is too small and too thin. It does not pay our Ontario farmers to keep their pigs over the year, and they find it more profitable to slaughter their pigs when young, as they get a better price for it in the cities, towns and villages; but it does not answer the lumbermen, who must have the heavy and fat pork which is not grown here. Therefore, any duty upon mess pork, or what is called clear pork, is just so much money taken out of the pockets of the lumbermen without any compensating advantage to the farmer. Between clear pork and mess pork there is this difference: clear pork is pork cut into small blocks of four pounds without any lean whatever. It is cut from the heavy part of the animal and is very fat pork. That has to be used by the lumbermen, principally in the Lower Provinces, and the fishermen, who use it in connection with the cooking of beans. The statement of the hon. gentleman is correct that a large amount of beef is consumed in the shanties. A lumberman from New Brunswick told me that, under any circumstance, if he had to pay $6 or even $10 a barrel duties for Chicago packed beef, he must have it. He could not get packed beef here to answer his purpose. That is my experience, and it is that of every lumberman. We must have salt beef, and we have to get what they call the salt mess beef of Chicago, as the men of the shanties will not eat anything else. We use large quantities of fresh beef which we buy from the farmers, but every dollar that is paid for mess pork, which is consumed by the shantymen, the miners and the fishermen, is so much taken out of our pockets without any compensating advantage to the farmer. This idea of stimulating production and giving protection to our farmers by increasing the duties upon heavy pork, is all a myth.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. The average of Canadian hogs, picked up and taken to Montreal to the small packing establishments which they have there, will run 50 pounds over the average of the Chicago hogs. The average weight of the Chicago hog is under 200 pounds, and the average weight of the Canadian hog is over 350 pounds.

Mr. COCHRANE. I take exception to the statement of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), that the farmers of Ontario cannot produce the pork required by Ontario, and I take the ground that the duty placed upon pork will stimulate the production of that commodity in Ontario to the extent of the requirements of the country. It is absurd to say that the farmers of Ontario cannot produce the pork which the country requires. It is humiliating for the farmers of Ontario to recognise the fact that we are importing over a million dollars of pork and paying duty on it every year. We can produce large hogs if we get a market for them, but, from the fact that large pork does not suit the taste of the people, there is no use producing it. I also

take exception to the opinion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who cannot see any difference between long clear pork and mess pork. Mess pork has the ribs left in, while long clear pork is the whole side of the hog with the ribs taken out, which makes a material difference. If a lumberman gets long clear pork as cheap as mess pork, he will not buy the latter. A hog does not require to be over 200 pounds in weight to make long clear pork, for that kind of pork is simply the whole side with the ribs taken out. I hope the Finance Minister will stand by his first proposition, and keep to the 3 cents duty on all pork with the exception of mess pork, and thus give the farmers of Ontario a chance to produce the pork the country requires.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no desire to enter into this discussion, further than simply to state that there must be some great misconception as to what is termed clear pork in this section. Several lumbermen have spoken, and they do not seem to understand what it is. What we term clear pork in this section is simply heavy mess pork with the bone taken out. What is termed clear pork in the Lower Provinces is, I understand, a different thing entirely. It is not long side or anything of the kind, but simply mess pork with the bone taken out.

Mr. WELSH. I do not agree with the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Simcoe. The hon. gentleman says they cannot grow pork over 200 pounds weight up where he lives. They must have very bad feed for their pigs. We can supply all the clear pork wanted in Canada from Prince Edward Island, and can supply pigs weighing 300 pounds each. I cannot understand how this discussion has sprung up again. I thought the question was clearly defined the other evening when we discussed this item.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is a very important matter for the Maritime Provinces to understand exactly what kind of pork clear pork is. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon all seem to differ as to what clear pork is. What we understand in the Maritime Provinces to be clear pork, is rather different from what was stated by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). It would be a very serious tax on the lumbermen and the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, who use the clear pork and not the mess pork, unless this is defined, because otherwise I am afraid that we will be saddled with the higher tax.

Mr. SPROULE. I am surprised to find the lumbermen taking the view that the men they employ are not able to eat pork. As I understand, a great many of these men are taken from the agricultural class. They pursue their agricultural avocations in the summer, and lumbering in the winter. In the summer they eat the pork from their farms, and I think they would be able to use the same diet in the winter. But the lumbermen speak of them as if their stomachs were different to those of other men, as if they could not digest pork, unless it were clear pork and that of the heaviest class. Perhaps, it may be that they think it would be cheaper, because the heavier pork could not be so easily digested. I know something of lumbering operations in this country for at least twenty years, and I know that the men were supplied in our part of the country with pork from the farmers. That was one of the valuable means the farmers had of selling their produce—supplying pork and oats and other necessaries to the lumbermen in the lumber camps. At that time, there was no objection made to the pork which was raised by the Canadian farmer. No complaints were made then, but, of late years, because the lumbermen have found it to their advantage to bring in western pork, because it is a little cheaper than Canadian pork, there is a howl raised all over the country by the lumbermen in consequence of this proposal of the Government. If this duty does the lumbermen any injury by increasing the price of pork, it will do the farmers good by enhancing the value of pork. The hon. member for West Simcoe (Mr. Cook) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have said something in regard to this question in opposition to the proposed duty, but these gentlemen are themselves interested in lumbering operations, and with them it is either money in their pocket or out of their pocket. They do not pay much attention to the interests of the great agricultural class of the community, many of whom they represent, or pretend to represent, because I think they are misrepresenting rather than representing the agricultural class. The interests of the farmers are to be set aside in favor of the interests of the lumbermen. They will sink the interests of the farmer because the lumberman can get American pork a few dollars cheaper than Canadian pork. I have never been able to understand why Canadian pork is not as useful, and will not sustain life as well, as any other pork. If a heavier class of pork is needed, Canadian farmers can raise it if you give them the market. There is one thing in which I think the Government are making a mistake, and that is in drawing a distinction between mess pork and clear pork. I fear the result of that will be that the larger portion of the pork which the lumbermen require will come in under the cheaper tariff. I think it would be better for the Government to make a duty of 3 cents a pound on meat all round, and do away with these fine distinctions. The farmers are an important class of the community, and they look to the Government to do them justice. It will be more in harmony with the wish of the agriculturists if the Government would drop these fine distinctions and put on a general duty of 3 cents a pound. The raising of pork is one of the valuable lines in which the Canadian farmers can engage, and I am sure they will look with disfavor upon any attempt to lower the rate of duty. I think the representatives of the agricultural class on both sides of the House are of the same opinion on this subject. They believe that if there is one question in which the farmers are vitally interested it is this question of pork, and that the Government should put it up to

a fair price, say 3 cents a pound, and so do justice to the farmers and do no injustice to the other classes of the community.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I do not understand much about the difference between mess pork and clear pork, but I do understand this : If hogs can come in at 30 per cent., and pork, except mess pork, is to be charged 3 cents a pound duty, the only result will be that Canada will be the scene of slaughtering all the hogs intended for this country instead of their being slaughtered in the United States. Take a hog of 200 pounds live weight, at 4 cents per pound. That is about $8. If you take that hog slaughtered, allowing 20 per cent. for shrinkage, you have a weight of 160 pounds, which, at 3 cents a pound, is $4.80. The live animal will have to pay a duty of $2.40 at 30 per cent., so that there is only a protection of $2.40, or about 1½ cents a pound, which can be of no benefit whatever to the Canadian farmer. The only difference will be that the hogs which now come in as pork will come in as live animals and will pay 30 per cent., while the heavy pork will come in at 1½ cents. The deduction which I have made, 20 per cent., is a little more than the usual allowance upon hogs which have to be slaughtered. I do not believe that it will ever pay the farmers of Canada to raise pigs to the weight of 220 pounds or 240 pounds, and I repeat what I said the other night, that the younger animal requires a smaller amount of feed in proportion to the older animal. The system of feeding that we have at the present time, in putting our hogs on the market weighing 150 to 170 pounds to the animal, is the most profitable for the farmers of Ontario, and I believe for the whole Dominion ; and if hogs are allowed to come in at 30 per cent. there is no protection to the farmers.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the tariff should be altered in some way so as to make it more clear, otherwise I am satisfied there will be great confusion. My hon. friend will recollect that a memorandum was sent to him from New Brunswick, asking to have the barrels examined, for the purpose of ascertaining what description of pork they contained. People should be able to know what kind of pork they are going to buy. In our Province, the lumbermen want the best kind of pork ; they want the best of everything, and they will desire to get the Chicago clear pork.

Mr. HESSON. I must confess that, like my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), I am unable to distinguish between the different grades of pork, whether it comes in under the name of mess, or ham, or bacon. We do know, however, that something over 24,000,000 pounds of meat were brought into this country last year, which paid a duty of 1 cent per pound. I presume, from the discussion that has taken place in this House, that that is the class of meat which is chiefly required by the lumbermen, as I understand they require heavy fat pork, and that is a quality that can be produced by the farmers of Canada. That pork came in at 1 cent a pound, and 3,500,000 came in under the heading of hams and bacon, as I find in the Trade Returns, at the rate of 2 cents a pound. It is fair to presume that the laboring classes and the artisans who, perhaps, had to buy some of this latter class of American pork, were paying 2 cents a pound duty, whilst the lumbermen were paying 1 cent a pound. Now, we are going to have that matter made worse ; if I understand the proposition of the Minister of Finance, the position will be made worse, for the people who have to earn their own living in towns and cities, than it has been in the past. I think the House heretofore has been somewhat misled by the interpretation of the Inspection Act, or by the arrangement of it under the present classification. We did believe that the purpose of the Government was to encourage the production of the heavier class of pork, and we are sure that the farmers of Canada can produce an abundance of that class of pork within six to nine months—all that is required for the wants of this country. I find that 24,000,000 pounds of meat came into this country during the past year, and I think that any one who is at all conversant with the capacities of this country to produce meat and to raise coarse grains, will agree that we could have produced all that meat ourselves. Raising coarse grains to feed stock is certainly a more reasonable way of making money than to sell the grain and impoverish the farms ; it would be much better to put it into the shape of meat, and sell the meat. I find that a pound of pork, at the lowest average, costs 6 cents to produce. The best feeders in the country give us to understand that a bushel of barley will produce 13 pounds of pork, and if you multiply that by 6 you have 78 cents for that bushel of barley. The same thing applies in a greater degree in the feeding of pease. A bushel of pease will make 15 pounds of pork. A hog can be kept on pasture at very little cost during the whole summer season, and if the pasture is short, a hog will live and thrive on ensilage the same as cattle. We know that a hog will live all summer and provide for itself, and then, if you put it up in the fall and feed it on barley, or pease, you can get 78 cents a bushel for your barley and 90 cents a bushel for your pease ; besides, you will have the offal of that hog for the nourishment of the farm, instead of impoverishing the farm by exporting the grain from the country at 35 or 40 cents a bushel for the barley. It is said the farmers of this country, as a class, have been ill-provided for in the past. We understood that the Government, in this matter, had formed a policy which was to give some encouragement to the farmers of Canada. I will read you an extract from the experience of a person who has been in the pork business for some time. He is a farmer, and has been accustomed to fatten a large number of hogs and sell them in the market, and he knows what he is talking about. You see that the farmers were all under the impression that the proposition of the Government with reference to the imposition of 3 cents duty on American pork was going to be carried out in good faith. Here is what this writer says :

"Farmers can in this present year of grace make more money by raising pork than in any other line of animal or agricultural enterprise. Look at it this way : One bushel of corn will make 13 pounds of pork. That is not guesswork, it is the demonstrated fact. Pork at present is worth about 6 cents per pound. Then one bushel of corn turned into pork is worth 78 cents. We shall be told that our farmers do not raise much corn—in some parts of Ontario none at all. Well, one bushel of barley will produce 13 pounds of pork. Is it profitable to sell barley at 78 cents? But one bushel of pease will produce 15 pounds of pork. Is there money in pease at 90 cents a bushel? Let us go a bit further. Pork can be produced for less money than by feeding on barley, corn or pease.

Pigs will keep themselves in summer if allowed good pasture, and, when pasture fails, they thrive on ensilage as well as cattle, and need grain only when fattened."

If the Government are going to allow American hogs to come into this market at 20 per cent., and American pork at a duty of 1½ cents, it will be a question whether the farmers of this country will get any benefit from it or not.—

"For the next year or two, hogs will command high prices. Last year we imported for home consumption 4,000 hogs, 8,000,000 pounds of lard, and 23,000,000 pounds of bacon, hams and pork. That is equal to 20,000 hogs of average size. Farmers will be able largely to increase their sales; and those who have made a study of the matter tell us that a pound of pork can be produced for less money than is required to produce a pound of beef. It is better to sell pork at 6 cents per pound than wheat at $1 a bushel."

Now, when we could secure for our barley 78 cents a bushel, and pease 90 cents, by feeding, as is evident from this statement of a man who knows what he is talking about, the farmers are going to be very grossly deceived in this matter. They have been led to believe that they were going to make money out of hogs, and out of grain, that their farms would be the better for feeding this stock at home. It is a most unfortunate state of things that they should have been led to believe that for one moment, if the Government are going to recede from the position they took then. They may attempt to mystify us about the classification of pork. But there is one great fact staring the people of Canada in the face, and that is, that 23,000,000 pounds of meat have come into this country during the past year, and that 1½ cents a pound duty is not going to keep out American meat. It will still come in, and crowd our producers of pork to the wall. If 20 per cent. is not sufficient on the heavy hog, make it 30, or 40 per cent. Hogs can be raised in Canada, raised at a profit by any man who understands it, or who pays attention to the matter. I say that, notwithstanding the demands of the lumbermen—and they are the most successful and wealthy men we have in Canada to-day—we have to consider a much more important industry than that of the lumbermen, we have to consider the class of small farmers who are endeavoring to make their living out of the hardest toil in which men can engage. Now, I hope that the Minister of Finance will consider this question again and let us have a thorough understanding about it. I quite agree with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), who deprecated any misunderstanding about the classification; perhaps very few of the officers at the different ports where pork is entered thoroughly understand the classification. Here we have gentlemen who have had some experience in this matter, and who are not agreed as to the particular classification of pork, or the particular style of the cut that should be in each particular barrel. You would have all the difficulty of opening the barrels and having them inspected, and in some cases the officers are not posted; and, under these circumstances, it would be much better to levy a duty of 3 cents per pound on all meat coming into the country, not only pork, but beef. The farmers of Ontario, and I am glad to say the same remark applies to Prince Edward Island, that beautiful island by the sea, are able to produce enough pork to supply the lumbermen with a heavy class of that article. I hope the Minister of Finance is not going to weaken on this matter; for, if he does so, he is going to make the most serious mistake committed during this Parliament. I do not pretend to say the Government can go through a Session without making some mistakes, but this would be the greatest mistake of the Parliament. I shall favor dividing the House on this question, no matter what the result may be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt the farming community will be very greatly misled if the Finance Minister insists on the views he appeared to entertain this afternoon. The hon. gentleman is aware that the McKinley Tariff is at present passing through the Congress of the United States. In Prince Edward Island we raise and export an enormous quantity of potatoes yearly, our market being largely in the United States. The increased duty proposed to be placed on potatoes entering into the United States will practically exclude us from that market entirely, and unless our farmers can utilise their potatoes by feeding them into pork they will be, to a large extent, a drag on their hands. The farming community were led to believe, when the hon. Finance Minister introduced this tariff, that such protection would be given to them on this one article as would ensure them the Canadian market. What did the hon. gentleman say in his speech? He said:

"It is proposed to introduce added protection to another series of the great farming products of the country. It is felt that in a country like ours, with its large grazing areas, equal to any in the world, with its rapidly increasing dairy and cheese industries, with its unrivalled facilities for the production of meats of various kinds, the time has come when these great industries should be protected by an adequate duty from the competition which they are at present receiving largely from the country to the south of us."

The hon. gentleman promised to put on an "adequate duty." What is his proposition? His proposition is that as regards the main classes of pork which are imported here, the duty shall be raised from 1 cent to 1½ cents—that is all. The hon. gentleman is told by lumbermen all round the House, that the increased duty of half a cent a pound will not keep out pork from the South. But the hon. gentleman's proposition was to place the duty at such a sum as would keep it out and give our farmers the Dominion market. He went on further to say:

"Now, there is no reason in the wide world, to my mind, why Canada should not only raise all the meat necessary for the consumption of her own people, but should become one of the largest exporters of these different kinds of meat to foreign countries. It is with a view of fostering these meat-producing industries with a fairly protective duty, that the Government have come to the conclusion to protect the farmers by raising the rates on these meats in this way."

What is the hon. gentleman doing? He is placing a duty of $6 a barrel on a class of pork in which there is no competition. The hon. gentleman knows that the ordinary pork imported from the United States, so far as the shipping interests are concerned, comes into the country in bond; that the shippers in Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Quebec import all their pork in bond, and it does not matter whether there is a duty of $6 or $16 placed on foreign pork which comes into Canada in bond and duty free. What market is the farmer going to secure? So far as the lumbermen are concerned, there is to be an increase of only half a cent per pound in the duty on pork; and so the promise

which the hon. gentleman made to the farmers is being broken, and the farmers are being deceived. It will not give our farmers sufficient protection to give them control of our markets; and, in view of the McKinley Tariff, by which our farmers will be practically prohibited from sending their potatoes to the United States, our farmers in Prince Edward Island will have no protection. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, spoke of the quantity of pork which Prince Edward Island could supply. I have no doubt whatever that we could supply the markets of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and have a large surplus besides; but, if the hon. Finance Minister persists in his decision in regard to the meat duties, as announced this afternoon, he will be keeping the promise of the ear but breaking it to the hope. The farmers will be deceived, and I protest against it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any person acquainted with me will know that I am a protectionist out and out. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns last year that there were imported into this country pork meats of all kinds and lard, the products of the hog, to the value of $2,300,000. Let us look at that for a moment from a practical standpoint. The lumbermen or merchants who import these products to that value have a merchantable article, and if it is sold and exported, Canada is no worse off than when it was bought. But we send $2,300,000 of our cash over to the United States to purchase those products. Suppose they are brought into the country and consumed here; the pork is consumed, but our money is out of the country. If, however, we pay the farmers of Canada this amount, although the pork is consumed here, the money is still in the country. Looking at the question in this light, from a national standpoint, it is clearly our duty to protect pork. In order that there may be no dispute about the classification of mess pork, clear cut and short cut, I would suggest that pork of all kinds when put up in barrels, salted, and beef when put up in barrels and salted, should pay a duty of 2 cents per pound or $4 per barrel; and fresh meats of all kinds, and hams and bacon, save and except pork salted and beef salted, should pay a duty of 3 cents per pound. Our farmers would then have as good protection as our manufacturers enjoy. Two cents per pound is at least equal to 35 per cent. protection on pork, taking the market value of pork the year round in the markets of the United States; for that would be paying $6 per 100, which would be a high price, as probably $5 would be a fair average value for pork in the United States. I think that would be the best solution of the difficulty, all classifications in regard to mess pork, clear pork, long cut, being wiped out.

Mr. BAIRD. I did not expect to have anything to say on this subject, but the interests of the Province from which I come require that something should be said. I am aware that it is very difficult to reconcile the various interests of this wide Dominion on a question of tariff; but if pork can be raised as largely as is represented in Ontario, surely its representatives should be satisfied with a duty of $3 a barrel, or 1½ cents per pound as sufficient protection. The lumbermen and fishermen of New Brunswick are willing to bear fair and reasonable burdens in the interests of the farmers; but when you place an excessive burden on them, a different feeling prevails. They have expected and believed that this duty would be raised as high as 1½ cents per pound, or a duty of $3 per barrel on pork. Then as regards the distinction between mess pork and clear pork, they had entertained the hope that that would be levelled down and no discrimination would be made. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has truly said that the question of inspection will be a serious one. I understand from practical men, that the work of inspection is attended with considerable danger to the article of pork; that if it becomes necessary that every barrel should be opened to ascertain that it is clear or prime mess, the inspector will be obliged to take a quantity out of each barrel, probably to open both ends of each barrel, and afterwards it would be almost impossible to place that barrel in a water-tight condition. If, moreover, the pickle is lost, the pork is readily destroyed. I had hoped, and I still hope, that the Government will see their way clear to make no discrimination between those classes of pork used by lumbermen, because if you make one class subject to a greater duty than the other it would be simply to compel the consumer to buy mess, and the Government would reap no advantage from it. The most important point is the amount of duty you intend to levy upon pork. I say that this duty of $6 per barrel will be burdensome, and surely the wealthy people of the Province of Ontario ought to have some consideration for the people by the sea, who are not well prepared to go into the raising of pork. If pork can be raised as freely and as liberally as is stated here by practical farmers from Ontario, who, I believe, are speaking correctly, there is surely no need of a prohibitory duty on that article. We fully concede that the Dominion of Canada is able and well prepared to raise its own beef, and we care not how you raise the duty on that article. But in the interests of the lumbermen and the fishermen, I earnestly urge that you will give them a fair and reasonable consideration, and that when you come to a duty of $3 a barrel on pork you will stop there.

Mr. HESSON. I may say, in reply to the last gentleman, that whilst the farmers of Ontario are quite prepared to compete with fair and reasonable competition in their own country, it is utterly impossible to compete with the western producers of pork, who get their corn at 10 cents a bushel. The hon. gentleman must know that, although a farmer may produce barley or pease, or even corn—and we produced about 17,000,000 bushels of corn in the ear in Ontario last year—yet they cannot produce it at 10 cents a bushel. No man of common sense can expect that a Canadian farmer feeding his stock on this most important food, can hold his own against the western farmer, unless he has protection. The American pork is not equal to the Canadian, every one knows that; and any one who has experience of Canadian pork will always prefer it to the western American. But it is impossible for our farmers to raise hogs to compete with the Americans; they have to pay duty for corn, and they cannot produce it as cheaply as in the Western States. What we want is protection against the American pork, and beef as well, without destroying the chances and hopes of our farmers through unfair competition. Gentle-

men on the opposite side of the House have repeatedly stated that the farmers of Canada have not been sufficiently protected, and now, when there is an opportunity of protecting the farmers, I hope they will show their honesty of purpose and advocate it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not know that I would have troubled the House with any further remarks on this question, were it not for some observations which fell from my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard), in which he indicated that there was a conflict of interest between the farmer and the lumberman. I understood my hon. friend to say—and I thought it a very singular theory to be announced by a member of the great Liberal party—that it was perfectly legitimate to put the lumbermen under contribution; I might say, to rob the lumbermen for the purpose of benefiting the farmers. If there is one principle, Sir, which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have advocated ever since I have had the honor of a seat in Parliament, it is that one class should not be burdened for the benefit of the other; and if there is one principle they have deprecated, it is that the protective policy, as they contended, has had the effect of robbing one portion of the community for the purpose of enriching another portion of the community. It was, therefore, with a great deal of pain that I listened to the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Béchard), and more particularly, because, from my own experience, I have come to the conclusion that there is no conflict of interest between the lumberman and the farmer. In my own locality, at all events, the lumberman has been the pioneer who has opened up the country for settlement. The lumbermen have opened up portions of the country which have subsequently been filled with the most prosperous farmers in that locality. Not only that, Sir, but the lumbermen have given to the farmers, in the newer portions of the country, a home market at higher prices than they could possibly obtain under any other circumstances, and, therefore, I hold that it does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend to say, that there is any conflict of interest between the lumberman and the farmer. Sir, I am not here to dictate to the Government what course they should adopt with regard to the amount of duty they should impose upon this particular article now under discussion. The hon. the Minister of Finance, and the hon. the Minister of Customs, after a long deliberation, have come to the conclusion that they will submit to this Parliament a proposition to impose on the heavier grades of pork a duty of 1½ cents per pound. It seems to me that what we have to ask these hon. gentlemen to do, under the circumstances, is to declare to this House, and in an unmistakable manner to the country, what classes of pork they propose to allow to be introduced into Canada under that rate of duty. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have declared it to be their intention to admit a certain class of pork, as defined by the General Inspection Act, at a rate of duty of 1¼ cents per pound. The General Inspection Act declares that mess pork is to be the rib pieces taken from hogs weighing not less than 200 pounds. I do not quite understand the definition of "rib pieces of hogs" to be exactly what my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) understands it to be. If I understood that hon. gentleman aright, Sir, he defined "rib pieces" to be those pieces that contained the rib. Well, if the ribs are taken out of these pieces, it seems to me that they are just as much mess pork after the ribs are taken out, as they were when the ribs remained in the meat itself.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend says "no," but I would like to understand where the difference is. If you take a certain portion of an animal, and call it mess pork with the bones in it, surely it is none the less mess pork after you take the bones out of it. Fish would not be any the less fish, if you take the bones out of it, than if the bones remained in the fish itself. So I say, that although I am not going to dictate to the Minister of Finance or to the Minister of Customs under what definition they shall bring in this particular class of pork that is proposed to be introduced at a lower rate of duty than the other class of pork, yet it is their bounden duty to intimate to the House and the country what class of pork they are going to admit at 1½ cents a pound. I quite agree with the observation made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), that the class of pork which we call clear pork in this section of the country is, perhaps, not the same class that is called clear pork in the Lower Provinces; it is mess pork with the bones taken out of it. I do not care whether the Administration determine to admit that as mess pork or not; but what I want them to do is to declare in the most unmistakable terms, so that importers will make no mistake about it, what class they will admit at the 1½ cent rate, and what class they will admit at the 3 cent rate. For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that, in my judgment, there is no possibility of importing any class of pork that would come under the definitions and regulations provided by the General Inspection Act; because it provides that all the barrels containing mess pork shall be branded on one of the heads, yet there is no brand on the mess pork coming from the United States at all; there is simply the name on the end of the barrel, and a description of the pork it contains. Therefore, I say it is necessary, in the circumstances, that the Government should define, in the most unmistakable terms, what they hold to be mess pork, and declare to the public what class they are going to admit at 1½ cents a pound, and what class at 3 cents a pound.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House will allow me, I will take this opportunity to make a brief statement in reference to this matter. I think it was altogether gratuitous on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, or hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to intimate that there was anything like an attempt by the Government to mislead either the House or the country in reference to this matter. I think the Government have been straightforward and outspoken on this matter ever since it has been introduced to the House. In the Budget speech I stated what has been read by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, that it was the proposal of the Government to put a protective duty on meats.

An hon. MEMBER. Adequate.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, I did say adequate protection, and I stand by that at the present time. When I came to give the proposals of the Government ten minutes later, the rates which were considered adequate by the Government were announced, and they are the rates which remain to-day, with the single exception of the rate on salt beef in barrels, which was reduced to 2 cents a pound. The Government thought that was an adequate protection, and such was stated to the House, and there has been no period since when any attempt has been made to mislead the House in any way with reference to the Government's intention. When the question was asked: what constituted the mess pork which should come in at 1½ cents a pound, there was no evasion then. Two or three evenings ago, when my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) asked the question, I told him that clear cut pork was interpreted by the Government as coming under the definition in the General Inspection Act —not only what was generally known here as heavy mess pork, but what was used in the Maritime Provinces by the lumbermen and the fishermen as well; and long clear cut pork, which was the same as the mess pork, which was taken from the same kind of hog, and was the same portion, except only that the rib was cut out, was supposed by the Government to come within the definition of the General Inspection Act. At that time, there was no attempt to mislead on this subject; and to-day, when the question was reiterated on the other side of the House, I made the same statement, which was consistent in every respect with the statement I made when the tariff resolutions were brought before the House. So much with reference to that. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) that it is of the utmost importance that there should be no mistake or misapprehension on this question, and that the House and the country, and the officers of the Government, should know thoroughly what kind of pork is to be admitted at certain duties, and what kind at greater duties; and in that view, I am going to suggest, as this discussion has arisen on an item which has already passed the Committee, and as there is no item now before the Chair, that the better course would be to remit this conversation at the present time, and the Government will take into consideration the question of the definition of mess pork, and in a day or two there will be other opportunities for bringing the matter up, and we can give maybe a more mature consideration to the point.

Mr. IVES. Let me ask the hon. Minister of Finance if, under his interpretation of the Inspection Act, there is any part of the hog between the ham and the shoulder that is not mess pork; and if so, what it is?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the rib portion.

Mr. IVES. There is the loin between the ham and the point where the rib ceases. There you come across another difficulty, and it becomes more obvious that there is going to be a good deal of difficulty about this matter. We have the question now raised whether the loin of the hog would come under the definition of the Inspection Act as mess pork, and everyone knows that there is no possible reason why that part should be charged 3 cents and the other part only 1½ cents.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I wish to say a word with reference to what has been said by the hon. member for North Renfrew.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would say to my hon. friend that this discussion is out of order and irregular, and if it continues longer, it should be on some motion. The item passed the House a few days ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is on the motion which the hon. Minister made before recess, that the Committee rise and report.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There are various ways in which the discussion could be continued, and be in order.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I merely asked the hon. Minister to explain the point I raised, and the discussion has taken a wider range than I anticipated; but I think the statement made by the hon. Minister just now is a fair one, that he will take time to consider this matter, and let us know at another stage at what decision the Government will have arrived at.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the statement made by the hon. Minister is one that should be received without further discussion; but I cannot divest my mind of the fact that his promise was to give an adequate protection, and he has had a statement from the lumbermen on both sides of the House that the protection he has offered of 1½ cents a pound on clear pork will not have the effect of keeping out that class of pork at all.

On resolution 2 (p. 2553),

Mr. FOSTER. You will remember, when I went over these items, that this was omitted. It is a repeal of the section which has now been amended so as to bring it into harmony with what it has been made since.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With reference to the duty on lime, the course taken by the Government may have the effect of destroying a very important and rising industry in New Brunswick, which has an output of a thousand barrels a day. The probability is that a prohibitory duty will be adopted by the Americans, which will have the effect of destroying that industry.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to that, I may say that the article of lime is one of the articles mentioned in the statutory offer of 1888. It is entirely in the hands of the Government either to reduce the duty or to take it off entirely, and it is not a matter that need be dealt with by the tariff. I do not think it would be wise for us to deal with it in the tariff before we know what legislation will be had with the United States, in reference to it.

Mr. MILLS. What about fruit trees?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The parties interested in endeavoring to prevent an increase of the duty by the United States say that the inaction of this Government neutralises their efforts, and that a prohibitory duty will be placed in the American tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. The efforts of the people interested in keeping the lime duty down at Washington cannot have been affected by the action of this Government, for we have taken no action so far as tariff legislation is concerned.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I said the inaction of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to repeated representations from the people of St. John, the Government caused to be made known that lime stood in a position in which parliamentary action was not necessary, and that this Government would meet the Government of the United States as far as it went in the matter—either lower the duty, or take it off altogether.

Mr. IVES. There are two sides to this lime question. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) speaks as if New Brunswick were the only portion of Canada which produces lime. He speaks of a thousand barrels a day as being the output of the quarries in the neighborhood of St. John, but there is as large an output from a quarry in the Eastern Townships, a very large part of which is sold in the southern part of the Province of Quebec to the pulp mills. Probably from ten to fifteen car loads a day are placed in that part of the Province of Quebec, and if the duty were taken off lime, they could be as well supplied from St. Albans, Vermont. If the Government were to remove the duty from lime and open the doors to the products of the St. Albans lime quarry, they would be materially injuring the Eastern Townships quarry. So far as the course of the Government is concerned, we have been giving that matter in the Eastern Townships some attention, and have been led to believe that the action of our Government upon the question of lime would not affect in any way whatever the action of the United States Government. No doubt the Rockland lime people are moving Heaven and Earth to have the duties increased so as to shut out St. John lime, and if they can bring political influence enough to bear, they will succeed, but without any reference whatever to the action we may take here.

Resolutions reported, as follows :—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 33—Revised Statutes—intituled : " An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," as follows :—

1. By repealing section one of said Act, and substituting the following in lieu thereof :—

In this Act, or in any other Act relating to the Customs, unless the context otherwise requires :

(*a*) The expression or contraction "*ad val.*" represents and has the meaning of the words "*ad valorem.*"

(*b*) The initials N.E.S. represent and have the meaning of the words "not elsewhere specified."

(*c*) The initials N.O.P. represent and have the meaning of the words "not otherwise provided for."

(*d*) The initials F.O.B. represent and have the meaning of the words "free on board."

(*e*) The expression "gallon" means an Imperial gallon.

(*f*) The expression "ton" means two thousand pounds avoirdupois.

(*g*) The expressions "proof" or "proof spirits," when applied to wines or spirits of any kind, mean spirits of the strength of proof as ascertained by Sykes' Hydrometer.

(*h*) The expression "gauge," when applied to metal sheets or plates or to wire, means the thickness as determined by Stubbs' Standard Gauge.

(*i*) The expression "in diameter," when applied to tubing, means the actual inside diameter measurement.

(*j*) The expressions "sheet" or "sheets" when applied to metals mean sheets or plates of not exceeding three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness.

(*k*) The expressions "plate" or "plates" when applied to metals mean plates or sheets more than three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness.

2. By enacting that the interpretation clauses comprised in section 2 of the "Customs Act," 49 Victoria, chapter 32—(Revised Statutes)—as amended, shall, unless the context otherwise requires, apply to, and form a part of this Act; and that any power conferred upon the Governor in Council by the said "Customs Act" to transfer dutiable goods to the list of goods which may be imported free of duty shall not be by this Act abrogated or impaired.

3. By repealing sub-section 1 of section 5 of chapter 33 (Revised Statutes), and substituting the following in lieu thereof :

The importation of any goods enumerated in Schedule "D" is hereby prohibited, and any such goods, if imported, shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown, and shall be forthwith destroyed,—and any person importing any such goods shall in each case incur a penalty of two hundred dollars.

4. By enacting that all medicinal or toilet preparations imported for completing the manufacture thereof, or for the manufacture of any other article by the addition of any ingredient or ingredients, or by mixing such preparations, or by putting up or labelling the same alone, or with other articles or compounds, under any proprietary or trade name, shall be, irrespective of cost, valued for duty and duty paid thereon at the ordinary market value, in the country from whence imported, of the completed preparation, when put up and labelled under such proprietary or trade name, less the actual cost of labor and material used or expended in Canada in completing the manufacture thereof, or of putting up or of labelling the same.

5. By enacting that regulations respecting the manner in which molasses and syrups shall be sampled and tested for the purpose of determining the classes to which they shall belong with reference to the duty chargeable thereon shall be made by the Minister of Customs, and the instruments and appliances necessary for such determination shall be designated by him and supplied to such officers as shall be by him charged with the duty of sampling and testing such molasses and syrups; and the decision of any officer (to whom is so assigned the testing of such articles) as to the duties to which they are subject under the tariff shall be final and conclusive, unless upon appeal to the Commissioner of Customs within thirty days from the rendering of such decision, such decision is, with the approval of the Minister, changed, and the decision of the Commissioner with such approval shall be final.

6. By enacting that any goods or packages being the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, and having been exported therefrom and intended to be returned, may be admitted free of duty on being re-imported to Canada, provided such goods or packages were entered for exportation, and branded or marked by a Collector or proper officer of Customs, and fully identified by the Collector or proper officer, at the port or place where they are so re-imported; and further, provided that the property in such goods or packages has continued in the same person or persons by whom they were exported, and that such re-importation takes place within one year of the exportation thereof.

7. By enacting that any person who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which shall be on the person accused, sends or brings into Canada, or who, being in Canada, has in his possession any bill-heading or other paper appearing to be a heading or blank capable of being filled up and used as an invoice, and bearing any certificate purporting to show, or which may be used to show that the invoice which may be made from such bill-heading or blank is correct or authentic, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to a penalty of five hundred dollars and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months, in the discretion of the court, and the goods which may be entered under any invoice made from any such bill-heading or blank shall be forfeited.

8. By striking out from the Schedule "A" to said Act the following headings, viz. :—

The words "Agricultural Implements, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 7 in said schedule.

The words "Books, etc.," which immediately precede item 33 in said schedule.

The words "Breadstuffs, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 52 in said schedule.

The word "Carriages" which immediately precedes item 83 in said schedule.

The words "Cotton, manufactures of, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 121 in said schedule.

The words "Fruits (dried) viz. :—" which immediately precede item 162 in said schedule.

The words "Fruit (green) viz. :—" which immediately precede item 165 in said schedule.

The words "Furs, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 174 in said schedule.

The words "Glass and manufactures of, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 181 in said schedule.

The words "Gunpowder and other explosives, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 193 in said schedule.

The words "Iron and manufactures of, viz. :—" which precede item 213 in said schedule.

The words "Pianofortes, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 344 in said schedule.

The words "Steel and manufactures of, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 403 in said schedule.

The words "Stone, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 414 in said schedule.

The words "Sugars, syrups and molasses," which immediately precede item 419 in said schedule.

The word "Tobacco," which immediately precedes item 438 in said schedule.

The words "Trees—fruit trees, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 441 in said schedule.

The words "Vegetables, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 455 in said schedule.

The words "Wools and woollens, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 473 in said schedule.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal the following items in Schedules "A," "B" and "C" to the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 33—Revised Statutes—intituled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," viz. :—

Schedule "A" items numbered 2, 5, 6, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 40, 45, 47, 49, 58, 67, 81, 87, 98, 99, 100, 109, 110, 115, 117, 118, 119, 123, 134, 149, 153, 157, 165, 166, 167, 169, 177, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 205, 206, 208, 209, 258, 262, 264, 265, 268, 269, 271, 274, 277, 283, 286, 288, 294, 295, 297, 298, 301, 305, 311, 312, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 335, 336, 340, 341, 342, 358, 361, 363, 370, 372, 376, 379, 385, 387, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 402, 411, 412, 413, 415, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 435, 437, 438, 448, 451, 452, 457, 459, 460, 461, 463, 467, 468, 473, 476, 481, 482.

Schedule "B," items numbered, 489, 490.

Schedule "C," items numbered, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 512, 513, 515, 518, 522, 523, 524, 526, 527, 529, 538, 539, 542, 544, 545, 550, 553, 554, 555, 564, 566, 568, 570, 571, 576, 577, 580, 581, 586, 587, 591, 594, 597, 601, 603, 604, 605, 608, 612, 613, 616, 620, 624, 628, 630, 632, 637, 643, 658, 665, 674, 677, 681, 682, 684, 686, 688, 697, 698, 699, 700, 703, 709, 710, 711, 712, 714, 725, 726, 728, 734, 737, 738, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 751, 756, 760, 762, 763, 764, 765, 769, 774, 778, 782, 793, 796, 801, 803, 804, 809, 810, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof by adding to such respective schedules, as follows :—

SCHEDULE "A."

1. Acid, acetic and pyroligneous, N.E.S., and vinegar, a specific duty of fifteen cents for each gallon of any strength not exceeding a strength of proof, and for each degree of strength in excess of the strength of proof, an additional duty of one cent. The strength of proof shall be held to be equal to 6 per cent. of absolute acid, and in all cases the strength shall be determined in such manner as may be established by the Governor in Council.
2. Acid, acetic and pyroligneous of any strength, when imported by dyers, calico printers or manufacturers of acetates or colors, for exclusive use in dyeing or printing, or for the manufacture of such acetates or colors in their own factories, under such regulations as may be established by the Governor in Council, a duty of twenty-five cents per gallon and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
3. Acid phosphate, three cents per pound.
4. Precious stones, N.E.S., polished but not set or otherwise manufactured, and imitations thereof, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
5. Animals, living, viz.:—Cattle, sheep and hogs, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
6. Artificial flowers, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
7. Feathers of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
8. Axle grease, one cent per pound.
9. Barrels containing petroleum or its products or any mixtures of which petroleum forms a part when such contents is chargeable with a specific duty, forty cents each.
10. Surgical belts or trusses and suspensory bandages of all kinds, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
11. Blacking, shoe and shoemakers' ink, and shoe, harness and leather dressing, and harness soap, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
12. Advertising pamphlets, pictures and pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price lists, advertising calendars, advertising almanacs, tailors' and mantlemakers' fashion plates, and all chromos, chromotypes, oleographs, photographs and other cards, pictures or artistic work of similar kinds, produced by any process other than hand painting or drawing, whether for business or advertising purposes or not, printed or stamped on paper, cardboard or other material, N.E.S., six cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*

Mr. FOSTER.

13. Geographical, topographical and astronomical maps, charts and globes, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
14. Newspapers or supplemental editions or parts thereof, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
15. Bank notes, bonds, bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, drafts and all similar work unsigned, and bill-heads, envelopes, receipts, cards and other commercial blank forms printed or lithographed, or printed from steel or copper or other plates, and other printed matter, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
16. Bookbinders' tools and implements, including ruling machines, and bookbinder's cloth, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
17. Fancy work boxes, writing desks, glove boxes, handkerchief boxes, manicure cases, perfume cases, toilet cases and fancy cases for smokers' sets, and all similar fancy articles made of bone, shell, horn, ivory, wood, leather, plush, satin, silk, satinette or paper; dolls and toys of all kinds including sewing machines when of not more than two dollars in value, and toy whips; ornaments of alabaster, spar, amber, terra-cotta or composition; statuettes, and bead ornaments, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
18. Brass in strips for printers' rules, not finished, and brass in strips or sheets of less than four inches in width, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
19. Braces or suspenders and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
20. Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, seventeen and a-half per cent. *ad valorem.*
21. Wheat flour, seventy-five cents per barrel.
22. Buttons of vegetable ivory or horn, ten cents per gross and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*

22½. Buttons of hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, five cents per gross and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*

23. Carpetting, matting and mats of hemp; carpet linings and stair pads, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
24. Tobacco pipes of all kinds, pipe mounts, cigar and cigarette holders and cases for the same, thirty-five per cent, *ad valorem.*
25. Clocks and clock cases of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
26. Clock springs and clock movements other than for tower clocks, complete or in parts, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
27. Horse clothing, shaped, N.O.P., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
28. Cocoa mats and matting, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
29. Cocoa paste and chocolate, and other preparations of cocoa, not sweetened, four cents per pound.
30. Cocoa paste and chocolate, and other preparations of cocoa containing sugar, five cents per pound.
31. Extract of coffee or substitutes therefor of all kinds, five cents per pound.
32. Collars of cotton, linen, celluloid or xyolite, twenty-four cents per doz. and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
33. Combs for dress and toilet of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
34. Colored fabrics, woven in whole or in part of dyed or colored cotton yarn, or jute yarn, or of part jute and part cotton yarn, or other material except silk, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
35. Non-elastic webbing, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
36. Elastic webbing, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
37. Old and scrap copper, copper in pigs, bars, rods, bolts, ingots and sheathing not planished or coated, and copper seamless drawn tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
38. Copper, all manufactures of, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
39. Copper in sheets or strips of less than four inches in width, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
40. Cotton cordage and cotton braided cords, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
41. Cordage of all kinds, N.E.S., one and one-quarter cents per pound, and ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
42. Cotton denims, drillings, bedtickings, ginghams, plaids, cotton or canton flannels, flannelettes, cotton tennis cloth or striped zephyrs, ducks and drills dyed or colored, checked and striped shirtings, cottonades, Kentucky jeans, pantaloon stuffs,

and goods of like description, two cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*

43. Cotton sewing thread in hanks, black, bleached or unbleached, three and six cord, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*
44. Jeans and coutilles when imported by corset and dress staymakers for use in their own factories, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
45. Cuffs of cotton. linen, celluloid or xyolite, four cents per pair and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
46. Curtains when made up, trimmed or untrimmed, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
47. Hammocks and lawn tennis nets, and other like articles manufactured of twine, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
48. Drain pipes, sewer pipes, chimney linings or vents, and inverted blocks glazed or unglazed, and earthenware tiles, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
49. Feathers, viz.:—Ostrich and vulture, undressed fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
50. Feathers, viz. :—Ostrich and vulture, dressed, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
51. Apples, 40 cents per barrel, including the duty on the barrel.
52. Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, N.E.S., three cents per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
53. Cherries and currants, one cent per quart.
54. Cranberries, plums and quinces, thirty cents per bushel.
55. Peaches, N.O.P.,one cent per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
56. Gas meters, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
57. Crystal and decorated glass table-ware made expressly for mounting with silver-plated trimmings, when imported by manufacturers of plated ware, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
58. Glass carboys and demijohns, empty or filled, bottles and decanters, flasks and phials of less capacity than eight ounces, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
59. Lamp, gas light and electric light shades, lamps and lamp chimneys, side-lights and head-lights, globes for lanterns, lamps, electric lights and gaslights, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
60. Common and colorless window glass; and plain, colored, stained, tinted or muffled glass in sheets, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
61. Ornamental, figured and enamelled colored glass; painted and vitrified glass; figured, enamelled and obscured white glass; and rough rolled plate glass, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
62. Stained glass windows, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
63. Silvered glass, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
64. Silvered glass, bevelled, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
65. Plate glass, not colored, in panes of not over thirty square feet each, six cents per square foot, and when bevelled, two cents per square foot additional.
66. Plate glass in panes of over thirty and not over seventy square feet each, eight cents per square foot; and when bevelled, two cents per square foot additional.
67. Plate glass in panes of over seventy square feet each, nine cents per square foot; and when bevelled, two cents per square foot additional.
68. Imitation porcelain shades and colored glass shades, not figured, painted, enamelled or engraved, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
69. All other glass and manufactures of glass, N.O.P., including bent plate glass, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
70. Gloves and mitts of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
71. Gold and silver leaf, and Dutch or schlag metal leaf, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
72. Gun, rifle and pistol cartridges; cartridge cases of all kinds and materials; percussion caps, and gun wads of all kinds, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
74. Hats, caps, and bonnets, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
76. Honey in the comb or otherwise, and adulterations and imitations thereof, three cents per pound.
77. India rubber boots and shoes with tops or uppers of cloth or of material other than rubber, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
78. India rubber boots and shoes and other manufactures of India rubber, N. E. S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
79. Corset clasps, spoon clasps or busks, blanks, busks, side steels and other corset steels, whether plain, japanned, lacquered, tinned or covered with paper or cloth; also back, bone or corset wires, covered with paper or cloth, cut to lengths and tipped with brass or tin, or untipped, or in coils, five cents per pound and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
80. Ferro-manganese, ferro-silicon, spiegel, steel bloom ends and crop ends of steel rails, for the manufacture of iron or steel, two dollars per ton.
81. Builders', cabinet-makers', harness-makers' and saddlers' hardware, including curry-combs, carriage hardware, locks, butts and hinges, N. E. S., and tools of all kinds, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
82. Fire-arms, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
83. Surgical and dental instruments of all kinds, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
84. Lap-welded iron tubing, threaded and coupled or not, one and one-quarter to two inches inclusive in diameter, for use exclusively in artesian wells, petroleum pipe lines and petroleum refineries, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
86. Wrought iron or steel nuts and washers, iron or steel rivets, bolts with or without threads, nut and bolt blanks, T and strap hinges and hinge blanks, N.E.S., one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
87. Jellies, jams and preserves, N.E.S.. five cents per pound.
88. Laces, braids, fringes, embroideries, cords, tassels, and bracelets; braids, chains or cords of hair; lace collars and all similar goods, lace nets and nettings of cotton, silk, linen or other materials, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
89. Lard, tried or rendered, three cents per pound, the weight of the package, when of tin, to be included in the weight for duty.
90. Lard, untried. two cents per pound, the weight of the package, when of tin, to be included in the weight for duty.
91. Lead, nitrate and acetate of, not ground, five per cent. *ad valorem.*
92. Lead pipe and lead shot, one and one-half cents per pound.
93. Leather-board and leatheroid, three cents per pound.
94. Skins for morocco leather, tanned, but not further manufactured, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
95. Belting leather and upper leather, including kid, lamb, sheep and calf, tanned, but not dressed, waxed or glazed, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem;* if dressed, waxed or glazed, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
96. Belting of leather or other material, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
97. Liquorice paste, two cents per pound.
98. Liquorice in rolls or sticks, three cents per pound.
99. Extract of malt (non-alcoholic) for medicinal purposes, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
100. Magic lanterns and slides therefor, philosophical, photographic, mathematical and optical instruments, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
101. Mess pork, as defined by the General Inspection Act, one and one-half cents per pound, the barrel containing the same to be free of duty.
101½. Salted beef in barrels, two cents per pound, the barrel containing the same to be free of duty.
102. Meats, fresh or salted, N.E.S., three cents per pound.
103. Dried or smoked meats and meats preserved in any other way than salted or pickled, N.E.S., three cents per pound; if imported in tins the weight to include the weight of the tin.
104. Milk food and other similar preparations, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
105. Mucilage, and liquid glue, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
107. Linseed or flaxseed oil, raw or boiled, one and one-quarter cents per pound.
108. Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, and costing less than thirty cents per gallon, seven and one-fifth cents per gallon.
109. Oil cloth and oiled silk, in the piece, cut or shaped, oiled, enamelled, stamped, painted or printed, india-rubbered, flocked or coated, N.O.P., five cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
110. Opium (crude) one dollar per pound, the weight to include the weight of the ball or covering.
111. Paintings, prints, engravings, drawings and building plans, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
112. Dry white and red lead, orange mineral and zinc, white or carbonate of zinc, five per cent. *ad valorem.*
113. Colors, dry, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*

114. Paints and colors, pulped or ground in oil or other liquids, and all liquid prepared or ready mixed paint, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
115. Paints, ground or mixed in, or with, either japan, varnish, lacquers, liquid dryers, collodion, oil finish or oil varnish; rough stuff, fillers, and all liquid, prepared or ready mixed paints, N.E.S., five cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
116. Oxides, ochres and ochrey earths, umbers and siennas and fire-proofs, ground or unground, washed or unwashed, calcined or raw, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
117. Paints and colors, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, one dollar per gallon.
118. Paper hangings or wall paper in rolls, on each roll of eight yards or under, and so in proportion for all greater lengths of the following descriptions, viz.:—
    (*a*) Brown blanks and white blanks, printed or plain, two cents.
    (*b*) White papers, ground papers and satins, not hand-made, three cents.
    (*c*) Single print bronzes and colored bronzes, six cents.
    (*d*) Embossed bronzes, eight cents.
    (*e*) Colored borders, narrow, and colored borders, wide, six cents.
    (*f*) Bronze borders, narrow, and bronze borders, wide, fourteen cents.
    (*g*) Embossed borders, fifteen cents.
    (*h*) All other paper hangings or wall paper, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
119. Paper sacks or bags of all kinds, printed or not, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
120. Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished, twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
121. Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, glossed or finished, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
122. Paraffine wax, stearic acid and stearine of all kinds, three cents per pound.
123. Lead pencils of all kinds, in wood or otherwise, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
124. Perfumery, including toilet preparations (non-alcoholic) viz.:—Hair oils, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes, and all other perfumed preparations used for the hair, mouth or skin, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
125. Photographic dry plates, nine cents per square foot.
126. Aluminised paper chemically prepared for photographer's use, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
127. Pickles in bottle, forty cents per gallon, including the duty on the bottles, and each bottle holding less than one-half pint shall be dutiable as containing one-half pint, and each bottle holding more than one-half pint, but not more than one pint, shall be dutiable as containing one pint, and each bottle holding more than one pint, but not more than one quart, shall be dutiable as containing one quart.
128. Pickles in jars, bottles or other similar vessels, forty cents per gallon on the ascertained quantity, the duty to include the duty on the jar, bottle or other vessel.
129. Pickles in bulk, in vinegar or in vinegar and mustard, thirty-five cents per gallon, and in brine or salt, twenty-five cents per gallon.
130. Plumbago, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
131. Plumbago, all manufactures of, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
132. Printing presses and printing machines, such only as are used in newspaper, book and job printing offices; folding machines and paper cutters used in printing and bookbinding establishments, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
133. Lithographic presses, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
134. Prunella for boots and shoes, and cotton netting for the lining of boots, shoes and gloves, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
135. Woollen netting for the lining of boots, shoes and gloves, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
136. Red and yellow prussiate of potash, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
137. Rubber belting, hose, packing, mats and matting, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber, five cents per pound, and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem.*
138. Sauces and catsups in bottle, forty cents per gallon, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*; and each bottle holding less than one-half pint shall be dutiable as containing one-half pint, and each bottle holding more than one half-pint but not more than one pint shall be dutiable as containing one pint, and each bottle holding more than one pint but not more than one quart shall be dutiable as containing one quart.

Mr. FOSTER.

139. Sauces and catsups in bulk, thirty cents per gallon, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
140. Soy, ten cents per gallon.
141. Seeds, viz.:—Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, N.O.P., when in bulk or in large parcels, ten per cent. *ad valorem*: when put up in small papers or parcels, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
142. Shawls and travelling rugs of all kinds and materials except silk, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
143. Sewing and embroidery silk and silk twist, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
144. Composition metal for the manufacture of filled gold watch cases, ten per cent. *ad valorem.*
145. Slate pencils, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
146. Castile soap, mottled or white, and white soap, two cents per pound.
147. Soap powders, pumice, silver and mineral soaps, sapolio and other like articles, three cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.
148. Spirituous or alcoholic liquors distilled from any material or containing, or compounded from, or with distilled spirits of any kind and any mixture thereof with water—for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at the rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent. under proof, but all such liquors shall be computed as of the strength of fifteen per cent. under proof, as follows, viz.:—
    (*a*) Ethyl alcohol or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl, or spirits of wine; gin of all kinds, N.E.S.; rum, whiskey, and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, N.O.P., two dollars per gallon.
    (*b*) Amyl alcohol or fusil oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil, two dollars.
    (*c*) Methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit, or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirit; absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, N.E.S.; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura, and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars.
    (*d*) Spirits and strong waters of any kind mixed with any ingredient or ingredients and being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures, or medicines, N.E.S., two dollars and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
    (*e*) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavander waters, hair, tooth and skin washes and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in bottles or flasks weighing not more than four ounces each, fifty per cent. *ad valorem*; when in bottles, flasks or other packages weighing more than four ounces each, two dollars and forty per cent. *ad valorem.*
    (*f*) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
    (*g*) Vermouth and ginger wine containing not more than forty per cent. of proof spirits, seventy-five cents per gallon; if containing more than forty per cent. of proof spirits, two dollars per gallon.
    (*h*) In all cases where the strength of any of the foregoing articles cannot be correctly ascertained by the direct application of the hydrometer, it shall be ascertained by the distillation of a sample, or in such other manner as the Minister of Customs may direct.
149. Starch, including farina, corn starch or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, not sweetened or flavored, two cents per pound;

when sweetened or flavored, four cents per pound, in all cases the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

150. Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids for almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspaper advertisements or engravings, and all other like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, N.E.S.; and matrices or copper shells of the same, two cents per square inch.

150½. Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of books and bases for the same, whether composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid, two-thirds of one cent per square inch, and matrices or copper shells of the same, two cents per square inch.

151. Stereotypes, electrotypes, and celluloids of newspaper columns, and bases for the same, composed wholly or partly of metal or celluloid, three-fourths of one cent per square inch, and matrices or copper shells of the same, two cents per square inch.

152. Water limestone or cement stone, one dollar per ton of thirteen cubic feet.

153. Curling stones (so-called) of whatever material made, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

154. Molasses derived from raw cane sugar in the process of its manufacture direct from the cane, not refined or filtered or bleached or clarified, testing by the polariscope thirty degrees or over and not over fifty-six degrees, when imported direct without trans-shipment from the country of growth and production, a specific duty of one and one-half cents per gallon, or when not so imported, of four cents per gallon; when testing over fifty-six degrees and imported direct without trans-shipment from the country of growth and production, a specific duty of six cents per gallon, or when not so imported, of eight cents per gallon; in all cases the package in which imported to be exempt from duty.

155. Syrups, N.E.S., cane-juice, refined syrup, sugar-house syrup, syrup of sugar, syrup of molasses, syrup of sorghum, corn-syrup, glucose syrup and all syrups or molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of refined sugars, or in the refining of sugars, or in the refining of molasses, or in the production of molasses sugars, and all bleached, clarified, filtered or refined molasses, a specific duty of one cent per pound and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*, and the value for duty shall be the value thereof f.o.b. at the last port of shipment.

156. Provided that molasses when imported for or received into any sugar refinery or sugar factory or syrup or glucose factory, distillery or brewery, shall be subject to, and there shall be paid thereon, an additional duty of five cents per gallon.

157. Saccharine or any product containing over one-half of one per cent. thereof, ten dollars per pound.

158. Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery including sweetened gums, candied peels, condensed milk when sweetened and condensed coffee with milk when sweetened, one and a quarter cents per pound and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

159. Sweetened biscuits of all kinds, popcorn, preserved ginger, condensed milk not sweetened, and condensed coffee with milk not sweetened, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

160. Telephones and telegraph instruments; telegraph, telephone and electric light cables; electric and galvanic batteries, electric motors and apparatus for electric lights, including incandescent light globes and insulators of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

161. Stamped tinware, japanned ware, granite ware, enamelled iron ware and galvanised iron ware, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

162. Tinware and manufacturs of tin, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

163. Cut tobacco, forty cents per pound and twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

164. Manufactured tobacco, N.E.S., and snuff, thirty cents per pound and twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.

166. Picks, mattocks, hammers weighing three pounds each or over, sledges, track tools, wedges or crowbars of iron or steel, one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

167. Shovels and spades, shovel and spade blanks and iron or steel cut to shape for same, one dollar per dozen and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

169. Trunks, valises, hat-boxes and carpet bags, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

170. Satchels, pocket-books and purses, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

171. Plants, viz.:—Fruit, shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

172. Gooseberry bushes, one cents each.

173. Grape vines costing ten cents and less, two cents each.

174. Raspberry and blackberry bushes, one cent each.

175. Rose bushes, costing twenty cents and less, three cents each.

176. Apple trees, of all kinds, three cents each.

177. Peach trees, three cents each.

178. Pear trees, of all kinds, four cents each.

179. Plum trees, of all kinds, five cents each.

180. Cherry trees, of all kinds, four cents each.

181. Quince trees, of all kinds, two and one-half cents each.

183. Cases for jewels and watches, cases for silver and plated ware, and for cutlery and other like articles, ten cents each and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

184. Cotton twine, one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

185. Twine for harvest binders, of jute, manilla or sisal, and of manilla and sisal mixed, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

186. Twine of all kinds, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

187. Umbrellas, parasols and sun-shades of all kinds and materials, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

188. Umbrella, parasol and sun-shade sticks or handles, N.E.S., twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

189. Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other packages, weighing not over one pound each, two cents per can or package, and two cents additional per can or package for each pound or fraction of a pound over one pound in weight—and the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty.

190. Vegetables, when fresh or dry salted, N.E.S., including sweet potatoes and yams, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

191. Velveteens, and cotton velvets and cotton plush, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

192. Veneers of wood, not over one-sixteenth of an inch in thickness, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

193. Walking sticks and canes, of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

194. Watches, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

195. Watch cases, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

196. Whips, of all kinds, except toy whips, fifty cents per dozen and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

197. Wire, of brass or copper, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

198. Wire, covered with cotton, linen, silk or other material, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

199. Pails, tubs, churns, brooms, brushes and manufactures of wood, N.E.S., and wood pulp, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

200. Fibre ware, indurated fibre ware, vulcanised fibre ware and all articles of like material, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

201. Clothing, ready-made and wearing apparel of every description, including horse clothing shaped, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat or other like animal, made up by the tailor, seamstress or manufacturer, N.O.P., ten cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

202. Carpets, viz.:—Brussels, tapestry, Dutch, Venetian and damask; carpet mats and rugs of all kinds, N.E.S.; and printed felts and druggets and all other carpets and squares, N.O.P., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

203. Smyrna carpets, mats and rugs, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

204. Yeast cakes, compressed yeast and baking powders in packages of one pound and over and not over fifty pounds weight, six cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

205. Yeast cakes, compressed yeast and baking powders in packages of less than one pound in weight, eight cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight of duty.

205½. Compressed yeast in bulk or mass of not less than fifty pounds, four cents per pound,

206. Wire of all kinds, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

207. Electric arc light carbons or carbon points, not exceeding twelve inches in length and in proportion for greater or less lengths, two dollars and fifty cents per thousand.

208. Uncolored cotton fabrics, viz.: Scrims and window scrims, cambric cloths, muslin apron checks, brilliants, cords, piques, diapers, lenos, mosquito nettings; Swiss, jaconets and cambric muslins, and plain, striped or checked lawns, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
209. Manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat, or other like animals, viz.:—Blankets and flannels of every description; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, felt cloth of every description, N.E.S.; horse-collar cloth; yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn, knitted goods, viz., shirts and drawers and hosiery, N.E.S., ten cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem.*
210. Plough plates, mould boards and land sides, when cut to shape from rolled sheets of crucible steel but not moulded, punched, polished or otherwise manufactured, and being of a greater value than four cents a pound, twelve and a half per cent. *ad valorem.*
211. Wrought scrap iron and scrap steel, being waste or refuse wrought iron or seeel and fit only to be re-manufactured, the same having been in actual use, not to include cuttings or clippings which can be used as iron or steel without re-manufacture, two dollars per ton.
212. Illuminating oils composed wholly or in part of the products of petroleum, coal, shale or lignite, costing more than thirty cents per gallon, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
213. Wrought iron or steel sheet or plate cuttings or clippings, as cut at the rolling mills or ship yards, and fit only for re-rolling and to be used for such purpose only, thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
214. Sulphuric ether, five cents per pound.

3. Resolved, That it is expedient to repeal the following items in the Schedule "A" to the Act 49 Victoria, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled "An Act to amend the Duties of Customs," viz.:—items numbered 30, 210, 281, 416, 417, and to make further provisions, by adding to the schedules to the said Act as follows, viz.:—

SCHEDULE "A."

214*a*. Bird cages, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*b*. Brass and copper nails, rivets and burrs, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*c*. Boots and shoes, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*d*. All manufactures of leather, N.E.S., twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*e*. Barrels containing linseed oil, twenty-five cents each.
214*f*. Lime-juice, fortified, with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent. of proof spirits, sixty cents per gallon.
And when containing more than twenty-five per cent. of proof spirits, two dollars per gallon.
214*g*. Lime-juice, sweetened, and fruit syrups, N.O.P., forty cents per gallon.
214*h*. Lime-juice and other fruit juices, N.O.P., non-alcoholic, and not sweetened, ten cents per gallon.
214*i*. Granite and freestone, dressed; all other building stone dressed except marble, and all manufactures of stone, N.E.S., thirty per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*j*. Grindstones, not mounted, and not less than twelve inches in diameter, two dollars per ton.
214*k*. India rubber clothing or clothing made waterproof with India rubber, N.E.S., thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*l*. India rubber surfaced waterproof clothing, ten cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*
214*m*. Biscuits of all kinds not sweetened, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem.*

SCHEDULE "B."

215. Salmon, pickled or salted, one cent per pound. Subject to the provisions of Section 3, Chapter 33, 49th Victoria, Revised Statutes of Canada.
216. All other fish, pickled or salted in barrels, one cent per pound. Subject to the provisions of Section 3, Chapter 33, 49th Victoria, Revised Statutes of Canada.

SCHEDULE "C."

217. Admiralty charts.
218. Alkanet roots, crude, crushed or ground.
219. Precious stones, in the rough.
220. Aloes, ground or unground.
221. Alum, in bulk only, ground or unground.

Mr. FOSTER.

222. Aluminum or aluminium and alumina and chloride of aluminium or chloralum, sulphate of alumina and alum cake.
223. Anatomical preparations and skeletons or parts thereof.
224. Aniline dyes and coal tar dyes, in bulk or packages of not less than one pound weight, including alizarine and artificial alizarine.
225. Aniline salts and arseniate of aniline.
226. Antimony, not ground, pulverised or otherwise manufactured.
227. Ashes, pot and pearl, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight.
228. Asphalt or asphaltum and bone pitch, crude only.
229. Argal or argols, not refined.
230. Beans, viz.:—Tonquin, vanilla and nux vomica, crude only.
231. Bells, when imported by and for the use of churches.
232. Bismuth metallic in its natural state.
233. Books printed by any Government or by any scientific association, for the promotion of learning, and letters and issued in the course of its proceedings and supplied gratuitously to its members, and not for the purposes of sale or trade.
234. Books specially imported for *bonâ fide* use of public free libraries, not more than two copies of any one book; and books which shall have been printed and manufactured more than twenty years, bound or unbound.
235. Borax, ground or unground, in bulk only, of not less than twenty-five pounds.
236. Botanical specimens.
237. Old scrap brass and brass in sheets or plates of not less than four inches in width.
238. Fire bricks, for use exclusively in processes of manufactures.
239. Gold or silver bullion, in bars, blocks, or ingots, and bullion fringe.
240. Burrstones, in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, not bound up or prepared for binding into mill stones.
241. Cups or other prizes won in competitions.
242. Cabinets of coins, collections of medals and of other antiquities.
243. Canvas of not less than forty-five inches in width, not pressed or calendered, for the manufacture of floor oilcloth.
244. Celluloid or xylite in sheets, and in lumps, blocks or balls in the rough.
245. Chalk stone, china or Cornwall stone, feldspar, and cliff stone, ground or unground.
246. Citron rinds in brine.
247. Clays.
248. Anthracite coal and anthracite coal dust.
249. Cocoa beans, shells and nibs, not roasted, crushed or ground.
250. Communion plate, when imported by and for the use of churches.
251. Copper in sheets or plates of not less than four inches in width.
252. Cotton yarns not coarser than No. 40, unbleached, bleached or dyed, for use in covering electric wires; also for the manufacture of cotton loom harness; and for use in the manufacture of Italian cloths, cotton, worsted or silk fabrics.
253. Cotton yarns in cops only, made from single cotton yarns finer than No. 40, when used in their own factories by the manufacturers of Italian cloths, cashmeres and cotton cloths for the selvages of said cloths, and for these purposes only.
254. Indian corn, viz.:—"Southern Dent Corn," of the variety known as Mammoth Southern Sweet, and "Western Dent Corn," of the variety known as Golden Beauty, when imported to be sown for soiling and ensilage, and for no other purpose, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council.
255. Colors, metallic, viz.:—Oxides of cobalt, zinc and tin, N.E.S.
256. Diamond drills, for prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power.
257. Diamonds unset, diamond dust or bort and black diamonds for borers.
258. Emery in blocks, crushed or ground.
259. Entomological specimens.
260. Extracts of logwood, fustic, oak, and of oak bark.
261. Mexican fibre, and tampico or istle.
262. Fish hooks, nets and seines, and fishing lines and twines, but not to include sporting fishing tackle or hooks with flies or trawling spoons, or threads or twines commonly used for sewing or manufacturing purposes.

262. Foot grease, being the refuse of cotton seed after the oil has been pressed out, but not when treated with alkalies.
264. Fowls, domestic pure bred, for the improvement of stock, and pheasants and quails.
265. Gas coke (the product of gas works), when used in Canadian manufactures only.
266. Grease, rough, the refuse of animal fat, for the manufacture of soap only.
267. Gums, viz.: — Amber, Arabic, Australian, copal, damar, kaurie, mastic, sandarac, senegal, shellac: and white shellac, in gum or flake, for manufacturing purposes; and gum tragacanth, gum gedda and gum barberry.
268. Hair, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled or otherwise manufactured.
269. Indigo auxiliary or zinc dust.
270. Brass, copper, iron or steel, rolled round wire rods under half an inch in diameter, when imported by wire manufacturers for use in making wire in their factories.
271. Jute yarn, plain, dyed or colored, when imported by manufacturers of carpets, rugs and mats, and of jute webbing or jute cloth, for use in their own factories.
272. Kryolite or cryolite, mineral.
273. Liquorice root, not ground.
274. Litharge.
275. Lemon rinds, in brine.
276. Lumber and timber planks and boards of amaranth, boxwood, cocaboral, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, sycamore, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satinwood and white ash, when not otherwise manufactured than rough sawn or split; and hickory billets to be used in the manufacture of axe, hatchet, hammer and other tool handles, when specially imported for such use; and the wood of the persimmon and dogwood trees, when imported in blocks for the manufacture of shuttles; and hickory lumber sawn to shape for spokes of wheels, but not further manufactured; and hickory spokes rough turned, but not tenoned, mitred, throated, faced, sized, cut to length, round tenoned or polished.
277. Locomotive and car wheel tires of steel, when in the rough.
278. Locust beans and locust bean meal for the manufacture of horse and cattle food.
279. Mineralogical specimens.
280. Mining machinery imported within three years after the passing of this Act which is, at the time of its importation, of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada.
281. Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts; but no article or articles shall be deemed a model which can be fitted for use.
282. Iceland moss and other mosses, and seaweed, crude or in their natural state or only cleaned.
283. Oil cake and oil cake meal, cotton seed cake and cotton seed meal and palm nut cake and meal.
284. Oils, viz.:—Cocoanut and palm in their natural state.
285. Orange rinds in brine.
286. Ottar or attar of roses and oil of roses.
287. Pelts, raw.
288. Pipe clay, unmanufactured.
289. Platinum wire; and retorts, pans, condensers, tubing and pipe made of platinum, when imported by manufacturers of sulphuric acid for use in their works in the manufacture or concentration of sulphuric acid.
290. Rags of cotton, linen, jute, hemp and woollen, paper waste or clippings, and waste of any kind except mineral waste.
291. Rattans and reeds in their natural state.
292. Resin or rosin in packages of not less than one hundred pounds.
293. Roots, medicinal, viz.:—Aconite, calumba, ipecacuanha, sarsaparilla, squills, taraxicum, rhubarb and valerian.
294. Rubber crude.
295. Seed and breeding oysters, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters.
295½. Seedling stock for grafting, viz.:—Plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees.
296. Seeds, aromatic, which are not edible and are in a crude state, and not advanced in value or condition by grinding or refining or by any other process of manufacture, viz.: Anise, anise-star, caraway, cardamom, coriander, cummin, fennel and fenugreek.
296¼. Silver, German silver and nickel silver, rolled or in sheets.
297. Soda, sulphate of, crude, known as salt cake.
298. Soda ash, caustic soda in drums; silicate of soda in crystals or in solution; bichromate of soda, nitrate of soda or cubic nitre, salsoda; sulphide of sodium, arseniate, binarseniate, chloride and stannate of soda.
299. Steel of No. 20 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 30 gauge, to be used in the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs and shoe shanks; and flat wire of steel of No. 16 gauge or thinner, to be used in the manufacture of crinoline and corset wire, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles for use in their own factories.
300. Sulphate of iron (copperas); and sulphate of copper (blue vitriol).
301. Terra japonica or gambier or cutch.
302. Ultramarine blue, dry or in pulp.
303. Whiting or whitening, gilders' whiting and Paris white.
304. Wool and the hair of the Alpaca goat and of other like animals not further prepared than washed, N.E.S.
305. Books printed in any of the languages or dialects of any of the Indian tribes of the Dominion of Canada.
306. Brass and copper wire twisted, when imported by manufacturers of boots and shoes for use in their own factories.
307. Noils, being the short wool which falls from the combs in worsted factories.
308. Seeds, viz.:—Beet, carrot, turnip, mangold and mustard.
310. Crucible cast steel wire when imported by manufacturers of wire rope, pianos, card clothing and needles, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories only.
311. Ribs of brass, iron or steel, runners, rings, caps, notches, ferrules, mounts and sticks or canes in the rough or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol or sunshade sticks, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades for use in their factories in the manufacture of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades only.
312. Fruits, viz.:—Bananas, plantains, pine-apples, pomegranates, guavas, mangoes and shaddocks; and blueberries and strawberries, wild only.
313. Camwood and sumac for dyeing or tanning purposes when not further manufactured than crushed or ground.
314. Blood albumen, tannic acid, antimony salts, tartar emetic and grey tartar, when imported by manufacturers for use in their factories only.
315. Manufactured articles of iron or steel which at the time of their importation are of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in the construction of iron or steel ships or vessels.
316. Wire of iron or steel, No. 13 and 14 gauge, flattened and corrugated, used in connection with the machine known as the wire grip machine for the manufacture of boots, shoes and leather belting, when imported by manufacturers of such articles to be used for these purposes only in their own factories.
317. Steel of No. 12 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 30 gauge, when imported by manufacturers of buckle clasps and ice creepers, to be used in the manufacture of such articles only in their own factories.
318. Blanketing and lapping and discs or mills for engraving copper rollers, when imported by cotton manufacturers, calico printers and wall paper manufacturers, for use in their own factories only.
319. Yarns, made of wool or worsted, when genapped, dyed and finished, and imported by manufacturers of braids, cords, tassels and fringes, to be used in the manufacture of such articles only in their own factories.
320. Chlorate of potash in crystals, when imported for manufacturing purposes only.
321. On imported Indian corn, to be kiln-dried and ground into meal for human food, or ground into meal and kiln-dried for such use, under such regulations as may be made by the Governor in Council, there may be allowed a drawback of ninety per cent. of the duty paid.

To amend Schedule "D" by striking out the following words which immediately precede item 813:—

"The following articles are prohibited to be imported "under a penalty of two hundred dollars, together with "the forfeiture of the parcel or package of goods in "which the same are found, viz. :—"

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal the following numbered items in the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 39, intituled "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs," viz. :—

Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 31, 32, 34, 37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 72, 79, 80, 85, 92, 94, 95, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 113, 115, 116, 119, 120, 122, 130, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 159, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 179, and by striking out from the said Act the following headings, viz. :—

The word "carriages," which immediately precedes item 11 in Section one.

The word "cottons," which immediately precedes item 21 in said Section one.

The words "Iron and Steel, manufactures of, viz. :—" which immediately precede item 39 in Section one.

The words "Tools and Implements," which immediately precede item 142 in the said Section one.

And the word "Woollens," which immediately precedes item 155 in said Section one.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to cancel certain Orders in Council made under the provisions of section 245, sub-section (1) of the "Customs Act," Chapter 32, Revised Statutes, transferring certain articles therein specified to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of duty, as follows, viz.:—

Sections 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 24 of Chapter 15, and the whole of Chapter 16 of the Consolidated Orders in Council of Canada, and the following as published in the Supplement to the said Orders in Council, viz.:—

Special regulations *re* lithographic printing presses;

Special regulations *re* ferro-manganese, ferro-silicon, &c., passed on the 4th and 26th of June, 1889; and the following additions to the Free List as also published in said Supplement as items added to the said Free List, viz..:—

Re felloes of hickory wood, O.C. November 16th, 1888.

Re homo-spring steel wire, O.C. December 6th, 1888.

Re sulphate of alumina or alum cake, O.C. May 22nd, 1889.

Re sumac, O.C. June 4th, 1889.

Also the Orders in Council defining the rates of duty payable upon certain articles as follows, viz. :—

On celluloid balls, etc., O.C. April 12th, 1887.

On Vermouth bitters or Vermouth wine, O.C. August 25th, 1888.

On sapolio and silver soap, O.C. April 4th, 1889.

On veneers of wood, O. C. May 14th, 1889.

And the following transfers to the Free List, viz. :—

Wire, for the manufacture of wire cloth, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Cotton yarn for covering wire, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Jute yarn, O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Wire of iron or steel for wire grip machines, O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Steel for the manufacture of buckle clasps, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Blanketing, lapping, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

Yarns for the manufacture of braids, etc., O.C. May 14th, 1889.

White ash lumber, O.C. June 10th, 1889.

Camwood, O.C. June 10th, 1889.

Steel wire for the manufacture of pins, O.C. September 19th, 1889.

Wire for crinolines, etc., O.C. September 19th, 1889.

Sulphate of soda, O.C. November 22nd, 1889.

Cotton yarn for loom harness, O. C. November 27th, 1889; and the Order in Council of May 14th, 1889, defining the rate of duty payable upon plough plates, mould boards, &c.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to further amend the Act 49 Victoria, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting Duties of Customs," by striking out from the item 399 in the Schedule "A" to the said Act the word "ginger" in the second line of said item.

7. *Resolved*, That Section 7 of 49 Victoria, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words;—

"Provided this section shall not apply to the export of any carcass or part thereof of any deer which shall have been raised or bred by any person, company or association of persons, upon his or their own lands, under regulations to be adopted by the Governor in Council."

8. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to further amend the Act 49 Victoria, Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs," by striking out from item 46 (Act number) (217, Departmental number) the words "skelp iron sheared or rolled in grooves," And substituting therefor:

"Skelp iron sheared or rolled in grooves not wider than eight inches in width nor thinner than twenty gauge, until such time as it is manufactured in Canada, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

9. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs on the articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after the twenty-eighth day of March instant.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of the resolutions.

Mr. McMULLEN moved:

That the resolutions be not now read the second time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole with the view of reducing the duty on binding twine and cordage.

He said: I intimated to the Government this afternoon that I would introduce this amendment if they did not change this provision in the tariff. I think, in view of the statement made in the Toronto *Empire* that the manufactures of twine and cordage are being bought up by a syndicate which desires to control this product, which is so much used by the farming community, the Government should have taken the hint and should have reduced the duty, even if it did not place it upon the free list.

House divided on amendment of Mr. McMullen:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Innes,
Barron,	Jones (Halifax),
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lister,
Bernier,	Lovitt,
Blake,	McIntyre,
Borden,	McMillan (Huron),
Bourassa,	McMullen,
Bowman,	Meigs,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Neveu,
Charlton,	Platt,
Choquette,	Robertson,
Cook,	Rowand,
Davies,	Ste. Marie,
Ellis,	Scriver,
Fiset,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Trow,
Geoffrion,	Waldie,
Guay,	Weldon (St. John),
Hale,	Wilson (Elgin),
Holton,	Yeo.—44.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	LaRivière,
Baird,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Barnard,	Lépine,
Bell,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Boisvert,	McCulla,
Bowell,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyle,	McDougald (Pictou),
Brown,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bryson,	McGreevy,
Cameron,	McKay,
Cargill,	McKeen,
Carling,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Chapleau,	Mara,
Cimon,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Moncrieff,
Cockburn,	Montague,
Colby,	Montplaisir,
Coughlin,	O'Brien,
Coulombe,	Patterson (Essex),
Daoust,	Porter,
Dawson,	Putnam,
Denison,	Riopel,
Dewdney,	Roome,

Dickey,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hall,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Ives,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Rykert,
Shanly,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox).
Wood (Brockville)—85.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is one other item in this tariff which, I think, in the interest of the country, should not be adopted, and that is the duty on nursery stock. I, therefore, move:

That the said resolutions be not now read the second time, but that they be referred back to Committee of the whole House with instructions to strike out the duty imposed upon nursery stock.

Amendment negatived on the same division.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I wish to read a letter which I have received from one of my constituents:

"DEAR SIR,—If you have an opportunity, will you please correct the statement made by Minister Foster that the duties on nursery stock ordered before the existing duty was re-imposed would have to be paid by the shipper or agent of the house selling the goods.' He is mistaken, or ignorant of what he is talking about. Our neighbors do not do business that way.

"I had a few things ordered before anything was heard of putting on the present duty, and I find I will now have to pay $10 or $12 duty on the stock I have coming in. I had to wait until the proper time came for shipping, and now must pay this outrageous duty, which on many things is much more than their cost.

"I am not alone. I know of four or five others in the same fix. My loyalty, as loyalty is understood at Ottawa, is gradually dwindling away; I will not be troubled with it very long."

Mr. PLATT moved:

That the resolutions be not now read the second time, but that they be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to remove the duty upon coal oil, refined, and used for illuminating purposes.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That the said resolutions be not now concurred in but that they be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by providing that all cheese imported into Canada for export be branded by the Customs authorities as follows:—"Cheese for export, the product of the United States."

I may just say in connection with this motion, that I brought this matter before the attention of the House some two years ago. Shortly afterwards there was a meeting of the Dairymen's Association, and the matter was discussed by them and they represented to the members of the Government that such action was not at all necessary. I hold in my hand a circular issued from Liverpool, England, in regard to this matter, which I will read:

"THE LIVERPOOL PROVISION TRADE ASSOCIATION AND EXCHANGE COMPANY, LIMITED.

"SECRETARY'S OFFICE, 24 NORTH JOHN STREET,
"LIVERPOOL, 26th March, 1890.

"DEAR SIR,—We desire to inform you that a Committee consisting of the undersigned has been appointed by this Association to watch the interests of the cheese trade, which are being seriously menaced by the continued increase in the manufacture of the article known as 'Filled' Cheese.

"We desire to co-operate with you in the direction of obtaining such legislation as will lead to the suppression of the manufacture of this article.

"The legitimate interests of the 'trade' are seriously imperilled, and the reasonable expectation of the consumer disappointed, and we are clearly of opinion that the distribution of 'Filled' Cheese is disgusting the British public with the pure article, and that our trade and mutual interests are in danger of suffering a permanent and lasting injury.

"We are in communication with our home sanitary authorities, and are placing the matter before our Agricultural Government Department, and members of the House of Commons.

"We venture to suggest that you should call upon your Government and State Legislatures to prohibit the manufacture of these goods.

"We would ask you to inform us what steps are being taken on your side, and what course should, in your opinion, be adopted to bring about the end we have in view.

"We await the favor of your reply.

"Yours faithfully,
"W. CARSON.
"A. W. DUNN.
"J. L. GRANT.
"C. HOLLAND.
"T. LONSDALE.
"SAMUEL WHITE.
"J. S. HARWOOD BANNER, *Secretary.*"

This is a circular issued by the principal cheese dealers in the old country, who, I am sure, are purchasing cheese imported from Canada and they believe it to be the product of Canada, while in fact it is the product of the United States; for I do not believe that we have in Canada, any manufacturers of bogus cheese, cheese filled with cotton seed. What they call in England "filled cheese" is adulterated cheese, cheese made out of a mixture of milk and cotton seed oil. This, if allowed to continue, will bring the cheese of Canada into disrepute in the English market, and I think it is high time that the Government should immediately take some action and apply the law so that when cheese is imported into this country for export, wherever it is bonded, the Customs officer receiving the cheese and placing it in bond, should be furnished with a stamp, and he should stamp not only the box, but the cheese, with the words "Cheese for export, the product of the United States." Then, when that cheese is placed on the market in England, it will be plain for the consumer to see that it is not an article of Canadian manufacture. The importance of the cheese trade to Canada is very great. I hold in my hand a circular containing a statement that four factories in the western part of Ontario last year produced 11,000,000 pounds of cheese, which brought a sum of $969.760, nearly $1,000,000. We have too large a production of cheese to allow our market to be imperilled by the export from this country of adulterated cheese from the United States, and being sold in the English market as Canadian cheese. Therefore I hope that the Government will consider this matter seriously and take the steps that are necessary to protect the credit of our cheese on the English market.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to point out what relation this amendment has to the tariff, in what way the result he is aiming at can be attained. I do not see that it has any relation to the tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. I fancy the tariff is dealing with the Customs regulations, and this is a matter, I think, that the Customs can deal with better than any other Department of the Government. If my resolution is out of order, or not relevant, I am

prepared to withdraw it with the understanding that the Government will deal with the question at the next Session of Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture by a deputation of cheese makers from Western Ontario. I visited the hon. gentleman in company with the deputation, and I think the Government are disposed to take the steps that are necessary in this matter, and I would suggest to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that the matter be left in the hands of the Government. The deputation of cheese makers were entirely satisfied with the representations made by the Minister of Agriculture, and no doubt proper steps will be taken by the Customs authorities to put an end to this abuse, that no doubt does exist with regard to the exportation of American cheese passing through Canada in bond, which is then sold in England as Canadian cheese, but which is in fact a spurious and inferior article that has worked an injury to our own cheese interest.

Mr. TROW. I highly approve of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor)——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind hon. members that the motion has been ruled out of order, and it cannot be discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. You might allow me for a moment to say to the hon. gentleman that although his motion has been ruled out of order, the very important subject he has brought to the attention of the Government will certainly receive the necessary consideration at our hands.

Motion agreed to, resolutions read the second time and concurred in, on a division.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 143) to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Secretary and Chief Clerk Railways and Canals..... $2,800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The right hon. the First Minister promised an explanation in regard to this increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The salary of the Secretary and Chief Clerk of the Department of Railways and Canals is at present $2,400, and it is proposed to increase it to $2,800. This increase arises from the importance of the officer's duties, and the admirable manner in which he performs them. Mr. Bradley, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will remember, performs the double duty of Secretary of the Department as well as the duty appertaining to a chief clerk. He is one of the best officers in the whole of the service. He has, practically, charge of the organisation of the whole of the Department of Railways and Canals, both branches of the Department being under his supervision; and, as a special mark of approbation for his great abilities, and his great zeal and earnestness, it is desired to give him this promotion. A similar act of gratitude, I may say, for faithful service, was done in the case of Mr. Hall of the Department of the Interior. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not object to this increase.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there are sufficient grounds for objecting to this increase. An officer who receives a salary of $2,400 a year, with the prospect of superannuation, receives a sufficient salary, and it is unfair that the Committee should be asked to consent to this increase. When once the principle is admitted that a servant who thinks himself entitled to exceptional consideration is able to secure from the Government a recommendation for an additional salary to be presented to this House, all sorts of applications will be submitted by men occupying similar positions in other Departments, and the result will be that we will have applications from year to year. When civil servants are engaged to discharge particular duties, there should be a distinct understanding in regard to the increases in their salaries. If the increase is to be $50 a year, which is the ordinary standard, that principle should be strictly adhered to, without any exceptions being made. If they are entitled to retiring allowances under the Superannuation Act, they look forward to such an allowance to support them after they have retired from the service. If you admit that an increased amount should be granted for special services you break through the principle established, and, as a result, you will have a large number of applications for increases, and all sorts of influence exercised to secure them. This increase should not be agreed to on this ground. Mr. Bradley may be a very efficient officer, and no doubt he is; I do not know what particular duties he performs, but a man who gets $200 a month for his services is fairly well paid; and it is unfair to ask this Committee to make an exception in his case, and add $400 a year to his salary.

Towards establishment and maintenance of Experimental Farms..... $75,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Before entering into a criticism of this item, I may say that I have examined the report of the Minister of Agriculture, and I consider that it is high time a change should be made in the report of these farms. While I criticise this report I wish it to be distinctly understood that I believe the hon. Minister and the professor in charge of the experimental stations are doing the best they can to make them a success. But in order that they may be successful and that the farmers may derive that benefit to which they are entitled from the large experiments made, there must be considerable change in the manner of getting up the report. Each experimental farm should give a financial statement, and a statement in detail of all the expenditures of the farm. For instance, the statement shows that during last year $12,660 were expended for labor upon this experimental farm of 450 acres, and during the last three years no less than $39,000 were expended. That amount would keep a gang of 42 men, paid one dollar a day the year round, summer and winter, which is a large number to be kept on such a farm. I say there should be a change in the preparation of the report. There should be a statement given of the amount of labor required to run the farm properly; there should be a statement of

the amount required to run the experimental portion of the farm; a statement of the amount the horticulturist requires for labor, and this should be divided into branches for raising small fruits and vegetables, and further a statement from the horticulturist of the amount of labor required for raising and distributing trees. A very large amount of grain has been distributed from the farm all over the country, and the amount of labor should be taken from that and credited. In justice not only to the farmers of the Dominion, but in justice to the managers of the Central Farm itself, it is an actual necessity that this ought to be done, in order that the farmers may understand correctly what amount of labor is spent on the farm proper, and what amount is spent on experiments. I may be told by the Minister; that we can find all these things in the Auditor General's Report, but I would ask how many of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, even if they do see the report of the Minister of Agriculture and the report of the Experimental Stations, have the opportunity of seeing the Auditor General's Report, and making an examination of that in connection with the farm. We should also have the statement, every year, of the number of horses kept on the farm, the number kept for general farm purposes, the number kept for experimental purposes, and the number kept for driving purposes, with their values. We should also have a statement of the stock kept on the farm and the value of that stock, together with the prices paid for the stock and the prices obtained for them when they are sold. Where animals are purchased as they have been on some of the experimental stations, for fattening purposes, we should have a statement of the weight of the animals and what was paid for them. We have a statement of what was paid for certain animals on the Nappan Farm, but we should also be told their weight at the time they were purchased, and at the time they were sold, the prices realised, and the manner in which they were fed, for I hold that every operation on these farms ought to be of an experimental nature. Then, when we come down to the farms proper, we ought to have a statement of land under crop, and the description of the crop, and we ought also to be told what the crop was that preceded the crop mentioned in the report. We ought to be told whether manure was applied to the farm, or how long ago since manure was previously applied, because every agriculturist knows that the success of a crop depends in a great measure upon the condition of the land, and the condition of the land depends on the amount of manure that has been applied, and the length of time since it has been applied. It is admitted by practical agriculturists, that not more than half the manure is taken out by the first crop, so that three or four, or perhaps five years will run around before the entire effects of the coating of manure will be exhausted. It is impossible for farmers to gain any benefit from that report unless they know the previous crop that has been in the field, the manner in which the soil has been cultivated, and everything in connection with it. I may be told that this is going into very minute details; but since we have gone to such a large expenditure in establishing these farms, the country is entitled to the fullest details. We find in last year's report, that fifty-three varieties of corn had been set on the experimental farm to be tried for corn fodder or for ensilage, and we are told that certain fertilisers have been used, but the report ends there. I expected, when we got the report this year, that we would have a statement of their experience with respect to ensilage. I find merely the statement that they are going on experimenting with a certain number of varieties of corn; but there is no result given with respect to the variety which produced the best results, or the benefit of the fertilisers. I find that on the Central Farm, they have put up a silo last year. I saw the silo myself, and I was well pleased to see the ensilage was excellent food, but when we get the report, it is perfectly dumb with regard to that, except that the silo has been built. The farmers of Canada are all watching the experimental farm, and are awaiting all the information they can get with respect to the success of silos. I hold that every year the experimental farm should give us their experience with all fodder corns, to the cost of their silos. This is something which has been asked at every farmers' meeting I have attended for the last twelve months. We get none of this information now, but I hope we will get it in time to come. Again, we find in the report last year, that there were some 251 varieties of potatoes, and that a certain amount of manure had been purchased, but there is nothing with respect to the results. We are told that perhaps this will be left for a bulletin to be issued at a future time. I hold that all the experience gained on that farm, and every detail in connection with it, ought to be embodied in the annual report, from year to year, so that any practical farmer throughout the country can take the report and compare the progress of the farm each year, and that he can compare what is being done with what has been done. If we get this information in bulletins, it will be spread through the country, no doubt, but the farmers of the country cannot make the same comparison as they could if it were published in the report. I hold hat bulletins ought to be supplementary to the annual report of each farm. I may be told that this would require a great amount of labor, and that it would be very voluminous, but seeing that we have voted up to the present year over $400,000, for the establishment and maintenance of these stations, I hold that the farmers of the Dominion should have the fullest information in every respect. I am pleased to see that on the Nappan Farm, we got a very good description of the work there. They have given us the number of rods drained and the cost of the drains, but they have neglected to state the depth of the drains and the description of the soil. We can tell the cost of these drains, but we cannot in reality tell whether it is at a high rate or at a low rate, unless we knew the depth the drains were put into the earth, and the quality of the soil. These are all experiments the result of which the farmers of the Dominion are entitled to, because there is no information which the farmer requires to-day more than a thorough knowledge of drainage, and I am sorry we have no account of that from the Experimental Farm, in Ottawa, except the statement that there are some fourteen or fifteen miles of covered drains, and so many of open ditches. I hold that we are entitled to get a statement of the cost of the

covered drains, and whether they are made in ordinary clay or in clay loam, and whether rocks had to be blasted or not. There are many farmers who would be willing to go into farms to improve them, but they want to know something about the cost, and they are all looking to the experimental farms for information on this subject. It is time we had a correct report, in every respect, with reference to these farms, seeing the enormous amount of money that has been spent on them. I will give the House now a few items of the expenditure on this farm. I find that there was expended in labor on the Ottawa farm, in 1887, $6,425; in 1888, $20,861, and in 1889, $12,662, or a total sum of $39,949. This would keep up a gang of 40 men for 313 days at $1 per day. I would like to ask what wages are paid to the permanent hands, and if they are hired by the day, the month or the year?

Mr. CARLING. I think they are hired by the week, and they are paid $1.25 per day.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I say that on a farm like this, the hands ought to be permanent and hired by the year. The Finance Minister may laugh and grin at it, but he only shows his ignorance of the condition of affairs in the country. There is no practical and thoroughly posted farmer in the country who does not hire his hands permanently from one year's end to the other, and I hold that the wage of $1.25 per day is higher than the farmers thoroughout the country are paying by a large amount. If they paid $313 a year, that would be $1 per day, summer and winter. I have compared what is paid on this farm with what the farmers are paying their men in Ontario, and I find that men are hired in Ontario by the year, and boarding themselves, for from $251 to $254 on the average. But I think it only fair that the men employed on this model farm should receive $1 a day, or $313 a year, because the men hired on an ordinary farm receive some little perquisites, which men employed on this farm do not get. I do not think the Government should introduce a system of extravagance in conducting this farm, and I hold that good practical men, can be got for $1 a day the year round. Then I find that for teams there was expended in 1888, $5,361, and in 1889, $1,576, besides what was spent for labor. I would ask how many teams are kept on the farm?

Mr. CARLING. We have six working teams on the farm. The teams to which the hon. gentleman refers were engaged in clearing the land, which was in a very rough state when we bought it. We had to clear 150 acres, and the teams were mostly employed at that time. I may say that the wages paid to the teamsters are $1.25 a day during the summer months, and $1 a day during the winter.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The next item I come to is manure. This is one of the questions which is agitating the farmers of the Dominion to-day, especially in the older settlements, how a soil that is worn down can be recuperated by the products of that soil. Any farmer can recuperate a worn-out soil if he has sufficient money to spend for manure to put upon it; but on this experimental farm green crops ought to be grown and experimented with thoroughly, with the view of ascertaining how a worn-out soil can be renovated. During 1887 there was spent on manure $1,682, during 1888 $1,379, and during 1889 $252; in all, $3,315. Now, if a large amount of manure is to be used, a portion of this farm ought to be set aside to be well manured, and the proceeds of that portion should be kept by themselves. Then the results would be ascertained, and you would find how many cattle could be kept on a given quantity of land. An experiment like that would certainly be beneficial to the farmers. I find that on implements $2,643 was spent I do not say that there are more implements on this farm than it requires. A large farm like this should have a large supply of implements; it requires more than an average farm, and I do not say that the expenditure on implements has been extravagant. But on harness there has been spent $611, which amounts to $100 for each of the six teams. That is a very large amount to spend on harness on a farm like that. The next item is law expenses, on which there was spent in 1888 $1,255, and in 1889 $2,805.

Mr. CARLING. I think a question was asked early this Session with reference to those expenses, and I explained that we had no law expenses in connection with the farm at the present time at all. All those expenses were in connection with the title to the property. There were fifteen or sixteen holders whose properties we had to expropriate, and we had to employ the law officers to see that we had a good title. We had to pay them, together with witnesses and arbitrators. But there have been no law expenses since.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then, how come they to appear in the accounts for 1889?

Mr. CARLING. They were not paid until that year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find in the last Auditor General's Report that the firm, which had already been paid $1,000, was paid over $2,000 more last year. The explanation given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture was that that firm had been engaged to go around with the arbitrators, and that that was their fee.

Mr. CARLING. That firm was employed by the Government to look after the titles and see that everything was correct, and to attend the arbitrators, and, I think, their charge was not too much. We had to have an arbitration with regard to nearly almost every piece of land we obtained, and in every case the Government had to pay the expenses of both sides; and I do not think, for the fourteen or fifteen cases, the expenses were very large.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There are no witness expenses for last year, and I was led to believe that the title was completed. There is another individual here, a Mr. McCracken, who had a bill in 1888, and who had another in 1889.

Mr. CARLING. That gentleman was employed on the other side, and we had to pay his expenses, because the arbitrators so decided.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). That is the very answer given us to the bill of over $300. Here is another bill of over $400 paid to that same gentleman.

Mr. CARLING. These gentlemen were not employed by the Government at all, but by the parties who own the property.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Are the titles complete?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Here is a little sum that may appear very insignificant, but which the farmers will require to have accounted for. For surcingles and horse covers and rugs, $165, since that farm was established. If the farm is to be a model for farmers to go by, it should have everything which is actually necessary, but on as economical a principle as possible. Then, with respect to fertilisers, I find $38 for potato manure, but in the report we cannot tell what benefit the manure was, whether the potatoes to which it was applied excelled the other potatoes. Then we have other fertilisers to the amount of $252. We ought to have a correct statement of all the fertilisers, the land they have been applied to, and what special benefits have been derived from their use, and there ought to be a part of every field left without being subjected to any fertiliser of any description. The next item is a purchase of cattle. Seven cows and one horse have been bought at $948, but I find that the amount it cost to purchase these is $392. I find a statement here with respect to services of Mr. Sharp for travelling and purchasing horses. Who is Mr. Sharp?

Mr. CARLING. He is the agriculturist appointed in British Columbia, and he was engaged making these purchases.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have not the least doubt that it is necessary to spend a certain amount of money, but we should have a statement of the different animals, and the price paid for each. I see there has been a little loss, such as will take place on every farm. Two animals died of inflammation of the stomach; we ought to have a statement in the annual report of the treatment by the veterinary surgeon, and what he considered the cause of the disease. What is the benefit of an institution like this unless everything, favorable and unfavorable, is laid before the country?

Mr. CARLING. The veterinary surgeon, after making the examination, gave us this statement: A Jersey cow took suddenly ill and died in a short time. A *post mortem* examination showed that the tissues of the stomach were much diseased, and the veterinary surgeon was of opinion that the cow had died of inflammation of the stomach.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then we find cartage, express and freight, $1,361. What was this for?

Mr. CARLING. On the tiles purchased for the drains, we had to pay freight and charges, and they had to be brought out by teams.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Farm teams or hired teams?

Mr. CARLING. It depended upon whether at the time the farm teams were engaged on the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). How many driving horses are there on the farm?

Mr. CARLING. Two driving horses belonging to the Government, and six working horses.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find the sum of $224 here for cab hire.

Mr. CARLING. While the work was going on and during the Session of Parliament, a number of distinguished people have come to Ottawa with the view of visiting the farm. I have taken them out at times, and have often taken a cab myself to go out and visit the farm during the progress of the work. It was necessary to pay some attention to the visitors and show them the advantages of the farm, and I do not think the amount spent is a large one.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find the use of a horse for twenty-one days charged.

Mr. CARLING. One of the horses was sick, and a horse was hired in its place.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find on the Nappan farm that there were twelve steers bought for the farm, for which $344 were paid. Are those the same steers of which there is a description given in the report of the revenue derived from the farm?

Mr. CARLING. These were steers bought and fed with the products of the farm, and sold again. I suppose they are the same ones.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). With respect to the other farms, considering they are just newly established, I am pretty much pleased with the report they give. They give careful reports with respect to experiments on different varieties of grain. One thing lacking, except in one of the reports, is the number of acres under crop. Each farm should give the number of acres in crop, and the fields of each farm should be numbered and a correct account kept, so that we would know what labor has been expended, and the result obtained. I approve of the system of distributing grain, and some of the grains distributed have been very beneficial to the farmers. I received myself in the spring of 1888 two little bags of grain, two and a-half lbs. of barley. I grew them the first year, believing they were two varieties, but we could not distinguish them, although we kept them apart. I sowed them last year and found them again the same variety of barley, but one of the best variety we have ever had. I think a strict account should be kept of the quantity of grain, and its value should be entered as revenue to the farm. In regard to the buildings, I find we have spent a great deal of money on the Central Farm, about $258,000. The Minister of Agriculture told us that the farm here would be established at the cost of about $160,000. I find that we had an estimate of the expenditure on the farm here of $17,200 on barns, $18,140 on the staff residences and about $5,000 on the fences, making $40,300 on the buildings and fencing. But up to May, 1888, we find that the expenditure ran up to $59,006. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if the buildings on the Central Farm are nearly completed?

Mr. CARLING. I think they are all completed except some small buildings for experimental dairies.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would ask if the buildings on the other farms are let by contract, what the contracts are, and if they are nearly completed?

Mr. CARLING. The buildings at Indian Head are completed. The buildings at Brandon are contracted for, and will be completed during the present summer. The buildings at Agassiz, British Columbia, will be completed this year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that for the buildings at Indian Head $29,000 were expended up to the 1st July, 1889, and $39,000 were spent at Nappan. I would ask what is the contract on the Agassiz farm ?

Mr. CARLING. The contract for the building at Agassiz has not yet been let. We are now asking for tenders.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Returning to the building at Ottawa, I was out on the farm and I saw a hen-house about 100 feet long and 20 feet wide in the centre which cost $3,000. Was that contracted for, and was there any advertisement for tenders ?

Mr. CARLING. It was advertised for by the Minister of Public Works and let in the same way as usual.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Was the contract let to the lowest tenderer ?

Mr. CARLING. That is the usual practice.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I know something about that business, and I could have put up the building for about one-fourth of what it has cost. Of course, I know that the Government always pay more than a farmer would pay, but I think that was a most exorbitant price for the building. Then there is a root-house there. What material is that composed of ?

Mr. CARLING. It is founded on cedar posts. and constructed of good material.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that has cost $1,111. Certainly, stone would have been much preferable to timber for a root-house, because timber will throw a certain amount of heat, and that building should not have been put up in that way. Besides that, it is built in a very inconvenient place. One of the first things to be considered in building a root-house is convenience and economy in getting the roots in and taking them out to feed animals, but this is not in a place convenient for either purposes, and I also consider that this is a most exorbitant sum for the building of that house.

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman know the length of that building ?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I should say it was about 80 feet.

Mr. CARLING. It is 100 feet long by 25 feet wide.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then I find a charge of $829 for alterations to Baxter's cottage. One would imagine that buildings put up at so large a cost would not require alterations so soon. What was wrong with Baxter's cottage ?

Mr. CARLING. It was a cottage removed from one of the lots, and it was practically rebuilt.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see also there is an amount of $1,684 for alterations to other buildings.

Mr. CARLING. I can hardly explain to the hon. gentleman all these particulars, because they come more under the Department of Public Works than under my Department, but I have no doubt that these alterations were required in connection with the very large number of buildings on the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that something like $1,000 has been expended for heating apparatus and material. I am afraid the system adopted has not been a very judicious one. I have been told that, in one of the buildings, it took twenty-one tons of coal to keep it heated during the winter. That shows that the system adopted was not very judicious, and I suppose it was in one of those buildings that it was found necessary to make this change.

Mr. CARLING. It was found necessary to put some additional coils in these buildings, but the parties themselves furnished the coal.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Here is F. Germain, work paid on contract, $348. What was his contract ?

Mr. CARLING. When part of the land was purchased there was upon it a building partly finished. We found it necessary to have it finished for the use of a couple of workmen and their families, and a contract was let for plastering, painting and doing other things to complete it.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Here is a large quantity of timber, 13,710 feet, and another lot of 12,740 feet. Was this timber used on any of the buildings, or was it for fencing ?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the particulars just now, but the timber was used in constructing some sheds and some temporary buildings.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Here is another matter. Last year I put the question to the Minister whether any of the staff on the farm was to receive any perquisites except their salaries, and the Minister replied that no perquisites were to be given; the Government were to give a salary and furnish a house, and that was all. I find here that Prof. Saunders got a house furnished at a cost of $2,242. Now, while I believe that every individual should be fully paid, I believe that a salary should be given and that no house should be furnished for any officer. Let the Government give the house, but let each officer furnish his own house. That is a far better way. This is certainly a large perquisite.

Mr. CARLING. It is not a perquisite, because it was in the agreement with Prof. Saunders when we engaged him, that the house should be built and that ordinary furniture should be put into the house.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then the Minister in his reply last year saying that no perquisite was to be given——

Mr. CARLING. What I understood by the hon. gentleman's use of the word "perquisites" was that the officers should have something in addition to their salary, which is not the case. It was part of the contract that a house should be built, and furnished with ordinary furniture.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It ought to stop there; it is a bad system indeed. We have had a great deal of discussion here with respect to one institution that is furnished at a large amount of cost, and if all the officials on the farm were to have their houses furnished, we would have another similar state of things. Here is a little sum that I see by the Auditor General's statement, that was paid outside the Order in Council. Has that been refunded ?

Mr. CARLING. In relation to that sum mentioned by the hon. gentleman I would like to read a letter written by Prof. Saunders to myself in relation to it :

"OTTAWA, 3rd February, 1890.

"To the Honorable
"The Minister of Agriculture.

"SIR,—In looking over the report of the Auditor General for the year ending 30th June, 1889, I have read with some surprise, a letter published by him at the foot of page 242 D, which will, I fear, produce a false impression. The letter is dated 14th January, 1889, and states in regard to the supply of some crockery and mattresses in furnishing the house I occupy, that the Order in Council which authorises the furnishing of the house expressly excludes articles of these classes, and calls for a refunding of the money expended on these items. The conclusion which would be reached by most readers on seeing this document, would be, that this was a case where the party in question had succeeded in obtaining, at the public expense, articles for his own use in direct violation of an Order in Council, that attention had been called to it nearly a year ago, and no answer having been received, and no restitution being made, the Auditor General had felt it his duty to call attention to it, by placing his letter in an unusual position, at the foot of the page on which the items occur.

In justice to myself, permit me to state the facts. In the first place, the letter is wrongly dated. It was written on the 14th January, 1890, *not* 1889, and the Auditor General's Report was submitted (see page 3) on the following day, 15th January, 1890. The official copy of the Order in Council, relating to my appointment as director of experimental farms, which was sent to me from your Department, and which I herewith submit, stated that the house was to be provided with the necessary furniture, except bedding, cutlery and plate, and when the question of supplies was being discussed, this copy was produced by me, and the necessary articles were furnished, in accordance therewith, by the Department of Public Works. Now, until after the Auditor General's Report was printed did I learn that the word crockery was associated with cutlery in the original Order in Council, and that this word has been omitted in the copy I had received. The Auditor General wrote the letter in question to the Secretary of the Department of Public Works on the 14th January, 1890, and, on the same day, sent a copy of it to the printer for publication in his Report, which was distributed to the House shortly afterwards. Thus no sufficient time was given for a reply or explanation. Had the Auditor General desired an explanation he could have had it at once through the telephone which connects his office with mine. As soon as possible after I heard of the matter, I enquired into it, and seeing the error, which was, however, no fault of mine, I at once refunded the amount paid for the crockery, but the Department of Public Works would not admit that mattresses were bedding, and I have not yet been permitted to refund that item.

"I cannot refrain from expressing my sense of the injustice done me by the Auditor General on this occasion, and my regret that any public officer should have the power to publish in an official report any document reflecting on the integrity of another officer in the public service, without being required to give a reasonable time for an explanation.

"I have the honor to be
"Your obedient servant,
"WM. SAUNDERS."

That is the explanation I have to give, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that Mr. McDougall was very unfair towards Professor Saunders, because he only notified him on the 14th, and had his report sent to the printers on the 15th. It appears in the report that Professor Saunders' letter was written in 1889, instead of 1890.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). As I understand it the Auditor General has got to act strictly under the Order in Council, and if he finds anything paid outside of that, it is his duty to take action at once ; he is not to know one individual from another. I would ask the hon. Minister if there is a thoroughly posted herdsman in charge of the cattle, who knows exactly about feeding and breeding animals. No farmer will keep a herd of good cattle who has not a thoroughly posted herdsman. It is of the utmost necessity in a place where there is such a large amount of money being spent on cattle of various breeds, that a skilful man should be in charge of them.

Mr. CARLING. We have a thoroughly posted herdsman who has had ten or twelve years' experience on the farm of Mr. Gibson, who, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a very excellent farmer.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Are you consuming on the farm all the feed you produce, or are you bringing some of it into Ottawa in the shape of straw taken from the farm ? One of the advantages of this experimental farm is to show how many animals can be kept on it, and in order that this can be done, everything produced must be consumed on the farm. If this course is not followed, the farmers are not benefited by the course pursued on this experimental farm. We all know that farmers settled near large cities are in a different position in regard to procuring manure than the general run of farmers in the country. But this farm should be conducted on principles so that farmers all over the country can pursue a similar course to that followed here. All the food produced on the farm should be consumed on the farm, and as many animals should be kept as possible, in order to show the farmers what can be done in this direction, because the most successful farmers to-day are those who are able to keep the largest number of stock on the smallest quantity of land.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is aware that this is practically a new farm ; at least the land had been tilled, but it had been worn out to a certain extent. It was necessary, as we had not a large number of stock, that we should procure manure for the farm. We did not sell the straw, but we arranged that in the winter our men should come into the city, obtain manure, and give straw in exchange.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I disagree with the hon. Minister, Every practical farmer will agree with me that if our farmers are to benefit from this experimental farm it must be conducted on lines which they can follow. It is impossible for them to follow the experiments made on this farm, which is supplied with manure not made on the farm.

Mr. CARLING. If we had a small farm of 50 or 100 acres we should not require all this manure ; but we have a farm of between 400 and 500 acres, which we are only getting into good condition, and of course it requires time and continuous supplies to get the farm properly manured. The committee will agree with me that we acted wisely, before we had stock, in making an exchange with the people of the city, according to the custom of the place, in giving straw for manure. When the farm is in proper condition we do not intend to have a full supply of stock on the farm. I suppose stock for 500 acres would be 150 to 200 head, but we do not intend to keep more than are sufficient to experiment with. We have already 4 or 5 different breeds, Holsteins, Short-horns, Jerseys, Ayrshires, and Polled Angus. We are experimenting with these breeds ; but, of course, we do not intend to keep a large number. When the calves grow up, they will be sent to the experimental farms in

British Columbia, or Indian Head, or Brandon, or Nappan. We do not intend to compete with the farmers, but we intend to make experiments and give the results of our experiments to the farmers of the country. The hon. gentleman has said we do not give sufficient information, that all the details and information should be given to the farmers. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), but it will be seen that Professor Saunders states in his report that bulletins will be issued covering these particulars. All this work, however, requires time to accomplish. This report is prepared for the calendar year ending 31st December, and it was with great difficulty we could get such a report of 150 pages ready to present to the House. But Professor Saunders is taking great care to have all the particulars with respect to corn, barley, wheat, pease, and oats, and other products of the farm properly arranged; and no doubt in a short time they will be given to the public; and when the hon. gentleman receives these bulletins, no doubt he will be satisfied that they contain all the particulars. The hon. gentleman has referred to the cost of these farms. The Central Farm, covering about 500 acres, is situated near the city of Ottawa and has an excellent site and it possesses all the different varieties of soil we require for experimental purposes; and we have selected all the farms in the other Provinces with the same object in view. The hon. gentleman is a member of the advisory board of the Guelph farm, and no doubt he knows what that has cost. No doubt he is aware that that farm up to the present time has cost something like $400,000, and it has been in operation a great many years. I think considering we have a farm nearly as large as the one at Guelph, that the expenditure has been not at all out of the way.

Mr. SPROULE. I suggest to the hon. Minister that, when the bulletins are issued, the name of the subject dealt with should be placed on the outside for convenience of reference. I do not agree with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) that the annual report should contain all the particulars he thinks it should embrace, because it must be got out in time for the Session of Parliament. If it contained all the particulars suggested it would be very bulky and expensive, and perhaps it would form one of the items of expense criticised by the hon. gentleman. It is to be regretted that he, as a practical farmer, should make an attack on an institution in which the agriculturists are directly interested. It is a very important and valuable institution, and it will issue, from time to time, information which will be of the greatest importance to the farmers. It should be the last institution against which the hon. gentleman should say one word. No doubt the hon. gentleman is justified in urging the reduction of the expenditure as far as possible; but in criticising the expenditure up to the present time, he has overlooked the fact that a large amount of work has necessarily been accomplished in a short time. The work, including the taking of a section of the wilderness and preparing and cultivating it for a farm, not only clearing it from stumps, but draining it, erecting buildings and conveniences thereon, in order to carry on agriculture on a large scale. Considering the size of the farm, over 400 acres, and the state of cultivation in which it is found to-day, within three years of the time of its purchase, the expenditure has not been a large one. The hon. gentleman has also criticised the cost of the implements put on the farm. But the hon. gentleman, the other day, gave us a statement of the implements required for an ordinary farm, and if he applied the same test——

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I named the quantity of implements, but I said I did not criticise them; and I did not find fault with the cost of the implements.

Mr. SPROULE. If that was not the hon. gentleman's object in making the reference, of course I have nothing further to say regarding it, unless, that if the cost of these implements are measured by the same expenditure he laid down to the House a few evenings ago, I say they are cheap; because, considering the amount of land, they are below the cost he estimated should be incurred for carrying on a farm of this description. The hon. gentleman says that this report should contain the *minutiæ* of all that is done on the farm. I take exception to that. I believe it would be much more valuable for the farmers, and they would be more likely to take note of it, if, from time to time, bulletins were got out which applied to the subject which was then under consideration. For instance, at the time corn was about to be grown, would be the important time for a bulletin to be issued on the subject of ensilage and green corn, so as to give the farmers the benefit of the experience gained at the Experimental Farms. I think they would take much more interest in it at that time, and they would be likely to gain greater benefit by it than if it were issued at any other time of the year. The same rule holds good in regard to experiments on other matters. The hon. gentleman criticised at some length the principle of putting up these buildings without advertising for contracts, but the hon. gentleman, it seems to me, arrogates to himself the right to take the contract to do the criticism for the whole of the Opposition in this House on this particular question, and he has neither invited tenders for it nor advertised to see whether it could be done cheaper and better by others. I think that is hardly carrying out the principle he himself advocates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman takes good care that the Government are not in the same position, for he always supplements every observation which the Minister addresses to the House by something which he has to say himself; but the hon. gentleman has not succeeded in drawing from the Minister any statement showing what has been done in the way of feeding pigs on chaff and straw.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not happen to be on that subject now, and the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would be the first to call me to order for transgressing the rules of debate if I referred to it.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I may say, Sir, that the Government have no necessity to advertise for one to offer criticism before the House so long as they have the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Sproule), for he is always ready to give his criticisms on any subject whatever it may be. The statement

made by the Minister proves conclusively what we have all along contended, namely, that the Government has bought far too much land for this experimental farm. They have only fifty head of cattle on 450 acres, and we have contended all along that the land purchased was far too large for an experimental farm.

Mr. CARLING. It is not intended for a stock-raising farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then why did you buy more land than was necessary to experiment with, for both grain and cattle raising? I hold that 200 acres would have been quite sufficient. In looking over the list of experimental farms on the other side of the line, I find that a farm of 150 acres is the largest they have got for experiments for both grain and cattle.

Mr. CARLING. I believe the hon. gentleman is one of the advisory board of the Guelph farm. They have 550 acres, and I would ask him, how many cattle do they keep?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). That is a question I cannot answer, for the reason, as you are all aware, that the Experimental Farm, at Guelph, had to put away their stock, but they have got new buildings now, and since I was there, they have bought a large amount of stock.

Mr. CARLING. Can you tell me about how many head they had?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.) I think they had 50 or 60 head of cattle.

Mr. CARLING. Only that number on 500 acres?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is a large amount of wood on that farm, but the Ottawa Experimental Farm is all cleared. The Minister of Agriculture stated, last year, that the Guelph farm cost $400,000, but I hold in my hand a statement of the Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Ontario, that that farm, up to the 31st December, 1888, only cost $307,000. As hon. gentlemen are aware, two great calamities swept that farm, and they twice lost their buildings. The hon. gentlemen will also remember that there is a large college at Guelph, capable of accommodating 150 students, in connection with which they had to erect extensive buildings, but there is nothing of that kind on the Experimental farm here, and, therefore, there is no comparison between the two. I believe that if the farm is to be thoroughly beneficial, bulletins should be issued; but I believe that these bulletins should be published besides in the annual report. I think it is not too much to have the report of a farm like this, even if the financial year does close on the 31st December. I think that in six weeks or two months the report could be handed to this House if the printers would get through with it. The accounts ought to be properly kept on that farm, and there ought to be no difficulty collecting them at the end of the year. I own a farm of 450 acres myself and I keep over a hundred head of cattle, and I can, in five days, give an account of the whole of its operation and a statement of every animal with its weight, and everything connected with it. Where there is a gentleman kept as accountant, as there is on this farm, I do not see that there should be any great difficulty in laying a detailed statement of each of these farms before the House.

Mr. KIRK. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture has anything to complain of, with regard to the criticisms made on this farm since its inception.

Mr. CARLING. Not at all.

Mr. KIRK. I think he will admit that the Opposition in this House have given him every reasonable assistance. It does appear to me that there is a very large amount of money expended on this farm, for which very little good has as yet been obtained. The advantages of this farm to the Dominion are yet to be seen, for there has not been much advantage so far. It does appear to me that the expenses of this farm are far greater than there is a necessity for, and it is remarkable that on a farm of 400 acres, on which there has been so large an expenditure, the receipts from its produce should only have amounted to $2,563. If the hon. gentleman is going to set an example to the farmers, he ought to be able to give a better showing than that.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman knows that we have been distributing the different varieties of grain all over the Dominion in small parcels of two lbs. each. I think we have distributed 3,000 bushels already to the principal farmers of the Dominion, and we are getting reports from these farmers as to the results.

Mr. KIRK. Even if the value of these 3,000 bushels is added to the revenue, it would not amount to a great deal. I would ask the hon. Minister what was his object in building such an expensive hennery as to cost $3,000. Is it the intention to raise hens and eggs for sale? I am afraid, if it is, it will be a losing concern if the United States are going to put 5 cents duty on eggs. Of course, I do not know what sort of building it is, but it does appear to be a large amount for a hennery. However, I must not forget that this is not a model farm by which the hon. Minister is trying to teach the farmers how to cultivate their lands, but that it is an experimental farm, and that this is one of his experiments.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is another item of $5,608 charged to the general expense account. I would like to know what that is spent for?

Mr. CARLING. That is the way the Auditor General classifies these accounts, after every detail has been given to him.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see also that so many seed grain mortgages are set down to the Agriculture Department.

Mr. CARLING. They have nothing whatever to do with the farm. Some money for seed was advanced some years ago in Manitoba, and mortgages were given for the seed.

Mr. FISHER. Before this item passes, I would like to say a few words. I am not at all disposed to enter critically into an examination of the expenses of the farm, because I can understand that up to the present time, at all events, the hon. gentleman and his assistants on these farms have had to labor under a great many disadvantages to bring them to the stage which they have already reached. But I would venture to make a suggestion or two to the Minister in regard to what I think might assist him to promote the efficiency of these

farms for the advantage of the country at large. In looking over the reports, I do not find, either in the Auditor General's Report or in the report of Prof. Saunders, any indication given of the heads under which the various moneys have been spent. We know that on these farms there are a number of different departments, such as stock-raising, experimental plots of grain, fruit trees and small fruits, and the sending away of immense quantities of grains to the farmers of the country for experimental purposes; but I do not find in any of the reports any information as to what amounts of money have been expended on these different services. I know perfectly well that in some respects this neglect—for I think I may call it so—really tells against the management of the farms in appearance, because a great many of these expenditures which appear to be charged against the farms in the Auditor General's Report, ought not to be charged against the farm at all. Then, there are the expenses which the hon. gentleman alluded to, of sending away thousands of bushels of grain, and the expenses of making up and sending away bundles of fruit trees and other trees and plants. All appear as if charged against the farm itself, although we know they have nothing to do with the operation of the farm as a farm, but they are really expenses connected with the work of the Department of Agriculture. I think in this respect the account keeping, as it has been conducted up to the present time, has not been of that service to the public which it might be. It seems to me, that an accurate and strict account ought to be kept of all these different operations and expenses. For instance, an account of the stock-feeding operations should be kept and published in the report, so that any farmer who wished to find out the expense of keeping certain animals for a day or a month or a year would be able to find in the report the details he desired on that subject. In the same way a fruit-grower ought to be able to find in the report what has been the expenses of some particular experiment, as the planting out of an orchard or the establishment of strawberry beds, or the comparative results and expenses of different methods. We have no such separation of the accounts made in the report; and while I am not going to criticise at all severely the fact that it is not being done up to the present time, I think for the future it ought to be done. In this way a great advantage would be reached for the farmers at large. There are other expenses which ought to be indicated in detail, for instance, all the expenses connected with keeping the teams on the farm. I think the expense of the team, when it is applied to the farm proper, ought to be separated from the expense of the team when it is utilised for the purpose of carrying loads of grain which are being sent off for distribution by the Department to the farmers throughout the country. In the same way an accurate account of the work of the men on the farm should be kept from day to day. I think the foreman should also, at stated times, make up accurate accounts of the labor employed in each building and on each crop. I understand from private information that that is being done, but there is no indication of it in the report of the farm or in the Auditor General's Report. I will not elaborate that point any further; but there is another point on which I wish to say a few words, that is with regard to the buildings. I must say that while it may be, and I believe is the rule of the Government, that all public buildings should be under the Department of Public Works, I think it most unfortunate for the management of our experimental farm that the buildings of that farm should be under the control of another Department than that which has the control of the farm. I understand that the hon. Minister of Public Works has a large staff of officials who are better acquainted with building operations than the staff of the hon. Minister of Agriculture; but I venture to say that it is practically impossible for the architect and contractors under the control of the Minister of Public Works to satisfactorily carry out the needs and desires of those in charge of the farm, and I feel convinced that until a change is made in the mode of carrying on the building for the farm, you cannot avoid great extravagance and loss, and in many cases unfortunate mistakes being made in the building, which will entail further loss and mismanagement in carrying on the operations of the farm itself. I think it is one of the essentials of the successful carrying out of these experimental farms that the Government should so arrange it that the Minister of Agriculture and those who have control of these different farms, should be allowed to manage their own buildings, as well as their own operations on the lands. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the Department of Public Works, but we can quite understand that it is practically impossible for two Departments to have control of an arrangement of this kind and manage it as economically and successfully as if it were in the hands of one Department. It would be very desirable that not only the farm building at Ottawa here, but all the different branch farms should be under the control of the Department of Agriculture. The hon. Minister has spoken about the size of the farm at Ottawa. It may not be amiss for me to point out that when these farms were initiated, hon. gentlemen on this side protested vigorously against the large area being purchased, which was bought for the farm, and I think that what has been shown to-night and the words of the Finance Minister himself, clearly indicate that our advice should have been followed. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), a little while ago, talked about this farm as being practically a section of the wilderness which had been created into a farm. The hon. gentleman is not very far wrong. A good part of that farm was a section of the wilderness at the time it was bought, and, as a consequence, a very large outlay was required to make it into a farm. We regretted that the Government saw fit to buy a section in the wilderness. I think at present the difficulties are accumulating which arise from the too great size of this farm. If it is to be used as an experimental farm for experimental work, there is no difficulty whatever in carrying on such experimental work on a farm of less than half the size. Its size simply adds to the difficulties of those carrying on experimental work. They have to deal with a large area, and they have to do farm operations which are in no way experimental; they have to do what I may call the ordinary rough and ready method of farming in this part of the country, and while some of their crops are very successful as experiments, other crops have shown that they had more or less to

grow them for the sake of those experimented with, and the result has been that the whole farm is not up to the average. I believe myself if the Government had followed the advice we gave them, and have less than half the area they bought, it would have been a great deal better, and I regret that since then the Government bought large areas in other Provinces, where the same mistake will be repeated and the same difficulty in the success of carrying out of experiments will be experienced. In regard to the bulletins, I wish to endorse what the hon. members for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and Huron (Mr. McMillan) have said. It is essential these bulletins should be sent out as promptly as possible. Without wishing to criticise, I must urge strongly that in future, before the spring operations are commenced in any part of the country, a report of the last season's work may be laid before the farmers. Whatever was done last season should be reported upon, and a bulletin issued before the farmers commence their next season's work. The last year I am aware on the farm at Ottawa a series of experiments were made in the growing of corn for fodder and ensilage purposes. Those experiments will bring out results of great value to the farmers. It is to be deplored that those results have not been laid before the farmers before this period, so that they might base their coming operations on the results of last year. A great deal of work has been done, and there may be good and valid excuse for this not being done at this time, but I take this as an illustration of what may be aimed at in the future. If the results of the corn experiments were before us or had been in the hands of the farmers, they would more or less decide their course in the coming year in the growing of fodder and grain by the results of those experiments. Not knowing the result of those experiments, they can be of no use to us this fall, but only a year hence, and thus much valuable time is lost. I merely urge this so that the bulletins may come out so promptly as to help the farmer as soon as possible. In regard to the management of the farm, I wish to give full credit for all that has been done particularly. I do not wish to unduly criticise what has been done. I feel that a great and good work has been done and I feel very much interested in the success of the work, but I know a great deal more can be done to benefit the farmer by this work which the Department of Agriculture has undertaken, than has been done yet, and I hope measures will be taken to make it as efficient as possible.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If there is any one part of their administration of which the Government have a right to feel proud, it is the experimental farms. It seems to me that as regards the officials in charge, there is a happy mixture of enthusiasm in the pursuit of their various offices, combined with great practical common sense, which is bringing about the most beneficial results. It might possibly be found convenient that the bulletins might be in such a shape that they could be bound together in separate volumes apart from the report, as to put them in one report would make them too bulky a volume. I wish also to say that it seems to me that, in the operations of a farm, when you take the year's operation you ought to take the whole period which relates to one particular crop, and to do that, you ought to begin on the thirty-first of March and end the first of April of the next year. You then get the whole cost of putting in your crop, the cost of gathering it, and the use you make of it afterwards. It is necessary to begin in April and to end in April. Then you have the whole crop from the time you put the seed into the ground until you dispose of it. I think that would be the most satisfactory result which could be derived from these experiments.

Mr. ROWAND. This is a subject upon which I feel great interest as a farmer myself. I want it to be understood that any criticism I may make of the farm is not made in an ungenerous spirit, but we are bound to criticise these public institutions. I am very anxious that the farm should prove a success, and that, when I go to my people, I may be able to defend the large expenditures we are making upon it. There is one thing wanting in regard to this experimental farm which we want to demonstrate to the farmers of Ontario, and perhaps to the farmers of the rest of the Dominion. Our lands at this time are practically exhausted. We have followed a system of farming which has been ruinous. We want to demonstrate to the farmers that the farm can be brought back into a fruitful state without going out of the farm itself. I am told by men who have tried it that that can be done. If that is so, the experimental farm should be used to demonstrate it, and if that could be demonstrated, we might have hope for our country yet. I see there is a large expenditure for labor on this farm, about $12,000 last year. If I tell that to the farmers in the County of Bruce, they will think there is a great waste of money. I think, the Government might avoid that to a large extent. I think some of that money must have been expended on what we call permanent improvements. The Government are planting trees and experimenting with trees, and I have no doubt, that some of this was expended for that purpose. I think all that should be placed by itself, and that the ordinary expenditure on the farm labor should be shown by itself. I do not see why the farm should not take credit for the seed grain which it sends out. These seeds are worth a certain amount of money, and it requires a certain amount of labor to send them out; and, if these things were credited to the farm, I think the accounts would look better. In reference to the farm itself and the buildings, of course I am aware that public affairs cannot be managed on the same basis as private affairs. I have gone over the farm several times, and have examined the fencing and the buildings, and it appears to me that there has been a most extraordinary expenditure. If I go home to the farmers in Bruce, and they ask me to describe the buildings and their cost, which I certainly shall do, they will say that is a farce; you cannot possibly advise us to go into such a style of building and farming. If I advise them to raise fowls, they would ask me what it would cost to build a hen house. If I say it costs $3,000, they will reply that they cannot expend so much money in that way, that a farm with its buildings, hen house included, could be purchased for that amount. If there is not a practical man on the farm who knows something about building, I think such a man should be secured, because I know from my own experience of farm buildings that the buildings on this farm have cost twice or

perhaps three times the amount they would in my section of the country. It is in no feeling of hostility to the farm that I make these remarks, because I believe that, if it is managed judiciously and economically, it will do a great service to the country.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) gave great credit to the Government for the manner in which they have conducted this experimental farm. I do not see what right they have for so much credit. Certainly they have good officers. I do not think you could get a better officer in the Dominion of Canada than the present superintendent. But I want to know what credit is due to the Minister when Parliament has placed in his hands almost unlimited money to carry out this undertaking. Nearly $95,000 were expended upon that farm last year, and, if the Minister could not make a good showing with that amount of money, I do not know how much he would require in order to do so. I see, under the head of conservatory, three items—fitting up water main, heating apparatus and testing house—amounting to $1,252.98. It appears there is a conservatory there, and this is an extra expenditure upon it. I should like to know what is the total amount which this conservatory has cost.

Mr. CARLING. This is really the seed testing house, and part of the money which appears there was, I think, used in fitting up the laboratory for the chemist. Has the hon. gentleman been on the farm ?

Mr. KIRK. Yes ; but not this year.

Mr. CARLING. I think, if the hon. gentleman visits the farm and sees what has been done there, he will find that this vote is not extravagant.

Mr. KIRK. I did not ask the question in any fault-finding way.

Mr. FISHER. I think this shows how utterly unsatisfactory is the present system of book-keeping on that farm.

Mr. CARLING. We have detailed statements of all these matters at the farm, but we cannot get these details out at the end of the year. The report of 150 pages was the work of Mr. Saunders. In our books will be found the cost of keeping cattle and horses per head for each animal.

Mr. FISHER. The Minister will see that while there may be some excuse for last year's work not being in Prof. Saunders' report of this year, at all events similar accounts for the year before have not appeared before the public in any way. If the Minister would say that he intends in next year's report to report up to the last year, he will meet my views to a considerable extent, although even then I do not consider the answer would be complete. I think the books ought to be kept in such a way, as my hon. friend at my side suggested, as that at the end of the year the public might see what had been done. A few weeks' work of the accountant would be sufficient to make up such a report. It would not be the work of Prof. Saunders. I am not so unreasonable as to ask that every individual item of this expenditure should be laid before the country, but I think the report should be in such a form as that, if it is asked for, it could be obtained by the Public Accounts Committee for instance. I think that the results of the different experiments with their debtor and creditor accounts, and the balance at the end of the year, ought to be included in the annual report of each farm, and until that is done I do not consider that the result of the farm's work will appear so as to teach very much to the people of the country. Now, I would just like to supplement a suggestion made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who asked the Minister to begin his farm year on the first of April instead of the first of January. I have done a little farm book-keeping myself, and I would suggest that the Minister commence his farm year on the first of October, and not the first of April, because I have found that the season's work has to be prepared for the fall before, and that the real work for the crop of the next autumn, before that crop is sold, is about finished by the first of October of each year. Therefore, I think that in keeping the accounts of the farm, or of special crops, or special fields of the farms, it would be much better to commence the year on the first of October and end it on the 30th of September.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister in what position the farm at Nappan is now ? I notice in the Auditor General's Report there is a sum paid to Rhodes, Curry & Co., $10,540, on account of contract work. What was the contract for ?

Mr. CARLING. The Minister of Public Works, perhaps, is not prepared to answer that question, but I am told that the contract was for $12,000 or $13,000 altogether, for the barns, stables and houses that were necessary for the people working the farm. I believe that will complete the outlay.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I notice there is a credit to the farm here in the sale of cattle. I suppose these cattle were purchased and found not serviceable.

Mr. CARLING. No ; they were ordinary cattle purchased for the purpose of using the hay and roots grown on that farm, and for the purpose of making manure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At that farm we are not making experiments or distributing grain from it in the same way as from the Central Farm at Ottawa ?

Mr. CARLING. No ; I think not. They are selling any grain they have to spare, but they are not making any distribution.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The farm here, then, so far as expenditure is concerned, is about complete ?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And the results have been successful, I hope ?

Mr. CARLING. I think so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I had heard a good deal about the expenditure on the farm here, and I visited it. I was prepared to see a much more extravagant style of buildings than I found there. I thought the buildings seemed to be what was required, although the sum mentioned for the barns, $22,000, does seem a pretty large sum. I do not think the buildings themselves are at all more than is required. If there is any fault to be found I should be disposed to think that it was in the construction of those buildings and the way

the contracts were given. I was greatly interested in what I saw at the farm, and very much pleased with it. I suppose a great deal of the money spent in it does not show at present. I hope the farm will be successful, and I think farmers generally take a good deal of interest in it, and are watching very closely what it is going to accomplish.

Mr. FISHER. I would ask whether any further appointments have been made to the staff of the farm?

Mr. CARLING. No new appointments. Mr. Hilborn, the horticulturist, resigned and started a farm for himself, and Mr. Craig was appointed in his place. That is all, except the appointment of Mr. Robertson as dairy commissioner.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask what Prof. Robertson's duties are in connection with the farm; what position he holds?

Mr. CARLING. He holds the position of dairy commissioner, and also as agriculturist to take charge of the stock, and to consult with Prof. Saunders as to agriculture generally on the farms; also to deliver addresses in different parts of the Dominion on butter and cheese making, and to make himself generally useful in imparting information to people in regard to dairy matters.

Mr. FISHER. Does Prof. Robertson take charge of the other farms as well as the Central Farm?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. FISHER. I must say that it seems to me rather difficult if not impossible, for a gentleman who is so much called away from the Central Farm as Professor Robertson is, to deliver addresses and instruct the people on dairy matters all over the country, properly to attend to agriculture on that farm. When it was recommended to the Government to appoint a dairy commissioner, I know the Dairy Convention and those who were specially interested in dairying, believed the whole time of a competent dairyman would be completely engrossed in the dairy interest alone, and I am rather sorry to hear that Professor Robertson has any other duties at all except those connected with the dairying industry. I can quite understand that Professor Saunders' frequent absences from Ottawa in looking after the other farms, require that he should have some assistance in looking after this farm at Ottawa, but I hardly think that one who is so frequently called away as Professor Robertson must be, can properly look after a great deal of the work upon the farm outside the dairy branch of it. I regret to hear from the Minister that the dairy commissioner has any additional duties to perform. Did I understand the Minister to say that Professor Robertson's assistant had been appointed?

Mr. CARLING. Professor Robertson's assistant has been appointed; he is a Mr. Chapais, of Quebec. He is to act as assistant to Professor Robertson in furthering the dairying interests of the Dominion.

Mr. FISHER. I desire to congratulate the Minister on his announcement to the House. I am personally acquainted with Mr. Chapais, and his appointment I am quite convinced will be satisfactory to the French people of the Province of Quebec, for whose benefit, I suppose, chiefly his appointment has been made. Although I cannot speak perhaps authoritatively for the French people of that Province, I have seen enough of Mr. Chapais' work in that Province, and among his own particular people, to know that he is thoroughly competent to do the work which will devolve upon him as Professor Robertson's assistant; and his well known enthusiasm and experience in the dairy business, and his own practice and acquaintance not only with scientific but practical dairying in Quebec, will be of great value to the people there and to Professor Robertson and to the Department. I am very glad to hear that this appointment has been made. I hope Mr. Chapais will be able to devote considerable attention to dairying in Quebec in particular, but at the same time I trust Professor Robertson will be able to come to us there and give us, especially the English people, the benefit of his experience, knowledge and teaching. I am convinced that with the harmonious working together of these two gentlemen, and I am sure they will be able to work harmoniously together, we will be able to reap great benefit.

Repairs and working expenses, Intercolonial Railway..... $3,200,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the First Minister give us an idea if there is likely to be an understanding arrived at with respect to freight traffic over the Intercolonial? He told us to-day that they had not yet come to an understanding on this matter thoroughly. I desire to impress on him again the point of view which I submitted to him on a previous occasion. I quite understand the advisability, in fact the necessity, of having a uniform classification of through freights, but I thought the suggestion I made might meet the difficulty with which the hon. gentleman has to contend, and my suggestion was to preserve the classification on the Intercolonial for local freight through the Maritime Provinces and not disturb the existing arrangements. When you once disturb all the industries affected by a change of rates along the line you at once raise a hornet's nest which it is not easy to suppress. I make this suggestion in the interest of the hon. gentleman himself, as well as of the people who are going to be benefited, because I know the difficulty that will be met with in reconciling conflicting interests. Again, with respect to the Cape Breton road. That, I understand, will be finished this autumn. I should like to ask the First Minister whether he intends working that road as part of the Intercolonial Railway, or whether he is going to work it on a separate system, and what I consider to be an erroneous system, as is pursued with respect to the Eastern Extension. It would be much better to work the Cape Breton road as part of the Intercolonial system; and that, of course, the Government will have to decide when the road has been opened. Another point I have heard remarked upon is this, that there has been very extravagant expenses for stations throughout Cape Breton. In every small and unimportant place, I am told, the station buildings are unnecessarily expensive. I have heard from a dozen different sources, that merely way stations, requiring very small accommodation, have had very considerable amounts of money expended on them, more than, in the opinion of people able to judge, was necessary. Again, I desire

to enquire whether the cost of the bridge over the Narrows has not exceeded expectations? I am sorry to hear the foundations have been more expensive, and that they together with the bridge, were likely to cost more than was originally contemplated. It is desirable that we should be informed what is likely to be the cost of that structure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the first point, as to the classification: I think we must hold to the uniformity of classification, so that the Intercolonial Railway shall have, with respect to all matters of freight, the same classification as the other important railways in the Dominion. That, however, is one point. The other point is as to the freight rates for the different classifications. The hon. gentleman has truly said that that increase, in order to keep up to a certain extent the rates charged by the two great railways in Canada, has raised a hornet's nest about my head, perhaps arising from the rates being put into force too suddenly, but to-day we have been able to come to an arrangement which I think will be satisfactory to all reasonable men who use the Intercolonial Railway. I will be able to-morrow or the next day to lay on the Table the Order in Council showing the rates to be charged on the Intercolonial. With respect to the Cape Breton Railway, it is a Government railway and is a portion of the Intercolonial, and it will be run as such. The Eastern Extension stands on a different footing. Perhaps in time it may be thought well also to make it a portion, technically, as well as in fact, of the Intercolonial system.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why on a different footing?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was originally a different railway. As regards the expenditure on station buildings, I am not able to state anything with regard to those buildings just now, but I have a very great opinion of Mr. Schreiber's economy, and I do not think he would plan or suggest an undue expenditure on these buildings. The road, of course, is a national one, and not only in regard to its road-bed but also as regards its buildings and appointments, it must be equipped as a Government railway and as a national work. I cannot give to-night to my hon. friend any statement as to the bridge at the Narrows. I have not heard there was any failure in the foundations. It was known to be an expensive work when it was undertaken; it was known, from the depth of the waters and other causes, that it would be a matter of considerable engineering and architectural skill to build that bridge, and it was considered to be such an expensive work that it was a matter of doubt as to whether we should not have a steam ferry instead of a bridge. But, after full consideration, we came to the conclusion that the first expenditure would be the best, that the bridge once built would cost little or nothing, and it would obviate accidents of all kinds, which must be reckoned on in case there is a steam ferry running, accidents to which all vessels of this kind are liable. As regards these two points, however, the expense of the station buildings and the state of the bridge at the Narrows, I will get my hon. friend the information to-morrow if he likes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Can the hon. Minister give me any idea whether they are likely to make any expenditure in Halifax with regard to the extension of the road there, this season. The Minister is aware that there has been a good deal of discussion on that point, and an annual appropriation has been made for increasing the accommodation, either by securing lands opposite to the present railway terminus, or extending the system down to the wharves. I have been one of those who always thought that the extension to the wharves would be in the interests of the railway as well as in the interests of the public generally. The right hon. gentleman is aware that there has been considerable opposition to that by some of the wharf owners, whilst others have signed a document intimating that they are willing to transfer their property and give the right of way free. I gave that ground, for I believe it would be in the interest of the railway, and in the interest of the city eventually, if that course was adopted. I would like to get some idea from the Minister, if he could give it to me, whether the Government propose taking any step this summer to further investigate the matter, or to make the expenditure in one direction or the other. It is evident that some increased accommodation is necessary, and I hope this season will not be allowed to pass again without the Government arriving at some decision in the matter. I would like to know if the Minister's attention has been drawn to the subject. I am aware that during the sitting of Parliament he has not time to devote to matters of this kind, but I hope that when he happily gets rid of all of us here, he will consult his engineers to see if they can arrange to carry out this work at an early date, which is required in the interest of the city and of the Intercolonial Railway as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can assure the hon. gentleman that my attention has been already called to the matter. I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman, although I speak without any local knowledge of the subject, that the best plan for the trade of Halifax would be to extend the road across the wharf. One thing or the other must be done, and will be done if I have anything to say to it. Either the terminus will go down, as the hon. gentleman says to the deep water, or we must extend the road across the wharf. There is considerable opposition, as the hon. gentleman has stated, to this, and even this afternoon I got a very strong protest from one of the gentlemen who has property there, saying it would be ruinous to him if it were extended in that way. However, in one way or the other, the increased accommodation called for must be obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman got the receipts and expenditure of the Intercolonial up to 1st April?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have the statement up to the 1st March, and I am sorry to say that the results are very unsatisfactory. There was then a deficit of $416,000, if my memory is correct. I would like the hon. gentleman to give me the figures up to the 1st April.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will make note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the Minister sees that a question of great importance is arising as to the effect of these various cross-

roads on the Intercolonial Railway. If I am correctly informed, the probabilities are strong that in some way or other we will be forced to make a revision. Even, though as my hon. friend suggests, and as the Minister knows, it may be unpleasant to the customers, we shall have to make a revision of the charges on the Intercolonial Railway, because there is a certain point beyond which it is utterly impossible, I think, for us to go, in the way of supplying a service at less than cost. In connection with that, I should like to know what the policy of the Government is likely to be? We are just now beginning to experience the force of the competition of the Short Line. We will have probably a further loss of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, and further competition when the Temiscouata line comes into operation. The time is not inopportune for calling the attention of the Minister to it, and for revising certainly some of the tariff arrangements which are now made. In that connection it is very important to know what the receipts and expenditure of the road are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has seen the receipts and expenditure up to the 1st March. He will see that there is a falling off, but not a great falling off, since last year, and that falling off, as I take it, is to be attributed to the Short Line. However, it is marvellous to think that the difference between the time to Halifax *viâ* Chaudière and the Grand Trunk Railway and around by the Intercolonial Railway is only three hours greater than the time by the Short Line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But to St. John you will find there is a material difference.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no doubt about that. As regards the Temiscouata and Moncton line, that depends entirely on the future. But, of course, with the Short Line and the Temiscouata line—if the road is built from Temiscouata to Moncton, and down to Halifax—it looks as if the Intercolonial Railway would become merely a local road. It is very difficult, as I have already found out, and as the hon. member has alluded to, to arrange the rates so as to make them at all paying. The slightest change in the way of an increase raises a tremendous cry, but that, I suppose, is a fate common to all Governments.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How about the Harvey and Salisbury line when it is built?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will not interfere with the Intercolonial Railway so much as the Temiscouata line. I find that those who use the Intercolonial Railway exclaim most loudly against the slightest increase, but they are wonderfully silent about the numerous reductions which have been made in the past.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would just say, in reply to my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright), that, of course, it is a regrettable feature that the loss has been so much on the Intercolonial Railway, but my hon. friend must remember that there has been an equally large, if not a larger expenditure, on the canals of the west, and the First Minister has announced, lately, that the sum of $12,000,000 or $14,000,000 is to be further expended in deepening the western canals to accommodate the trade of the St. Lawrence, and to bring that traffic down to Montreal. It is not expected, under these circumstances, that we are to receive any direct returns, because I believe that the hon. Minister finds as much difficulty in dealing with the rates on the canals as he does with the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite as much.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And the right hon. gentleman is very often called upon to make considerable reductions to bring the traffic that way. Therefore, the Intercolonial Railway does not stand in an exceptional position. It stands in very much the same position as the canals, as it is for the general trade of the country. I believe it is of more benefit to the people of the west than to the people of the east, and the canals are entirely for the benefit of the people of the west.

Mr. KENNY. In confirmation of the last remark which fell from my hon. colleague, I beg to state that an examination of the freight carried over the Intercolonial Railway into Halifax will show that there has been a steady increase in the quantity carried from the west to the east, showing that the Intercolonial Railway is really of more use in developing the trade of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec with the Maritime Provinces, than it is to the Maritime Provinces themselves. There has been a great falling off, I regret to say, in the western-bound freight from the city of Halifax, which is largely due to the fact that the subsidised transatlantic line of steamers, the Allan Line, and also the Dominion Line, land all their westward bound freight at Portland. But we hope that the Government, when they make a contract for the transatlantic service, will insist that the steamers must make their terminal ports within the Dominion of Canada, which would very materially increase the traffic over the Intercolonial Railway. It has been pointed out that the residents of the Maritime Provinces have to bear their share of the taxes incidental to the development of our canal system, and we find no fault with that, because it is in the general interest. But it does fall harshly on our ears, when we are so constantly told as we are from the other side of the House——

Mr. JONES (Halifax). From both sides.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend will pardon me —especially from his political associates, that the Maritime Provinces are a great tax and a great burden on account of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. Now, the Intercolonial Railway has fulfilled its national mission; we could not have any national existence without it; and I hope, in the interest of the general trade of Canada, that the road from Edmundston to Moncton, commonly called the Temiscouata road, will be constructed, and that provision will be made for it by the Government.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to enquire of the hon. Minister of Railways if he has found any means for obviating the difficulty I mentioned to him the other night with regard to the delay at Truro of eastern-bound passengers and mails over the Eastern Extension Railway. I mentioned that the connections with the Quebec express from Quebec and the Halifax express going east from Truro were of such a nature that passengers and mails are obliged to lie over at Truro for 22 hours.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On hearing that statement, which was rather an astounding one, I

called the attention of the Department to it, and called for a report, which I hope to have.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not only the traffic on the Eastern Extension Railway that is delayed, b it all the passengers and mails for Prince Edward Island are in the same position, and it is a very serious matter. If I left here to go to Prince Edward Island, I would be just two hours late for the train that leaves Halifax in the morning, and there is no reason that I can see why that train should not be detained at Halifax until twelve o'clock in order to make connection.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I trust that the hon. Minister of Railways has heard something of the tremendous row that was made in St. John with regard to the rates of freight, especially those on lumber over the Intercolonial Railway. Some of these complaints were made in the paper which supports the Government. A number of shingle mills were obliged to close up in consequence of these high rates, which are practically prohibitory. Of course, there is a difficulty in consequence of the deficiency in the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway, which however, cannot be avoided. It merely shows that the Intercolonial Railway, from a commercial point of view, was put in the wrong place. Another complaint made is that everything has to be managed from Ottawa, which is a cause of great inconvenience. It would be better if the manager of the railway were stationed at Moncton, where parties could more conveniently make arrangements with the railway, and where it could be more efficiently controlled than at present, when everything has to be referred to Ottawa, a thousand miles distant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards the tariff on lumber, the rates are very much lower on the Intercolonial Railway than they are on any other railway which carries lumber; but I will repeat to the hon. gentleman that for the present, at all events, we have returned to the old tariff, in consequence of complaints that contracts had been made under the expectation that the tariff would not be raised; and also from this consideration that the timber in the Maritime Provinces is principally spruce, an inferior kind of wood which will not stand the same freight as the pine which is carried in the west. The tariff will be quite satisfactory with regard to the lumber. With respect to the management being at Ottawa, the management is at Moncton, and the whole of the everyday business is conducted by Mr. Pottinger, who is a very good officer; and although Ottawa is a considerable distance from Moncton, the telegraph annihilates that distance. Mr. Pottinger has large powers as a manager ought to have, and it is only in special cases he has to apply here. If a good deal of business is done here, it is because of the complaints that the officials down there were too independent, and that there was a contract offered to tender, but when it was opened the unsuccessful tenderers claimed there was favoritism, and perhaps other grave charges were brought. It was with a great deal of reluctance and in consequence of great pressure brought upon Mr. Pope, my predecessor, that all those matters were removed here.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would suggest to the First Minister, in view of the competition likely now to exist between the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether it might not be possible to have it understood that freight reductions could be arranged for. As an illustration, I might mention that a steamer arrived lately to my firm from Germany with a cargo of sugar for Montreal. The fixed rate over the Intercolonial is twenty cents, and rather than pay that, the steamer took it around to St. John and shipped it over the Canadian Pacific Railway for fifteen cents. Under such circumstances, special arrangements might be made by the Intercolonial rather than lose the trade altogether.

Mr. KENNY. It is a matter of competitive rates, and I understood my hon. friend the other night to argue that it was not in the interest of the Intercolonial to accept freight from the city of St John, at the same rate as is charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not if they lost by it.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. colleague must remember that these are competitive points, and that the Intercolonial, with its connections west, is bound to carry that freight at the rates at which the contract commences, and I do not think it is in the interest of the Intercolonial to lose that trade. I quite agree with the contention that it is the interest of the Intercolonial to accept the lowest freight rather than it should be diverted to another railway; and if my hon. friend's argument is good for a western it is equally good for an eastern-bound freight.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My argument with reference to the eastern-bound freight was as to whether it was advisable for the Intercolonial to compete for freight from St. John with the Canadian Pacific Railway if they had to carry at a loss. I am not suggesting the Government should carry freight from Halifax at a loss at all.

Mr. ELLIS. I was going to make a remark sympathetic with the First Minister. The First Minister may have another application from St. John, if it is found he is cutting Intercolonial rates in the interests of Halifax as against the port of St. John.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I draw the attention of the First Minister to an outrage committed on the city of St. John. A little map is published by the Intercolonial Railway in which they have ignored St. John and described Halifax as the Canadian winter port.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not only received one complaint, but several, from St. John about this map. Well, the map says the truth. It says simply opposite Halifax, "the winter port for mails, passengers and freight." It is a winter port for mails, passengers and freight. I am going to cure that by having another map issued by which, opposite the city of St. John, will be placed also "winter port for passengers, freight and mails, when they go there."

Prince Edward Island Railway..... $230,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman will give his attention to the remarks I made the other day in reference to a short branch on that road from Hillsborough. The matter is being very strongly pressed by my constituents, and I believe the branch, which would be only about 15

miles long, would be the best paying part of the Island Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we might better say the branch on which there would be the least loss.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There would be no increase in the rolling stock required, and there would be nothing but the cost of constructing the road through a very good country.

Rir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister has not given us any explanation of the increase of $25,000 in this vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a misprint. The expenditure last year was $245,000 instead of $205,000, as it appears here, so there is a decrease of $15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The expenditure last year appears to have been $247,000. There is no particular reason for taking estimates unless you can keep within them. I wanted to know why, when it cost nearly $250,000 in 1889, you are able to cut it down to $230,000 in the succeeding year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot state the reason at present.

Mr. KIRK. Does the Minister intend to build the Short Line Railway at or near New Glasgow in order to avoid the hills?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the fewer railways we build down there now the better.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have had enough money thrown away in the direction of New Glasgow.

Mr. KIRK. Does the hon. gentleman consider that the Pictou branch is to be utilised as a part of the Short Line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will have to answer that question on a future day.

Cape Breton Railway..... $110,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is expected that this road will be placed under traffic about the beginning of July next. It is rather difficult to make even an approximate estimate of the traffic. It is estimated that there will be expended on locomotive power, $22,000; car expenses, $16,000; maintenance of works, $16,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Those seem to be operating expenses, and not for equipment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is for the supply of locomotive power, I take it, as well as car expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Those are almost of necessity operating expenses, all of them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand the hon. gentleman, there would be a dead loss of about $45,000 to begin with, and a possibility, I hear, of its rising from time to time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot answer as to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have noticed on the Intercolonial Railway that as traffic rises the deficit increases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the traffic rises more expenses are incurred in carrying it.

Committee rose and reported progress.

TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. WALLACE moved third reading of Bill (No. 77) to amend the Act for the Prevention and Suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of trade.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will not object to the passing of the Act. I see the object the hon. gentleman seeks to attain is to enable workingmen to combine as craftsmen without being subject to the penalties of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE EXTRADITION TREATY.

Mr. MITCHELL. Inasmuch as the Extradition Treaty has passed the United States Congress, and one has also passed the English Parliament, I desire to ask whether that Extradition Treaty is now in force, and if so, where we can get a copy of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Extradition Treaty is now in force in this country, but it has not yet been transmitted by Her Majesty's Government to this Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ASSENT OF BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following notification from Government House:—

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
"OTTAWA, 21st April, 1890.

"I have the honor to acquaint you that the Honorable Sir William Ritchie, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 24th inst., at three o'clock p.m., for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present Session.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"CHARLES COLVILLE, Captain,
"*Governor General's Secretary.*

"The Honorable
"The Speaker of the House of Commons."

THE BREMNER FURS.

Mr. McNEILL presented the unanimous report of the Select Committee in reference to the furs taken from Charles Bremner, a Half-breed, residing at Battleford.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he is prepared to name a day for

the consideration of this report in reference to General Middleton ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must see it first.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, certainly; but is the hon. gentleman prepared now to name a day ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not now.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) to amend the Patent Act. He said : This Bill is intended to permit of leasing machines as well as absolutely selling them, applying the same principle here as has been adopted in England and the United States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CARAQUET RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, What is the amount of the gross earnings of the Caraquet Railway Company for the year ending 30th June, 1889 ? What is the amount of the operating expenses of said railway for same period ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The gross earnings were $18,210.16, and the operating expenses $27,409.23.

MILITIA CLOTHING SUPPLIES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Is it the intention of the Militia Department to continue the system of asking a few firms, by circular, for prices for militia clothing, and giving three years' contract with virtually no competition ; or do they intend to ask for tenders annually, by public competition, and give all who wish to compete a fair opportunity to tender for such supplies ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government intend to adhere to the three years' contract system. As to the second part of the question, I am not in a position to give an answer yet, as the matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

ONTARIO FISHERY OVERSEER.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Has the vacancy, caused by the death of the late James Greer, Fishery Overseer, in the Province of Ontario, been filled ? If so, what is the name of his successor ? At what date was he appointed, and what salary does he receive ? Is there any person named James Greer now in the employ of the Fishery Department.

Mr. COLBY. The vacancy referred to has not been filled, and there is no person of the name of James Greer at present in the employ of the Department.

THE BANKING ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman not going to give any explanation as to possible changes in the Bill, or are we to consider that the Bill as it stands is proposed to be put into force ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not any very extended observations to make with reference to the Bill, so far as contemplated changes are concerned. Discussions will, of course, arise on the separate provisions when the House is in Committee on the Bill. One change has been made, however, of sufficient importance, I think, to be entitled to notice at present, that is, with reference to the guarantee redemption fund. The House will remember, as I explained on the introduction of the Bill, that the proposition was to have a guarantee redemption fund, equivalent to 5 per cent. of the average circulation of the banks, of which 2½ per cent. was to be paid in when this Act came into force, and 2½ per cent. one year after that date ; and thereafter the fund was to be kept up to 5 per cent. of the circulation. Of course, the logical conclusion of that, and what would have been under the worst circumstances the practical conclusion would be that the banks would become mutual insurers of each other's circulation. If, for instance, after they had contributed 5 per cent. of their average circulation, one of the banks had failed, and its assets should not be sufficient to cover the notes, and the amount of the note issue remaining to be redeemed should absorb the 5 per cent. deposited, then the banks would have been called upon immediately to put up another 5 per cent.; in the event of other failures taking place sufficient to exhaust the second 5 per cent., the banks would be called upon for another 5 per cent.; and so on in that proportion. Of course, it is to be hoped that such a catastrophe will not occur in the financial experience of the country, and that no such extreme action will be rendered necessary by the state of business in the country and the consequent failure of banks. That, however, as I said, was the logical conclusion. The objections to that arrangement entertained by some of the banks were represented to the Government; and, after consultation, and a pretty thorough consideration of the representations which were made, I propose to change that provision in this way: The 2½ per cent. of the average circulation will be put up when the Act goes into force, and the other 2½ per cent. will be put up a year thereafter, making up the initial fund of 5 per cent. of the average circulation ; and in the event of the impairment of that 5 per cent. guarantee fund, the banks, instead of being asked to make up the deficiency at once to the amount of the failure of the realised assets of the failed bank to recoup the fund, will be asked to make it up in instalments of 1 per cent. per annum, making the payments extend over five years. So that the guarantee fund which will be first provided, over and above the securities we have at present, will be 5 per cent. of the average circulation. In the event of the failure of a bank, we will have that fund, and we will also have the double liability and the assets of the bank, with which to meet the circulation of the failed bank. And the impairment of the fund, to whatever amount it may be impaired, and to whatever amount the realised assets of the bank fail to make up the deficiency—instead of being put up at once by the other banks to the full sum, will be contributed in instalments extending over five years, at the rate of one-fifth per year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And at the end of those five years ?

Mr. FOSTER. The fund will then have reached its full 5 per cent., though certainly it may reach that proportion before that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Provided there are no failures before that.

Mr. FOSTER. If the assets of the failed bank are sufficient to recoup the fund to the full amount, then the fund comes up to 5 per cent. by that process of recouping from those assets.

Mr. BLAKE. There are to be no further contributions?

Mr. FOSTER. Not unless the fund is impaired.

Mr. BLAKE. Not beyond the second 5 per cent?

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that when the 5 per cent. fund is paid up, a bank fails, and that the realised assets of the bank are not sufficient to meet the impairment and bring the fund up to its full 5 per cent.—say by 1, 2 or 3 per cent.—then the banks, instead of making that up at once, will make it up by payments extending over five years, at the rate of one-fifth of the impairment each year. It will then be up to its full amount again. Suppose a failure again takes place and the realised assets of the failed bank are not sufficient to recoup the fund, the banks will again make payments at the rate of one-fifth a year until the full amount is reached.

Mr. BLAKE. And so on indefinitely?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is the chief change which I have to announce to the House. There may be some betterments that may be made in the different clauses as we consider them, and I ask the co-operation of the House in order to make these clauses as perfect as possible. I may mention here that there are two clauses concerning which very many representations have been made by the banks themselves, and by other parties who are not bankers. These are with reference to the audit and the item of unclaimed balances. The House will remember the discussion that took place, in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) participated, with reference to the audit and inspection. Now, what was proposed in this Bill was not an inspection and was not a Government audit but was a shareholders' audit and not an inspection. Well, very many representations have been made to the effect that this audit, being simply an audit and not an inspection, would not have the effect it was destined to have, of being really an efficient check on the management of the banks; and that, on the other hand, as it would be understood by the public to be an audit, it might have the effect of inducing a sense of security out of proportion to the value of the statement of the auditors themselves. In consideration of those representations, and with the view of not making any change, which we do not think would be actually beneficial and result in increased security of a decided kind, I have concluded to omit the section with reference to the audit. With reference, however, to the unclaimed balances, although there may be some alterations made in the section—and that is open to the consideration of the Government and the House—I propose to stand by that item in its essence, as a vital part of the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no intention of opposing the second reading of this Bill, but there is one point which appears to me of great moment, and to which I would like to call the special attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice and also the hon. the Minister of Finance, and indeed, the House generally. But, before I proceed to deal with that, Sir, I will just repeat what I understand to be the construction of clause 55, which it is proposed to amend. By that, I understand, that whereas, under the existing clause, as we have it here, banks are liable to the full amount of their means for the circulation, that maximum of liability is practically reduced to 13 per cent. of the circulation in the ten years during which their charters run. There is, first, the liability of 5 per cent. to be paid up during the two years. There is, thereafter, a further possible claim of 5 per cent. by five yearly instalments, and should that also prove insufficient, there will be a further claim for the remaining three years of the term, amounting in all to 13 per cent. during the ten years. If I am in error, the hon. gentleman will correct me, but I think that is the necessary construction from his remarks. As to the Bill in general, so far as the public are concerned, there are two points of special moment. The public, no doubt, are very desirous that our bank notes should be redeemable at par—the notes of all the banks of Canada all over the Dominion; and, so far as I can judge, although I reserve full right to discuss that item, and bearing in mind that we have already a Dominion note circulation of ones, twos and fours guaranteed by Government, I think that object is very fairly attained by the Bill. That, however, will be, no doubt, discussed in Committee. There remains, however, a second object of very great importance, the object which clause 55 was destined to carry into effect. With respect to clause 55, I think, as it stood, that it probably did give pretty perfect security, but at a risk so great that the banks were thoroughly justified in remonstrating against it. Now, with respect to that, I think, looking at the alterations proposed by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that it is probable the guarantee he now proposes will be sufficient in the case of banks doing business in an ordinary way. But I can see, and this is a question to which I want more especially to address myself, that, under existing circumstances, a very grave risk does exist where bank managers and cashiers attempt to practise a fraud on the public, and that there is no sufficient guarantee taken against that. It is for the Government to consider whether any means can be devised which will provide a sufficient guarantee against the particular fraud which, I think, may be practised under the provisions of this Act. Up to the present time, our note circulation has practically regulated itself in this way: It is, to all intents and purposes, impossible under our present system for a bank to get out more than a reasonable amount of circulation. The bank cannot put out its circulation to an unlimited extent at present, or, if it did, it would find it impossible to get parties to take it. But the whole status of bank notes is altered by the hon. gentleman's present proposition. The bank notes issued by the smallest banks in the Dominion are to be put on a par with the notes of the largest, the best managed, and the most solvent institutions. We have nearly forty banks in this country—I believe the exact number is thirty-eight. Many of these banks have a very small capital. I believe there is no serious risk in the propositions now submitted to us in regard to banks which are

managed in the ordinary way. In regard to banks which are so managed, I believe that the precautions taken will be sufficient, but I submit for the consideration of the Government and for the consideration of the House that, should cases arise in which two or three resolute, unscrupulous scoundrels were to get possession of a bank, it would be quite possible for them, under these provisions, to issue a circulation—not perhaps to a practically unlimited amount, as might have been done under clause 55 as it originally stood,—but a circulation largely in excess of what this Act permits them to do. No doubt the Minister will say that legal precautions can be taken against this difficulty, and that the men can be punished; but there is no guarantee at all provided against the case of deliberate fraud, and there can be no doubt that a very great temptation, a very great premium, is offered for the commission of such an offence by persons such as those who, in former times, got hold of two or three of our minor banks. Unless I am misinformed, in regard to some banks which failed recently, attempts were made to put a large amount of their notes in circulation, although the quantity was far below that which could be put in circulation under this provision. Many of our banks have a capital of only $200,000 or $300,000. It is not an unreasonable stretch of imagination to suppose that men of an unscrupulous character might get hold of those banks, and I cannot see any provision in this Bill, should those parties contrive to issue, say, two million dollars of their notes—and that would be about the maximum of the guarantee of 5 per cent. in the first instance—should they get that amount legally issued, I can see no means taken in this Bill to prevent it, and I believe the associated banks would be obliged to redeem those notes to the last penny. Of course, the parties who issued these notes might be prosecuted and punished, but that would be no consolation to the country or to the parties who are depending on this clause for the security of the note issue. I do not think there is any guarantee in regard to that, or that there is any possibility of preventing it under this provision, other than the punishment which might be inflicted upon the designing scoundrels who might be guilty of it. But the men who would be guilty of such an action would not be likely to remain in Canada in order to be punished, and these bank notes, as far as our guarantee goes, are made as good as gold, and, I believe, we would have to redeem them to the uttermost. I am not going to divide the House upon that point, at all events for the present, but I think it is one which deserves the serious attention of Government, and I do not see how such a proceeding is guarded against by any provisions contained in this Bill. I shall reserve any remarks in regard to the other clauses until we get into committee, but I think that clause does require very serious consideration on the part of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I was very glad to hear the statement of the Finance Minister in reference to the audit clause, because I am more than ever convinced that it would be practically illusory, and would, therefore, being a pretence of a protection which does not really exist, be very injurious in its operation. As to the point to which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) alludes; there is no doubt whatever that, to the extent to which you give an added security for the redemption of bank notes, you render possible the emission and the longer circulation of a somewhat larger quantity of that species of security. You render it possible for an obscure bank to issue notes in a remote part of the country with greater ease than it could to-day, and you also render it possible that these notes may remain perhaps somewhat longer in circulation than they now would. The natural course of commercial dealings will restore these transactions to their normal state. An excess of circulation will find its way back to the banks, and there will be a return to the normal state by their redemption. All the change which I can perceive in regard to the normal operations of our system, which is now being proposed, is that there are somewhat greater facilities given for the emission, in remote parts, of notes of an obscure bank, and possibly the keeping of them in circulation for a somewhat longer time than under the present system. My hon. friend has pointed out that there have been cases of abnormal issues when banks were *in extremis*, or when banks were desirous to increase the funds at their command by an excessive circulation, even though they were not actually *in extremis*. I fail to see how it is possible to guard against the deliberate fraud which my hon. friend suggested as possible. You have to balance the advantage and the disadvantage in cases of this kind, and you cannot give the public the security desired in regard to the issue and, at the same time, declare that if there is a fraud the notes will not be redeemed. It is only by a very vigorous application of stringent provisions of the criminal law, and perhaps by a more rigid supervision of the issue operations of the banks by the officials of the Department, that you can guard against that species of fraud. The other point to which the hon. gentleman alluded led him to make some remarks which I heard with some disappointment. The clause to which he alluded in reference to unclaimed balances, as it now stands, is, I think, of a very arbitrary and violent character, even if it were propounded in a Legislature which had a proper jurisdiction to deal with the people's property: but I regard it as objectionable from another point of view. This is not a proposal to tax, but it is a proposal to alter the devolution of personal property and to provide that, in such cases, there shall be a sort of escheat of personal property to the Government of the Dominion. I think that is an invasion of the just rights of the Provinces, and, though I admit the right of this Government to provide for taxation, I think the proposal so to alter the status of the private property of citizens of this country is a matter to be dealt with by the Local Legislatures, which are charged with the disposal of property and civil rights, and not by this Parliament.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). When the Government policy in the renewal of the bank charters was made known, I gave notice of an amendment to the effect that any bank which secured its note issues by a deposit of Dominion bonds with the Finance Minister, should be relieved of the necessity of contributing to the redemption fund, and I proposed this amendment because of the injustice to solvent and conservatively managed institutions which the scheme involved. I am glad to know,

therefore, that upon deliberation by the Government, that element of injustice has been, to a large extent, eliminated from the proposition. But the fact the Government had thought it necessary to bring in the security of 5 per cent., indicates that, in its opinion, the present bank currency is not adequately secured. The element of injustice still remains, to some extent, although, I grant, in a modified form. Now, Sir, the proposition which I intend to submit to this House will not, I dare say, meet with general acceptance, but I would like, with your permission, to support it with two or three authorities. The proposition is not a new one. It was introduced in the United States by the Secretary of the Treasury, in 1861, but long before that, in 1844, it had been incorporated with the banking system of England by Sir Robert Peel. As hon. members are, no doubt, aware, more than £16,000,000 of the notes issued by the Bank of England are rested upon the security of Government bonds, so that the force of precedent is in favor of a bond-based currency. Another objection made is that the system in the United States is now failing, that the National Bank currency there is rapidly disappearing, and, as a matter of fact, within the last ten or fifteen years, the amount of National Bank notes outstanding in that country has fallen from $360,000,000 to about $125,000,000. But the National Bank circulation of the United States is shrinking, not because there is anything inherently weak or wrong in the system, but because the Government, out of its excess of revenue, is so rapidly redeeming its bonds. That is a difficulty which I hope some day will beset us in Canada, but we are not likely to encounter it for the next ten or twenty years. Now, Sir, one of the strongest opponents of the bond-based currency system is the general manager of the Bank of Commerce, in Toronto, Mr. Walker, a banker of large experience in the United States and Canada, and of recognised eminence in his profession. In a pamphlet which he has issued to members of the House, I find that he uses these words:

"It must seem strange to leading financial authorities in the United States, that at a time when ex-Comptrollers of the Currency, such as Mr. Knox and Mr. Trenholm, are suggesting schemes to replace the National Currency, now secured by United States bonds, by some so-called National Currency secured in quite a different manner—in order to avoid the extinction of the National Banks—there are still people in Canada desiring to create a currency based upon a public debt."

Now, the authorities quoted by Mr. Walker, namely, John J. Knox, who was at one time Comptroller of Currency in the United States, and Mr. Trenholm, who, until a little more than a year ago, was Comptroller of the Currency, are, curiously enough, both strongly in favor of that very system. Only in the month of January last Mr. Knox was heard before a Committee of the House of Representatives on the subject of banking and commerce, and he was asked by one of the members of that committee, Mr. Wright:

"What is your opinion of a circulation based upon the capital and assets of a bank, without other security?"

And this was Mr. Knox's answer:

"It is said that an unsecured note issued by the banking institutions of the country, based upon the assets of the bank and the individual liability of the shareholders, would respond to the demands of business. If the volume was too great the notes would return home for redemption; if the volume was too small a greater amount would be issued. But if elasticity should be obtained at the risk of safety, the mistake would be irreparable. The currency of the State banks previous to the late war was said to be elastic, but unfortunately it was as elastic in value as in volume, and there is no danger of an unsecured bank currency being substituted for treasury or bank notes which are perfectly safe."

Now, that is testimony given only in the month of January last by one of the authorities quoted by Mr. Walker as being hostile to the currency system now prevailing in the United States. I could quote testimony equally strong given in his last report by Mr. Trenholm, late Comptroller of the Currency of the United States. But it will be said that experience in Canada has proved that our currency is amply secured. Since our banking system was established in Canada, only one case has occurred in which notes were not paid at 100 cents on the dollar, that is, the case of the Mechanics' Bank of Montreal, which failed prior to 1880. If the present provision of the law, giving note holders a preferential claim, had been in operation at that time, the note holders of the Mechanics' Bank would not have suffered the loss of one dollar. But the objection, as I take it, to our system is this, that while it gives elasticity, while it gives enormous facilities for profit to the bank, it does not give that security to the public which the public is entitled to have. Now, I doubt very much whether many people in Canada are aware of the fact that the banks are not required to hold one single dollar of reserve. In no other country of the world does so lax a system of banking prevail as in Canada, not so much as respects the administration of that system as the law upon which it is based. The issue of the Bank of England, over and above the amount of Government securities held, must be covered, dollar for dollar, by gold. The issues of the Bank of France are represented by $10 in gold for $12 of currency; the issues of the Imperial Bank of Germany are covered in the same way. In the case of the Scotch banks, upon which our own banking system has largely been modelled, the banks hold more than 70 cents in gold for every dollar in notes. In the United States, not only are the banks required to deposit Government bonds, to secure their note issues, but over and above that, they are required to hold in the cities 25 per cent. of all their deposits in gold or legal tender, and in the country and rural districts they are required to hold 15 per cent. of their deposits in lawful money. Look at the position in Canada as compared with the United States. On 30th September last there were 3,290 National banks in the United States, having liabilities, that is, deposits and circulation, amounting to $1,604,000,000; against which they held in specie, United States bonds and legal tender, $465,400,000; or they had in cash, 29 cents for every dollar of liability to the public, and their loans and discounts were only 60 per cent. of their total assets; while in Canada, on 28th February of this year, the liabilities of the banks were $154,400,000, against which they had in specie and Dominion bonds only $18,500,000, or 12 per cent. of their liabilities in cash, as against 29 per cent. in the case of banks in the United States. The percentage of mercantile loans to total assets in Canada was 75 per cent. It will be said, however, that the system works in Canada so as to develop our resources and

promote the commercial prosperity of the country. I dissent from that view. What, in my opinion, it does, is to foster and promote mercantile competition, rather than to develop the resources of the country, and if hon. members will look at the bank statements they will find that the tendency has steadily been, in periods of prosperity, towards a reduction of the reserves and an increase of the loans, until finally more sail is spread than the keel will counterbalance, a sudden contraction of loans is necessitated, and a commercial crisis precipitated. But I say more than that. I say that, taking the banking system of Canada as operated during the last fifteen or twenty years, it has never been fully tested, and I will tell you why. The reason is because the Government, the railways, municipal and other corporations have been constantly borrowing money abroad. The Dominion Government, during the last fifteen years or thereabouts, have borrowed some $200,000,000, the Canadian Pacific Railway have borrowed many millions, the Grand Trunk and other railways have borrowed largely, the Provincial Governments have followed the same course, as have also our municipal corporations, and the result is this, that by means of these loans the supply of foreign exchange has been kept up, the means of liquidating foreign mercantile indebtedness and of remitting interest on foreign loans, supplied, and a strain has not been put upon the banks that otherwise they would have sustained, while if we had been compelled to pay our foreign indebtedness out of the resources of the country the reserves of the banks would have been found utterly inadequate for the supply of exchange. To-day it is no exaggeration of the facts to say at least $25,000,000 have actually to be sent out of the country each year, either in the shape of goods or of gold or foreign bills for interest alone, in payment of interest on amounts borrowed abroad, and we know the amounts are not sent in goods or gold. We have been maintaining the equilibrium of the exchanges by securing these foreign loans, but the moment we cease to do so and we are thrown back on our own resources, we must necessarily fall into a condition which will expose the utter inadequacy of the present bank reserves. This was not the condition some years ago, when we had a less flexible and pliable currency system; before the period when the banks found it so profitable to establish agencies for the purpose of enlarging their circulation, before they got into the habit, which unfortunately is their habit now, of straining their credit to the very utmost, to carry as large an amount of loans as possible. In 1868, the banks held 35 per cent. of their liabilities to the public in coin, legal tenders and Government securities, whereas, to-day, including not only the legal tenders and the Government bonds, but adding also the net foreign balance due the banks, their reserves are only 19 per cent., the decrease being some 16 per cent. as compared with twenty years ago. In my judgment, and from what study I have been able to give to the question, I am satisfied, that looking at the experience of the past, unless our bank reserves are increased, there may be produced, at a comparatively early day, a serious financial stringency in this country. It was so in 1875. At that time, the Government had been borrowing largely for public works, from the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

period of Confederation down to 1874 or 1875; credit had been inflated in every direction, enterprises had been abnormally stimulated, our imports largely exceeded our exports, the balance of trade was heavily against us, and the way in which the position of affairs became revealed, was by the inability of the banks to meet the demands made upon them for foreign exchange to satisfy our mercantile indebtedness abroad. At the end of February, 1875, the banks were overdrawn in Great Britain and the United States to the extent of $5,300,000, whereas only two years before, in February, 1873, the banks had to their credit abroad $8,571,000; that is to say, they had exhausted $14,000,000 of foreign balances in the two years over and above the exports sent abroad during that period. Inasmuch as the Government do not see their way to enforce on the banks a better system of currency, it will be regretable if they do not insist on adequate reserves being held by the banks at all times against their liabilities to the public. Under the new law proposed by the Finance Minister, the existing system will not be improved one iota, because the banks will continue circulating their notes and holding a small reserve against them; indeed the position will be worse, because these notes will rest on the security of every solvent bank in the country; and the position, in my view, will be rather aggravated than improved, and the result can hardly fail to be most unsatisfactory in practical working.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not rise to discuss the question which has been raised by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), although I may express the hope that, if the proposition contained in section 55 of this Bill is adopted by the Government, the proposal of my hon. friend, or something nearly akin to it, will be accepted by the Government. I rather desire, at the present time, to express my want of confidence in the proposal of the hon. the Minister of Finance in this section of this Bill accomplishing the object he has in view. The object sought to be attained is to provide for the prompt redemption of the circulation of all banks in case of suspension or failure. That, of course, is a very desirable object, but unless we can make ample provision to secure it, I think it is better that we should leave the matter stand as at present. My first objection to this scheme is, that it is entirely inadequate to accomplish that object. The amount held in reserve, or supposed to be held in reserve, by the Government, 5 per cent. on the circulation of the country, while it would be sufficient to provide for the redemption of the circulation of any of the smaller banks, is entirely insufficient to provide for redemption of circulation in case of the failure of one or more of the larger banks of the country. There are at least five or six banks which, in case of failure, would entirely exhaust this fund, and then leave their notes only partially redeemed. There are other objections to this Bill. The element of injustice which it contains, and which has been referred to by the hon member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and the danger of fraud which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to—a danger against which I scarcely see any mode of providing at the present time, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has also said. There appears to me to be still

another objection to this proposition, and one which has not yet been referred to. The proposition compels all the banking institutions of the country to guarantee to a certain extent the circulation of other banks. Attention has been drawn to the fact already, that this obliges the larger banking institutions of the country to come to the rescue of the smaller banks in case of suspension or failure. It is a good feature of the proposition that it makes the larger banks responsible for the circulation of the smaller, to the degree provided for, at all events ; but it must be remembered that at the same time it makes the smaller banks responsible for the circulation of the larger. Now, in case one of the larger banks of the country—through over-speculation, or through any implication in any of the large commercial transactions into which the people of the country are engaged—should be obliged to suspend payment even temporarily, and the circulation of the bank were to come upon this fund, it would be exhausted, and the effect of that, to my mind, would be, to create a general panic among the banking institutions of the country. If this clause had remained in the position in which it was when the Bill was first introduced, that effect would be disastrous in the extreme. The inevitable result, in my opinion, would be, that every banking institution within the country would be compelled to suspend payment at once. These results may be, to some extent, modified by the changes which the hon. Minister has proposed to-day, but still, the danger is not yet removed. My own view of the position of the smaller banks is this : Their business is largely of a local character ; they depend for the continuance of their business upon the local knowledge of their patrons, upon the confidence which the managers, directors and shareholders of each particular bank have in the business of that bank ; and also upon the confidence which the creditors, the depositors and the persons having business transactions with the banking institution, have in the management of its affairs and in its power to meet its liabilities. Now, the effect of creating this joint liability is to introduce an element which tends to create distrust in the minds of the very best friends of every banking institution in the country. I may here remark that, where one bank fails, our experience in the past goes to show that many others are probably involved by the same causes, and may be obliged to suspend about the same time. The effect of having this liability forced upon the banking institutions of the country, a liability which the banks have no means of providing against, is to create distrust in the minds of the best friends of these institutions, and in time of difficulty, as we all know, every bank requires the help of its best friends. Those who are most likely to come to its rescue on such occasions, with the help of private means, or by the help of their credit, will be deterred from doing so, from the very fact that they have a liability over which they have no control forced upon them by the provisions of this Act. It appears to me, Sir, that this is a very serious feature in this proposition, and, as far as I am concerned, I regret that this principle has been introduced in the Bill. I do not propose to oppose the passage of the section, because I understand there is some arrangement by which the banks have accepted it ; but I still desire to express my opinion that it is a mistake in regard to the best interests of the banks themselves, as well as in regard to the business of the country generally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not propose to say anything on the question of policy, but one or two questions of a legal character have been raised, upon which, perhaps, I should say a word. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) called our attention to the inadequacy of the provision in the Bill for the restriction of illegitimate circulation, and he has already been replied to upon some of the points which he raised. I would merely mention in this connection, that a clause making it highly penal for the directors, or any of the officers of the bank, to issue more than the legitimate circulation, was drawn yesterday, and will be moved during the progress of the Bill in Committee. With regard to the constitutional question which was raised in relation to the legislation on the subject of "unclaimed balances," I should venture to hope that the view put forward by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is not one which, on reflection, he would be inclined to adhere to. I do not propose to enter into an elaborate discussion at present, but merely to say enough to show that the point has not been overlooked. I shall present in brief form, for his consideration, and that of all the other members of the House, the contrary view, which is one that, I think, can be sustained on a more full and careful consideration of the principle. The objection, that we are interfering, in claiming the "unclaimed balances," with the prerogatives and powers of the Provincial Legislatures, and virtually changing the devolution of personal property, seems to be based on the theory that this Parliament has no control over civil rights. The provisions of the Bill in that regard seem to me supported by the principle which is put forward on high authority, that we have power to deal with civil rights, and to deal with civil rights to the fullest extent, in so far as whole and complete legislation is concerned, in relation to the subjects over which this Parliament has jurisdiction. I admit that this is not a provision in relation to taxation, that it cannot be founded on any principle which gives this Parliament the right to tax the banks. It is a provision in relation to banks and banking, if it is a provision within our powers at all ; and this Parliament, and this Parliament alone, has the power to constitute a bank, to say what institutions shall carry on the business of banking in this country ; and, having that power, we have a right to say under what limitations that business shall be carried on from time to time, what rights the shareholders of the bank shall possess in its shares, what liability they shall incur, what limitations shall exist in relation to their transactions, and even in what manner the shares of the institution shall devolve, whether as ordinary personality or otherwise. We have a right further—as we have done in a number of statutes referring to important matters under our jurisdiction, such as works of a Dominion character, promissory notes and bills of exchange—to provide, even the civil procedure in our courts, for everything that concerns banks and banking. Although stating this in positive terms, I am not putting it otherwise than simply as a statement of

the view on which, I venture to think, the soundness of this provision can eventually be sustained, on a full discussion which we shall, no doubt, have upon it in Committee.

Mr. CASEY. I very much regret that the hon. Minister of Finance has not decided to adopt the suggestion frequently made in this House and in the press, that the Government should establish a truly national currency. The issue of currency of any kind is properly a function of Government, and is in no sense a necessary function of a bank. The true business of a bank, to put it briefly, is to deal in debts. Genuine banking business consists in dealing in debts which one person owes to another, the collection of which is carried on in a bank. To such an intelligent assemblage as this, I need scarcely elaborate that idea by pointing out in detail how a bank does deal in debts. Everyone knows that when a bank lends money on a business transaction, it buys one man's obligation to another, and takes the onus of collecting the debt and thereby making a profit. The lending of money by a bank does not in any sense involve the issue of currency by a bank. When we remember that no bank in England, except the Bank of England itself, has any power to issue notes at all, and that the Bank of England is, so to speak, merely a machine for issuing notes for which it has put up an equal amount of gold, we can see that the power to transform the bank's credit into currency is no part of the lending business of a bank. I say, to transform the credit into currency, for that is the power our Canadian banks have. They do not hold securities of any kind for their notes. They are not compelled to put up full security, even with the Government, for their notes. They are allowed to coin their credit, to turn their credit amongst a mercantile community into a currency which passes from hand to hand virtually as money for currency which passes without question is to all intents and purposes money. This is a privilege not possessed by any banks in Great Britain, nor by any banks in the United States. I cannot speak with such confidence of the banks of other countries; but in those two countries it is recognised that a bank has not a right to coin its credit and to issue a currency based merely upon its own credit, for that is what our bank notes are based upon. If the bank is not known to be solvent, its notes are of no value. The value of a note depends entirely on the public estimate as to whether the bank will be able to pay it on demand, as expressed on the face of the note itself. Now, Sir, I believe that the Government, which has a credit vastly greater than that of all the banks put together, should derive whatever advantage is to be derived from this coining of credit into currency. This principle is recognised in England. The Bank of England, although compelled to put up a sovereign for each pound, pays to the Government a very handsome sum annually, I think $200,000, just for the privilege of printing and issuing notes; and if, following our somewhat broader system here, notes are to be issued dependent almost entirely on the credit of the issuer, I think the advantage derived from that issue should accrue to the Government and not to the banks; and the right to issue currency upon credit should, consequently, be taken from the banks and be held solely by the Government of the country. We have,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

to a certain extent, utilised our credit by the issue of Dominion notes. I believe that no notes should be in circulation in the country except Dominion notes, or such as bear the direct guarantee of the Dominion, which would practically amount to the same thing. I have already explained to the House my views on this point in some detail, and I shall go no further in that direction than to say that I believe the best method in which the nation could avail itself of its credit would be by an issue of notes in the name of the Dominion, and directly payable by the Government of the country, though not issued directly by that Government, to the users of the currency. In other words, the currency of the country should be a Dominion currency, issued by the Government, and circulated through banks only. That is to say, I do not think the Government should have the power of printing notes whenever they think fit, and issuing them in payment for public works or for any liabilities of the country as such. In this respect I would restrict the present facilities possessed by the Government for issuing notes. The issue of notes by the Government in that direct manner is practically a forced loan without interest, because those who deal with the Government are compelled to take these notes, and by such acceptance of the notes, the Treasury practically effects a loan on which they pay no interest. Now, I do not think that is a wholesome power to be in the hands of any Government. It tends to foster extravagance in the undertaking of public works or other enterprises when the debt can be paid, for the time being, merely by the issue of paper. Of course, in the long run, our notes being on a gold basis, they must be paid in coin; and, therefore, our system allows the Minister who has control of our finances to incur at any time, lightly, debt, the payment of which may fall upon the Treasury unexpectedly, and when it will greatly embarrass the country to pay it. I conclude from these two lines of argument, that the Government should be the sole source of the issue, and the banks the only means of distribution of the currency of the country, and this currency being a national currency, being based on a promise to pay in gold, being based on the credit of the country, should be made a legal tender, payable as gold, on all debts and obligations whatever. The scheme devised by the Government to assure the security of note holders, certainly does seem as if in the long run, within a greater or less time after the suspension of any bank, it would secure the payment of all the outstanding notes of that bank; but I consider this scheme is one scarcely fair to all parties, and certainly not immediately efficient in maintaining the standing of the notes of a suspended bank. I say it is scarcely fair to all parties, because I do not consider it is absolutely fair to undoubtedly solvent banks to be called upon to contribute to a fund which shall be temporarily used at least for the payment of the notes of banks not able to redeem their circulation. I submit this is scarcely fair, although it is probable the bankers may have agreed to it, or else, I suppose, we should hardly find such an important proviso in the Bill. But it does not follow, because they have agreed to it, that it is a fair or the most effectual arrangement. It is quite possible that the banks might agree to something which they do not consider absolutely

fair because it is preferable to the introduction of a system which would deprive them of the right to issue notes at all. Very probably, if they accept this proviso, it is from some such idea as that. The banks, of course, wish to retain the power of issuing notes, and might probably agree to something which would bear rather hardly upon them in many cases in order to maintain that power. Again, it is provided that the notes of a suspended bank shall bear 6 per cent. interest up to the time of payment, whether that payment be made by the liquidators of the bank, or, failing that, by the Government itself out of the redemption fund. Of course this provision is based on the fact that the notes have become non-negotiable securities, and that the holders are practically out of their money until the notes are paid, and are, therefore, entitled to interest. But this 6 per cent. interest on the circulation of a suspended bank is a pretty heavy drain on its assets, and diminishes by that much the amount ultimately payable to other creditors of the bank. It is rather hard on those other creditors, that the bank notes which constitute a first lien should bear interest at 6 per cent., which interest must come out of their share of the assets. It is clear, if the Government issued or even guaranteed the circulation of the country, there would be no necessity for this 6 per cent. interest, for the simple reason that the notes of the suspended bank would never cease to be negotiable. No matter what might become of the bank, the notes issued by it and guaranteed by the Government would remain perfectly negotiable and could be cashed at any time, and there would be no necessity, and indeed, no desire, on the part of holders to cash them. They would be just as good after the bank failed as before, and there would be, therefore, no necessity to diminish the assets of the bank by paying this 6 per cent. When I spoke on my own motion with regard to this matter in the early part of the Session, I argued that the Government would be amply guaranteed by a first lien on the assets of the banks, in guaranteeing their circulation. This is true certainly of the banks as a whole, but might not be true of individual banks. It probably would be better, in every respect, if a scheme of national currency were devised by which the banks would be required to deposit with the Government a certain percentage of their circulation in the form of Government bonds; and I do not think the percentage would need to be large. I do not think that we need introduce the United States system of requiring a deposit equal to the amount of the circulation or anywhere near that. Probably 25 per cent. in addition to the first lien would make the Government perfectly secure in guaranteeing the note circulation of any bank. And the requirement of such a deposit of bonds would have another good effect, apart from obtaining absolute security for the notes and an absolutely uniform currency throughout the Dominion. Such a requirement would induce, and, in fact, compel the investment of a considerable amount of funds in Government securities, which would be thus held in Canada, instead of being sold abroad. Now, it is undoubtedly a great advantage, that our public debt should be held at home, and that the Government should be indebted to the citizens of our own country, instead of the citizens of foreign countries. That principle is fully appreciated in England, and in the United States, where the National Bank system has compelled a large, though, to my mind, an unnecessarily large investment, in the debt of the country. I will now leave the question of a national currency, with the simple repetition of the position I have taken, namely, that it is as much the duty of the State, and of the Government representing the State, to issue and secure the absolute soundness of all paper currency, as it is their duty to look after and monopolise the coinage of metallic currency. Every note allowed to be circulated in the country, should be as good as the metallic coin circulated, and should be under the same guarantee—the guarantee of the Government and the State. Regretting that this principle has not been appreciated by the Finance Minister, that he has not turned his great ability towards working it out in its proper form; regretting that he has had recourse to the old patch-work style of adding a few patches to this legislation, I will leave that branch of the question as to chartered banks. But I want to say, in addition, that there has been room for a long time for the introduction of a measure dealing with a smaller class of banks than those which are dealt with by this Act. I regret that the Finance Minister has not introduced a measure by which small local banks could be incorporated by letters patent, without special Acts passed in Parliament, and by which they might obtain, on the deposit of bonds or other securities with the Government, a certain amount of currency from the Government for local use. It is known to all of us who come from farming constituencies, that the farmers of the country, although most of them are amongst the most solvent people of Canada, are frequently in need of small amounts for immediate wants. They have no difficulty in borrowing $1,000 or $2,000 on mortgage, but they find it difficult to get $300 or $400 to use in harvest time, or at other times when they need small sums. The chartered banks object to deal with the farmer, no matter how sure they may be of ultimately receiving their money. They prefer to deal with the mercantile man, with whom they find they can turn over their money more rapidly than they could if they dealt with the farmer. This has necessitated the creation of a class of local banks throughout the country, who lend money to the farmer at whatever rates they can get a bargain made for. They put the farmer's note into the bank as collateral security, and get their own note discounted in order to carry on the business still further. The rate of interest obtained by these private bankers from the farmers is generally much larger than that charged by the chartered banks to mercantile men. They get from 12 to 15 per cent., and sometimes a great deal more. The local banker is thus a middleman between the farmer and the chartered bank. He gets money at about 7 per cent., and lends it to the farmer at 12 per cent., putting in the farmer's note as collateral in the bank. The local banker is simply a middleman, and his capital increases as a snow ball increases as it rolls along. Practically, it is the farmer's security which the bank holds for the loan, and yet the bank will not deal directly with the farmer, and the result is that the farmer pays an enormous commission to the private banker for acting as middleman between

himself and the chartered bank. He, therefore, probably has to pay twice as much as any man engaged in business in a town would have to pay to a chartered bank for similar accommodation. The same thing applies to small dealers in country villages who are unable on account of distance to deal directly with a chartered bank, and have to deal with the local banker instead. It appears to be quite unnecessary that the farmer or the local dealer should have to pay such tremendous rates for the money he borrows when his security is perfectly good, and if the present class of chartered banks do not care to deal with him directly, it would be easy for the Finance Minister—the present occupant of that position possessing such great abilities—to establish a class of banks that would be able to deal with this portion of the community. It might be that no local banker would be able to lend to the farmer or the small dealer at the same rate as a chartered bank can lend to a mercantile man, but still he could lend on reasonable rates which would leave him a large profit. It seems to me that something similar to the scheme which prevails in the United States, of national banks might be introduced in regard to these local banks, though I admit that system would not be applicable to the large chartered banks. If any individual, or any association of individuals, were to deposit in the hands of the Government, say $100,000 or $50,000, or any reasonable sum, and obtain letters of incorporation and were allowed to hold a certain amount of Government currency for circulation, there is no doubt such a scheme would be taken advantage of very largely throughout our country districts. Even in places where no one private banker had the necessary capital, two or three would join together and enter into the business. That would absorb a large amount of the issue of bonds representing the debt of the country, and would afford much greater facilities to the farmers than they now possess. They would not take away anything in the long run from the business done by the chartered banks, because all these smaller lines of business ultimately flow into the larger branches of commerce. Every dollar the farmer borrows and spends augments the business the merchant would do with the chartered banks, and the same thing applies to all other classes of the community. The farmer and the small dealer would get their money cheaper, and the country would be advantaged by selling a larger portion of its national debt at home. I hope the Minister of Finance will, before next Session, try to devise a scheme to carry out such a desirable result. I understand that the escheat clause of this Bill is to be so modified that it is not necessary to discuss it now, but I desire to join my protest with that of others against such a clause having been introduced at all, because I do not think the State has any right to seize upon any deposits or dividends, no matter how long they may lie in the banks. I received a letter to-day from the manager of a bank in St. Thomas, in which he said he had recently paid a deposit receipt which had been outstanding for sixteen years. The audit clause, I am glad to hear, has been abandoned, and as to the exact amount of the guarantee fund and other matters, of course, discussion will take place when we get into Committee.

Mr. CASEY.

Sir DONALD SMITH. When the hon. the Finance Minister brought down the resolution on which this Bill was founded, I addressed the House very briefly ; I do not intend to speak long at present, but I wish to say just a few words on the subject. I said then that I could not agree with the hon. gentleman that the proposition of 5 per cent., as it then stood, would be efficient, or would be of any benefit as a security in respect of all the banks. I think so now, and I doubt very much if the alteration made will have the effect of ensuring security in any way. On the contrary, while I presume it has been in a certain sense accepted by the banks as a compromise, I hardly think that the country will agree to the view that in having 5 per cent., and in having afterwards 1 per cent. to lean on, the public will have what will secure them against any important failure of any large bank, or of any two or three small banks. However, it is a concession, and one which I am glad to see the hon. gentleman has granted. As I said before, I should greatly prefer, and I believe the country also would prefer, that we had a thoroughly secured currency. I do not know but that the hon. gentlemen themselves, who think it desirable to make this proposition, may also be of the same opinion and that ultimately we ought to come to that. I give them credit for doing what they believe is best at the present moment, but, of course, there are differences of opinion with regard to that. Suppose that instead of honesty on the part of all the officers of the banks, we have in some one or more of those banks, cashiers or even some directors who may think that it would be well to make money honestly if they can, but to make it in any way, and that they may put foward at a certain time a great deal of money in circulation, far beyond what they are entitled to do, what is there to prevent them doing so? I would ask, could not that be done? Could they not put out bundles and stacks of their currency throughout the country at any moment they so desired? The hon. Minister of Justice has just told us that to provide against any such felony, for of course felony we all agree it would be, a stringent penal clause would be enacted. True, it is very well to punish those people, but in the meantime, where has that money gone? How are we to recover it? So that really I think in this respect we are not in a very sure or a very safe position with the 5 per cent. I am glad to know that the Minister of Finance has decided that we are not to have that audit, which it was supposed at one time would do so much good, and would be such a protection to the country. I feel sure that it would be anything but that; it would be a delusion, it would lure on people to suppose that that they had a substantial audit, while they were really having nothing but the appearance of one. As to the Government taking up all outstanding balances, I really think that is a point which we might well have left alone. Is it the case in England, or in any other country of Europe? Is it so in the colonies generally, or in any other colony except, I believe, one colony in Africa? Well, are we so much wiser, are we so much better accustomed to banking, or so much better acquainted with banking, or with finances, than those who have had to deal with these matters in England and elsewhere for so many years, that we

should wish to try this experiment? Are not those moneys safe in the hands of any solvent bank, and will they not be delivered up to the proper owner when called for? Is it not to be supposed that they will take every proper means of finding out to whom these moneys belong? I have no doubt that every good bank, every bank that is honorably conducted, has done so, and will continue to do so, and that they desire to keep no moneys which do not rightfully belong to them. Then, why find another set of trustees; and why, instead of leaving it always in trust as it is at present, should it be taken over by the Government in trust at all, as it is proposed now to do in a roundabout sort of way—I desire to say so respectfully—so that it may fall into the public treasury at length? Surely there has been nothing in the past in the conduct of our banks which justifies that policy. If we find that it is not so throughout the United States, if it is not so in any other portion of the world, with the exception, perhaps, of the Cape of Good Hope in Africa, must we ignore everything that has been done in every other portion of the civilised world and go to Africa to find means of imposing, what is, after all, a sort of penalty on the banks? If we do so, should we not also go to some of those countries to see what greater privileges are given to the banks than are given to them in Canada? Now, I trust that the sense of this House, and of the country, will be that we should continue in the future a system which has worked well in the past, and that we should not attempt to take from the banks that which we have no reason to believe they have not administered well in the past. I can conceive that it might be well, with respect to those unclaimed balances, that when a bank became insolvent, then they should pass into the hands of the Government, not to be lost to the shareholders, but that they should go to the Government to be taken to satisfy the claims of the shareholders. That, I think, would be equitable enough; but to take the amount from the solvent banks would, I think, be a very great injustice. However, as I said at the commencement of my remarks, I desire only to say these few words at present, reserving until the House goes into committee such further observations as I may have to offer.

Mr. KENNY. I was under the impression until I came into the House this afternoon, that the banking system of Canada was the best we could possibly have for the development of our country and for the advancement of our trade generally. To the faults found with our present banking system by some of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, I desire to refer for a few moments. One of those hon. gentlemen has made the objection that the banks have given enormous profits to their shareholders. In this Assembly are many hon. gentlemen who are shareholders of banks, and when they consider the double liability which attaches to their investment, and that the average dividend is only 7 per cent. per annum, I think it will be recognised that there is not much in that objection to our banking system. I was under the impression that our system was so nearly perfect, that in its revision, it would be only desirable to secure the greatest protection possible to the involuntary creditors, the note holders, and to make provision for the negotiation at par of the bills of the banks in all localities throughout the Dominion. That is eminently desirable, and that, I hope, will be attained by the Bill which is now before the House. The audit clause, I am glad to find, has been removed; but it seems that it became necessary to go as far as the Cape of Good Hope to incorporate a very objectionable clause in this Bill. I refer to the clause which contemplates the absorption by the Dominion Government of all unclaimed balances. The Bill as it now reads provides that at the expiration of eight years, those balances shall be taken by the Dominion Government. I do not know—I suppose we will hear in committee—whether unclaimed balances consist of current accounts only or if they also include deposit receipts, for which a deposit receipt has been issued and which is virtually a demand obligation on the banks. But, under any system, I think, it would be most unfair that the Dominion Government should insist upon appropriating to the Dominion Treasury those unclaimed balances. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in the course of his remarks, if I understood accurately the purport of his argument, endeavored to convey to the House the impression that the American banking system is a superior one to ours. The banking system of the United States, we all know was a war system, which was brought before the American public under very peculiar circumstances, and which, I contend, is in no way to be compared to our own system. The hon. gentleman referred to a statement made by Mr. Knox, lately comptroller of the circulation. If I remember aright in a speech which Mr. Knox delivered in Boston in the early part of the present year, that gentleman stated that a currency not based upon Government bonds, but based upon Government securities and specie, provided a better circulation than a circulation based solely on Government bonds. But it seems to me we must go abroad to receive from a foreign country the most emphatic approval of our banking system. I find in the leading financial journal of the city of New York, a very complimentary reference to the Canadian banks. It is as follows:—

"Incident to the renewal of the charters of Canadian banks which expire in 1891, there appears to be a disposition, in certain quarters, to modify the existing law in respect to circulation.

"Taking it all in all, the Canadian banking system as it now stands is a model of banking legislation. The law does not needlessly trench on the liberties of the banks, and yet it provides safeguards that amply protect the depositors and note holders. It has so far worked admirably for the convenience of the banks' customers and of the public at large. Its provisions relating to circulation have satisfied every requirement as to elasticity and safety. While the banks, on the basis of their present capital, have the power to issue about $60,000,000 of notes, the actual issues have ranged between the maximum of $36,000,000 and a minimum of $30,000,000; showing that the liberal powers of issue have been exercised with conservatism and have not proved a temptation to inflation. The entire freedom of the circulation to contact and expand in adaptation to the changing requirements of business has shown its beneficial results in a moderateness and steadiness in the rate of interest previously unknown; and no case of failure has occurred in which the note holders have failed to be paid in full.

"We know of no system that more closely conforms to the best and broadest economic ideals of banking: none better calculated to afford the largest possible accommodation: none better adapted to insure a safe utilisation of the surplus balances of the people, and none better qualified to supply the daily fluctuating wants of trade with a safe and convenient circulating medium.

"Under existing law, the notes are a first charge on the entire assets of the banks with the duplicate liability of the stockholders added; and just what that means in plain figures will appear from the following statement as for November 30, 1889:—

Assets created by paid-up capital	$60,190,000
Assets created by reserve funds or "surplus"	20,140,000
All other assets	172,650,000
	$252,980,000
Double liability	60,190,000
Total	$313,170,000

Then this New York paper goes on to say:

"The amount of notes outstanding at the same date was $34,900,000; showing that the circulation was only 11 per cent. of the amount of assets pledged as a first resource for its redemption. The note holders of Canada need desire no better guarantee than this; and if they are wise enough to learn from the unfortunate experience of their neighbors in mixing currency arrangements with treasury finances, they will never permit resort to any such vitiation of banking functions within their domain."

I think that is a panegyric upon the banking system of Canada, which goes far to meet the objections which have been raised by hon. gentlemen in this House. But it is evident that hon. gentlemen who contend that our Canadian system is inferior to the American system are not borrowers of money. If they were living to-day in Montana or Dakota and compelled to pay from 1 to 2 per cent. per month for money, while Canadians settled immediately north of those States borrow all the money they require at 6 or 7 per cent. per annum, they would then find there is a great difference between the American and Canadian system. But, Sir, some hon. gentlemen seem to imagine that there is great danger from the failure of larger banks, and others from the failure of small banks, and that the system which has been adopted with the concurrence of all the banks, of placing in the hands of the Dominion Government an amount of 5 per cent. upon their present circulation, as a safety fund, is inadequate to meet any difficulties which may arise in connection with the bank circulation. In my remarks I shall confine myself solely to the bank circulation, because I understand that the idea of the present legislation is mainly to protect the involuntary creditor. The article which I have just read from the United States financial journal points out the amount of our bank circulation, and the protection which we have for that circulation. I find that on the 31st March last, the circulation of our chartered banks amounted to $31,704,281, and now let us see what we had available to meet that circulation. I find, Sir, in the bank returns of that date, that we had on hand in specie, $6,128,388; in Dominion notes, $9,741,402; in Dominion Government bonds, $2,698,783; in Provincial, British and foreign bonds, $5,398,053, and there was a balance to the credit of the banks, due to the banks of Canada from foreign countries, of $10,393,027. From that item I deduct the amount due to foreign countries by Canadian banks, $193,921, and it leaves a balance of $10,199,106 in their favor on that one item. Now, these figures aggregate $34,765,732, or, we had in these assets, immediately available, and in the hands of the banks, $34,765,732 to meet a circulation of $31,704,281. I desire to point out to my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), who called our attention back to 1875, when the banks of Canada owed $5,000,000 to foreign creditors, to the fact that to-day, I am happy to say, the banks of Canada have

at their credit, in the hands of their foreign creditors, the sum of $10,199,106. The hon. gentleman may meet me by the statement, that money being cheaper in England than it is in the United States, the Canadian banks have gone to England to borrow money; but when I look at the bank returns of the 31st March, 1890, I find that the Canadian banks owed Great Britain $2,291,824, and there was due to the Canadian banks from Great Britain $1,841,256, leaving a balance of indebtedness by all the chartered banks of Canada to Great Britain of only $450,568. Now, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), instead of travelling back to 1875, had given us the condition of our banks to-day, I think it would be more satisfactory to the House. The opinion has been expressed by the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) that the proposed system of making a provision for the protection of the note holders will not be deemed satisfactory either by the House or by the country, and some hon. gentlemen expressed the opinion that whilst it might meet the difficulties in case of failures of small banks, it would be inadequate to meet any strain which would be imposed upon the banking system of the country, by the failure of any of the larger banks. Now, Sir, in order to inform myself on that point, I have taken the trouble to look carefully into the circulation of the five largest banks in Canada, excepting the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of British North America, and I find the following results:—

Merchants' Bank of Canada, circulation	$2,691,038
Canadian Bank of Commerce	2,596,102
Molson's Bank	1,558,618
Imperial Bank of Canada	1,328,232
Bank of Toronto	1,322,611
	$9,496,601

These are the largest circulations of any five banks in Canada, with the exception of the two I have named, and they aggregate $9,496,601. I have examined the assets of these banks, in order to see what they had to meet this demand liability, and I find that these banks, on the same date, held the following:—

Specie	$1,652,395
Dominion notes	2,898,619
Notes and cheques in other banks	2,105,070
Dominion Government stock and other debentures	1,329,747
Provincial, British and foreign bonds	1,149,248

I have examined the foreign indebtedness of these banks, and I find that the balance due to them in foreign countries, which, I assume, means principally the United States of America and also due to them from Great Britain, amounts to $794,595. Therefore, in these assets alone, which may be considered as cash assets, and largely immediately available, these banks held $9,929,674 to meet a total circulation, as I have mentioned before, of $9,496,601. Whilst the total assets of these banks amounts to $76,186,517, the circulation therefor is only 12½ per cent. of their total assets, and if you add to these assets the double liability for which the shareholders are responsible you aggregate an amount of $93,000,000, upon which the circulation only amounts to 10 per cent. But some of my hon. friends seem to be alarmed at the condition of the smaller banks, and for my own information —and I venture to trespass on the time of the House to read it—I have examined into the condition of the five smallest banks of issue in Canada.

I mean smallest in the matter of circulation. I have made this examination solely from the standpoint of protection of the circulation, and I find that the five chartered banks of Canada having the smallest circulation on the 31st of March last, are the following :—

Exchange Bank of Yarmouth	$ 50,387
Banque St. Jean	52,406
Commercial Bank of Windsor	81,132
Bank of Yarmouth	81,810
Banque de St. Hyacinthe	147,208
Total	$412,943

Now, I have heard hon. members of this House contend that the greatest danger to our banking system is the existence of the smaller banks of Canada, and reference has been made to the very small reserves some of these banks hold. I am not here to defend the banks which hold very small reserves. I consider such banking business illegitimate and irregular, very unwise and injudicious, and very unsafe for the shareholders of these banks, as well as for the general public ; but I do say, looking at the condition of the five smallest banks of Canada, that we need have no alarm as to their perfect ability to meet their circulation. I find the assets of these five banks, on the 31st of March last, to be as follows :—

Specie	$ 54,059
Dominion notes	64,494
Notes and cheques of other banks	32,623
Balances at credit of these banks in Great Britain and foreign countries	127,643
Dominion Government bonds	19,200
Foreign and Provincial securities	89,500
Total	$387,519

I am surprised further to find that there was due to those five smaller banks from other banks in Canada, $210,197. From this I deduct the indebtedness of these five banks to other banks in Canada, amounting to $4,142, leaving $206,055. This, added to the above total of $387,519, makes their total assets $593,574, or $180,000 in excess of their circulation. So that I state unhesitatingly that, with that condition of things—which hon. gentlemen can verify by the returns of March last—we need have no anxiety as to the safety of the circulation of our smaller banks. But applying to them the same principle as I have applied to the larger banks, I find that the total assets of these banks amounted to $3,602,089 ; so that their circulation is only 11½ per cent. of their total assets ; or if we take into account the double liability clause, their circulation is only 6½ per cent. of their total assets. Thus, the liability of these five smaller banks is actually less than the liability of the five large banks. Therefore, I hope that my hon. friends who had some misgivings as to the effect on the involuntary creditor of the suspension of a number of our larger banks or a number of our smaller banks, will realise that there is no good ground for alarm. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) thinks our present banking system fosters local competition. Well, Sir, I think that is eminently desirable. If we had not this local competition in our banking, we should have to pay a very much higher rate for our money than we are paying to-day ; and if we adopted the American system, which some hon. gentlemen recommend, Canadian merchants and farmers would have to pay a much higher rate of interest than they are now paying. There are other points in connection with this Bill with which we may have an opportunity to deal in committee ; but I contend that our present banking system is admirably fitted to meet the requirements of the commerce of our country.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is one of the most important questions that have been brought before the Legislature during the present Session. There is nothing on which the country more depends for its prosperity and success than a proper and judicious and safe banking system. We have got along very well with our banking system in Canada in past years. There have been occasional difficulties, but those difficulties, as they have arisen, have been removed every time the Banking Act has been renewed. Successive Governments have tried to remove friction wherever it has existed, either in the working of the banks or in regard to the security to the public for the involuntary indebtedness which people are bound to assume in accepting the notes of the banks, as they have had to do in Canada. I am sure this House must have been very much pleased at the able exposition of the present banking system, and the relative character and standing of the different banks, which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has given in the very able speech he has delivered. But, Sir, it appears to me that this question has thinned itself down to one single point, as between the banks and the public, or the Government and Parliament of Canada. As I understand it, there were four points to which, when this Bill was introduced, the banks of the country took exception, and the public also took exception. Three of those points have been removed. The concurrent redemption of the notes of all banks anywhere in the Dominion of Canada was very much desired, and was not provided for in any previous Banking Act ; but an arrangement has been come to between the Government and the banks by which that is provided for in the Bill now under the consideration of the House. There was nothing the country wanted more than that. If a gentleman from Ontario travelled to Halifax, he found that the notes of a Western bank were at a discount there ; if a gentleman from Halifax or St. John came to Montreal, he found a discount taken from the notes of the Eastern banks there ; if he went to British Columbia, he found 5 per cent. taken from the notes issued in Montreal, while in Montreal 5 per cent. was taken from the notes issued in British Columbia. The next point about which there was some discussion was the security of the circulation. We have had a fair security for the circulation of the banks in Canada in past years ; but I must say I think the Government have taken a reasonable precaution to give additional security to the country for the involuntary indebtedness the public have to accept from the banks in carrying on the business of the country ; and, as I understand, the banks have agreed to the terms the Government are proposing to the House on that point. I need not recapitulate the arrangement ; it is that 5 per cent. of the circulation of the banks is to be put up as a security in case of the failure of other banks. That is the point that concerns the banks more than the general public. What the general public have to deal with in this case is to see that the currency which they are bound to expend in the carrying on of the traffic

and business of the country is properly secured to them as in the ultimate result; and that is, I now understand, secured. Therefore, upon that point there is no need for any further discussion. Upon the next point, the different kinds of audit, I am glad to think the Government have settled that point. It is almost impossible to have an audit which would be thoroughly reliable. Take the case of some of our larger banks with thirty or forty agencies spread throughout the country, how would it be possible to have an audit. It would have to be done in one day in the different places, in order to have a perfect audit. It would be a mere delusion, and I am glad the Government have abandoned that proposition and have come to an understanding with the banks in relation to that. It is not a question the public are affected by, as the public are secured, and therefore need not care whether the audit is a perfect one or not. The last point about which there is likely to be some discussion, is in relation to these unclaimed balances. This is not exactly the stage of the Bill at which we should discuss that point, but while on my feet I may state my opinion about these unclaimed balances. I would like to ask, what is the object of the Government in seeking to take out of the hands of the banks in which the people have deposited money, the unclaimed balances for which these banks are liable? Is it for the purpose of revenue? I can see no other object. Under the securities which are now provided in the Act, these unclaimed balances are perfectly safe, and may be called for at any time. If it is for fear they will be outlawed, let the Government put a clause in the Bill providing that the statute of limitations shall not run against unclaimed balances in any chartered bank in the country. That will secure them on that point. If the Government think these balances are safer with them than with the banks, they have either given security to the depositors by the Bill, or they have not. If they have not they should do it. If they have, it is better for the public that the money should remain where it is deposited. Otherwise, after a lapse of years, a depositor or his heirs would have to come to the Government, and submit to interminable delays and expense before he could get what was due. I can see no possible reason for asking that unclaimed balances shall be absorbed by the Government, but I have been told the Government did this under the belief that it is the custom in England. I am informed, however, on good authority that no such custom prevails in England. It is true that where the English consols are paid as they are at the Bank of England, deposits are made by the Government of England in the Bank of England to meet these consols; if after a period of years any of these balances are unclaimed, the Government ask that these moneys shall be repaid to them. Is that a parallel case to the one the Finance Minister asks this House to assent to? It is not. In the former case, the Government are asking to have their own money repaid to them which has not been called for, and they are quite right, but in this case the Government are asking that the money of myself and others or our forefathers, if it be uncalled for in the course of five or ten years, shall be paid into the hands of the Government to become the property of the country. There is no reason at all for this except one, and that is

Mr. MITCHELL.

that the Government are short of revenue, and the amount of the unpaid balances is a sufficient object to make them enact a law of this kind, which I think would be actual spoliation, and I think this House ought not to agree to it. There is no parallel for it in any Government but the Government in Cape Town, in the south of Africa; and I think we are much more able to legislate intelligently as to the wants of the people than they are in a remote colony like that, and much more likely to know what is best in the interests of the country. This is a question the public is interested in, and I think it is not in the interests of the general depositors who may choose to deposit their money in the banks, that balances which may be left unclaimed should be handed over to the Government. We know that very often a man, on the birth of a child, may deposit $100 or $500, only to be called for when the child comes of age. Is it to be said that this money shall be paid over to the Government of the country, and the person entitled to it shall have to come and memorialise the Government and employ a lawyer, and be delayed probably from week to week before he can get his money? No; let us leave the money where the people deposit it. If it is not safe there, make it safe. If it is safe by this Bill, and the Government say it is, there can be nothing short of the necessity of raising some money which can induce them to submit such a proposition. I can see no object whatever in taking from the banks these unclaimed balances and passing them into the hands of the Government. I am glad to know that harmony is likely to prevail in relation to this Bill. We do not want unnecessary changes in our banking laws; we want to have safety and security and permanency established in relation to the currency of the country. We want to have our banking laws disturbed as seldom as possible; and if we find in the past we have had a reasonable amount of security and elasticity in the system established under our Canadian Banking Act, let us continue that system. Do not let us alter or haggle with so important a thing as the banking system. I, therefore, think the Government would do well, as they have agreed to three propositions, to agree to the fourth, and leave the unclaimed balances in the hands of the banks where they were originally deposited.

Mr. HESSON. I must confess I feel rather disappointed in the Bill presented. I think my opinions are pretty well known as to what would, in my humble opinion, be the best course to pursue in reference to granting to the chartered banks of Canada again the privilege of circulating their own bills. I am in favor of a national currency and a legal tender issue, and I hold most firmly that it is the duty of the Government to take that circulation entirely into their own hands. They have gone a certain distance in that direction; they have taken up the circulation of the ones, twos, and fours. Let them go a step further and take up the fives and the tens, and I believe that would leave very largely the circulation, at all events, in the hands of that class of people who suffer most from the failures of banks to redeem their circulation at a particular time. We all know well that no security could be so satisfactory to the people as that offered by the Government which should take the responsibility of issuing the circulation. The banks are in a perfectly sound

condition, and can easily put up securities in order to obtain all the circulation they require for the wants of the trade of this country. Possessing a paid-up capital of over $60,000,000, it cannot be difficult for them to acquire such Government securities, or other satisfactory securities, specie or 4 per cent. bonds, or any other satisfactory securities, in order to obtain all the circulation they need. Their present circulation, on a capital of more than $60,000,000, is about $34,000,000 or $35,000,000, which, I believe, covers the utmost wants of the people. If these banks cannot find means to put sufficient security in the hands of the Government to obtain a circulation sufficient for the wants of the business men of the country, there must be something very strange about their paid-up capital. It may be said that there are no Government bonds to invest in. Why, in the British markets to-day, they can obtain Dominion securities on as good terms as they can obtain any other financial securities in the world. What has been the result of the United States insisting on their national banks putting up similar securities in order to obtain the circulation? It has been to put up the price of the United States 4 per cent. bonds to 126. I would be satisfied that the Government here should issue dollar for dollar, that for every dollar issued there should be put up Government securities at 4 per cent. The Government security would be there to redeem that circulation at any time. Why should we not allow the banks to issue to the fullest extent of their capital, so long as the Government are satisfied with the security and it remains in the hand of the Government? The bank would be earning 4 per cent. on that amount so deposited, and it would be better to have that amount paid to the banks here than to those who are fortunate enough to hold our securities in Great Britain. I have here the report of the Fourth National Bank, which is one of the largest banks in the State of New York. It appears that their whole circulation is $180,000 upon a deposited security of United States bonds of $200,000. That is, 90 per cent. of circulation is obtained by the bank putting up one hundred cents on the dollar in Government securities. That bank, under its admirable management, has been enabled to do business amounting to more than twenty-four millions of dollars during the last year. In that amount I find discounts and time loans, $7,752,000; demand loans, $8,581,000; legal tender notes, $1,000,000, and gold reserve, $3,640,000. Now there is a bank carried on upon a gold basis. We boast of our banks doing business on a gold basis, and do not desire to disparage the standing of our banks, but the management has been such that I am surprised that more grievous disasters have not fallen upon this country, because of the way in which our banks have been compelled to carry on their business. Otherwise, when the business men of the country needed assistance, the banks could have come to the rescue, but the amount of reserves they were compelled by law to keep would prevent that. I have been asked to oppose the audit clause. Four or five requests have been made to me, by letter and telegraph from bankers in the west of Ontario, to oppose that clause. At first, I thought that it would be in the interest of the people and the bankers as well to allow the people to know the true state of affairs in each bank, but I think the bankers are themselves most likely to know the true state of affairs. We are aware that the banks have been compelled to make returns from time to time to this Government, and that serious disasters have often followed just after favorable reports have been made. I am, therefore, pleased that the Minister has thought proper to withdraw that scheme of audit as valueless and troublesome. In regard to the unclaimed balances, the same gentlemen who asked me to oppose the audit clause have asked me also, to oppose the clause affecting this question. I cannot agree with them in that respect. The banks have concealed from the public the fact that there are any unclaimed balances; but I am inclined to think, in consequence of the extraordinary efforts which are being made by the banks to have this clause eliminated, that there must be such balances and that they are desirous of retaining them. If these balances exist, there can be no wrong done in allowing it to be known. We know that they hold certain amounts on deposit, that they have certain amounts of reserve, that there is a certain circulation, and all other matters connected with the affairs of the bank are made known to us, but we have yet to hear that the banks have reported to any one that they held unclaimed balances. It has been said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) and others that these unclaimed balances are safe in the hands of the banks. My answer to that is a return brought down to this House showing fourteen banks which have gone into insolvency and have been wound up, and not one of those fourteen banks made any return, either to the public or to the Government, or even to the depositors, of their holding any such balances. It has never been known what has become of those unclaimed balances, and we have serious reasons to believe that they do exist, when the banks make such strong exertions to prevent the passage of this clause. I think it would be no disgrace to have it known that certain parties had funds lying there to their credit.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. HESSON. When you left the Chair at six o'clock I was referring to clause 89, with reference to unpaid balances. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) holds that they are at present in the hands of the very best trustees when they are vested, as they are, in the various banks of the country. Now, in reply to that, as I said before, I have the utmost confidence in the management of the banks, although we have seen some unfortunate wrecks occurring where all seemed, at one time, smooth and successful sailing. I have here a return of fourteen banks that have gone into liquidation, and it occurred to me that if they held unpaid balances, or unpaid dividends to stockholders, these claims might have remained for a number of years without having any applicant, and they were made over to friends of those parties who, perhaps, were dead and gone, and the banks were, at all events, none the worse in consequence of that unclaimed balance remaining in their hands. But they would have been unsatisfactory trustees for the friends and relatives

of the depositors, or those who might have considerable interest in the payment of those balances. The banks I refer to will be remembered by many gentlemen in this House. They are: The Commercial Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of Acadia, Liverpool, N.S., the Metropolitan Bank, Montreal, the Mechanics' Bank, Montreal, the Consolidated Bank, Montreal, the Bank of Liverpool, Liverpool, N.S., the Stadacona Bank, Quebec, the Exchange Bank of Canada, Montreal, the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, the Pictou Bank, Pictou, N.S., the Bank of London in Canada, the Central Bank of Canada, the Federal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown, P.E.I. Now, these banks were at one time flourishing and successful corporations, and had large paid-up stock; in many cases they had good prospects, but they proved in many cases to be unworthy trustees. Now, I hold that the Government are altogether better trustees than any bank corporations could possibly be. I have a communication from a bank manager, amongst a number I have received the last few days, in which, referring to clause 89, he says:

"As to unclaimed dividends and depositors' balances which it is sought to escheat, these are simply debts due by the bank to its shareholders and depositors, and no bank dare outlaw or plead the statute of limitations as a reason for non-payment."

It may be there is not a statute of limitations; it may be that they had not refused to pay their shareholders, and, so far as the shareholders are concerned, the Government should not interfere; but, so far as the depositors are concerned, and parties who were deeply interested through them, they may have suffered through men who may have had some peculiar notion as to the way in which they should provide for their families. Suppose a case of Smith depositing a thousand dollars to the credit of some member of his family, to be paid over as a marriage dower, or to some person when he or she becomes of age. The father or the friend has deposited that to the credit of a certain account, for a certain number of years, it may be ten or fifteen years before he thinks of interfering with it. The person who originally deposited the money may die before the end of the term, and it may be a matter that was known only to himself and the bank, no one else may know anything about it. At present there is no way whereby we can reach cases of that kind, because the banks hold they are not bound to disclose those things, that they are bound to secrecy so far as depositors are concerned; and that is perfectly right so far as general accounts are concerned. I do not know if any such cases exist, but it looks to me very much as if there were large items of this kind, when there is such a tremendous effort made to have this clause dropped by the Government. I trust that the Government will not drop this clause, notwithstanding that I have been canvassed against it by four or five representatives of banks, both by letter and by telegram. If the banks are safe trustees for the people, surely the Government are much safer still. Now, I wish to give some figures relating to the fourteen banks that we find by the returns of this House have become insolvent and wound up their business, showing that they were very bad trustees. I do not wish the House to suppose for a moment that I am referring to the management of the banks in general. These are special cases, it is true, but they are too numerous to be overlooked. As in the case of the Mechanics' Bank when it failed, the people are led to believe that these banks have reserves which make their circulation equal to gold at any moment. I will present the figures in reference to these banks in a tabulated form:

Bank.	Special	Dom. Notes.	Total.	Notes in Circulation.	Deposits.
	$	$	$	$	$
Mechanics'	1,171	1,317	2,488	168,132	253,000
Cons'ida'ed	16,750	13,159	29,909	537,039	1,013,000
Exchange..	1,718	5,022	6,730	380,218	1,715,000
London....	16,386	19,911	36,297	155,970	2,138,000
Central....	54,073	120,068	174,141	492,855	1,001,000
	90,098	159,477		1,734,214	6,120,000

Bank.	Stock Subscribed.	Reserve.	Stock Paid Up.	Dividend
	$	$	$	Per cent.
Mechanics'.....	1,000,000	.....	194,797	57½—57½
Consolidated.....	2,092,000	.....	2,080,920	Full.
Exchange.....	500,000	300,000	500,000	Full—64
London.....	1,000,000	50,000	241,101	Full.
Central.....	500,000	45,000	500,000	Full—86

The Bank of Prince E. Island, capital paid up.. $120,000
do do do liabilities..... 660,000

Now, Sir, any gentleman who has brains can calculate what that represents. It is just about three cents and a quarter on the dollar that they had in gold to pay these unfortunate bill holders and depositors, It may be said, and is said, that in the case of some of these banks the creditors were paid in full. In the case of the Mechanics' Bank they had a paid-up capital of $194,797 and they paid back 57½ cents on the dollar to the bill holders 57¼ to the depositors. The Exchange Bank paid their circulation, but they paid only 54 per cent. to depositors. The Central Bank paid their circulation in full, and 86 cents on the dollar to the depositors. But what I wish to point out is this: that when banks come to grief it is not the wealthy man who suffers but the poor man, the man who, perhaps, goes with his weekly wages to a store on a Saturday night and then finds that the bills he has received for his week's wages are worth only 30 or 40 cents on the dollar. Some speculator, however, is ready to buy them at that figure, and he holds them until they realise par. This is an unfortunate state of things, which the Government would avoid by taking the circulation into their own hands. I hold, and I shall maintain it if I stand alone, that the Dominion Government has the right to endorse every dollar of the circulation, and not only so, but that every bill should be a legal tender for all purposes. At the present day any one can refuse to accept a bank bill, because he has heard rumors in regard to the bank or he does not approve of its management; there is no law to compel a man to accept a bank bill. I do not care how good the basis for the circulation may be, there may be doubts as

to the position of a bank, and in distant portions of the country, and abroad also, bank bills are refused except at 4 or 5 per cent. discount. As I have shown, the specie and Dominion notes held by five of the banks, when they closed their doors, would not pay three and a quarter cents on the dollar. I maintain this would have been avoided if the Government had taken up the circulation of paper money. We have at present a Dominion issue, and no one will deny that that is the best circulation, for the banks to-day esteem it as a gold reserve. When discussing this question before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on 16th January, 1890, Hon. J. Knox, late Comptroller of the Currency, said:

"Owing to the rapid reduction of the circulation the banks have had on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States since July, 1880, not less than $20,000,000 in gold, for the purpose of retiring their notes. Since 1st January, 1886, the amount so held has not been less than $42,000,000, and since 1st May, 1886, not less than $61,000,000. From March, 1887, to March, 1888, the amount was over $100,000,000, and since that period it has at all times exceeded $70,000,000, which large sums on deposit in the Treasury, without interest, have been of great service to the Government in maintaining gold payments."

Thus Mr. Knox points out that there is on an average $70,000,000 of gold lying at the credit of the banks which are entitled to issue circulation. I have pointed out that the Fourth National Bank of New York only had $180,000 of their own circulation, but they did a business of $24,000,000, and they had $4,000,000 of gold in reserve. If the Government would take the circulation into their own hands the whole country would be better off, and the people would feel more confident in regard to the circulation, and the results would be altogether more satisfactory. The American banks, notwithstanding what has been said about their reducing their circulation, have been able to accumulate large quantities of gold, and they find it cheaper to take the gold and lock it away than to buy American securities. The banks have only the right to issue 90 cents on the dollar on the amount of their paid-up capital, and they refuse to invest in Government 4 per cent. securities, for which they have to pay a large premium as high as 26 per cent. I believe the United States Government have been considering the propriety of issuing bonds at 2¾ and 2½ per cent. instead of 4 per cent. The country and the Government would reap great advantage by the Government taking the circulation into its own hands, and I maintain that the banks would then be in a position to lend money when the people require it most. It is well known to business men that when the time of depression comes and you need the aid of the banks, you fail to obtain relief. They have plenty of paper money, and you will take it and give them the best security that could be offered. Yet they are not at liberty to give you discount, no matter how good the securities may be, for the agencies of strong banking institutions pick up the circulation and demand that it be redeemed in gold. Thus the banks cannot keep out their circulation. If such a change were brought about here banks would be able to work up to their full limit of $60,000,000 circulation, instead of being limited to $30,000,000, and accordingly the banks would be better off and the whole people would have the advantage, which is now deprived them, of a circulation at a much less rate of interest than at present, because they are obliged to hold $10,000,000 of legal tender notes and $6,000,000 in specie, or $16,000,000, which are locked up and don't earn a dollar. That is done in accordance with the terms of their charters. If the banks had greater freedom in some respects it would be better for the country. I am sorry the Finance Minister has not gone so far as I had anticipated, but it may be the dawning of a better day. No doubt young men will live to see a legal tender issue by the Government, and I hope still the Government will take further steps in that direction. The late Finance Minister, I think it was, went a considerable distance in that direction. He first took up the issue of ones and twos, and then of fours, and I hope the present Finance Minister will yet take up the issue of fives, and then of tens, and in this way the result so much desired will be accomplished.

Mr. WALDIE. In the discussion that has taken place on this question, the attention of the House has been drawn to the character of the circulation in the United States, and several commendations from the ministerial side of the House as to that system of banking have been made. I am quite satisfied that the system of banking in Canada is preferable, for the people of Canada and for the commerce of Canada, to the system of the United States. I am very much pleased that an arrangement has been made, and will be embodied in the Bill we are now discussing, by which the objections to our circulation have been removed. The objections to our circulation were that the holders thereof could not convert it at all points throughout the country. This having been removed, and the banks having come to an agreement with the Minister of Finance on the subject, I think that our circulation is in one of the best positions that the circulation of any country could be in. It has pliability, it can be increased when the large quantity of products in this country are being marketed. It has greater power of expansion than has the circulation of a currency based on the deposit of public securities, which is limited in its amount, and the disadvantages to the Government are not so extensive as the House would be led to believe by the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who favor national currency. In our circulation of $30,000,000, there is at least 30 per cent. held as a loan made to the Government upon which no interest is being paid. Against the $30,000,000 or odds at present in circulation, the banks are lending the Government about $9,000,000 without receiving any interest. They are carrying Dominion notes locked up in their treasury, which are Government circulation, and which are not used, and the Government have the benefit of that money in consideration of the privileges of circulation the banks have obtained under their charters. In order that every one may feel that the circulation is based upon safe principles; in addition to the 30 per cent. of the Dominion notes, the banks are carrying 20 per cent. in gold, and an additional sum in other Government securities, so that there is really over 50 per cent. of available assets in gold, Government notes, and Government securities represented, as against the circulation. When the banks have agreed among themselves to redeem the notes of other banks, I think that everything has been done in that direction that the

country demanded, and I think that the Government deserve credit for having succeeded in meeting the proper and right demands of the country in this matter. I do not think any danger will arise to the larger banks from this arrangement which has been entered into. Five per cent. upon our present circulation is a million and a-half dollars, and there are only three banks in the whole Dominion which each have a circulation exceeding a million and a-half. I do not think that any danger will arise from this in the near future. The protection afforded being satisfactory to the banks, I believe it ought to be satisfactory to the country also. Then as to the banks themselves. The House should remember that a bank which tries to force its circulation beyond the proper extent is immediately met by the other banks taking that circulation and returning it whence it was issued, and drawing against it for exchange or gold. It is only during the period of the transmission of that money that the risk is run of the larger banks suffering by the over-issue of the smaller banks. Now, with regard to the dangers of an over-issue, I have listened to the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House on this subject, and I do not think there is much danger of an over-issue, but against any possible danger that may arise in this direction, the Government have provided very severe penalties—I think unreasonably severe penalties. I have confidence in the management of our banks as a whole. They are not only safe to obey the law of the land in the amount of circulation, but they are also safe custodians of the deposits that have been placed with them. I think it would be unwise on the part of the Government to disturb the custody of these deposits in these banks, and I believe that the proposition to do so has not been called for. A statement has been made that it was at the request of the Montreal Board of Trade that provision is introduced; that unclaimed balances should be appropriated by the Dominion Government. As against that proposition I have in my hand, and I will read it to the House, a resolution passed by the Council of the Toronto Board of Trade, which takes an entirely different view of this matter. It reads as follows:—

"*Re* UNCLAIMED BANK DEPOSITS, DIVIDENDS, &C,

"TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE,
"COUNCIL MEETING,
"26th February, 1890.

"Moved, seconded and resolved: The attention of the Council having been drawn to the resolution passed by the Montreal Board of Trade in April, 1889, calling for legislation to compel all corporations, individuals, trustees, executors, &c., to send legal notification to the address of any person to whom such corporation, individual, trustee or executor, is indebted, of the amount due to such person, if the account between the parties has remained unchanged for three years, and to compel such corporation, individual, &c., to advertise in the newspapers of the place where the account between the parties was opened, of the existence of such indebtedness, and to compel returns to be furnished to the Government of the particulars of such indebtedness. This Council is of opinion that any such legislation would seriously interfere with the privacy of contract, would disclose the confidential relations between institutions and their depositors whose accounts often remain unchanged for a long term of years, would lead to encourage claims being made by impostors, would entail unnecessary expense upon the parties interested, and is not a matter falling within the legislative powers of the Dominion Parliament. This Council is further of opinion that no such legislation as has been suggested be granted, and order that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Finance.—Carried."

This resolution was carried by the Council of the Board of Trade of Toronto, and is in direct opposition to the resolution that was carried some time ago without discussion by the Montreal Board of Trade. The Montreal Board of Trade intended their resolution to apply to all unclaimed amounts and balances, no matter in whose hands they were, and was not intended to apply to banks alone. I believe that the banks, having been made the custodians by the depositors, are entitled to retain the custody, at least, until some more substantial reason is given against the principle than a casual resolution passed by a Board of Trade. There are other reasons against this provision. There is no such legislation in England nor in the United States, as has been stated, and these are two countries which are referred to very frequently in our legislation. In addition to this, it is looked upon as an assumption of power by the Government of this country, and gives to the legislation of this country a degree of instability which should not attach to it. I hold in my hand a newspaper published in the city of New York, the *Mail and Express*, dated Wednesday, April 16, which has an article with the following heading:—

"A Canadian grab—The outrageous Banking Act introduced to Parliament—A scheme to rob the people—It provides that all deposits remaining unclaimed after three years shall be turned over to the Minister of Finance for the public uses of Canada—The depositor might recover it later if he had great luck."

After quoting the portions of the Act bearing on the subject, the article says:

"LOOKS LIKE SPOLIATION.

"This seems to be an attempt at downright spoliation on the part of the Canadian Government when they enact that, after so short a period as five or eight years, they should seize unclaimed dividends and deposits 'for the public uses of Canada.' The joint stock banks of England and Scotland, some of which date back nearly two hundred years, hold all such moneys sacred, and no Government of Great Britain has ever dared to seize any so-called 'unclaimed' funds. The United States Government have never made any such demand on their banks, and, in fact, Congress would never allow such a measure of spoliation to pass, being the guardians, as they are, of the rights of the people.

"It is known to many officials of the old New York banks that claimants or heirs of old deposits or dividends will now and then appear, after from ten to fifty years or more have elapsed. The banks and people of Canada are likely to stoutly resist any such attempt at spoliation as that quoted above. The Canadian Government, whose high credit is undoubted, is inconsiderate to suggest such an enactment, as it damages its own good name by seeming to resort to such devices to raise money. The depositor who placed his money in a good bank for security and interest would find it no easy task to recover it if, after a few years, he found it had been appropriated 'for the public uses of Canada,' as the Act so benignly puts it."

With the exception of this provision for appropriating uncalled for deposits and dividends, I will support the measure now before the House. In the course of this discussion, some unfair criticisms have been made of our banks, with regard to the proportion of their liabilities to their securities. I may say that it is possible to make that proportion appear greater than it really ought to be, by taking large deposits made on Government account at certain periods, and taking the returns of the bank at those periods, and drawing an unfair comparison between them. I think it is more reasonable to trust the banks of Canada

with the monetary affairs of this country than to load on the Government further responsibilities and duties in that respect. The Government now have the responsibility of levying on the people nearly $25,000,000 to meet the interest on the public indebtedness, and I am afraid that if trade does not improve, they might, if they took any further control of the finances of the country, cause greater stringency than at present exists. I trust that the Banking Act will be shorn of that clause to which I have referred, and will be adopted by the House.

Mr. COCKBURN. I regret to observe on this side of the House a disposition to regard as unsatisfactory the present monetary system established in Canada. For myself, I know no system of banking better adapted to the wants of a young and growing country—none which could have so well kept pace with its rapid development, and none which is better suited to still further promote that development. The banking system of Canada is based to a great extent on that of Scotland, and I think it will be acknowledged on all sides that while in England, in France, and in Germany there have been commercial convulsions which have torn those countries asunder, Scotland has been well guarded against similar attacks. We have been referred, strange to say, from this side of the House to the United States, as the country from which we might get an example of a monetary system, which we might wisely follow. Now, Sir, I have taken the trouble to look into some points connected with the United States banking system, and I desire, in the few remarks I have to make, to confine myself mainly to this aspect of the case. I find that as far as the percentage of gold or legal tender is concerned, we need not trouble ourselves much about the comparison. To a banker the important question is not the percentage which he may hold of gold or legal tenders, or both, but the question in his mind really is how readily he can convert his assets; and when you see the form in which our banking assets are held, as was shown by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) this evening, you will concede that every provision has been made that a Government can make, for the immediate and secure redemption of any notes issued by the banks. When a Government has gone the length of securing that every note issued by a bank shall be paid in coin on demand, it has gone the length of its duty; and in my opinion the less the Government interferes with the banks after it has secured that object, the better for the banks and for the commerce of the country. With regard to the United States system, I do not think any person in that country occupying a prominent position in economic science now holds that that system ought to be retained any longer than is necessary to replace it by some so-called national currency secured in a quite different manner, far less that it ought to be considered worthy of being adopted in any other country. It was the creature of the distressing circumstances of the great civil war, a state of affairs which I trust we shall never see in this country. In 1862 there existed some 1,500 banks chartered by the various States, all more or less weak, and all unable to support the Government in the dire crisis of the civil war upon which they had entered. The result was that the Government themselves were compelled to find the sinews of war and to issue $400,000,000 of legal tenders and a much larger sum in bonds. The legal tenders were put out at the same time that the 1,500 banks had their notes out. The result was that in the conflict between the greenbacks and the notes issued by the banks, the banks were, perforce, compelled to suspend payment. When, in 1863, Secretary Chase and President Lincoln formed the present banking system in the United States, if you can call it a banking system, it was not with the idea of establishing a permanent system adapted to the commercial wants of the country, but to save the life of the nation by forcing the issue of the new national notes. A currency should be the outcome, not of the wants of any Government or of the supreme demands of the war department in a special crisis. Such crises must be met by the particular devices of the time. A currency ought to be the outcome simply of the commercial wants of the country, and be commensurate with the volume of trade; it ought to represent the flux and reflux of trade; it ought not to be in the form of a solid, immovable mass, as you find it in the United States, so that at times when the trade rises to a certain point it is utterly impossible to obtain enough money at any price; but it ought to be founded, as our Canadian system is, on the expansion and contraction of the trade of the country. When Secretary Chase brought forward this measure, he found that if they were to carry on war against the Southern States, they must have the means at their command; and accordingly in 1863, this system was devised. He attained his object by the new bank circulation based upon Government bonds, and the system of fixed money reserve. The assistance thus afforded the Government may be seen by the fact that in 1866 the national banks held no less than $200,000,000 in legal tenders and over $330,000,000 in bonds. And what amount of specie, of which we hear so much as being the basis of this system, had they to guarantee this issue? Why, to maintain those $530,000,000, they had only $9,000,000 specie. As far as actual cash held by the banks can be taken as an evidence of strength, we can bear comparison with any other country. The proportion of specie and legal tender to liabilities in the United States is about 12½ per cent, leaving out the legal note issues; in Canada, the proportion against all liabilities, including note issues, is about 10 per cent. In England the reserve of cash, including cash balances, is only 10·30 in the ordinary London banks; in some of the city banks they have only a cash reserve of seven, and in others it is as high as fifteen. But the average actual gold reserve held in England is said to be much less than 10 per cent. The question may be asked: why is it that in Canada we have so small a gold reserve? Well, that is a question I leave the Government to answer. The Government have taken from the banks already ten million dollars in gold; that is to say, the banks have paid ten million dollars gold and received in return ten million pieces of paper called legal tenders or Dominion notes. On these notes the banks are not receiving a dollar of interest, while in the United States, the banks receive a certain per cent. return on their deposits with the Government, in exchange for the legal tenders issued to them. In Canada the banks are handicapped to that extent that they have given about ten million dollars gold supposed to be lying in the Dominion Treasury, for which they have received ten million dollars legal tenders,

and at the same time there are in circulation, in the smaller denominations of ones, twos, and fours, some five million dollars. If the banks had not been compelled by the Government to put up these ten million dollars, they could now have in their strong safes over ten million dollars of gold. Some one has spoken of the large profits obtained by Canadian banks. There are no banks in the British Empire so weighted down, in one way and another, as the Canadian banks. Let me read to you from the *Bankers' Magazine*, how matters stand in Great Britain. I find that the aggregate deposits in the British banks reached no less a sum than $3,000,000,000, and that these represent in proportion to the aggregate capital and surplus profits 5·95. That is to say, that the deposits in the banks in England amount to at least six times the capital and the surplus, or they are about nine times the amount of the paid-up capital. How is it in Australia? There the aggregate capital of the banks is $83,750,000, and the aggregate deposits $683,000,000, so that the banks hold $8.15 in deposits for every dollar of capital they have subscribed. This is taken from the *Bankers' Magazine* of August, 1889. In the United States, I find from the Comptroller's accounts of 1889, that the aggregate capital of the banks was $612,584,000, and that the proportion of the deposits to the capital is $3.10 to every dollar paid up. How is it in Canada? We have $60,200,000 of aggregate bank capital, and our proportion of deposits is only $2.19, or 2⅕ times. Yet, still we have those weights put upon us, loading us down, of payments having to be made in a manner out of capital, before we can touch any profits. Let us never forget that all restrictions upon banks are taxes upon the public. Well, what have the profits been? I find from the Comptroller's report of the United States National Banks that, during the year 1889, they paid dividends averaging 8 per cent. Our Government returns show that the Canadian bank dividends have averaged 7·11. If I put together the statements of the leading banks of England, including the Bank of England, I find the average dividend is 12·79. Leaving out the Bank of England, the average would be a great deal higher, as the Bank of England is the central depot for the reserve of gold, and it is obliged to keep a much larger gold reserve than the others. The highest dividend paid by any American bank was 100 per cent. last year. The highest dividend of any Canadian bank was 12 per cent., and of any English bank of which I have any knowledge 20 per cent. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Hesson) held before us a paper, showing the failures which had taken place in Canada since Confederation, and which he had extracted from a return submitted to this House. But I read a different story from that return to that which the hon. gentleman gave us. I see in it signs of encouragement. What do I find? I find that since Confederation there have been thirteen banks which have more or less failed. Nine of these have failed, and four of them have gone into voluntary liquidation, but I find that every one paid its note holders in full, with the exception of the Mechanics' Bank, which paid only 57½ per cent., and it would have paid the note holders in full had the prior lien on the assets then existed, and the same precautions taken then with reference to the management of banks which are taken now. With reference to depositors, I find every bank paid in full with the exception of the Mechanics' Bank, which was in existence before Confederation, and it paid 57½ per cent., while the Exchange Bank paid its notes in full and 64 per cent. to the depositors, and the Central Bank of Toronto, which is still in liquidation, has already paid its notes in full and 86⅔ per cent. to depositors. This is a record of which we may well be proud. When we turn to the United States, which have been held up to us as an example, what has taken place there since 1863? The total number of national banks organised since the 5th February, 1863, is 4,148, of which 3,319 are now in operation, 829 having disappeared from the national system. These are accounted for as follows:

Passed into voluntary liquidation to wind up their affairs	542
Passed into liquidation for purpose of re-organisation	79
Passed in liquidation upon expiration of corporate existence	79
Placed in hands of receivers	130
	830
Less restored to solvency and resumed business	1
Total passed out of system,	829

Thirty-eight of these have been reorganised. With reference to these banks which have failed since 1863—three years before Confederation—what are the returns? The note holders, of course, were paid in full, because the Government held the securities put up by the banks. But, how were the depositors treated? With two exceptions, the depositors in Canada were paid in full. In the United States, since the organisation of the National Banking system 130 banks have failed thereunder, paying dividends to creditors—not to shareholders—as follows:—

Banks Failed.	Paid Div'd.	Banks Failed.	Paid Div'd.
49	100 p.c.	4	58 p.c.
1	99	2	57
1	98	1	51
1	96	3	50
2	95	1	49
1	93	1	48
3	90	1	47
2	89	1	46
1	88	4	45
1	85	1	44
1	82	1	42
2	81	1	41
1	80	4	40
1	79	1	39
1	78	2	38
1	77	1	35
1	76	1	34
2	75	1	30
1	74	1	28
1	73	1	27
1	70	2	25
2	68	1	24
1	67	2	23
1	66	1	20
1	65	1	17
1	64	1	15
1	63	2	Unreported.
1	62		
4	60	130	

That should be sufficient to show that we ought to be content with the system which has been so signally successful in Canada, and that we should not feel any temptation to fall back on a system which has produced such a result in the United States in so short a time. Here is a return of insolvent National Banks showing the progress of liquidation during the year ending the 1st November, 1889, with the dividends paid to the depositors in each case:

DIVIDENDS paid to Creditors of Insolvent National Banks during the past year, with the total dividends in each case, up to 1st November, 1889.

Name and Location of Bank.	Date of appointment of Receiver.	DIVIDENDS PAID DURING THE PAST YEAR.			Total Dividends paid Depositors.	Proportion of Interest paid Depositors.
		Date.	Amount.	Per cent.		
			$ cts.		Per cent.	Per cent.
Lowell National Bank, Lowell, Mich....	Sept. 19, 1888..	Dec. 1, 1888..	35,893 25	40·	40·	
do do ..	.....	April 20, 1889..	45,166 57	50·	90.	
First National Bank, Auburn, N.Y.....	Feb. 20, 1888..	Dec. 17, 1888..	76,597 04	10·	35·	
do do ..	.....	Feb. 19, 1889.	39,433 51	5·	40·	
do do ..	.....	Mar. 27, 1889..	39,542 18	5·	45·	
State National Bank, Raleigh, D.C.....	Mar. 31, 1888..	Dec. 20, 1888 .	31,072 50	10·	30·	
do do ..	.....	Feb. 16, 1889..	32,307 45	10·	40·	
do do ..	.....	June 3, 1889..	16,303 23	5·	45·	
Second National Bank, Xenia, Ohio....	May 9, 1888..	Dec. 29, 1888..	68,387 16	20·	100·	100·
First National Bank, Corry, Pa.....	Oct. 11, 1887..	Jan. 31, 1889..	43,502 61	25·	75·	
First National Bank, Buffalo, N.Y.....	April 22, 1882..	Feb. 5, 1889..	4,473 45	·50	43·50	
Peoples' National Bank, Helena, Mont..	Sept. 13, 1878..	Feb. 12, 1889..	1,189 72	·7285	40·7285	
First National Bank, Bozeman, Mont...	Sept. 14, 1878..	Feb. 12, 1889..	403 65	·575	98·925	
National Bank of Sumter, S.C.....	Aug. 24, 1887..	Feb. 18, 1889..	15,067 86	20·	100·	
Lancaster National Bank, Clinton, Mass.	Jan. 20, 1886..	Mar. 22, 1889..	34,316 25	20·	90·	
do do ..	.....	Oct. 15, 1889 .	17,158 07	10·	100·	
First National Bank, Livingston, Mont.	Aug. 25, 1884..	April 1, 1889..	5,264 41	20·	95·	
Henrietta National Bank, Henrietta, Tex	Aug. 17, 1887..	April 20, 1889..	12,502 75	10·	100·	100·
California National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.....	Jan. 14, 1889...	April 27, 1889.	292,882 23	65·	65·	
California National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.....	.....	Aug. 31, 1889..	45,182 71	10·	75·	
Pacific National Bank, Boston, Mass...	May 22, 1882..	May 3, 1889..	47,942 14	2·	57·	
Mechanics' National Bank, Newark, N.J.	Nov. 2, 1881..	May 10, 1889..	129,678 95	4·885	66·135	
do do ..	.....	June 22, 1889..	33,694 58	1·27	67·405	
Fidelity National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio	June 27, 1887..	June 15, 1889.	388,280 84	10·	35·	
Hot Springs National Bank, Hot Springs, Ark.....	June 2, 1884..	June 29, 1889..	3,285 50	9·	100·	100·
Fifth National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.....	Nov. 15, 1887..	Aug. 5, 1889..	108,601 75	10·	90·	
First National Bank, Albion, N.Y.....	Aug. 26, 1884..	Oct. 1, 1889..	109,959 22	28·50	28·50	
Richmond National Bank, Richm'd, Ind	July 23, 1884..	Oct. 8, 1889..	7,317 23	2·	73·	
First National Bank, Anoka, Minn.....	April 22, 1889..	Oct. 14, 1889..	21,040 68	30·	30·	
			$1,706,447 49			

If you compare these statements in any way you please, you will find that, as far as the note-holders and the depositors are concerned, the position in Canada is far better than the position in the United States; and, therefore, I deprecate hon. gentlemen asking us to adopt a system which has produced results so bad in comparison with our own system, which is an admirable one, and is founded upon the Scotch system which has weathered many a commercial storm. Then, look at the manner in which our banks, which are few in number, are disseminated throughout this country. We have only thirty-four or thirty-five banks in Canada, but they have, including head offices, about 420 branches, which are spread throughout the length and breadth of the land, though they are under the control of the powerful central institutions, so that the same rate of interest is practically charged from one end of the country to the other. On the same securities that you can obtain money in Toronto at 6 or 7 per cent., you can get it beyond the Rocky Mountains at about 1 per cent. more. In the United States it is very different. Looking at the rate of interest during the last nine years paid for money in New York I find that the result has been this:

Year.	Lowest Rate.	Highest Rate.		Equal in Percentage to	No. of Weeks in which Excessive rates Prevailed.
	P. cent.	P. an'm	P. diem		
1st half 1880...	2	6	1/365	52	10
2nd do ...	1½	6	1/365	144	5
1st half 1881...	2	6	1	371	4
2nd do ...	2	6	1/8	52	12
1st half 1882...	2	6	1/8	52	5
2nd do ...	1½	30	.....	30	13
1st half 1883...	1	25	.....	25	9
2nd do ...	1	6	.....	6	.....
1st half 1884...	1	5	3	1,100	2
2nd do ...	½	4	.....	4	.....
1st half 1885...	½	4	.....	4	.....
2nd do ...	½	10	.....	10	1
1st half 1886...	1	9	.....	9	3
2nd do ...	1	10	½	192	19
1st half 1887...	1	6	¼	97	16
2nd do ...	2	10	.....	10	13
1st half 1888...	1	6	.....	6	.....
2nd do ...	1	10	.....	10	1

It is urged that these excessive rates are very seldom paid, but it cannot be denied that this table shows that they prevailed during portions of

113 weeks out of 468 weeks, or during about 25 per cent. of that time. It may be said that these high rates were charged to stock brokers, but generally stock brokers offer first-class securities, and those are the amounts which they had to pay. I ask if any such fluctuating money market as that has been found in the history of Canada. Such a fluctuating market as that is enough to derange the whole commerce of the country. There is nothing stable or settled about it. It is here to-day and there to-morrow. I hope, therefore, that hon. gentlemen will be careful to go through the figures which I have placed before them, and to see if these offer a ground for supporting the system which they advocate. We have now a system admirably adapted to meet the demands of the country by providing for contraction and expansion. We know that large demands for money are made at certain times by the community on the banks for the purpose of carrying lumber, produce, cattle or wool or other products of the country, and there is comparatively no difficulty in consequence of that, but in the United States, with the solid iron wall which has been erected there, the banks are unable to meet those increasing demands, while our admirable system, based on the Scottish system, enables us to meet all these crises, so that they pass quietly over us, and we are almost unconscious that they have existed. With reference to the proposal that the Government should appropriate the unclaimed balances, I regret to say that, while I am at one with the Minister of Finance in the general scope of the admirable Bill which he has presented to us, I cannot agree with him, that these unclaimed balances should, at any time, be appropriated by the Government. The Bill says that after a certain time, these unclaimed balances shall be paid by the banks to the Minister of Finance and Receiver-General on behalf of Her Majesty, and shall be appropriated for the public uses of Canada. I could understand that the Government might, in strict legality, take the position of trustees of these unclaimed balances and might occupy the same position that the banks now hold, but that the Government should actually appropriate these sums for the public uses of Canada, and expend them on public buildings or canals, and should place me in this position, that, if I wanted to have my money after a certain time had elapsed, it would be necessary for me to go to the Treasury Board, hat in hand, and beg them to recommend by report to the Governor in Council to restore to me by an Order in Council, the money I thought I had safely deposited in a bank, is, I think, a claim which no Government has a right to put forward. The Government claims here all the dividends of the banks which have remained unpaid for more than five years. I think there is no reason why they should not go a step further and claim, on the same basis, all the stock which those dividends represent. I trust the Minister may see his way to make some arrangement, which will probably effect the object he has in view, which I cannot suppose is to appropriate the few paltry balances in the banks, at a time, too, when the banks are to put up about $1,750,000 in connection with the guarantee fund. I suppose his desire is to establish some means by which in the case of people who have left those balances and who have since died, or whose existence is no longer known to the banks, their friends may be made aware of the fact that such balances are lying there. I think the whole object will be attained if every year the banks make a return to the Finance Minister of all sums that have been lying in the banks unclaimed for at least the last ten years, and about which there has been no communication between them and the depositors, about whose identity or existence the banks may be in doubt. But that the bank should make a statement of a private account between it and an individual who is perfectly cognisant of the fact that he has money there, and that this private account should be divulged to the public, is, I think, not necessitated by the circumstances, and is a requirement unknown in England and not imposed by the Federal or by any State Government in the United States. I cannot but think if these returns were made annually to the Finance Department, and a register kept there of the names and last known addresses of all persons having money in the hands of the bank, the owners of which the bank did not know, the object would be obtained, and people would understand at once that in the Department at Ottawa they could see at a glance the names of all those persons, and that they could obtain all the required information at the banks. I hope that as the Finance Minister has so graciously yielded the point with reference to the audit, he will take into his serious consideration the propriety of adopting this proposition with reference to unclaimed balances. I would also draw attention to another point. I doubt very much whether it would be competent for this Parliament to override a provincial law in a matter of this kind. It appears to me that it would be an attempt on our part to override the decisions that have been arrived at, for instance, in the Mercer and other cases, with respect to property. No doubt that was a matter of real estate and this is a matter of personal estate, but I think the same law will apply to both, and that it would be beyond the competence of this House to appropriate, for the public uses of Canada, money that had been handed over to any bank for safe deposit. If we were to do so, we should, in justice, also require all the loan companies of Canada to give in their returns, we should want the Government Savings Banks to give up what they have, and all the courts, all the trustees, all the corporations, all the executors, everyone, in fact, who had, in any shape or form moneys that did not belong to him, and the real owners of which he did not know. With reference to other points in the Banking Act which are matters of detail, I shall refer to them in the committee. As this is a question in which neither party is seeking to gain any political advantage, I feel assured we may expect assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite in making such a Bill as will be commensurate to the wants of the country, and will keep our finances on a sound basis, and continue them in the same sound channel in which they have hitherto run.

Mr. DENISON. I wish to say a few words with regard to only one clause. I refer to the unpaid balances. It seems to me there is a strong pressure from the banks to allow them to keep these unpaid balances. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman who last spoke that it is only a paltry

sum that is in question, for if the sum was a paltry one, you would hardly see the banks making such strenuous efforts to retain control of it. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) I think, instanced a case where a child might have money put into a bank for its use. That is covered by the latter part of clause 89, which says:

"Provided always that in case of moneys deposited for a fixed period, the period of five years above referred to shall be reckoned from the date of determination of such fixed period."

There is no doubt, therefore, that that particular instance, which was put forward with the idea that it was a strong point, has no weight whatever. Now, the question comes up, who is best entitled to these unpaid balances? If they are unpaid, it is either because the general public are not aware of the balances lying there, that the parties are dead, or for some other reason. Who are best entitled to that sum? I consider, of course, that the Government who represent the public, have the best right to these unpaid balances, instead of the bank which is composed of certain individuals. It is said there is no other precedent for this action but that of a colony in South Africa, but if we consider it desirable that a change should be made in this direction, I think we may well go to Africa for a good precedent. Even if there were none, that is no reason why Canada should not originate a new idea, if it is a good one. I think it would be quite proper for us to start out now and change the law in this direction. There is one other point that I will mention. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) referred to a number of telegrams and letters he had received from his constituency. I understand he is not the only member who has been flooded with telegrams and letters with reference to this matter. I know that on every side of me hon. members have been flooded with these letters and telegrams. That only shows that the banks are endeavoring to manufacture public opinion to serve their own end, and I think we should not be guided by their opinion, but that we should have in view solely the interest of the public.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. WELDON (St John). The word "ship" is used in a very different sense in another part of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. The expression will be changed to meet the case.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In sub-section *d* I find it stated that the expression "warehouse receipt" includes specification of timber. I should like to know whether it is to be understood in that sense, and if a specification of timber is to constitute a warehouse receipt. That has not been the practice heretofore. The specification is the mere evidence of the measurement and quantity of timber in the lot, and it seems to me that a specification should not constitute a warehouse receipt.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears that this expression is in the old Act, and I will look into it and see if any addition need be made.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Sub-section *d*, as now framed, may make a very considerable difference in certain cases. The rulings of the court, and especially of the Supreme Court, have been that it was necessary that a receipt should be given by the party who receives goods for other persons on his wharf. An important case has been recently decided in Quebec on this point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These clauses in the present Bill are altogether different from those in the old Act.

Mr. FOSTER. In sub-section *d*, on line 24, I propose to add after the word "merchandise" the words "delivered to him as bailee and" which confines that to a *bonâ fide* warehouse receipt.

On section 10,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not see why we should insert that provision making the minimum capital $500,000. There will be applications made to this Parliament, no doubt, for the incorporation of banks with less than $500,000 capital, and if the demand is made for good reasons, this clause will be set aside. Of course we cannot bind the future course of this Parliament, and our successors would be at liberty to grant charters to banks having only $200,000 capital, if they choose to do so. This stipulation would only amount to advice to our successors; it would be simply an intimation that the opinion of Parliament, as a general rule, is unfavorable to incorporating banks with a small capital. But I do not think it is the business of this Parliament to give that opinion in the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is the advantage of putting it in the Act. The impression has gained, and it certainly has been the impression of the Government, that the amount of capital embodied as the minimum in the last Act was too small, and that the capital stock ought to be enlarged. Of course this cannot bind future Parliaments, but it shows what the opinion of this Parliament is, and, consequently, so far as that goes, it is a guide, and I think a help, in the way of keeping up what we consider to be best, namely, the formation of banks with a large capital. I do not think there can be any objection to the provision, and I do believe there would be an advantage.

Mr. CHARLTON. What was the minimum stated in the last Act?

Mr. FOSTER. $200,000 and $100,000 paid up.

Mr. CHARLTON. I doubt if it is a wise policy to increase that by 150 per cent. as it is a rather long step in advance. It seems to me that the minimum stated here is somewhat large.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is too large.

On section 13,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This provision would be much more severe in the case of a bank formed with a capital of $500,000 than in the case of one with a capital of say $2,000,000, because the amount required to be paid up in both cases is exactly the same, namely, $250,000. That is, 50 per cent. of the capital is required to be paid up in the one case, and only one-eighth of the capital in the other case; so that it would be much more

difficult for a small bank to start business than a large bank. Would it not be better to require that a certain percentage of the capital should be subscribed and paid, say that 75 per cent. should be subscribed and 50 per cent. paid up, so that the conditions would be the same, in the case of both a large bank and a small bank?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the hon. gentleman does not object to the amount of $250,000 being required to be paid up in the case of a bank with $500,000 of subscribed capital. If a bank has a capital of $1,000,000, the security is just as great, so far as the note circulation is concerned, because the bank can issue only to the amount of the paid-up capital. I do not see that the objection lies, provided we require a sufficient amount to be paid up. I wish to amend this by striking out on page 4, line 6, the words, "and such number of auditors not less than two."

Mr. WALDIE. I would call the attention of the Committee to the provision requiring the capital to be paid into the hands of the Receiver General or the Minister of Finance. Under the Old Act, the money was deposited in a chartered bank, and the payment was certified to the Treasury Board, the chartered bank allowing interest on the money, while the new bank was in process of getting into operation. This change does away with that, and prevents the organisation of a bank, say at Winnipeg, or at Calgary, or at other points where there is no Receiver General, and where the Minister of Finance cannot easily be reached; and it also entails a loss on the subscribers to the new bank, by preventing the payment of interest on the money, pending the commencement of operations.

Mr. FOSTER. On the other hand, what we are striving for is attained by this provision, and would not be attained by the provision in the old Act. The facilities for making the deposits were altogether too great under the old Act—so great that in operation there was really no security at all. Now, it will be certain proof of the *bonâ fides* of the subscribers if they put up the money in real cash.

Mr. WALDIE. I do not see that there is much difference as to the *bonâ fides*. The security would be ample if one of the chartered banks would give a certificate that the money had been deposited. Under the present provision they would certainly lend the money which would be deposited with the Finance Minister, and in that way they could get round it. I do not see that this extra burden should be put upon new banks while they are being organised.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I think it would be far better that the money should be actually paid in to the Finance Minister.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see any objection to the money being paid in. On the contrary, I think it is a most desirable provision in order to prevent mere paper payment. I would submit, however, that it is not necessary to provide that so much as $250,000 should be paid in. Under the old law, $100,000 was sufficient, and we know that some of the best banks had only half a million dollars of subscribed capital to begin with, and $100,000 paid up. The object must be not so much to preserve a monopoly for the existing banks as to see that banks brought into existence are established on a safe and sure basis; and anything that will tend to prevent the establishment of new banks will operate against the best interests of the country. If you require $500,000 to be subscribed *bonâ fide*, and a proportion of each share to be paid up, say 25 per cent., or $125,000, then you may consider that you will have ample security for the payment of $500,000 in a short time. If you allow the $250,000, or whatever the deposit may be, to be made up by one shareholder paying more than his proportion, and another less than his proportion, you will have an unsatisfactory share list, because you may have fictitious subscribers. Twenty-five per cent. on each share of the subscribed capital of $500,000 would give a paid-up capital of $125,000, and each share would be forfeited unless the shareholder paid the three-quarter balance, so that, practically, you have $500,000 available in a very short time, and the concern would not be hampered at the very outset. It is desirable that banks should be established, and that existing banks should not have the whole monopoly, and I would ask whether there be an objection to cutting down the cash amount required to be deposited to $125,000. There is an impression that the amount fixed is largely the result of the views or solicitations of the banks. I understand the bankers pressed this point on the hon. Minister, no doubt in the public interest, and no doubt with due regard to their own interest, but their advice is not to be accepted as representing both sides of the question. I would suggest that each shareholder pay 25 per cent. on his subscribed capital in order that we may have $125,000 deposited on a subscribed capital of $500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That would only make half the guarantee.

Mr. MULOCK. Just half. Formerly the subscribed capital had to be half a million dollars, and each subscriber had to make a payment of 10 per cent. on the amount he subscribed, and the bank was required to have $100,000 on deposit in some chartered bank before it could commence business; but under that provision a bank could start on a nominal capital of $500,000, of which $400,000 might be entirely valueless. All the safeguard the law required was that there should be $100,000 in some chartered bank, and a subscription list of $500,000, and there was no provision for any investigation to see whether that $500,000 was *bonâ fide* stock on which 10 per cent. had been paid. Now you are going to the other extreme.

Mr. CHARLTON. This provision would require a bank, with a capital of $500,000 subscribed, to deposit 50 per cent. of the capital. If the capital subscribed were a million, only 25 per cent. need be deposited: and if the capital were two millions, only 12½ per cent. need be deposited. The application of the clause would be unequal and unfair, and it would be better to adopt a provision requiring a certain percentage of the capital stock to be paid in.

Mr. WALDIE. With regard to making the payment to the Receiver General, while it may be entirely agreeable to the representatives of the Government banks, it may not be so agreeable to the bankers in the other parts of the Dominion. It really is just taking the moneys of subscribers to new capital in the organisation of new banks,

and placing it in the Government banks, because the Minister of Finance will hand it over to the Government banks, and I do not think any of the chartered banks would facilitate the organisation of an unsubstantial bank.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we had better discuss this, not as to what the bankers propose, but as to what we think would be sufficient security. I think we are all agreed, that the facilities have been altogether too great for the formation of banks within the last few years, and that at present the impression is we have about as many banks as the business of the country calls for, and that, while we do not wish that there should be any monopoly in the banking business, yet the opinion is that when a newcomer makes its appearance it should establish its *bonâ fides* beyond doubt, and that it should not be an easy matter to start a new bank in Canada. To put up $250,000 on a subscribed capital of $500,000, or of a million dollars, ought not to be a hardship in the case of men who are in good faith establishing a reliable bank, nor is there any hardship that it should be handed over to the Minister of Finance and remain here a certain time. The object of that was to make sure that there would be a *bonâ fide* raising of money as a guarantee of the integrity of the new institution. That money may not have to remain here very long, but the promoters of the bank may push forward its organisation.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it fair to give a bank with a million dollars subscribed capital double the facility you give one with half a million dollars? The same amount is here required in all cases, whether the capital be $500,000, or $2,000,000, or $5,000,000. An equitable arrangement would be to require a certain percentage of the capital of the bank to be deposited.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing inequitable in the clause, if we remember its real object. The real object of this provision is to establish a minimum under which a bank cannot be organised. The question of policy involved is whether it is wise to allow a bank to go into operation with a smaller capital than half a million dollars subscribed, and a quarter of a million dollars paid up. If we arrive at the conclusion that that is a safe minimum, what is the necessity of imposing restrictions on banks with larger capital? Why call up a larger proportion of capital in relation to a bank with a subscribed capital of one or two million dollars, which cannot be used? but there is no necessity of imposing restriction on a bank of larger capital. On the contrary, in relation to that class you have a much larger security. The object is to prescribe the minimum of subscribed capital and of paid-up capital before a bank shall start business. As regards the amount, and in relation to what the hon. member for North York said, the matter has been pretty well considered, and not considered only in the light of representations from the bankers, but also in the light of existing facts; and it is a significant circumstance that we have followed here the practice of the last decade in incorporating banks. I do not think there is an exception to the rule; and if there is, there is, at any rate, a fixed rule on the subject, that this amount of subscribed capital and paid-up capital shall be required before a bank comes into operation. This provision is necessary to prevent sham organisations.

Mr. CHARLTON. You are providing for a minimum amount of capital before a bank can be organised, and a minimum security for the larger banks. I think that the larger bank should give a greater security than a bank starting with half a million of capital.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the security for?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the amount should be in proportion to the capital.

Mr. FOSTER. This is only to insure that the bank will commence business.

Mr. CHARLTON. A bank with half a million of capital is placed in a much worse position than any of the large banks. It is well to provide that the money shall be paid into the hands of the Receiver General; but I think it is not equitable to require the same amount of money from a small bank with half a million of capital as from a large banking institution. I think it should be so much per cent. on the capital.

Mr. MULOCK. I think my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) fails to consider the whole scope of this Act. The subsequent clauses provide for an increase of capital afterwards, but every bank will start with the minimum capital required by law.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In any case, so long as they have half a million subscribed and $50,000 paid up, they can start.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, and we want to make a safe minimum. People who desire to enter into the banking business will avail themselves of the easiest methods, and will in any case provide that the stock shall be as small as possible under the law. The Minister of Finance talks of millions as if millions were to be picked up on the bushes every day. I have had some experience in lending assistance towards the establishment of a bank, and I know it is not an easy matter to get the money required for the bank to go into operation. I am not referring to a weak institution, but to one that stands at the head of the banking institutions of this country, as far as the share list is concerned. If the Minister looks at the proposition I have made, he will see that it possesses some elements of strength which do not exist in his own scheme. Under his Bill there is no proposition to make a shareholder pay anything on his subscribed capital, so that, although there may be $500,000 subscribed and $250,000 paid, there may be a number of the subscribers in default. I propose to make every subscriber pay in gold 25 per cent. of his subscribed stock, so there would be $125,000 in gold paid on the $500,000 subscribed, and you are absolutely certain that the whole will be available, because every subscriber who has paid up a fourth of this stock will follow his capital, and the whole of the capital being intact, either he will continue to follow it or someone else will. That would be a great security to the bank. I am at one with the Minister in the view that every safeguard should be established in regard to banking, but I think that a bank with $500,000 subscribed and a quarter of the amount paid up is just as sound as a bank at this stage need be. The soundness of the bank does not depend on the amount of money

on hand, but on the amount of available assets as compared with the liabilities, and the bank with $500,000 to begin with will increase in wealth, as circumstances will admit, but you are now going to prevent the establishment of small banks. It is not in the interest of the country to hand over the whole banking system to the existing banks. The Minister of Finance may take the view that the country does not require more capital to be invested in banks, but others may take a different view of that subjet. We know that in times of stringency large sums of money find their way out of Canada and are invested in New York or Chicago. In those times of stringency, small banks would be available for the local needs of the people. Whether the present suggestion came from bankers or not, I know that anything which would prevent further rivalry in banking circles would meet with their approval. I am in favor of the general scheme of the Finance Minister, but I object to a policy which would hand over the whole banking system of the country to the existing banking institutions. I move, if the Minister of Finance will not accept my suggestion, that $250,000 be struck out and $125,000 substituted. The masses have no show here at all. If there is an attempt to make a railway law at all to meet the requirements of the masses, the railways can prevent such legislation. Now, if it is to bring banking capital within reach of the people the bank influence in this House is strong enough to prevent any relaxation of the law in that respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. It is so, because I can scarcely make a proposition that hon. gentlemen opposite do not come out and denounce it. Now, have they considered this scheme? I ask the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), who is so anxious to prevent any further facilities for the public, if he has considered it? I never knew him to fail to re-echo a sentiment from the Treasury benches, on this occasion as on every other, like the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), he is always found ready to endorse a proposition of the Government, I will say, it looks to me, without reflection. I move that the sum of $250,000 be struck out, and that $125,000 be substituted.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I do not know where the suggestion came from that the minimum should be $250,000; but, trying to regard the matter, as I hope I do, in the interest of the public at large, and not that of any bank, I am somewhat surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that it is a difficult matter for any number of gentlemen who would associate themselves together to form a new bank, and in whom it was likely that the public would have confidence, to raise $250,000 as a minimum.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; it would be difficult.

Sir DONALD SMITH. Still I cannot look upon it in the same light, and I trust that the Minister will adhere to the proposition.

Mr. ELLIS. I think it would be difficult. No doubt there are gentlemen in Montreal and Toronto and other large cities in Canada where there is a great deal of wealth, who find it easy to raise hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars; but in other sections it is not so easy a matter to control such large sums. It may be quite right to have the capital of the bank made $500,000, but I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that it would be better, looking at the country as a whole, to prevent the monopoly which the banks evidently desire, whether they have moved in that direction or not. I think it would be better not to insist upon this large sum of $250,000 to be paid up. In the section of the country from which I come it would be exceedingly difficult to raise such an amount of money to be paid up for the formation of a new bank.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move that the words "$250,000" be struck out, and the words "25 per cent. on capital stock" be substituted therefor.

Amendment negatived.

On section 14,

Mr. FOSTER. The sixteenth line comes out, as not necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not got the General Banking Act before me. Looking at it generally, this is a pretty large sum. I would request the Minister of Finance, if he is making any alteration in the clauses, to notify the Committee of what he is doing. There is no alteration, I suppose, in those we are now discussing, except this amendment he is proposing to make.

Mr. FOSTER. The old law gave the right to the Treasury Board to issue a certificate on being satisfied that $100,000 has been paid up, and the section just before makes it necessary that $250,000 shall be paid up.

On section 15,

Mr. MULOCK. This simply means, with the help of clause 13, that no bank can be established at all, because, under section 15, as worded at present, the bank must make this deposit within one year of its getting its Act of incorporation. I do not know whether the Minister intends to adhere to that requirement.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Why not?

Mr. MULOCK. Because a bank may be incorporated to-day and it will not be possible to complete its working organisation within one year.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). If they cannot raise $250,000 within a year after getting their Act of incorporation, their Act ought to cease.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member may think so, but I think he will find there will never be a bank incorporated.

Mr. FOSTER. The last phrase is to prevent the keeping of the prospective organisation of a charter dangling before the public for an indefinite length of time.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think one year is a very wise provision.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it is quite long enough.

Mr. MULOCK. The bank again speaks.

On section 17,

Mr. FOSTER. After the word "aforesaid" in the fourth line, please insert the words "without interest."

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I was going to call attention to that. Under the law it was the practice for banks to deposit the amount subscribed and paid up in an incorporated bank and that bank was in the habit of paying interest. Under this law there will be no interest paid, and it will, in fact, be a loan made to the Government without interest. I think the Government should allow interest on the amount in their hands.

Mr. WALDIE. The Minister of Finance can arrange with the Government to allow interest on the deposit at some rate of interest, and it is unfair that more drastic clauses should be inserted in this Bill than existed in the former Act, and that also there should be a loss of interest. You are making it more difficult to organise the bank, and then you are denying the promoters the privilege of receiving interest on their money until their organisation is completed. At least 3 per cent. interest should be allowed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I hold that interest should be allowed at the rate of 3 per cent. after ninety days.

Mr. FOSTER. The provisions were framed for the purpose of preventing a charter remaining a long time without its provisions being taken advantage of. That idea will be vitiated the moment you allow the parties a percentage on their deposit.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The question of interest could be no object as influencing delay.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When we borrow money it is at 3 per cent. But we do not borrow the money in this case, but it is deposited with the Government. In the case of regular loans they cover a certain period, but in this case the money is liable to be withdrawn at any time, and it is not worth 3, 2 or even 1 per cent. to the Government.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Government receives money in the savings banks and allows interest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No sum of $250,000 is accepted and 3 per cent. interest paid.

Mr. CHARLTON. The proposition is that interest at 3 per cent. should be allowed at the expiration of three months. The money is, at all events, in the hands of the Government, and it is only fair that interest should be allowed.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is unfair that the Government should ask those who associate themselves together for the purpose of starting a bank to place $250,000 in cash in the hands of the Government or in any chartered bank for three, four or five months. No doubt they should protect the public against the establishment of institutions that might prove disastrous, but a reasonable amount of encouragement should be afforded those desirous of starting new banks. We expect the country to grow and the population to increase, and we are all looking forward to a great future in the North-West. This being the case, the Government should afford facilities for the establishment of new banking institutions. Instead of doing so, the Government are virtually placing an embargo on new banking institutions. The Government should allow, after thirty days, the current rate of interest, and fifteen days' notice should be required on the withdrawal of the deposit.

Mr. FOSTER. We must recollect that the payment of $250,000 down is not necessarily the initial step towards organising the establishment of a bank. I suppose business arrangements can be made and a great deal can be done with respect to organisation of a bank before that amount is required to be deposited. Then, again, the Government may not be in need of money. I do not see what reason there is for the Government being obliged to take a forced loan and pay interest upon it. All these considerations go to show that a provision not to pay interest would be far more beneficial, considering the object in view.

Mr. CHARLTON. It must be remembered that, while this may be a forced loan, it is the Government that requires the organisers of a new bank to deposit this money in their hands.

Mr. FOSTER. They will do it more quickly if no interest is paid.

Mr. CHARLTON. After the money has been in the hands of the Government three months, interest should be allowed at 3 per cent.

On section 18,

Mr. MULOCK. Is it not possible to bring this one bank (La Banque du Peuple) under the general law?

Mr. FOSTER. The bank occupies now, and has occupied for a series of years, an exceptional position. It is founded on a different principle, its charter was granted a great many years ago, thirty-five or forty years ago, and at each revision of the Bank Act it has been allowed its separate privileges to a certain extent. The present proposition is to allow the same so far as they have been allowed heretofore almost entirely, and in their internal regulations they are regulated by the terms of their own charter. These are not, so far as this section is concerned, very important matters. But on all important points, with one or two exceptions, the bank has to conform to the sections of the banking law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does it affect their circulation?

Mr. FOSTER. Not as yet.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the double liability apply to the shareholders of the bank?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not apply. Later on I will have a proposition to submit to the Committee on that point.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it bound by the guarantee provision which applies to other banks?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The shareholders of this bank are personally liable for the whole amount.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister will see that one very important provision in the Banking Act is not applicable, I refer to the provision in the law which limits the amount which the directors are permitted to borrow from the bank. Perhaps there may be some provision in the charter of that particular bank, limiting the borrowing powers of the directors, but under section 18 of this Act, that provision is not made applicable to the bank in question, and unless there are some restrictions in the charter of that bank, the directors may borrow the whole capital of the bank themselves, and yet the other banks are, to a certain extent,

liable for their conduct. Is it right that that power should be left to the directors?

Mr. FOSTER. By their own charter they are restricted.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the restrictions? We should understand what the powers of the officials of this bank are. We may know how the bank stands to-day, but we do not know how it will stand a few months hence.

Mr. FOSTER. We will allow that clause to stand.

On section 19,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Sub-section 2 of this clause provides that every director of a bank must be a natural born or a naturalised citizen of Her Majesty. The Bank of New Brunswick is very awkwardly placed in regard to this. A number of the shareholders are persons who are living in the city of St. John, who are citizens of the United States, the number of persons eligible as directors is very small. We have also a large American business done on our river, and it is really very essential that the shareholders should be at liberty to elect American directors if necessary. I do not see why there should be any restriction as to the nationality of a director, but if there is to be a restriction, instead of all the directors being British subjects, it might be provided that the majority of the board shall be British subjects. I think there could be no objection to that. My opinion also is that there should not be a provision to prevent persons holding less than $3,000 worth of stock becoming directors. The experience of persons connected with banks is that men who hold a smaller number of shares often take a greater interest in the bank than those who have a large number of shares. I would suggest that the clause should read "the majority of the directors shall be natural born or naturalised subjects of Her Majesty."

Mr. FOSTER. There can be no very great difficulty experienced in this so far. That has been the law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Yes, there is a difficulty now, and I know a difficulty will exist in a very short time in the Bank of New Brunswick. As my hon. friend knows, we have a very large American business connected with the logs from the State of Maine, coming down our river, and it is very important to have a person connected with that business on the board. I cannot see at all how it endangers the stability of the bank that a shareholder who happens to be an American subject or a French subject, should not be eligible. If there is any possible danger that can be anticipated, the provision that the majority of the shareholders shall be British subjects, ought to be sufficient.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not see any necessity for providing that directors must not be American citizens, or of any other nationality than our own. I do not think there should be any such national distinction drawn in this matter. If American citizens are shareholders in a bank, I cannot see any possible reason why they should be debarred from being elected directors of the bank if it is thought necessary, and I think it better to leave out that provision altogether. We need not consider the question whether a man is an Englishman, a Frenchman, a Chinaman, or what country he belongs to, provided he pays up his money like any other shareholder.

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that we should allow the possibility of our monetary institutions getting under the control of aliens. You will find that all the tendency in the United States is in quite the contrary direction.

Mr. HALL. We should not overlook the provision of the law that in ordinary companies the majority of the directors are required to be British subjects.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) might be adopted, that the majority should be required to be British subjects.

Mr. BOYLE. I would like to ask whether all the directors would not have to be put on the same footing. If this qualification applies to one, should it not apply to all? Do not the shareholders elect directors irrespective of any other director, and might they not elect a majority of aliens?

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask whether the provision requiring that a stockholder, to be eligible as a director, must hold $3,000 of stock, was a provision of the old banking law?

Mr. FOSTER. He had to hold the stock, but this requires in addition that the stock shall have been paid up.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be well to let the shareholders exercise their discretion as to who is the fittest person to be a director? Some person might be considered well qualified to be a director, though holding a smaller quantity of stock.

Mr. FOSTER. We have to look not only to the qualification of the director, but to the security of the public, and the security of the public is increased by the clause as it stands. It is a question in my mind, whether any difficulty will be experienced in obtaining well qualified directors holding $3,000 of paid-up stock.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I quite agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Some of the small banks with $200,000 capital will experience a difficulty in electing directors under this clause. I think a limit of $2,000 would be quite sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the difficulty will not be a practical one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, As regards the larger banks, with a capital of $500,000 and upwards, it is probable the difficulty will not arise; but as regards the smaller banks with $200,000 capital, the difficulty will arise. That difficulty will be met by qualifying on borrowed stock. The clause will be evaded by a dead certainty, and, therefore, I doubt the wisdom of putting it in the Act. If the hon. Minister will look over the list of shareholders of the banks, he will find that in the case of a number of smaller ones this provision, which he thinks a valuable precaution, though I do not, will have the effect of limiting the choice of directors to a very small number, and very probably depriving the shareholders of the opportunity of using the services of some of their best men.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the Bank of New Brunswick, for example, which has a capital of $500,000, there are only thirteen persons who are eligible for directors. Some of them cannot be got under any circumstances, and others are out of the city; so that practically there is scarcely more than the number required by law who are eligible for directors.

On sub-section 5, section 24.

Mr. FOSTER. The term has been reduced from three to two years. Three years seems to be a long time for a proxy to run, considering the greater facility we have now for travel. In fact, two years now is far better than three years at the time the previous Act was adopted.

Sir DONALD SMITH. There might be many cases in which this provision would prevent shareholders from having a voice at the meeting.

Mr. FOSTER. What case can you suggest?

Sir DONALD SMITH. It is a great inconvenience to renew the proxies, and it is more likely to place the management of the affairs of the bank in the hands of the few who are able to attend, notwithstanding the fact that travelling facilities by steam are much greater, and that post office arrangements are improved, so that letters and proxies can be sent much more readily and quickly. Still, people may be travelling in Africa or in China, or anywhere else, and, where they have given proxies for three years, they may be inconvenienced by the change to two years. I should like to know if there is any good to be derived from this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The objection would apply to three years as well as to two years.

Sir DONALD SMITH. Not to the same extent.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The shareholder can remove his proxy and give it to someone else.

Mr. TISDALE. It is well known that people give their proxies to persons, without taking the trouble to recollect when they expire.

Sir DONALD SMITH. As there is no principle involved in this, I hope the Minister will allow the law to remain as it is now.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there is a principle involved in this, and I think that every proxy should expire after the annual meeting. People give their proxies to others, and it is a delicate matter to cancel them. The result is that the bank, practically, passes out of the control of the shareholders into the hands of the directors on proxies given in years gone by. We know that proxies may be revoked, but I think the shareholder should be protected against his own good nature, and the proper thing is to allow the proxy to run out at the end of the year.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canals—Repairs and working expenses $481,116

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do present receipts compare with the total expenditures? There are considerable other expenditures in addition to this $481,000 incurred on account of canals. The vote for railways and canals chargable to income amounted to no less than $302,000, so if you add this sum to the $481,000 you get a total expenditure of $783,000. I am not quite sure at this moment what the total receipts are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can have the receipts on concurrence. The items for the Intercolonial Railway are in the Supplementaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find from the Public Accounts that it is as I supposed. The receipts have been growing small by degrees and beautifully less. The sum total that we received in 1889 appears to have been a little under $300,000, and our total expenditure on the canals in the two items to which I called attention, verges on $800,000. Now, that is even worse than I had supposed it to be. I do not know that the hon. gentleman is specially blameworthy about that, but at the same time, it is a very serious matter. If my memory serves me, we used to get within $100,000 or $150,000, at any rate, of the money that we expended. Now, we are confronted with a deficit on canals of $500,000 a year. That suggests that one of two things, either they are becoming monstrously unprofitable, or that there is serious mismanagement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe the management is unexceptional; I have not heard any question of that. As regards receipts, that depends, first, upon the immense increase of railways; second, in the diminution of the tolls themselves, which has been considerable, as the hon. gentleman knows. For instance, the tolls on cereals in the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals are reduced from 4 cents to 2 cents. I have reason to hope that when our canal system is completed, there will be a large increase of the craft on the canal, because the tendency is, as the hon. gentleman knows, to increase the draught, and size, and carrying power of the barges, vessels and propellers plying on the canal. When the whole system is increased to fourteen feet, I have little doubt but that there will be a large increase of transport on those canals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should be very glad to think that would be the case; but recollecting our past experience, I entertain very great doubts indeed as to whether the results will do more than to keep up our present very small receipts, and that means a very much increased loss on anything we have been accustomed to heretofore.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so. I have not got the whole receipts at present with me. But this matter can be brought up again on the Supplementaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Everybody would like to see our canal system made as perfect as it can be with reasonable regard to economy, but in the teeth of the fact that we expend $800,000 a year and only get $300,000, and that as the result of a very large expenditure going on during the last fifteen years, it raises very grave questions as to the correctness of the data on which the hopes of the hon. gentleman are founded as to getting increased receipts. I do not mean to say that it is not possible that the thing may be compensated

in other ways. But the loss is very heavy, we are losing nearly $3 to $1.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This discussion is quite apropos to the discussion that took place last night with reference to the Intercolonial Railway, when I pointed out that the reduction on the canals was likely to involve as heavy a deficiency as has been unfortunately sustained in the working of the Intercolonial Railway. I was not aware then that the deficiency was as large as has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is evident, I think, from this expenditure which has been given, that if the working of the canals involved this large annual deficiency and the Government propose to spend a further large amount, as indicated by the First Minister, for deepening the canals and they propose to reduce the freight through the canals, we should not hear so much as we have been hearing about a deficiency on the Intercolonial Railway, and about the necessity of rearranging the tariff over that road. I think they should both be treated in the same way, because one public work is of as much importance to one section of the country as the other is to the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is quite true, but the inference to be drawn would be rather that we should try to amend both. The net result is that we are losing, probably, over a million a year in the public works which, I think, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance pointed to as being a source of revenue to us—I think he called it a " princely endowment," but it is one which involves a dead loss, over and above the interest, of a million dollars a year.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ask the Minister when the contract was issued for the deepening of the Rideau Canal ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no contract made. The work is required to be done speedily and completed before the canal was opened in the spring. The Department have, therefore, employed men and are doing the work themselves.

Mr. BARRON. Had the fact of an election coming on in this city anything to do with it ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not fair. The remark is not worthy of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose there was a vote last Session for the work ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No ; there was a general vote for maintenance and repairs, and the money required is being taken out of that vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I am surprised the work was commenced so late. I understand it was commenced only a month ago. It might have been commenced early in the winter, and have supplied employment for the people, instead of rushing it through as is now being done. What wages do the men receive ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, I will tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow. The work was commenced in consequence of considerable pressure being brought to bear by steamboat owners who have put craft on the canal requiring a greater depth of water, and also, because the volume of water has very considerably diminished with the clearing up of the country.

Mr. MULOCK. I only complained that the work was not commenced earlier and carried on during the winter, so that it might have given employment to the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The attention of the Department was called to it before by the steamboat owners shortly before it was commenced.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister's attention was called to it only shortly before the work was commenced, that is an answer to my question. The necessity for the work must have been known for a considerable time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never heard it before. If so, that would account for the work not being commenced sooner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call attention to one or two of these entries. We will take the case of the Rideau Canal. The hon. Minister is asking for a vote of $63,000 for maintenance and repairs of the canal, while considerable sums appearing under the heading " chargeable to income " amounting in all to $40,000. We are, therefore, spending on the Rideau Canal this year over $90,000, chargeable to income, and the total receipts are put down at $7,000. It appears to me that this canal requires to be carefully investigated and overhauled. It seems to be almost impossible to spend so much money, if the matter was properly investigated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the expense of keeping up the canal has materially increased for years. The canal was a military work constructed by the Imperial Government to give an interior line of defence in case of war. Accordingly, it has never paid in any way whatever. Still it must be kept up. There is an immense population living in its vicinity, and it supplies means of transport to a very large and important community. The canal cannot be filled up, and it must be maintained. There is an increase of $2,000 for the item, for the purpose of meeting some claims of damage for overflow in the vicinity of Kingston. A surveyor will be engaged to ascertain the values of those claims.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking at the matter in a business point of view, the Minister is aware that the Rideau Canal, which was valuable at one time, has been almost entirely superseded by the number of railways constructed in that quarter. I think he would do well to consider between this and next year what can be done with the Rideau Canal, for a charge of $90,000 for its maintenance and receipts for $7,000 do not constitute an item that is defensible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must keep it up, I take it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is an open question whether it is worth the trouble.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope we will be able to give a more satisfactory account next year, but I cannot promise. The hon. gentleman no doubt remembers when the Rideau Canal paid well. I remember the time when an enormous business was done through it, that was before the St. Lawrence Canals were built ; and to add to the

misfortunes of the canal half a dozen railways have been built.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. Minister does not adduce those sentimental reasons for spending $90,000 next season. That is an appeal *ad misericordiam*, and might come in under certain circumstances, but scarcely for the benefit of the Rideau Canal. I will not press the matter further, but I thought it right to draw the attention of the Committee to it, because the subject calls for more investigation than it has received from the head of the Department for a considerable time. It is impossible to suggest what could be done ; but there is a huge quantity of land which was lost by the construction of the canal, and it is possible that thousands or hundreds of thousands of acres might be reclaimed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is possible that some of the lands might be reclaimed and sold. Applications have been received from various parties on the line of the canal for lands, if they could be reclaimed.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who has the superintendence of the work here ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The superintendent of the canal is Mr. Wise, and he employs foremen or overseers. He is responsible for it. We do not appoint these men in solemn conclave of the Council, we do not ask what their politics are, all that we know is that the engineer is told to get the necessary number of men to blast these rocks, and place them on the work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am not saying that the Minister enquires into the political stripe of the men employed, but I did suppose he would have an idea of the amount the work would cost, and the number of men employed. Has he received any report as to when the work is likely to be completed ? Of course the canal will have to be opened as early as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe it is announced by the Superintending Engineer that the canal will be opened on the 1st of May perhaps.

Mr. MULOCK. There is another matter in regard to canals to which I wish to call attention. During last summer the public were greatly shocked by an investigation going on with regard to certain matters connected with the management of the Welland Canal, and we have learned in our part of the country, with very great pain, the report of a strife between an hon. member of the Senate, and, I think, to same extent, the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in regard to the management of the canal. The Senator in question charged some of the officials, if I remember the evidence aright, with profiting by their position, with using some of the public servants for their own advantage, with obtaining material for their own benefit, and so on. I think the Government should lay the report of the Commission on the Table, that we may have an opportunity of seeing if there is anything in these accusations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There were some charges brought against the superintendent of the Welland Canal, Mr. Ellis, by an hon. gentleman of the other House. These charges were made in his place in the Senate, and he gave specific statements as to certain short-comings of the local superintendent and the Government granted a commission to investigate that. A gentleman was appointed for the purpose, whose report, I think, has been laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Yes ; weeks ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report speaks for itself. There have been some irregularities, but the integrity of the officers has been maintained by the report of the commission.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask what progress has been made in regard to the Trent Valley Canal. We know that at one time the First Minister, and especially the former Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper), was deeply interested in this work and promised its early completion. I think, as early as 1881, he announced that this canal would in a very short time connect the upper waters with Lake Ontario, but, although, some slight work has been done here and there since then, the canal does not appear to have materialised to the extent promised. We heard of a commission roaming about the country, occasionally. Nearly two years ago, the Minister of Railways announced that he intended to have a commission appointed, as to whether or not the work was practicable. It would occur to one, that that was an enquiry which should have preceded the original promise made to the House and to the country. The fact that they appointed the enquiry after the promise was made that they would complete the canal, is rather calculated to make one think that the Government make promises before they have evidence that they could carry them out. The commission to which I refer appears to have held its meetings at odd intervals, and the commissioners do not appear to proceed with any great degree of business promptitude. In fact, they appear to be fully sustaining the reputation of some commissions, that it is a commission not for the purpose of discovering how the work could be carried out, but how the work could be strangled. We ought to know if the Government have determined to abandon the work, or if they are prepared to say that what they promised in 1881 was a premature promise without proper foundation, then we should know it. We should know why the Government have not completed this work with the promptitude they promised on the eve of the general election, in 1882. Is the report of the commission to be kept for a year or so, until the thing shall do good work again ? I think it is important that we should have some information about this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had all this discussion before during this present session, on the items for the expenditure for the Trent Valley Canal, and I do not know that it would be of much service to go into it again. The hon. gentleman is not correct in stating that when the Government of the day commenced the Trent Valley Canal, they did so without necessary information. The hon. gentleman is not as old as I am, and cannot look back for so many years, but there were two elaborate reports by engineers of skill as to the construction of this canal, its object and its value as a commercial work, with a full estimate of the cost. These are to be found in the blue-books of the time. When the question of this canal was revived, after great pressure

from that part of the country, they had these reports before them. Although the hon. gentleman speaks rather contemptuously of what has been done, there has been work of great value locally carried on, giving interior navigation of a very considerable extent, which has been fully acknowledged and appreciated by the people. Whether the cost of the construction of canals has increased I do not know, but it was ascertained from reports of the scientific officers of the Government that the completion of the whole system would cost a very much larger sum of money than was estimated in the two reports to which I have alluded—one by Mr. Clarke, and the other I think by Mr. Shanly; and it was thought prudent to go on with these interior works, improving the route locally, and having a commission to ascertain what would really be the cost at the present day of completing the original scheme. That commission has met from time to time and taken evidence. Although the commissioners have been appointed for some time, they are not paid for that time; they are only paid for the time they actually expend in the search and examination into the question. When they will be able to report I cannot say just now, but when I give him the other information, I will also tell him when I expect that the report will be made.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to impress again on the hon. First Minister the great importance of having the report distributed during the recess, if possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have promised that.

Mr. BARRON. And not only that, but also, if possible, the evidence which has been taken and on which the commissioners base their report. It is believed in our part of the country that the report is going to be adverse to the building of the canal. Whether that impression is justifiable or not, I do not know; but it would not be fair to those who believe that this work is a necessary work, to ask them to accept the commissioners' report, without being able to arrive at a conclusion from the evidence as to whether they were right or wrong. They have gone to the other side to take evidence with regard to the Erie Canal, and it would be well for us to have that evidence also. Inasmuch as the hon. First Minister said at the beginning of the Session, that he expected the report this Session, I think he ought to ask the commissioners to report as quickly as possible, because there is a feeling throughout the Midland district that the Government are not altogether relieved from the responsibility for the delay in the commissioners' report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report of the commissioners, as soon as it is received, will be printed. The evidence, however, may form an enormous volume. If it comes within reasonable proportions it will be printed with the report; but if it contains plans and drafts, and all that sort of thing, the cost of printing it would be enormous. At any rate, it will be accessible to all parties who wish to examine it, and if necessary, and it is ordered by Parliament, a *précis* of the evidence may be printed.

Mr. BARRON. The cost of this work is estimated by some of the engineers at $10,000,000,

and that expenditure is fully justified by the large number of people in the locality who are interested in the work. If that is so, even if the evidence is lengthy and the cost of getting it great, that is no reason why we should not have the evidence in full, in view of the great importance of the work. It would be impossible for us, from a condensed statement of the evidence, to judge whether the commissioners had arrived at a proper conclusion or not. Even supposing the commissioners have thus far sat forty days, and have taken evidence for five hours each day, I do not think it could possibly be so voluminous as the hon. Minister supposes.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the nature of the reference to the commission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is principally as to the cost and the best mode of construction of the last portion of the Trent Valley Canal, which extends to the River Trent at the head of the Bay of Quinté. The commission was issued before I had anything to do with the Department, but I am quite sure there were no instructions of any kind to the commissioners as to how they would report. Indeed, if they were gentlemen, they would not submit to any suggestions of that sort. They had a free hand to report as men of science what their estimate was, and what was the best and cheapest mode of finishing the canal. As regards the evidence, I hope that it will not turn out to be so voluminous as to make it inexpedient to print it with the report. At all events, we are in the hands of the House, and if the House orders it to be printed next Session, it will be printed. In the meantime, it will be accessible.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course, the canal was recommended for two reasons—that it might serve the local purpose, and that it would be a means of communication between the upper waters and Lake Ontario for larger vessels. There will be a great difference, of course, whether it is to serve as a local work or as a through work. Does the reference to the commission cover both classes of works? Perhaps a copy of the commission could be laid on the Table.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly; I will get a copy of the commission.

Collection of slide and boom dues.....$6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought arrangements were in progress by which these were going to be transferred to the Local Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought some negotiations were going on.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Land and Cable Telegraph Lines of the Sea Coasts and Islands of the Lower Rivers and Gulf of St. Lawrence and Maritime Provinces, including cost of working steamer *Newfield* or other vessel when required for cable service.....$28,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why is there an increase of $2,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The lines have been extended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how many miles does this cover?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are three different systems. In Cape Breton the distance is 126½ miles; New Brunswick, 42 miles; the Magdalen Islands, 156¾ miles; Grosse Isle, 53 miles; and the north shore of the St. Lawrence, 732 miles.

Telegraph Lines, North-West Territories, $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far north do these extend now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As far as Fort Pitt. There is another called Victoria, also.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate $58,438

Mr. FOSTER. I saw the leader of the Senate yesterday and he told me they are going into a very thorough examination of this whole matter, and that the report is pretty nearly ready, and will be submitted to the House. This also may come up on the Supplementary Estimates, for there will be an item with reference to the Senate in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this is allowed to pass, it is on the distinct understanding that an explanation will be forthcoming. It is a matter of importance, in several ways, that we should get it. I will not vote for the principle that we are to vote money here and are not to get an account of it from the Senate.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a. m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

MR. SPEAKER,—

His Honor, Chief Justice Sir Wm. J. Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honorable House in the Chamber of the Honorable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to authorise the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain Funds.
An Act respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.
An Act respecting the Erie and Huron Railway Company.
An Act to amend "The Patent Act."
An Act to amend "The Copyright Act."
An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Rainy River Boom Company.
An Act respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Owen Sound and Lake Huron Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.
An Act to confirm an agreement between the Montreal and Western Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Confederation Life Association.
An Act respecting the Summerside Bank.
An Act to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America.
An Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.
An Act respecting the Calgary Water Power Company (Limited).
An Act further to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter one hundred and seven of the Revised Statutes.
An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.
An Act to grant certain powers to the Chambly Manufacturing Company.
An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilisers.
An Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.
An Act to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company."
An Act to incorporate the National Construction Company.
An Act respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the River Detroit Winter Railway Bridge Company, and to change the name of the company to the River Detroit Railway Bridge Company.
An Act respecting the Central Ontario Railway.
An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.
An Act to prevent the Disclosure of Official Documents and Information.
An Act respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would like to ask if the Government has any idea of our sitting on Saturday, as many of us are anxious to get away as early as possible?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we can give up the first Saturday, but we can compromise by taking next Monday for the Government. After next Saturday, we will take Saturday.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman can give us some slight information, judging by the amount of business the Government have to submit to the House, as to the time when we are likely to get through, assuming that this side of the House treat them generously, as we are prepared to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to hear from the third party that they are going to treat us generously.

Mr. MITCHELL. We always do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not dispute that now, as the hon. gentleman is in a generous mood, and I have no reason to complain of the

course of the Opposition, generally. We will endeavor, by acting together, with slight differences occasionally, to get through as soon as possible. I think by Monday we will be able to speak more positively.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us to-day whether he has any more measures to introduce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can state that we shall have Supplementary Estimates for 1890-91, and a measure respecting certain railway subsidies, and also respecting some land grants for railways; and a special measure respecting the Calgary and Edmonton road. I may say across the floor that the proposition is in order to ensure the immediate construction of the road from Calgary to Edmonton—the Royal assent having been given to the Act to-day—to grant it the same terms as those under which the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Prince Albert Railway has been constructed.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman when he thinks it probable that these railway subsidies will be submitted to the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Next Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask if it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Bill on the Order paper in the name of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to amend the Fisheries Act? It very largely affects the lobster fisheries in the Maritime Provinces, and a great many representations have been made to hon. members from those Provinces asking them to object very strenuously to the punitive clauses of the Bill, and there will be very strong opposition to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the hon. gentleman an answer on Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. And there is the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters. I would like to know if that is to be pressed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will answer on Monday.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the right hon. gentleman also give an answer on Monday as to whether the Act respecting stamping on leather will be dropped?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Inland Revenue will be able to answer that.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask if the report from the officer investigating the charges made against Captain Robertson of the steamer *Baltic* has been received?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall be able to tell the hon. gentleman as soon as the President of the Council, who is acting as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, comes in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might remind the hon. First Minister that three months at least have elapsed since that commission was stated to have been issued, and the commissioner surely ought to have been able to make his report by this time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe he has reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 134) respecting fishing vessels of the United States of America.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to add the words "on the Atlantic coast" to the third line and to make the fees $1.50 per ton.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is omitting two important sections of the old Act which has now expired, the one providing that United States fishing vessels will not be required to enter or clear at the Customs when they do not remain more than twenty-four hours in port, and the other that American fishermen shall only be liable to forfeiture in the two cases of fishing or preparing to fish.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt the subsections referred to are no longer law. They were originally part of the protocol intended to establish a *modus vivendi*, under a treaty to be considered by the United States, and as such they were given vitality for two years. It is not intended to re-enact them, but simply intended to establish a license system, which has been generally called the *modus vivendi*, although that extended to other subjects as well.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a great change of policy on the part of the Government, and it may have serious effects. If the hon. gentleman intends to require that American fishing vessels, when they enter any bay or harbor, must report at the Customs each time, he would bring about the same state of irritation which existed before the *modus vivendi* was brought into operation. The chief cause of complaint made on behalf of the United States fishermen was that they were required to enter at the Custom house every time they entered a port and pay the Customs' fees. That caused more irritation and annoyance, and was the cause of more correspondence than any other complaint the Americans made. The solution which was arrived at by the passing of the third sub-section, rendering it unnecessary to enter at the Custom house, was a satisfactory one. That did not give dissatisfaction to the American fishermen, or cause any loss of national dignity on our part; but, if the hon. gentleman repeals these clauses, and enacts that whenever the American fishermen come into our waters for repairs or for bait, or for any other purpose, they are violating the law unless they enter at the Custom house, he will bring up again the same trouble which existed before this *modus vivendi* was agreed to. The other section appears to be still more important. As a matter of policy, we decided to put a modified construction on the Treaty of 1818, though it was susceptible to a number of different constructions. There were offences specified there under which the American fishermen would be liable to forfeiture, but it has been agreed under the *modus vivendi* arrangement that only two offences would render the vessels liable to forfeiture. The one was the actual offence of fishing, and the other was the offence of preparing to fish. For us to revert to the old system would be to cause endless trouble, perhaps from the hasty action of our officers on the coast, so that the trouble from which the Gov-

ernment have been extricated with some difficulty will arise again. The Government will bring the country into a great deal of trouble in this matter if they pursue this course.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not requiring any vessel to enter at the Customs house and pay dues. Any vessel of the United States entering for the purposes for which it was permitted to enter under our law, as far as I can discover, was never required to pay one cent of Customs dues or any other dues. The master of a vessel was never required to pay any Customs duties, but he had to report at the Customs if he remained more than 24 hours in the harbor. We are not of necessity returning to any system of administration which existed before, but we are conferring exceptional privileges upon those vessels for which licenses are taken out. We are not renewing any privileges previously granted, but any United States vessels that enter our ports will be dealt with in accordance with the treaty, in accordance with the legislation of this Parliament, and on friendly terms so far as they are consistent with our fishery protection.

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree with what my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has stated. Either the clauses which are omitted from this Bill were necessary at the time the *modus vivendi* went into operation, or they were not necessary. If they were necessary, what reason has the hon. gentleman for excluding them from this Bill? Those clauses worked very well at that time, and why should we create a new state of things which may lead to complications with the United States, possibly from the ignorance of Custom house officials on the coast, or from a disposition, which has sometimes been evinced, to annoy. That might lead to complications of a very unpleasant character. These clauses were either necessary in the old Bill or they were not necessary. If they were necessary in the Bill which was passed two years ago, they are necessary now, and it appears to me that they should be added to this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They were not necessary, and it is not proposed to introduce them now.

Mr. MITCHELL. They must have been thought necessary at the time by the hon. gentleman or his predecessor.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They were put in because they were in the protocol.

Mr. BLAKE. From an observation which dropped from the hon. gentleman in the course of his explanation, in which, as I understood, he said it was not intended, with reference to vessels taking licenses, to alter the system of administration which has prevailed up to this time, I drew the inference that, if it was not thought advisable to alter the system prevailing at the present time, it might be a matter of policy to hold *in terrorem* the power of altering the system in regard to vessels which had not taken out licenses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not alter the system as to vessels which take licenses, but we do not propose to alter the law in regard to vessels that do not take out licenses. I do not wish to be understood to say that we will revert to any system by which the provisions of the protocol will be disregarded. On the contrary, the contention of our commissioners was that the Act had not been disregarded, and it is not intended by the Government to enforce any more stringent provisions in the future than those which have been enforced heretofore, but it is necessary to have a strict supervision of our waters for the protection of our fishermen.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do I understand that these fishermen will have to enter at the Custom house?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Does that also apply to the second clause?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot at this moment undertake to say to what class of offences the penalty of forfeiture would be applicable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is unfortunate that the Government think it advisable to pass this Act, which is only a temporary Act for one year, and not to insert the conditions and agreements come to by the contending parties at the time of the Treaty of Washington. The same contention was made then, that the Government did not exact from the American fishermen any improper entries. It was contended by the American fishermen that they were harassed, and it was to meet their views that this clause was put in. By removing these clauses, you will create a great deal of suspicion as to your intentions in regard to the American fishermen, and I cannot see why that matter cannot be left as it was, seeing that it only affects one or two years.

Bill reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I just wish to say that I do trust that the Government are well satisfied that the greater degree of governmental elasticity and power which they obtain by the omission of these statutory provisions, will compensate for what, I apprehend, may be the suspicion and hostile comment provoked by that omission. I feel the delicacy of the situation, and I shall say no more than this. I cannot help believing that, from the circumstance of these provisions having been inserted in our statute for the past two years, a considerable, and perhaps an undue degree, of emphasis will be attached to this change, and that, unless there be important reasons for reserving the powers which their omission does reserve, there are very important reasons against a change for the proposed short period of a single year; but of this I feel the Government are the best judges.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

CONFUSION IN THE HOUSE.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before proceeding further I would take the liberty of drawing the attention of the Government to a matter of vital importance to members of this House. The members on the back benches on this side—I do not know how it is on that side—often cannot hear a single word when the Ministers speak, nor frequently can we hear, on this side of the House, what is said by members on the front Opposition benches. Now, it is highly desirable, either that better order should be kept in the House, or that members, if they have got to communicate with each other,

should do so in very subdued tones, so that those on the back benches may have the privilege of hearing what Ministers say, as well as what is said by those on this side of the House. If the back benches are so often empty, it is because the members find it too tiresome to sit there when they cannot hear what is going on.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

(In the Committee.)

On section 27,

Mr. COCKBURN. I think that we should provide that stock which is not taken up, and which may be selling at a higher price than the rate fixed by the directors, should be made free and should not be tied down to the *pro rata* to which the other stock is tied down. There is one amount of stock taken up first which is fixed by the directors, and which shall not be sold if the stock is selling at 50 premium, or shall not be allotted at less than 50 premium. But there is some other stock not taken up at all. Then, I say, let that fetch the market price, whatever it is.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no objection to that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I quite agree with that proposition.

Mr. WALDIE. There has been a principle adopted by some banks and by some companies where shareholders were unable to subscribe for additional stock and the stock was selling at a larger premium than it was allotted at, that the stock was so sold and the premium paid over to the party entitled to it. In the case of parties unable to subscribe for additional stock that seems a very inequitable way to do, and this will prevent it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I was going to suggest to make the time three months, instead of six months, within which the allotted stock shall be taken up by the shareholders.

Mr. FOSTER. It was three months before. My hon. friend last night was very anxious for an extended time, but now he seems anxious for a contracted time.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Three months will be sufficiently long. If the time were extended to six months the shareholder would have time to speculate as to whether he would take stock or not. Ordinary people would take the stock when it was first allotted, but the wary and clever speculator would wait until the six months had almost expired in order to see whether the stock would rise in value or not, and if there was a rise he would sell his right to subscribe. Our postal arrangements are so perfect that communication can be rapidly had with shareholders in all parts of the world, and an answer can readily be obtained within three months.

Mr. FOSTER. Three months appears to be a sufficiently long time. It is possible if it were extended to six months that cases such as have been mentioned might occur. But we must look at the other side of the question also. A subscriber must be allowed due time to get his notice. He also may find it necessary to make financial arrangements to meet his allotment of stock. If the Committee place the time at three months the time may occur in the holiday season, the subscriber may be travelling and it may be impossible to hear from him within that time and for him to make arrangements to take his stock. In that event he would lose it. I think time should be given to prevent these not remote possibilities.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I consider that three months is ample time. There is ample time for negotiations for stock within that time. In the meantime the shareholders would be tying the hands of the directors of the banks for six months, notwithstanding the fact that the increase of capital is for the benefit of the shareholders and for the public.

Mr. FOSTER. It is simply a balance of inconveniences.

Mr. COCKBURN. Although the time allowed was longer than six months, I, on one occasion, lost an allotment of stock, when travelling. Six months is a very short time to allow, for notice is required to be given to all the shareholders who are travelling, and time is required to consider whether they will take up the stock. I would prefer a longer time than six months.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Speculators in stock move more rapidly than people who invest *bonâ fide;* so six months would be a fair time to allow.

On section 28,

Mr. FOSTER. This section provides for the reduction of the capital stock.

Mr. ELLIS. The Committee last evening fixed the minimum amount of both subscribed and paid-up capital. Does this section imply that the Government can go below that limit; and if a bank can go below that limit, why should not a bank start on a less amount of capital than the Committee fixed last evening? If $250,000 is the least at which a bank can start and carry on business, surely when its capital falls below that sum, it should be closed, if the argument which prevailed in the Committee was a good argument.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The capital stock can be reduced at the instance of the Treasury Board, but they would not follow a policy injurious to the interests concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. We have, however, already provided that a bank should not start business with a capital below half a million. We may very well put a provision in this clause, providing that the reduction shall not be below half a million dollars. I think if we insert in the first line the words "may be reduced to any sum not below $500,000," that would be right.

Mr. FOSTER. We will allow the clause to stand for the time being.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Clause 5, section 28, would seem to imply that the reduction of the capital is not to take effect, or have any force, until a Bill is passed by Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be either way.

Mr. KIRKPATICK. It ought to be one way or the other. I think we ought to make them come here in every case.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not the proposition that in every case they should come to Parliament. The idea was, that just as the capital stock may be increased, under the safeguards which are placed in the Bill, so there may be a means by which capital stock may be decreased, under the safeguards in section 28 ; or, if the bank chooses, it may come to Parliament and ask for legislation in order to decrease its capital stock.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Do you not think that may cause doubt of the legality of a reduction, without the sanction of Parliament ?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. But, if in some cases the bank has to come to Parliament for a Bill of sanction, we ought to say in what case they need not come.

Mr. BLAKE. We can say in the clause " if in any case legislation is asked " before the words " to sanction."

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; that would be right.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I suppose it would not be necessary to have a certificate of the Treasury Board.

Mr. BLAKE. Not if they get prior information, so that they may form a judgment on what they should do if the Treasury Board should refuse it.

On section 29,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the words " shall be personal estate " in the second line, declaring the character of the property in bank stock, ought be in the clause at all. We have nothing to do with saying what the character of the property shall be.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well ; strike the words out.

On section 30,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the provision here relating to the appointment of executors, administrators and curators, and dealing with the stock after the death of the owner, is a matter with which we have nothing to do. It will depend on the law of the Province relating to personal property how the interests of any deceased person in bank stocks shall be dealt with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You might say " personal representative," and entitle him to take the place of the deceased.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it is necessary at all. I think these words should be struck out.

On section 32,

Mr. HALL. It seems to me that the regulation with reference to the cancellation or forfeiture of shares ought to be by by-law, otherwise the directors might exercise their discretion about it, and it might be irregular, and sometimes unjust. I would suggest that you add after the word " or " in the twelfth line, " under the provisions of a by-law to that effect."

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would hardly do to deprive the directors of the right to exercise discretion in individual cases. If a defaulting shareholder became insolvent, the proper course would be to forfeit, and if he were solvent, it might be a question in each case whether it were best to forfeit or to sue. The matter cannot be dealt with by a general by-law, but the directors must have discretionary power, which is exactly what the Bill gives.

Mr. FOSTER. The section is exactly the same as the old law.

On section 33,

Mr. COCKBURN. The 18th line of this section says : " if the directors declare any shares to be forfeited." Does that mean any of the shares mentioned in the same paragraph ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. COCKBURN. This seems to be a little wider. For instance, the directors might declare shares to be forfeited which were held as collateral for a debt.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It should read " any such shares."

Mr. COCKBURN. In the case I mention it might be deemed advisable to sell the shares ; or, if there were other creditors, it might not be necessary to sell them at all. If you make it read " any such shares," that would confine the provision to the shares mentioned in this item.

Mr. TISDALE. I think six months is too short a time within which to require the bank to sell forfeited shares. We might say twelve months.

Mr. BLAKE. I think wherever the bank possesses itself of its own stock by forfeiture or otherwise, there should be a very short limit within which to dispose of that stock. The public will be under the impression that there is a double liability, when in the case of the forfeited or acquired shares there would be none at all, and it will not understand the extent to which the bank holds its stock in its own hands.

On section 34,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that this clause, making provision with regard to pleading, is beyond our power, and would only cause confusion. I know that I have successfully urged that view before the courts with regard to a fire insurance company.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject of insurance is not necessarily a matter of Dominion control. In ordinary cases I would agree that this Parliament has no control over procedure ; but in banking transactions, I submit that our power is just the same as it is in the case of bills of exchange and promissory notes, to regulate the procedure in regard to those matters which are under our jurisdiction. The point was argued in my own Province, where it was decided to be *intra vires*, and I know it is a very useful provision indeed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I admit the force of the objection of the hon. Minister of Justice, but it is not necessary in this case. When we provide for banks calling up their shares, that is as far as we can go ; to enforce their payments, the banks have to go to the courts, and those courts are regulated by the Local Legislatures. I have a very strong opinion that we have no right to interfere in the matter of pleadings in the courts.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We have special power given us by the British North America Act, to legislate upon procedure in criminal matters, but we have expressly taken from us the right to legislate on procedure in civil matters; and surely this is a procedure in civil matters. The criminal law is under our jurisdiction, and if merely having that jurisdiction carried with it the right to legislate on procedure, it would not have been necessary to give us that right specially in the Act. I agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that we have no right in this matter to legislate as to how the declaration should be framed.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think our right to legislate on the subject of banking extends as far as the hon. the Minister of Justice says it does. That right properly includes the right to legislate on the general principles of banking, the incorporation and the powers of banks and bank managers, but I do not think it necessarily includes our right to legislate on procedure in the particular civil matters connected with banks any more than in other civil matters, because such procedure is under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures; and, as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has said, the procedure in criminal matters being placed under our jurisdiction, and that in civil matters not being so placed, we have no right to legislate on the latter. I want the House to consider what will be the consequences of this doctrine, applied to the extent the hon. the Minister of Justice proposes to apply it. We are going to have two sets of civil procedure—nay, perhaps, two dozen sets. At any rate, we will have two sets all through the Provinces. We are going to have the set which the Province which has to do with procedure in civil matters, provides, and which presumably will be satisfactory, for the only interest the Province can have is to provide reasonable facilities for the prosecution of all civil matters in its courts; and we may well leave all to the Province. But if we say no; if we decide to intervene—then for the banks we establish one code of procedure and one rule of evidence; for railway companies we may establish another; for bills and notes a third—and the result will be confusion worse confounded. At the best it is the establishing of two codes instead of one; and that is very bad indeed. Therefore, it seems to me, it would be better to omit the reference to procedure in this matter, and to trust to the Local Legislatures whose duty it is to provide efficient remedies in this as in all other cases.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall be delighted to assist my colleague in removing from the Bill, or any Bill of the like kind, any provision which is not clearly useful, concerning which our jurisdiction is questioned, with a view to avoid doubtful ground. This seems to me an eminently useful provision, and one that has been repeatedly applied, and applied with advantage. As I have already stated, there exists no Provincial legislation providing for a case of this kind. This section is an exact transcript of a section which has been on the Statute-books for nine years at least, and it has been found very convenient in practice. It has stood the test of legal examination, and has been decided to be *intra vires* of this Parliament. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) calls attention to the fact that civil procedure is given to the Provincial Legislatures. So are civil rights, but there is not a clause or subsection of this Bill which does not treat of civil rights. With regard to the inconvenience of having several sets of procedure, that is undoubtedly very great, and that is simply a reason why, when dealing with Customs law, federal works, bills of exchange, and banking laws, we shall endeavor not to multiply the systems, but to have them nearly as uniform as possible. If we are to hesitate about this section as being within our powers, what shall we say of the law for the protection of revenue officers, which provides that in a suit for damages in a civil court, in any Province, on a simple plea of "not guilty," or of the general issue certain things may be given in evidence, or of provisions all through the Railway Act as to what shall be evidence, for reasons of public convenience, such as the provision that a simple certified transcript of the document itself shall be received in evidence, to avoid inconvenience and loss of suits arising from documents having to be searched for at Ottawa. In every phase of our legislation we have to provide for the inconveniences of the federal system as well as its convenience, and we have to see, when dealing with subjects under our control, that we provide reasonable facilities for their prompt execution and for the protection of our officers. In this case we have to provide a simple means of recovering money due on a bank share. We had an illustration of the same thing occurring the other day with regard to bills of exchange, concerning which it was proposed, and I understand the proposition has been adopted in the other House, that we should adopt a provision with regard to costs in proceedings on bills and notes. In every phase, it seems to me, the right to deal with this subject of procedure is bound up with our right to legislate on a subject at all. Whether it is necessarily involved, is a very difficult question to decide.

Mr. BLAKE. That is just the question, whether it is necessarily involved. That is the question put in the case of "Cushing and Dupuy" before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In dealing with the question of insolvency, they stated an insolvency law is a law of such a nature that procedure is essentially and necessarily a part of it; and inasmuch as insolvency is placed expressly in the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament, and inasmuch as procedure is essentially and necessarily a part of it, the Federal Parliament has the right to deal with the procedure. I agree so far. But you have always to come to the question of reasonable necessity, and not to the question of convenience which the Minister suggests. He says we must provide for the inconvenience of the federal system. Yes, but we have to recognise honestly its inconveniences. We have to recognise that with its advantages there are certain inconveniences, and we have to submit to those possible inconveniences instead of endeavoring to accomplish the impossible—instead of endeavoring at once to take the benefit of absolute legislative union and the federal system together. There will be points of conflict, points of contact, points of divided authority. What is our rule? Our rule is that everything which is essentially necessary to the execution of the federal power is given it. All that may come within that rule is, I agree, implied

ex necessitate ; but anything which is a mere question of convenience I do not think is implied. I grant there is a large doubtful border land in respect of which the Legislature has to act conscientiously and carefully so as not to exceed its powers, and in respect of which, acting conscientiously, it is extremely difficult on many questions to know what is the judicious solution, but I do not see that we are on that border land just now, because there is no pretence that this provision as to procedure under the Banking Act is necessary at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the subject of convenience, when I speak of convenience, it seems to me that involves to some extent a question of necessity—not necessity in its absolute sense, but the necessity we are under of providing a free and economical working of the system of banking which w establish. With regard to that, I am most anxious to avoid crossing the boundary line or touching on doubtful territory even ; but what is the position ? The convenience of this clause, if it be *intra vires* of this Parliament, is admitted. It is admitted that without some provision of the kind the procedure would be difficult, cumbersome, and expensive. There is no Provincial legislation upon the subject. It is more than doubtful that the Provincial Legislatures have any power to deal with it. I am so strongly of opinion on that point that I would not hesitate at this moment to advise the disallowance of a provision of a Provincial Legislature that a declaration on a bank share should take a certain form. I only mention this to show I am perfectly convinced on the point. There has been the decision of a court in one Province on the point, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) tells me that in a case which he thinks analogous, but in respect of which I think there is a wide distinction—that is, the insurance case—there was a decision, though whether by one judge or the full court of the Province I do not know. This is a provision which has been on the Statute-book for nearly a decade.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend says this has been on the books for a decade. Can he point out the case in which any question has been raised upon it ? I recollect one *nisi prius* decision which was delivered by the present Chief Justice of Canada, where he held that it was beyond the powers of this Parliament to order a party to give evidence in a special case. Here the Dominion Parliament creates the debt as between the shareholder and the bank. Once the debt is created, to enforce it is a matter of property and civil rights, which, I think, is altogether within the power of the Local Legislature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If I understand the Minister of Justice rightly, he makes a distinction between an insurance case and a case of a bank, on the ground that a Local Legislature may legislate on insurance as well as this Parliament, and may, therefore, provide for procedure within its own jurisdiction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No ; what I meant to say was that insurance, unless in relation to insurance business in more than one Province, is altogether a matter for the Province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In that case, the question of procedure would not be a matter of jurisdiction at all, but a matter of policy. If the position of the Minister of Justice was pressed to the extreme, it would amount to this : that in order to give effect to any Act of the Parliament of Canada, it would be within the power of this Parliament to provide for the procedure in any particular case. If that is so, then there is no jurisdiction given by the British North America Act in matters of civil procedure, or except in matters which come within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. I do not so understand the provision in that Act. I think that construction would render it meaningless and nugatory, and the same thing would apply in regard to the administration of justice in civil cases. There would no longer be exclusive jurisdiction on the part of the Local Legislatures in regard to procedure in civil cases where the legislation was within the powers of this Parliament. I do not think that is within the meaning of the British North America Act, and I think we are to legislate upon the subject-matter proper, leaving the matter of procedure for the Local Legislature to determine, and the question of convenience is for them rather than for us to consider. In the case of Cushing against Depuy, the Privy Council said the procedure was a necessary part of the Act of Insolvency. It is easy to see that you cannot legislate in regard to insolvency without providing the procedure. The questions as to how the property shall be dealt with, how the estate shall be wound up, and how it shall be distributed amongst the creditors, are all questions of procedure ; but that is not applicable to a bank.

Mr. BLAKE. I recognise the force of the view of the hon. gentleman as to our obligations in consequence of having, for a number of years, acted upon an Act which we passed in regard to this matter, but I do not think it is right, because we once went wrong, that we should persist in going wrong for ever. There is a safety-valve given to the Dominion of Canada with reference to its laws, both civil and criminal. If that safety-valve did not exist it is clear that the execution of these laws might be altogether rendered nugatory under the British North America Act, because if the power to create courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction existed only in the Local Legislature, there would be a possibility of excluding all jurisdiction in regard to Dominion matters. But it was not the intention that the Dominion should meddle with the procedure in civil and criminal courts. It was the intention that this should remain with the Provincial Legislatures, and that intention is indicated by the terms of the Act. But this safety-valve was provided that, for the better execution of the laws of Canada, the Dominion might create additional courts to execute those laws if necessary, so that if any Province failed in its duty so far, abrogated its jurisdiction so far, or acted in any matter so arbitrarily or vexatiously as to create great disadvantage and difficulty, this Parliament could stretch forth its hand and make its laws effective by creating another court. No doubt in that case the power to create the procedure would be incidental to the power to create the court. But as long as that case, which would be entirely abnormal, does not exist in any Province, we are not to interfere with the procedure in any of the courts. When we have necessarily to create a court for th execu-

tion of Dominion laws, we must, of course, create the court *totus, teres, atque rotundus;* we must make it adequate to discharge the duties which devolve upon it, but I feel that in this case we are exceeding our just limits when we propose to interfere with the procedure in the courts of any of the Provinces.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think we should see where the line is to be drawn between the Provincial and the Federal power, and it seems to be judicious that members of Parliament here should take a reasonably large view of our own powers. The case of Cushing and Dupuy has been referred to by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I think that few hon. members are prepared to say, following that rule, that there are not a considerable number of sections in the Insolvency Act of 1869, or in the Act of 1875, with respect to which it would be a straining of words to say they are absolutely essential or absolutely necessary to the working of the Act. They could be better described by saying that their presence was very convenient, and that is all the Minister claims for section 34, which is now challenged, that its presence there makes greatly for convenience in the working of the Act. The old rule that the concession of a power involves the concession of all that is necessary to make that power effective, is the rule that we must rely on. I was not impressed with the reasons given by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), because we know that in more cases than one the clauses of section 91 have been construed and held to involve the power to legislate on a matter of civil procedure. It occurred to me as I followed the arguments of the Minister of Justice and of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken across the House, that the matter is one of some doubt, and that it is a reasonable description of this section to say that it would make greatly for the convenient operation of the Act. It can hardly be claimed that it is absolutely necessary or essential; but I say again that the words "absolutely necessary" or "essentially necessary" are not a fair description of the *ratio dicidenda* that was relied upon by the Lords of the Privy Council in that notable insolvency case; and if there is any doubt in the matter, seeing that our brethren in the Local Legislatures in Ontario, in Manitoba the other day, and in Nova Scotia, are very properly straining to the utmost the assertion of their powers, let us give ourselves in this Parliament of Canada the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. HALL. In the company's Act, still in force, this provision exists in exactly these words; so that, I think, our legislation in this respect might be made uniform, and that if we give this provision in the case of an ordinary company, which was incorporated under the general Act, we should at least continue the same provision in the Banking Act.

Mr. BLAKE. That is, if we be wrong, let us be uniformly wrong.

On section 39,

Mr. HALL. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the provision with reference to authenticating these declarations of transfer. Of the banks upon the frontier, many of the shareholders reside across the line in the United States, and it is found very inconvenient indeed for them to be obliged to make those declarations, as they must under the provisions of the Act, before a British consul, and in the border States it necessitates making the declaration before a British consul residing either in Boston or New York. These provisions do not exist with reference to the transfer of real estate, and I would suggest that after the word "authenticated," in the 16th line, we add these words: "by the clerk of the Court of Record, under the seal of said court." I think that would be authentication enough for the protection of the banks, and I am sure that it would be a great convenience to parties in the border States who have to make such transfers.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make that change.

Mr. MASSON. The Ontario Registry Act requires the judge of a Court of Record or the chief magistrate of the town to certify these declarations. It would be well to have uniformity in the provisions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it would be better to leave the section as it is, for British consuls are found in almost every place, and difficulty might arise if the clause were extended.

Mr. HALL. It is very well for hon. gentlemen to be satisfied with the provision where a British consul is near at hand; but those cases I have mentioned are cases of shareholders in banks, living on the frontier of this Province, in the United States. Under this provision a transfer cannot be made in the United States without authentication is made before a British consul, and in many cases such consul will not be nearer than Boston or New York, 300 or 400 miles distant.

Mr. TISDALE. That is the way real estate can be transferred, and it should be sufficient for the purpose of this Banking Act.

On section 40,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This clause is in direct contradiction to the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec, for it would allow a married woman to dispose of her shares without the consent of her husband. It is a direct contradiction of Article 77 of the Civil Code, which says that a married woman can never transpose any portion of her property without the consent of her husband. Even when separated as regards property, a married woman could not dispose of bank stock or shares without the consent of her husband.

Mr. BLAKE. This section attracted my attention in the sense mentioned by my hon. friend. It is an attempt to follow the law of Ontario, and, as I understand from the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Weldon), of New Brunswick also. It is an attempt to indicate what the civil relations between husband and wife shall be in a certain sense and to a certain extent in regard to this particular species of securities. Can it be said that this is necessary, or even so very convenient for the working of the Act as to come within the border land of necessity?

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This subject is considered of such importance, and it is in fact our public policy, that no agreement in a marriage settlement can change the law and can give a wife power to dispose of her property without the consent of her husband.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not disposed to hold that it is even necessary, or even highly convenient.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Suppose a case, which is the most frequent one in the Province of Quebec, where there is community of property between husband and wife, because, under our law, when two parties marry without any marriage contract made before the marriage they are supposed by law to have agreed to be in community of property. In that case all bank shares and movable property belonging to the wife now belong to the husband and are considered to be the absolute property of the husband. I would suggest to the Minister to reserve this section and endeavor to draft it so as to meet the laws of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the section stand.

On section 43,

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this clause. It simply provides, where the bank entertains reasonable doubt as to the legality of the suggested means by which the alleged transmission is occasioned, for its filing its petition in the courts and making declaration, &c. That certainly does not seem to be within the limits we have now discussed, even according to the hon. gentleman's own views. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that in some of the Provinces at any rate, if not in all, modern and well advised provisions have been made for trustees and shareholders applying to the courts. In my opinion it would be better to leave this out of the Bill altogether.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; I think the provision is ample in all the Provinces. We will allow this clause to stand until I consider it.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would suggest a provision similar to the one which has been found useful in the Province of Quebec. Where there is any doubt of the ownership of any property, notice of the application to the court is published in the *Official Gazette* and in one English and one French newspaper. It must be published two months before the application is made to the court, and when application is made any one who is interested can appear.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has found that law a good law in the Province of Quebec, and let him have it. We are satisfied with our law in Ontario and let us have it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The law in the other Provinces is not so much in the interests of the newspapers as in the Province of Quebec. When a petition is presented in the court in the other Provinces, notice is given to such parties as the court requires to be notified and in such manner as the court orders.

On section 44,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). There is an objection to that clause, as it conflicts with the law in the Province of Quebec. In our law, when there is any joint ownership, each of the owners can only dispose of his share of the joint property and draw his share of the dividend, but under this, if there is joint ownership, one of the owners can draw all the dividends by power of attorney.

On section 46,

Mr. BLAKE. As to this forty-sixth clause, I wish to call your attention to a proposition which I, for a long time, have felt would be an improvement, with reference to the accounts submitted to shareholders of companies—not exclusively of banking companies, but inclusive of banking companies. You will observe that the last paragraph of this clause says that the statement shall exhibit: "the amount of debts due to the bank, overdue and not paid, with an estimate of the loss which will probably accrue thereon." It is, therefore, proposed to be recognised by the Legislature that an important element in considering the condition of a bank to be announced to its shareholders, is a statement of the overdue debts and an estimate of the loss, probably accruing on them. We know very well, by sad experience, that that provision by itself is frequently illusory, because arrangements are made, anterior to the general meeting, by which debts cease for that occasion only, to be overdue debts, and the amount of overdue debts stated does not always represent the actual amount. I do not impute this as the normal condition, because I do not know. But what we do know is, that when a bank does break, and the secrets of the prison are revealed; it is made quite clear that a large number of accounts which did not appear in the last annual statements as overdue debts, but which, according to all sound principles of banking, should have been treated as overdue debts for a long time, were, through the manner in which the business was carried on, prevented from so appearing. That we cannot altogether remedy, but what we can do is this: we can speak of the past, and insist on not simply confining ourselves in the information that we provide for the shareholders to receive, to what the net profits made were. We can require a statement which will practically give the gross, by stating the amount which out of the gross had been written off, or passed to "suspense account," in respect to bad or doubtful debts during the operations of the current year. I believe the losses to the public and to shareholders in our banks have been due almost exclusively to the fact that the knife was not put into the rotten accounts at the time it ought to have been put in. There is, in private as well as in corporate life, a sort of reluctance on the part of people to acknowledge that a debt is bad or doubtful. Now it is a sign of such extraordinary and exceptionally good fortune as to be almost in itself suspicious, when a large public institution, engaged in lending millions of money to the public, and under the conditions under which such loans are made, pretends to carry on its operations for twelve months without having incurred losses; and what I think we ought to know is, what amount the directors of a bank have either written off or put to suspense account for bad or doubtful debts in the course of the year for which they give an account to their shareholders. I propose that you add to the section, after the word "circulation" in the eighteenth line, the words, "the amount written off, and the amount placed to suspense account, for bad and doubtful debts."

Mr. CURRAN. Will that cover the gross receipts for the year?

Mr. BLAKE. It practically covers them, because the directors would state the amount written

off. You might require to know also, what they had spent in the administration of the bank for the year.

Mr. KENNY. I would respectfully suggest that that is a matter which, with all propriety, might be left to the shareholders of the bank themselves to regulate by by-law. The hon. gentleman contends that the annual statement should show what the suspense account is. If there is a suspense account, the annual statement will show it. The Committee must remember that the usual phraseology in bank reports now is that provision has been made for all bad and doubtful debts; and to the accuracy of that statement the officers and directors of the bank pledge themselves when they submit it to their shareholders. As regards bad or doubtful debts, I do not know what very great advantage it would be to the general public or to the shareholders of the bank to have their precise amount stated. If the shareholders of the bank do not make provision in their by-laws for such a statement, I do not think it necessary that we should incorporate it in this Act.

Mr. BLAKE. Why do we provide in this Act for a statement of what the directors expect will become bad out of the amount of overdue debts? We provide for the anticipations of the directors; they are obliged to tell what they expect they are going to lose, and the hon. gentleman tells us that it is not right to require them to state what they have lost.

Mr. CURRAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would point out what particular objection there would be to requiring the gross receipts of the bank to be given. Knowing what they were, and seeing the net result, the shareholders would have an opportunity of pronouncing upon the actual management of the bank; they would know whether it had been properly conducted or not. If there be any reasonable objection to the insertion of the particular words which would give us that result, possibly they might be left out; but my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has merely stated that that might fairly be left to the shareholders themselves. I think it is the duty of Parliament to protect the public, and to see that these institutions are managed in such a way as to give the greatest possible security to the public, and unless some tangible reason can be given why these words should be omitted, I think they should go in.

Mr. KENNY. What the general public are specially concerned in, and what more immediately concerns the shareholders of the banks, are the net profits. No matter what the gross receipts are, the earnings of the banks are simply the net profits, and I do not see what advantage could be derived from changing a system which has worked very well in the past.

Mr. CURRAN. How can you tell how the management has been, if the gross receipts are not shown?

Mr. BLAKE. Precisely.

Mr. CURRAN. They might give a statement of what the profits were, but the shareholders could not tell the margin between the gross profits and the receipts.

Mr. KENNY. I never heard of that being refused at an annual meeting.

Mr. BLAKE. If it is never refused, let us make sure that it will always be given.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). In support of the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I would mention two cases that came before this Parliament. Two of our local banks came here some years ago to get their capital reduced. One got its capital reduced 30 per cent., and the other got its capital reduced 40 per cent. The annual report of those institutions, presented only a few months previously, represented to their shareholders that, after having written off all bad and doubtful debts, they were in such a position that the capital seemed to be intact; and yet they came to this Parliament shortly afterwards to have their capital reduced. If the provision proposed by the hon. member for West Durham had been in force, it would have been impossible for those banks to have made such reports. They were entirely misleading. I know people who bought the stock of those banks, believing it was good, while, as a matter of fact, they were swindled. If the provision suggested by the hon. member for West Durham is adopted, it will compel the directors of banks to be prudent, and it will protect the shareholders as well as the public who are interested as buyers of the stock of those banks. The case of the Consolidated Bank is known all over the country. The last annual report of the directors to the shareholders of that bank represented it to be in a most prosperous condition, and in that report was the statement that they had written off all bad and doubtful debts. They did not say, however, how much they had written off; if they had stated that they had written off the whole capital of the bank, they would have stated the truth. These cases illustrate the necessity of the provision proposed.

Sir DONALD SMITH. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has truly stated that if a bank came forward and said they had lost nothing in the year, that might create the suspicion that their statements were not very correct; but, on the other hand, the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) says if the public were told what was lost they would know whether the bank was well conducted or otherwise. I really think it might very well be left as before to the banks, but as it is not of very great consequence and there seems to be a feeling that it would have a good effect, the alterations proposed by the hon. gentleman might very well be adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to hear the observations of my hon. friend, who speaks, of course, with great authority, and although he does not think the clause very useful, still he does not seriously object to it. I can assure him there are many people who do not happen to be bank shareholders, depositors and people occasionally interested in the operation of the banks, besides many shareholders, who have felt very much the want of this clause; and they believe that a good many of the very disgraceful statements which have preceded, sometimes only a few days, the collapse of banks would have been prevented if there had been some such protection as this. I do not pretend that it will give the exact facts, because you cannot prevent bank managers from being sanguine; you cannot prevent a banker, over-sanguine or venturesome, who has entered into a doubtful transaction, from taking

the most hopeful possible view of it, and waiting until the last day or the day after the collapse before he will write anything off. All you can hope for is an approximation to the truth. It will be a little more light which I expect to obtain by this, and I think it will be valuable light, both by the suspicion which would be evoked by any considerable institution pretending to carry on its business without loss during the year and by the knowledge of the mercantile community in which the bank has its principal office. It is some clue, at any rate, to the character of the bank's transactions for the year; and as even those who take the natural view of the bank's directors, who are always desirous that these uncomfortable incidents should not become public, do not oppose it very seriously, I trust it will meet the favorable judgment of the Committee and of the Government.

Mr. COCKBURN. I see no material objection to the clause of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), although at the same time I sympathise with the views of the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), that perhaps very much good will not result. If the bank directors are the sanguine people they are represented to be, they will, in drawing up their statements, make considerable difference in the amount they are going to write off or in suspense. So that those interested in buying stocks may perhaps be as much misled then as they are now; and thinking they have a rock on which to build their house, they may find themselves in the shelving quicksands. However, as there appears to be a general impression that the bank directors desire to conceal this knowledge from the public, I have no objection that the public should get all the information they can under this clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt this will be some protection, though not a great deal. The fact of the matter is that, as a general rule, where a bank has incurred considerable loss, that loss is very apt to be tolerably well known to a considerable number of people; and the knowledge that it is well known will operate as a very considerable check on bankers in making their statements; and to that extent, although of course you cannot prevent men from over-estimating their doubtful debts, it will afford a very considerable and valuable means of information to those who choose to take pains to inform themselves as to the condition of the bank.

On section 46,

Mr. COCKBURN. This section calls on the directors to declare the amount of reserved profits at the time of declaring the dividend. But at that time they are not in possession of that information.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand how bank directors can declare a dividend without having before them an estimate of their reserve profits. That is one of the elements on which they should proceed in determining a dividend.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes, but this calls for more than an estimate. It calls for the actual amount. The directors may have an estimate which will justify them in declaring a dividend, but not all the data to enable them to give an exact statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is to ascertain the good faith of the directors in declaring the dividend and the justifiability of the dividend. If the dividend be unjustifiable when declared, it is not made justifiable by circumstances which transpire later.

Mr. FOSTER. I will allow that clause to stand and consider the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest, if the hon. gentleman proposes to make a change, that he should not alter the clause but make an additional provision for an actual statement at a later day.

On section 51,

Mr. KENNY. I question the wisdom of allowing banks to declare dividends of 8 per cent., which have only 20 per cent. reserve. I do not think that it is in the public interest that they should be allowed to do so. Hon. gentlemen must remember that sometimes directors of banks are subjected to great pressure from their shareholders for increased dividends, and I think it will be admitted that we have not a bank in Canada with 20 per cent. of a reserve which is paying more than 7 per cent. dividend. Further, I do not think that any bank, with 20 per cent. reserve, is warranted in paying over 6 per cent. dividend. I, therefore, submit to the Committee that it would be in the interest of the banks, and in the public interest as well, to increase this amount to, say, 50 per cent.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is the other extreme. I think 25 per cent. would be enough.

Mr. COCKBURN. It is difficult to fix the rate. I quite agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) in the statement that there is no bank with 20 per cent. reserve that can afford to pay more than 6 per cent. dividend. The average rate of Canadian banks is 7·11. I think we might make the reserve fund 40 per cent.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think 25 per cent. is enough.

Mr. TISDALE. This change has not been suggested until to-day, and it may be very serious to compel the banks to double up their reserve. I have never seen any discussion in the papers and I have never heard anywhere else an expression of opinion in favor of a change. This has been the law for many years, and it would be injurious to put up the amount of the reserve to 50 per cent. simply because one gentleman gets up and proposes it. Some 40 or 50 millions of capital are invested in these banks. The capital may become impaired, and for years the banks might have a very small return. If there is a desire to put up the amount of the reserve, I think it would be reasonable to put it up to 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. If any change is made, it should be made with regard to the general earning power of money. It would be unfair to make such a change unless the bank had not a large rest. The present proposition is as illusory in regard to banks in Ontario as it would be to say that loan companies should not receive more than 8 per cent. I do not see how any bank with only 20 per cent. of a rest can earn more than 7 per cent. at the present rates of interest.

Mr. KENNY. My only object was to protect directors from the clamoring of shareholders, who are frequently very unreasonable.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the amount be made 30 per cent.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved that it be 25 per cent.

Amendment of Mr. Foster agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose there is no need on my part of discussing the merits of the Electoral Franchise Act. In 1885 the House had a most ample discussion on that measure. The law is now on the Statute-book, and is accepted by the country, if not cheerfully accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. The object of the Government now, and it should be the object of Parliament, in amending the present law, is twofold ; First, to facilitate as much as possible, and in a better manner than before, if possible, the working of the law ; and second, to reduce the cost of the working of that law and render it less expensive. When the Electoral Franchise Act was introduced it was predicted that the cost of its working would be ruinous to the country. I must say that the prediction, if not realised, was, at all events, from our first experience with the law, in a certain manner warranted by the facts. The first revision cost, not three-quarters of a million, as had been predicted, nor even half a million, but somewhat over $400,000. The second revision took place in 1889, three years after the first revision, which took place one year after the passing of the law. As I had occasion to state in the beginning of last Session, the cost of the last revision was a little over $150,000. I stated then, and my expressions have been commented upon in an unjustifiable manner, that it was my personal opinion that if the operation of the law was to impose upon the country every year the sum which the last revision had cost, I, for one, would be prepared to say that the expenditure was too large. I stated then, also, that I thought that, at least, until the machinery for executing the law was more complete, a revision every year, with its attendant cost, was not necessary. That also was my personal opinion. I must say that I think the Government is responding to a sentiment which is not only shared by a large number of the members on this side of the House, but also by a large number of the hon. gentlemen opposite, in deciding that a revision in the present year is not necessary, and would entail too large an expenditure upon the country to warrant its being made. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, will say that when I introduced that measure I said that beyond the clauses which I then stated the Bill would contain, no other important clause would be inserted in this Electoral Franchise Act, nor has any material amendment been made to it with the exception of two or three amendments to which I have added a few clauses taken from measures proposed by hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. When I say that the Government will be approved by this side of the House, and I hope by both sides of the House, in not making a revision this year, I am not saying anything contrary to what I said in the beginning, when I said that no other amendment to the Electoral Franchise Act would be made to the Act. The suspension of the Act for one year is a measure by itself. The Government, I think, is responding to a desire felt, if not expressed on both sides of the House that a revision would entail too large an expenditure to warrant its enforcement during the present year. I might quote here an expression uttered on the floor of this House last year by an hon. gentleman sitting on the opposite benches ; he said that, outside the expenditure imposed upon the public treasury, a revision entailed a considerable expense on the individual members themselves ; and on the candidates in the various constituencies. Nobody will deny that a revision involves a great deal of anxiety, trouble and expense, both to the members already representing constituencies, and to the would-be candidates for those constituencies. Now, whatever expenditure is imposed upon the individual citizen in this connection ought to be avoided, and the Government is not more justifiable in imposing that expenditure upon citizens individually than it would be in imposing it upon citizens collectively, when it would fall upon the public treasury. A revision during the course of this year would take place in most unfavorable conditions. If I am not mistaken, provincial elections will take place in two of the largest Provinces of the Dominion, Ontario and Quebec, in the months during which the revision would take place, and perhaps also a general election will take place in Nova Scotia, the third largest Province of the Dominion. We know the commotion, and the excitement, and the trouble which attend the holding of these provincial elections. If we had a revision this year it must be admitted that it would take place in very unfavorable circumstances. But is there no other reason why that revision should not take place ? We have not yet reached the end of this Parliament ; according to law this Parliament will cease in the beginning of 1892. The writs for the general election for the next Parliament will have to be issued before the date of the returns of the writs for the elections of 1887, if I am not mistaken, sometime about March, 1892. But, before the natural expiration of the life of this Parliament, a most important event in the Dominion must take place—a general census must be taken during next year, 1891. That census will occupy part of the year ; but I understand the numerical census will be over about the month of July. Everybody knows that from the result of that numerical census the representation of the different Provinces may be altered considerably. The result of the decennial census controls the representation in this Dominion, and while the representation of the Province of Quebec must remain stationary, according to the Act of Confederation, the representation of the other Provinces may be either increased or decreased, according to the ratio of increase or decrease in proportion of the standard population of the Province of Quebec. After the census of 1891, as after the census of 1881, in the course of natural events the country would require that the repre-

sentation should be remodelled or readjusted in the different Provinces. I do not suppose, for example, if after the census has shown an increase in population such as to warrant an increase in its representation in the same ratio as occurred in the census of 1881, that the electorate of Ontario would allow Parliament to sit for more than one Session before the representation was readjusted. The revision of the lists beginning on 1st June, 1891, will be continued from that date until its final completion on 31st December, 1891. The revision of the list has nothing to do with the census, and the census will not in any way affect the revision of the lists. The revision of the lists is a kind of an electoral census done yearly according to the law; it is an electoral census. The census, as I have said, has a great effect upon the representation in this Parliament. If in July, 1891, the census shows that the representation must be changed it will become necessary to have new elections soon after the census; and those elections should take place in the beginning of 1892, by the natural death of this Parliament according to the Constitution. The question which presented itself to me was this: By the experience of the past, could a revision, beginning in June, 1891, be satisfactorily made, and would it be ready for the eventuality of elections in 1892. There is no reason to doubt it. The delay which has occurred this year was a delay that cannot occur another year. The Bill itself will prevent it. We have thought, and rightly so, that for the work of revision supplementary lists should be printed, showing the number of votes to be removed and the number of votes to be added at the revision. We thought that the Government printing office at Ottawa might supply the want and do the printing of those supplementary lists of names to be removed and names to be added. We have been mistaken in our calculation, for two reasons: First, the printing establishment after a year and a-half was not in a complete state for its efficient working; and, second, we had not calculated that the change in the different lists in the polling districts was so large after three years' revision. We had not thought that the number of polling districts in the Dominion would reach 7,000, that the number of votes in the Dominion had increased from a little over 900,000 in 1886, to a little over 1,000,000 in 1889. No less than 7,000 polling districts now appear on the voters' lists, which means 14,000 different lists, the supplementary lists being double. These had to be printed, and they had to be printed at a time when great difficulties were encountered by the Government in the working of the printing bureau. But the Bill which, on behalf of the Government, I propose to-day provides that the printing of the supplementary lists may be done in the different districts by the revising officers themselves, under instructions and according to the rates of the Queen's Printer. Then the difficulty which we met with, and which has caused the revision to be completed later than the date fixed by law, namely, 31st December, will not occur another year. I may say that even with the difficulties we had to encounter this year, if the necessity had existed for an election to take place in February this year, the lists might have been completed for such election, and completed more perfectly than they ever were completed according to the old system of municipal lists. I have already stated that the voters' lists now existing as revised in the Dominion, are more perfect, more complete, than they have ever been before. I state that, whoever may state to the contrary. I more particularly refer to the Province of Quebec. In elections in which I have taken part so long ago as 1859, I know that, on an average, most of the elections were held on lists which were certainly, on an average, two or three years old. I maintain that our present lists represent more truly, completely and perfectly than any lists ever before published, the electorate of the country. The question comes: how can we facilitate the working of the law as it is, and how can we reduce the expenditure? The cost of printing has been most singularly reduced since the beginning. The first revision of 1886 cost us 12 cents per name, or rather per line, for printing; but the supplementary lists which were printed last year have not cost us more than 3½ cents per name, or line. The first lists printed by the revising officers had to be kept in type by the printing offices in the different constituencies, for three or four months, during the whole period of revision; whereas in printing the supplementary lists, every page which is read and corrected by the revising officer, can be distributed, and every printing office in the country, no matter how small it may be, can do that work. In this Bill we have tried to reduce the expenditure, and I hope the House will approve of it. The law at present states that the revising officer shall post the lists in three conspicuous places in each polling district; and as there are 7,000 polling districts, 21,000 lists had to be posted, which alone entailed an expenditure of between $11,000 and $13,000. This posting of the lists has been represented by the majority of revising officers as useless. The first rain that fell, or the first wind that blew, or the first ill-intentioned person who wished to take down the list, made the posting useless, and hence we provide now that such posting shall not be obligatory. With the organisation of political parties as it is at present, and with the distribution of the lists precedent to the revision, to each member of Parliament, and to each of the unsuccessful candidates, as well as to others whom I shall name hereafter, we think the circulation ought to be sufficient without the posting. We restrict the distribution, and do not give the list to the unsuccessful candidate who has not secured the necessary number of votes to save his deposit; for I do not see why a man who is condemned by law to lose his deposit of $200 should be treated as an elected member of this House. When we have to distribute two copies to each of the successful candidates, to the unsuccessful candidates, to the mayor, the reeve, the deputy reeve, the secretary-treasurer, the school secretary, and when the lists are posted in the post office and in the office of the revising barrister, which during election time is open to the public, I do not see that it will be necessary to post the lists as before. The different clauses of the Bill will also explain some smaller reductions in expenditure. We have not yet faced the question of the reduction of the salaries of the revising officers, and the fact that the Government will not ask this year that a revision shall take place, will, if Parliament consents to this, give us time to consider the important question of the salaries of the revising officers. Two modes might be suggested to lessen the ex-

penditure in this direction. One will readily see from the fact that there are 215 constituencies, and about 170 revising officers, that the expense is necessarily large in this direction. Taking the salaries of the revising officers, as now regulated, at an average of $500 each, you have an expenditure of $85,000 for salaries alone.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Abolish the Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We might also abolish Parliament, it would save a great deal of money to the country, and if I were to judge by some of the discussions I have heard here, and to which I have listened very patiently, it might not be a bad thing to do, but we cannot do it, and we do not do it. I say that two modes might be suggested for decreasing the large expenditure on account of revising officers' salaries. One would be to reduce the number of revising officers by extending the electoral districts over which they preside. It is not surprising that, at the beginning, this new system was difficult, and the best men we have employed as revising officers have themselves acknowledged that it could not be otherwise than difficult on application at first. But the difficulties of the duties of revising officers are greatly lessened and working of the law becomes more easy, as it becomes better known and as the officers become better acquainted with the operation of it. One mode would be to enlarge the electoral divisions as entrusted to the different revising officers, and so diminish the number of revising officers; another would be to reduce the salaries of the revising officers and find some means of rendering their duties less onerous than they are at present. We must not forget that throughout the greater part of this Dominion the officers presiding at the revisions are judges; and I might risk the opinion that these judges are not overpaid. Nobody will say that the county judges of Ontario are overpaid; I will not say that they are not paid enough, but certainly nobody will say that they are overpaid. In other Provinces, in the Province of Quebec for instance, a considerable number of the revisers do not belong to the judicial bench. I do not know whether it would not be advisable to increase the number of revising officers belonging to the bench. I know that in the Province of Quebec, the judges have shown themselves adverse to performing duties which they regard as connected in a certain measure with political action; I know that our judges of the Superior Court in the Province of Quebec have not in general felt disposed to assume those duties, wishing, as they have said, to remain independent of anything which would tend to bring political recriminations against them. But I do not see great strength in the objections which have been made, and I am one of those who think that a larger number of revising divisions in the Province of Quebec should be taken by gentlemen occupying the position of judges. Indeed, we might see our way, in satisfying public opinion, and perhaps in satisfying just claims, to prescribe those duties as part of the judicial duties of judges, as we have done with regard to the decision of electoral contests. Perhaps some of the provisions of this law may appear to be ridiculously insignificant; but we must not forget that the multiplication by very large figures makes important the smallest change in regard to cost of the revision of the list. For instance, suppose we could, as we will, in the printing of only one of the supplementary lists, decrease the price which we have paid, which was, I think, 3½ cents per name, or per line; suppose we decreased that by one-and-a-half cent per name, one would suppose that would amount to very little; but in the smallest supplementary list, that is, the one which has the fewest names to be removed, that would amount to an immediate saving, in the 7,000 polling districts, of over $1,000. Then, it appears to be a small matter to post up two or three lists on a fence or on public buildings in a municipality; but when we multiply the saving in this item by the number of polling districts, it reaches between $11,000 and $13,000. We last year reduced the expenses of clerical assistance. There is no need to have the services of criers in the courts, and by dispensing with them we will effect a further reduction. In this way, as the working of the law becomes familiar to the people who are charged with that work, and as soon as the law becomes more generally known, the working of that law will become as easy and regular as any municipal action. Those who have in charge the working of the elections, Conservatives and Liberals, will take the work in hand, and that work will be done carefully and well. It has been said on the other side of the House, and on this side too, perhaps, in Conservative newspapers as in Liberal newspapers, that the expenditure was very large, and that the Provincial system of voting would be preferable. I have it from one of the most intelligent revisers of Ontario, that the Provincial system of revising the lists by the Provincial authorities is not at all as cheap a method as some hon. gentlemen are apt to say. The cost of that system does not show as the cost of our system does, because the expense is divided and sub-divided among many different municipalities; but I could read, and during the debate I may read, the expression of opinion of that revising officer, who stated that he had certified, under that system, an account of so much for this clerk, so much for printing, so much for the assessor, so much for another municipal officer, all of which collected together amounted to more than the cost for a similar revision of the Dominion list. I do not say that the case is everywhere the same; but I say that the revision by the Provincial authorities is not so cheap as people have given it out to be. This Bill is practically a repeal of the Act of last year, substituting every clause of last year's amended Act by another clause amending in a different manner the different clauses of the Electoral Franchise Act. I thought it was better to do this than to have an amendment to the amendment which was itself an amendment, and which would render it difficult for the revising officers to understand the law. We have not repealed, as I intended at first, the Act of last year, because the Act of last year, repealing a great many clauses of the main Act, such clauses would not have revived. But practically this Act is the Act of last year amended in all its principal clauses.

Mr. LAURIER. So that, after all, it appears we are not to have a revision of the lists this year. My hon. friend, I admit, on a previous occasion, did not state as much, but he hinted as much on another occasion. The hon. the First Minister, when questioned on that subject, almost

practically declared there would be a revision. True, he did not say so in so many words; but, when asked whether there would be a revision or not, he said there would be, according to law. Well, the law provides there shall be a revision every year; and when asked if the law would be amended this year or not, the hon. gentleman would not reply. Despite the fact that the law requires a revision every year, the hon. gentleman proposes to do again what he has done on two or three different occasions. He proposes to amend the Act, and to dispense again with the revision. The more we look into this Act, the more it is discussed, the more we must come to the conclusion that it is illogical, uncalled for, and absolutely unnecessary. If there is anything in the law on which there could be no doubt, it is that there shall be a revision every year, because an election may be held at any moment. We know to our cost that death is an ever-vigilant enemy, and that a constituency is apt to be opened at any moment, and we will be exposed to taking the votes of the people, not according to the existing electorate, but upon a list two or three years old, and an electorate which is not existing at the time. The fact is the Government are both afraid and ashamed of their own progeny. They put a law in the statutes providing for a revision every year, and then they are afraid to apply the law. The hon. gentleman stated, as an argument in favor of the Act, that the revision of the lists under Provincial laws is almost as cheap as the revision under this law. If it is as cheap in the Provinces——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As dear.

Mr. LAURIER. Then why should his statement, when he said there would be no revision, have been cheered as it was? In making that statement he, no doubt, relieved the hearts of his followers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And your's too.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, because we believe the Act is altogether unnecessary, and we want to fall back on the Provincial lists. Why was the statement cheered so enthusiastically by the hon. gentleman's supporters? Because every man, whether on this side or on the opposite side, is afraid of the expense incurred by this revision. On this side we have to submit to the want of a revision, but on the other side they are in the majority, and could have the law amended in the sense in which we desire to have it amended by falling back on the Provincial lists. As to the amendments proposed, I will not say, as my hon. friend has said, that they are childish or even small. Some of them commend themselves to my judgment, and may perhaps tend to make the Bill a little less imperfect than it is.

Mr. BARRON. With regard to the saving of expense mentioned by the hon. the Secretary of State to be effected by not posting up the lists, great injustice will be done in many constituencies. The hon. gentleman suggests the advisability of keeping the lists in the revising officer's office for the inspection of any one who wishes to see them. That will not be satisfactory, especially in large constituencies and in constituencies in which the revising officer does not reside. Take, for instance, the constituency which I represent. It is very long and extends very far back, and it will be utterly impossible for many people anxious to see the lists to see them to any advantage if they are confined to the revising officer's office.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose by the amendment that they shall be kept in every post office in every polling district. More than that, of the two copies given to the different municipal officers, they are obliged to have one of the copies posted up and exposed.

Mr. BARRON. Then I misapprehended the Secretary of State. He refers to the expenses of the revising officers. I will suggest to him a means of saving expense, by reducing the number of revising officers. There is no reason why the county court judge, who is considered efficient for the administration of justice in the whole county, should not also revise the list for the whole county instead of two revising officers being appointed, as there are for the county of Victoria, for instance. That, no doubt, is the case in many other counties in Ontario, because I do not speak for any other portions of the Dominion. It might be said that in that case the salary of the county judge would have to be increased, but, though that may be true, it would not be necessary to double his salary, and I think a great saving could be made there.

Mr. MITCHELL. Necessarily when a subject of this kind is discussed by the Minister whose duty it is to place the views of the Government before the House, it creates a great deal of interest. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the Secretary of State in regard to this measure which very largely affects the election of representatives to this House. The hon. gentleman has gone into a great deal of detail in stating the intentions of the Government. At present I am merely going to repeat some of his words with the view of ascertaining whether I have rightly interpreted his statements. He says that the census will be taken in 1891, and that this House will expire in March, 1892, and I inferred from what he stated that we would not have an election until after the natural expiry of the term of this Parliament on the 31st March, 1892.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hope so.

Mr. MITCHELL. No doubt the hon. gentleman hopes so. It is not what he hopes or wishes, but I want to ascertain for myself, as well as for the House and the country, whether I have rightly understood his statement, that the Government have resolved not to have an election until after the expiry of the present Parliament, in March, 1892. A friend of mine here suggests that they are drawing a herring across the track. I do not think so. My hon. friend is more suspicious than I am. I do not know if he is afraid of them. I am not. The reason stated is, that there is a decennial census to be taken under the British North America Act. We took one in 1881, and must take another in 1891, and by another provision of the Act a re-arrangement of the Provincial representation must be made, taking the Province of Quebec as the pivot. The Premier is aware, as well as others who assisted in framing the Constitution, that it is very difficult to decide how the increase or decrease of the representation should be provided for, and the method which now exists is the one which was agreed upon for the re-

arrangement of the representation in Parliament in proportion to population. If the Province of Quebec has a population remaining stationary, say at 2,000,000, and the other Provinces remain stationary, no change will be made ; but, if the Province of Ontario, for instance, has increased 10 per cent. more than the Province of Quebec, its representation will be increased ; and if the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick has been decreased, their representation will be lessened, so that the representation will be taken from the smaller Provinces and will be given to the larger Provinces, while the Province of Quebec remains with the same representation. My hon. friend the Secretary of State has at very considerable length explained the objects of this Bill, and I understand from him, that the redistribution will be made after the census is taken, which will not be later than July, 1891.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is the numerical census.

Mr. MITCHELL. How can you have a census which is not numerical ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is something more in the census than the number of individuals. The largest part is outside of that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking of the census which applies to the representation in this House, and that means the number of people in the different Provinces. Then, the numerical census having been ascertained in July, 1891, it will become the duty of the Government of the day to determine the manner in which the representation of the different Provinces shall be settled. I am not going to say that the population of Quebec will decrease or that that of Ontario will increase, but, if there has been no special emigration from Quebec, knowing the productive character of the population of that Province, I have no doubt that its population will have increased more than that of the other Provinces, or at all events that it will hold its own. The question becomes one for the smaller Provinces as to what the effect may be upon them ; and if the exodus from these smaller Provinces has been as great as we have reason to believe, I am afraid there will be a necessity for a redistribution which may not affect the smaller Provinces so favorably. No doubt the western Provinces cannot be affected beyond a certain point by the increase, because until they have a certain amount of population, they have all got a representation far beyond what their population would give them if they come in on the basis of the old Provinces, and in all probability there will not be very much change made in them. Now, my hon. friend has gone on to state that in order to get at the basis of that representation this census will have to be taken, and, as he states, the Provinces never would consent to remain as they are for one Session, if the changed relations made by that census were such as to warrant the necessity of giving to Ontario, we will say by way of illustration, half a dozen members more than she had before. We might take from the Maritime Provinces one or more representatives, leaving them a less number than they had before, and these western Provinces would never consent to have a House sitting here in which they had a less relative number of members than they were entitled to under the Act. Then assuming that I have correctly stated the proposition made by the hon. gentleman—and if I have not correctly stated it, then the hon. gentleman may correct me—the next conclusion we arrive at from what the hon. gentleman says, is that these Provinces which may be entitled to increased representation, will not consent to be represented in the House by a less number of members than the British North America Act, which is the charter of our country, gives them. Then we will have to have another Session ; assuming that we had a Session in 1891, at the ordinary date, we will have to have another Session in the fall of the year, or in the beginning of 1892, which Session will terminate, as I understand, on the 31st day of March, 1892, or thereabout, and one of the great objects of that Session will be to carry out, not only the spirit, but the letter of the British North America Act, under which we sit here, and that will require a redistribution of the representation based upon the population, as given by the numerical census which is expected to be completed on the 1st July, 1891. In other words, then, I am to understand from the hon. gentleman that the Government contemplate having two Sessions of this Parliament more before a general election. There is nothing like putting the thing in plain language, because my hon. friend wrapped it up pretty well, but I watched very closely what he was saying, and I now put it in plain and distinct language, open to correction by the hon. gentleman, that the inference to be drawn from what he says is, that we are going to have two more Sessions of this Parliament before a general election takes place. My hon. friend alongside of me (Mr. Davin) who occupies, perhaps, a doubtful constituency perhaps like myself, may rather like it ; but I must say that I see no reason to object to it. My right hon. friend looks at me because he knows that I have a little suspicion of the inner workings of this thing. I entirely approve of it, not, perhaps, for the same reason as my hon. friend who sits beside me, namely, that our constituencies may be doubtful ; but I approve of it because it must work in another way unless two sessions more are held, and for this reason : Suppose that next session, being the fifth session of this Parliament, the Government should choose to dissolve the House and go to the country before that census was complete, or before the distribution under that census was accomplished, what would be the result then ? If Ontario was entitled to six constituencies more, do you suppose she would rest satisfied to have six less representatives sitting here in the House than she was entitled to ? Certainly not. They would have to have another general election, and immediately afterwards a redistribution, after the census was completed, and therefore, as the matter may not be very generally understood in the country, and as there is a good deal of anxiety as to what the effect of this census may be, I may state that I entirely approve of the course the Government are taking. They cannot do otherwise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. If hon. gentlemen who say " hear, hear " were as sure of their seats as I am, perhaps they would not be so ready to say that. I am not afraid of their machinations and manœuvres. They have tried them upon me often ; I am ready for them whenever the time comes, whether it comes this year or next year. I want the people

to understand what is ahead of them, and I want the Government clearly to state whether I have correctly interpreted the statement of the Secretary of State, that he means to imply that two sessions of this Parliament more will be held after this one, in order to complete the result of the census and carry out the British North America Act in readjusting the representation on the basis of that census. I think I have correctly stated what I understood, at all events, from the remarks of the hon. gentleman. Now, having gone thus far, let me say a little more. I have given the Government credit for pursuing a course which is inevitable unless they want two elections in one year. But, Sir, let me warn hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, let them look out for gerrymandering; that is what they have to watch. My right hon. friend has tried the game before; he knows how needful and how necessary it is, but I want to warn my right hon. friend now, that if, under the pretext of carrying out the British North America Act and doing what he is legally entitled, and is probably compelled to do, that is, to readjust the representation, if he tries on his gerrymandering scheme, perhaps it will not result in the same way it has resulted before, and I just warn him now, and I warn him all in good part—I do not desire to impute to him an intention of doing it—but judging from the experience of the past, I am very much afraid that members on this side will have to look out for themselves and see that they do not get gerrymandered out of existence. That is all I am going to say at this stage of the Bill. But I want to have it thoroughly understood by my hon. friend beside me, who is situated as I am, that I think I correctly understand the intimation given by the Secretary of State that we are to have two Sessions before a general election will take place, if the spirit of the British North America Act is to be carried out. My hon. friend says: "Oh, that is a red herring pulled across the track." I say it is not a red herring pulled across the track; I give the right hon. gentleman credit for understanding the spirit and the letter of the British North America Act, and he knows as well as I do that unless he wishes to have two elections in two years, it it absolutely necessary to have two Sessions, and one of them to occur after the census is completed on the 1st of July, 1891.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the question of my hon. friend whether we are going to have two Sessions more, my only constitutional answer is this: That I am not authorised by His Excellency the Governor General to announce in what mode the prerogative of the Crown will be exercised in that regard.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, Mr. Chairman; he is not authorised to announce it. But as the prerogative of the Governor General is exercised under a very wily and shrewd old statesman, and as I had some little experience not only with political affairs for the last forty years, but with my right hon. friend, I venture to predict that in carrying out the spirit of the law, while he can command a majority in this House, unless some great crisis occurs, in which he is compelled to go to the country, he will just give us two Sessions more and we will have the census by that time, and he can readjust the representation; and if he comes in at the head of a majority, as he expects to do, but I shall be very much disappointed if he does, then, I say, he will have us five years more. The old bird will pursue such course as will perpetuate his power in office.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, it is within the bounds of possibility that some other parties might have something to say as to the length of this Parliament's duration as well as the hon. First Minister. He might lose the confidence of the Opposition and of a sufficient number on his side of the House to prevent the hon. gentleman having all the say in the matter. We are unable to congratulate the hon. Secretary of State and the Government on their skill in legislation. We are again considering a Franchise Bill. In 1886, the Franchise Act was adopted, and it was well considered. Last year it was amended, and all the talent of the Government brought to bear on it. The hon. Minister of Justice devoted himself largely to it, and I do not hesitate to say that, when he brings his abilities to bear on a subject, he brings great abilities; but he found the subject complicated and difficult to work, and this fact alone should have led the Government to have sought its total repeal. What credit is it to the Administration to note this fact, that the Act was passed only three or four years ago, after mature deliberation, and then, after a general election had been held under this revision, its defects were apparent and revision was needed. Last year a Bill was introduced to amend the Act, a Bill containing only 13 sections. To-night we have to consider another amended Bill, a Bill of 10 sections, and of those sections one is a new section to make legal what would otherwise be illegal, and of the remaining nine sections, six, namely, sections 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9, are to repeal sections of the Act passed last year. That is a sample of the legislation introduced into this House by the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not so. While these sections may be repealed, they are re-enacted, but in slightly different terms, and in order to reduce the expense.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Certainly there are differences, and it is in regard to those differences I am commenting. We shall have this difficulty: that the Franchise Act will be complicated by the Amendment Act passed last year and the Amendment Act of this year, and it would have been preferable, if the Government thought that the amendments now proposed were all that would be necessary for some time, to have introduced a new Bill, so that the whole franchise legislation would be contained in one Act. But possibly the Minister thinks that amendments will again be required next year. The House already knows my views on this question. I do not believe in the Bill; it involves a great expense, and the Minister recognises this, for he is trying to curtail it by doing without a revision this year. If, however, an election should take place in any constituency or a number of constituencies, the result will be the disfranchising of hundreds or maybe thousands of voters who have the right to vote. These are objections always urged by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on previous occasions; but I suppose our duty now is to consider the amendments introduced, and see what their bearing is as we proceed with the Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As I attach a good deal of importance to the good-will of my hon. friend who has just spoken, I must endeavor to remove the very unfavorable impression he has received of this Bill from a hasty reading of it. My hon. friend is a layman, he is not a gentleman of the long robe, and he does not see that I have been obliged to repeal several clauses only to amend them, and it would have created confusion if they had not been repealed. My hon. friend did not pay a compliment to my poor little Bill in failing to give credit to any of its provisions. I may say, however, that two or three of the best provisions in my Bill embody the suggestions made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not pronounce that judgment on the Bill. My line of argument was that if the hon. gentleman approved of the suggestions made last year when he received them, why did he not embody them as amendments last year? I find fault with him in that regard, not with respect to this Bill, which we will discuss on its merits. Why did not the Minister, when experience showed him that our suggestions were correct, insert them in his Bill last year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For a very good reason, because we have had the experience of a revision this year, which we had not last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister's proposed amendments to the Franchise Act remind me of the improvements required in the old gun, that wanted a new lock, stock and barrel. The hon. gentleman's Franchise Act requires amendments of very much the same character, amendments that will remove every vestige of the measure as it originally stood on the Statute-book. The Government have set before themselves the very difficult task of making this a workable measure. So far they have amended it on several occasions without being successful, and they have now come to Parliament for further amendments. One of the objections we made when it was originally proposed was, that it would entail a very large expense on the treasury, and also a large expense and much trouble upon those who took an interest in securing a fair, and, on the whole, a complete voters' list for each constituency. The hon. gentleman in this Bill has proposed further amendments. He has not had the courage to propose to the House the total repeal of the Bill and a return to the more satisfactory system of preparing a voters' list, one more in consonance with the federal principle of the Government. The hon. Minister told us that this is not so expensive a system as that adopted in the various Provinces, and that, in fact, he hoped to make this a very efficient and inexpensive system of preparing a voters' list. The hon. gentleman forgets that we impose on the Provinces no additional expense by adopting their lists as voters' lists for the elections to the House of Commons. The Provinces are obliged to prepare for the election of members to the Local Legislatures voters' lists in every constituency in each Province of the Dominion, and so when we use these lists we do not entail any expense, nor impose any additional expense on the treasuries of the Provinces, and, we are told, no expense whatever upon the treasury of the Dominion, so that, however cheap the hon. gentleman may make the preparation of an independent voters' list under an Act of the Parliament of Canada, it will be so much in addition to the expense that the country was called upon to bear already. The hon. gentleman must in a large degree fail in any attempt at cheapness and efficiency, because there does not exist any machinery by which the Dominion Parliament can prepare a voters' list as it is prepared in the various Provinces. The hon. gentleman will see that in the very name of the officer, by whom these lists are prepared, there is a misnomer. You call him in the Bill, a revising officer. Who originally prepares the list; is it not this same officer? Look at the preparation of the lists in England, and you will find that the person who is called a revising officer, and who is appointed by the judge on circuit, is really a revising officer. The list is there prepared by other persons; it is prepared by persons acquainted with the people in each parish, just as the municipal council and the assessor are acquainted with the people in a township here. This Parliament has no such machinery provided for the original preparation of the list, and the result is, that in that preparation, if it were not for the large expense incurred by private persons, who aid in the preparation of these lists in the interest of party, the hon. gentleman's system would be even a greater failure than it is under existing circumstances. I think that failure is shown, not only by the various amendments that the Government have submitted to Parliament, each succeeding Session, but it is also shown by the fact that the Act is in a state of suspended animation for a great portion of the time. The hon. gentleman proposes now to suspend the law next year, as he has proposed to suspend it on former occasions, and so for a great portion of the time there is no voters' list which is not an old list. There is no voters' list on which there is not a large number of persons who ought to be struck off, and a large number of others who, by law, are entitled to be on the list, but who cannot be put there. Why did the hon. gentleman not prepare the voters' list for the years 1886, 1887 and 1888? It was because of the enormous expenditure. We, on this side of the House, told the hon. gentleman and his leader, that there would be serious expense incurred in the preparation of this list, but they did not believe our representations, whereas the facts have shown that we under-stated rather than over-estimated the amount of expense that would be incurred. The result was that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were afraid to carry the law into operation; they were afraid that the enormous expense and trouble which would be imposed upon their friends as well as upon their opponents, would be such that the pressure from their supporters would have compelled them to remove this law from the Statute-book; and so it is suspended from time to time, in order that it may be maintained in existence at all. Any act or step taken to carry it into operation, year after year, would necessitate the repeal of the measure altogether. I ask the hon. the Secretary of State whether it would not be the wiser and more statesmanlike course to propose the repeal of this measure and to return to the condition of things which existed before the measure was introduced at all? The hon. gentleman himself has intimated views, at an earlier period of the Session, which, it seemed to me, pointed to the

fact that his own private judgment was against the Bill, and that, in his opinion, it ought not to remain on the Statute-book. He did not hesitate to tell the House that if this expense cannot be largely reduced, he would favor the repeal of the measure altogether, so that the hon. gentleman, after all, does not think that the measure is of so excellent a character that an unlimited expense would be justified in making it efficient. The hon. gentleman in his statement, as it seemed to me, pronounced the condemnation of the policy of the law. From the character of our country, from the large number of persons put on the voters' list who are not permanent residents in any one constituency; workingmen whose earnings are sufficient to allow them to go on the list, but who may be in one county to-day and in another county to-morrow, it cannot be made a proper list. They should vote, if they vote at all, in the constituency in which they are residents at the time an election takes place, and yet there is no provision made to place these parties on the list to which they properly belong. This could not be done. The hon. gentleman admits that the expense at the present time is so very great that it would not be proper to undertake to carry the law into active operation. What is the result of this suspended animation of the law? It is that there are from 20 to 30 per cent. in many constituencies, before the new list can be prepared, whose names are on the list who ought not to be there, and others whose names ought to be on the list who are not on the list at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. How many?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). 20 or 30 per cent.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says: "Oh, no." Of course I have not the data, but the hon. gentleman no doubt has, and he will be able to tell us how many names, on an average, ought to be struck off each list.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The average is not over 4 per cent. per year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And how many ought to go on?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say the change on the average is not more than 4 or 5 per cent. per year. It is under 5 per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have my list in my desk, and it represents twice that number.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend must remember one thing, which I am sure he knows as well as I do, and that is that the first revision was not done as it will be done in the future, when the law is better known and better executed, and it covered a period of nearly four years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And from the policy the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt, this is to be the normal condition of things.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He proposes only a fitful and occasional preparation of the voters' list. It is only when a general election is about to take place that the expense will be justified, by the necessities of the case. That is the position which the hon. gentleman has taken; that was the position which led to three years' suspension, and that is the reason he proposes to take no action next year. I say that this is an extremely unsatisfactory condition of things, because you declare by law, that a certain number of persons are entitled to go on the voters' list, and at the same time you declare that no machinery shall be provided by which these names shall be placed on the list. On the contrary, you say that they shall not go there. Now, Mr. Chairman, having said this much with regard to the principle involved in the Franchise Act, of which this Bill is an amendment, I would just make a few observations on the provisions which the hon. gentleman now proposes as an amendment. I notice that one provision the hon. gentleman makes, is, that on, or as soon as possible after, the 1st of June in each year, the revising officer shall cause a list of voters to be prepared, and so on. Well, I do not find any proposition at all for striking off any names; if any property has been sold or has changed hands, I do not find that the new proprietor or tenant is the only person whose name is to be put upon the list. The names of parties which were on before will be put on again, unless active steps are taken, outside of any duty imposed on the revising officer, and the names that ought to be taken off the list will be allowed to remain. It does seem to me that the measure ought to go further and define with more distinctness the duties of the revising officer. In many cases he depends on others to do the work the law has imposed on him. The law says he shall do certain things—that he shall strike off certain names, obtain certain information, put on other names, and so on; and yet with regard to all these duties the usual practice is for the revising officer to depend on the local leaders of the respective parties to furnish him with the information, and to take the necessary steps to have some names put on and others taken off. This is not a satisfactory condition of things. What ought to be done is to devolve the duty on the revising officer to make a correct list, and to take the initiatory steps which are necessary to remove from the list the names that ought not to be there, and to put on others that ought to be on. I know, from communications which I have had from different parties, that this is not done. In many cases the revising officer believes that if the information is not brought before him, and if all the necessary steps are not taken by somebody else, he is not called upon to do anything. He acts as though he were sitting judicially, instead of acting as an administrative officer, whose duty it is to obtain the information for himself, and to make the changes which the law requires him to make, and which he is paid to make. The other parties are not paid, and I do not see any reasons why large sums should be paid out by people who, merely from public spirit and zeal for the public interest, perform those duties, while the officer who is paid to discharge them merely acts when information is brought under his notice. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman's Bill, assuming that we are to continue to operate this law, does not make it sufficiently clear and explicit what the duties of the revising officer are.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has expressed his view that this measure requires such complete reconstruction that the gun shall have a new lock, a new stock and a new barrel; and I observe that hon. gentlemen opposite, most of them, give some color to that

view. They admire the rifle very much ; they polish up the barrel, oil the lock, and varnish the stock ; but what must weigh on all of them is that, after all this is done, the gun they have all admired should be hung up in the hall and should not be allowed to shoot ; because I understand that three years ago, after having tried the rifle once, they decided that it should not shoot for three years more

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It shot sometimes.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes ; it did the hon. gentleman's business. It shot then ; and I understand that the proposal which is to be introduced into the Bill to-night, and which the hon. gentleman says is of small moment, is a proposal which was made under very great pressure from behind. The pressure from behind says : "However useful the weapon is, however admirable it is, however elegant it looks, for God's sake, do not let it shoot again." It reminds me a little of Don Quixote's helmet. He made himself an admirable helmet, which, if I remember rightly, was composed largely of pasteboard. Having adjusted it, he thought he ought to test it, and he gave a slash at it with his sword. The helmet was so injured that he had to repair it ; but he was judicious enough after the repair to decide that no further test should be required, and that the helmet should be considered and adjudged to be a sufficient and satisfactory helmet, capable of resisting every assault without any further test whatever. The hon. gentleman will postpone his test for another year in order to improve his helmet. No greater proof of the soundness of the views of those who opposed this measure could be given than the legislation which has been placed in your hands, showing that the hon. gentleman realises it to be severe, unjust and expensive in its operations. I confess I am surprised that my hon. friend from Brant, contrary to his usual fairness, should have so much complained of these constant amendments, because he and I agree that the measure is so bad that it cannot be made good, and that the task—the impossible task—the Minister has set to himself is to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

Mr. DAWSON. I would suggest a slight amendment to the first clause of the Bill. Before doing so, however, I may remark that the electoral district which I have the honor to represent is so extensive that the rules which are applicable to other districts will not apply in all cases to it. It is as large in area as the whole of the rest of Ontario, being over 1,200 miles from east to west, and from 200 to 500 miles from south to north. The population is very thin and scattered in many places over that district ; and yet, it is divided into different polling districts, which are in some cases so large that the revising officers, though they do the best they can to meet the requirements of the population, find it, in some instances, difficult to do so. Some of the polling districts are hundreds of square miles in extent, and how is it possible to accommodate the voters with only one polling station in each of such polling districts ? How is it possible that the people can get to the polls ? At the last election, the people in some places held separate polls of their own, as they could not pretend to get to the regular polls ; but, of course, votes cast under such circumstances did not count. At one place, there was a polling station on an island in Lake Superior, fifty miles from the nearest settlement ; and the people in order to get there underwent great hardships, going by boats through the ice, and otherwise exposing themselves in the severest winter weather that has been known for a long time. It is the same in other parts of the district. For instance, at Sudbury there is a polling district, and the same polling district takes in Moose Factory on the shores of Hudson's Bay. I should like to know how a voter on the shores of Hudson's Bay at Moose Factory, which is now in the Province of Ontario and district of Algoma, can come and record his vote on a given day at Sudbury where the polling station is. There is a way of remedying this to a certain extent without encroaching on the system at all, and I would suggest that in each polling district of the District of Algoma the revising officer may be allowed to establish more than one polling station so that the people may be able to record their votes. There can be nothing inconsistent in this, the District of Algoma being so enormous in extent that an exception might be made in its favor without giving ground for similar arrangements in ordinary districts. With the leave of the House, I would move, in amendment to the first section, that section 1 of the proposed Act be further amended by adding thereto the following as a subsection :

That in the electoral district of Algoma, the returning officer may establish when it appears to him to be necessary for the convenience of voters, more than one polling station within a polling district.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is only one objection which, though not a great one, is a fundamental one. The amendment is an amendment to the Electoral Franchise Act and not to the law of elections. It applies to the returning officer and not to the revising officer. I have already one amendment in the same sense which, before the Bill is concurred in might be considered, and if necessary this small amendment to the Electoral Act might be introduced.

Mr. DAWSON. If that could be arranged, that is all I desire. I only desire some amendment in the law by which it would be possible for a returning officer to have two or three polling booths in the one electoral district.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose that in the first section the amendment of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) be embodied, namely, that the occasional absence of any farmer's son shall not disqualify him from being placed on the list of voters, and I propose to add "or of an owner's son."

Mr. BARRON. I would suggest to the Secretary of State the consideration of an amendment which I proposed in private conversation with the Minister of Justice not long ago. It is this : I have found by the Act that on more than one occasion there has been a disqualification by reason of a proposed voter living with his mother on land owned by her, but the father not being dead. The Act requires in such a case, for the voter to be qualified, that the father must be dead, but I have known cases where the father has been living separated from the mother. In that case, the revising officer held that the law did not justify him in putting the proposed voter on the list. This

would be the proper place to put in an amendment to provide for such a case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will consider the amendment, and before the Bill is reported will see whether I can do something in that sense.

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to the amendment proposed by the Secretary of State to section 3, I would point out to the Secretary of State that, while he provides for placing upon the list the sons of farmers and others who are absent for a certain time, there is no provision for keeping on the list those who have been already on the list, but who may be absent in the same way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to making the amendment in the 9th line read "placed or retained."

Mr. CHAPLEAU, If my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) had read the paragraph with the original clause, he would see that the amendment would not be necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it not time that this Act should be consolidated? The same amendment should be made in line 10 of that clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to that, but I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) places sufficient stress on the observation of the Secretary of State, that this section is to be read as if it were in the original Act.

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the fact of a young man attending an institution of learning which is not in Canada to inure to his benefit under this clause?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As it stands here, it refers to an institution of learning in Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Many young men who are qualifying for the medical profession and other professions go out of this country for a time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not see why a young man who happens to go to the United States or any other foreign country to attend an institution of learning should be disqualified. I think it would be just as well to say that they should have the right if they were absent for six months to attend an institution of learning, whether in Canada or not.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to leave out the words "in Canada."

Mr. LAURIER. Has the Minister of Justice been informed that some wage-earners have qualified themselves to vote in two separate districts, particularly those engaged on railroads—conductors, brakesmen and others, who travel from one section to the other, say from Campbellton to Rimouski, or from Rimouski to Point Lévis—men who are not married, who do not keep house, but are boarders at each place? They sleep one day at one place and another day at another. I understand that in some cases these employés have qualified both in Point Lévis and in Rivière du Loup, which is not the intention of the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That subject was mentioned last year. I was under the impression that it was provided for in some way; I will look into it.

Mr. MULOCK. The first part of section 1 provides that any case of absence not beyond six months shall not disqualify the owner, and subsection *a* provides that the son of a mariner or a fisherman, a student, though away from home, shall be deemed constructively to be at home. Now, there are many other cases in which sons of owners are absent for a longer period than six months, and if this clause is left as it is, they will not have the same privileges as the sons of mariners or of fishermen, and students. Now, it is not an unusual thing for a son, the mainstay of his parents perhaps, who has acquired a trade, to move off to seek for labor, and he is absent, perhaps, a longer period than six months, why should he not have the same rights that the sons of some other tradesmen may have? Of course, I recognise the fact that the absence is more likely to take place in the case of the son of a mariner or of a fisherman, but the other case does happen, and it is happening every year. I remember a case happening in my own experience, where a son lost his vote by reason of being away longer than the period the law allowed. In one case I remember quite well a carpenter who had crossed from one riding to another, from the Township of Georgina into the Township of Scott, adjoining. His parents were living on one side of the road and he worked on the other side with a tradesman. He was absent longer than the time allowed and lost his vote, he had no vote in either riding. Now, on all the borders of ridings this risk is run all the time, and if you do not provide for this case and put that class of sons in the same position as the son of a fisherman or of a mariner, you are discriminating against a most worthy class, who are trying to do their duty by their country and by their families.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We must draw the line somewhere, and we have drawn it at six months. A young man may absent himself for two, three, or four months, and retain the right to vote, but not if he is gone six months. We have made a further extension of time in the case of mariner's sons. If a farmer's son is absent in an institution of learning for six months, he should have a right to vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose the census is taken in the manner the hon. gentleman alluded to some time ago, the young man would be counted as a resident of Canada, even if he had been absent in a foreign country for more than six months.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the census is to be taken *de jure*, he will be taken; if the census is only *de facto*, he will not be taken, because he will not be present.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is to be taken *de jure*, I am told.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then he is a citizen of Canada and so enumerated, though he may be absent for more than six months in a foreign country; he is a citizen, but he is debarred from the right of voting.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. People becoming owners only ten days before the list is made are also debarred from the right of voting, although they are citizens.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Does the Government intend making a difference between a mariner's son and the son of a mechanic or of a laborer, who may go away for five or six months to work at his trade? If he goes away he is deprived of his vote, whereas the mariner's son retains his.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We say the owner's son is not a resident with his father if he is more than six months absent.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then we are to understand that a mechanic's son is not placed on a footing of equality with a mariner's son?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps the latter has some advantage, that is all.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has not made out a case for this discrimination. I can hardly understand a fisherman's son being absent for a longer period than six months and having the right to be deemed as at home, while you do not apply the same principle to the son of any other class of men. In the case of a fisherman's son pursuing his calling, under this section *a*, he may be away for ten years, but he is still deemed to be at home. It is an extraordinary doctrine. A mariner's son may be gone for ten years, but as long as he calls himself a mariner's son and is pursuing his calling, he retains a right to vote.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not the mariner's son or the fisherman's son who may be absent, but it is the son of the owner, being a mariner or being a fisherman.

Mr. MULOCK. However long the mariner is gone, however long the fisherman is gone, provided that he is carrying on the pursuit of a mariner or of a fisherman, he is constructively at home for the purposes of this Act. The Minister will admit that there is no limitation of time. Now, why should there not be a similar provision in favor of other industrial classes? Why should they not be put on the same footing? The sons of landsmen should have the same rights as the sons of those who pursue their calling on the sea. I think that clause has got to be applied to all, or else repealed. It is one of the difficulties of the working of the Act, though, I suppose, in time the Act will be made more perfect. Perhaps, if you limit the right to vote to residents, it will be got over.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). How will it be with farmers' sons who leave the farm three, four or even six months? It would not be right to disfranchise farmers' sons under these circumtances.

Mr. WALDIE. I desire to call the attention of young men who work in the woods. My own son is away more than six months getting out logs.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The clause was framed especially to meet the cases of young men lumbering, and six months was thought to be a sufficient time.

Mr. WALDIE. They are absent more than six months, from October to May.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In any case in which a man earns more than $300 he has a vote as a wage-earner.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that sons of farmers and of fishermen have been taken care of, and this should also be done for lumbermen. Lumbermen go away early in October and do not return until May and why should they be disfranchised?

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will be on the list as wage-earners.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The clause was made specially to meet men who might be away three, four, or five months lumbering, and six months was considered a sufficient time.

Mr. MITCHELL. If sons of lumbermen go away from home, why should they not be entitled to the franchise as are sons of farmers and fishermen? The Secretary of State asked the Committee some time ago, what more economy he could practice in regard to the Franchise Act. If he wants to economise, let him wipe out the Act entirely and adopt the Provincial lists, which can be done without expense. When the hon. gentleman introduced the first Bill on this subject I supported its principle, because, theoretically, this Parliament should make the law and control the law which elects the members to it. I received very little credit for my action, but I must say I condemn almost every feature of the Bill which has been introduced. If that principle had been honestly carried out and the system had been economically worked, it would have been a proper course, but it was not economically carried out. In the first year over half a million dollars were expended, and the Government are now postponing the revision of the voters' lists on account of the expense. If economy is desired, let us go back to the old system, for it is impossible to understand this Franchise Act, which is altered almost every year. I move in amendment:

That all the words in the first section after the word "Act," be repealed, and the following added thereto: "And all other sections of the said Act and Acts amending the same be and are hereby repealed."

Mr. MULOCK. That is a motion which must commend itself to the judgment and intelligence of this Committee. The Act stands condemned by the action of the Administration itself. In 1886 we spent three months in endeavoring to produce a workable and perfect measure. Each year the Administration has admitted the failure of this measure. One year they declare it is so bad it must not be inflicted upon a long-suffering people, and another they endeavor to improve it. They took two years to improve it, and in 1889 they tried to apply it again to the country. They applied it, and so convinced was the country that the Act was unwarrantable and not in its best interests, that I understand a large majority of the supporters of the Administration have petitioned the Government not to put the Act in force this Session. It is generally recognised that the Government, recognising the objectionable character of the measure, intend to suspend its operation at least for this Session. It is highly in the interests of the country, for very many reasons, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) be adopted. The expense is an insuperable objection, and it has been proved beyond all question that it is going to amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, which this country is little able to afford in its present condition. We have built a vast structure to enable the Government to print these various voters' lists, and, in undertaking the business, the Government has entered into competition with the legitimate printing trade of this country, which, I presume, is not altogether appreciated by them.

I understand that the Secretary of State, in order to equip the printing bureau for the purposes of this Act, was obliged to issue orders for the purchase of plant in excess of the largest orders ever given for plant since printing was an institution. I understand that the Secretary of State ordered forty tons of one kind of type.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. More than that.

Mr. MULOCK. You see how moderate I am in my estimate. I have been told by printers who have seen the accounts, that the Minister was obliged to issue orders for quantities of plant of various kinds, exceeding in amount the largest order ever given by the largest printing establishment in the world.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MULOCK. The man who told that to me——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Did not know what he was saying.

Mr. MULOCK. He knew a great deal about it. He is engaged in the selling of printing supplies, and has an establishment in England, and an agency in Canada. He told me that the largest order ever given in the world for a certain quantity of type, was given by the printing bureau, here, and that the next largest order for a certain kind of type, was given by the great thunderer, the London *Times*. The hon. Secretary of State spoke candidly, no doubt, when he said he did not court the patronage of having to run a printing office, in view of the difficulties he recently experienced in the working of this institution. These difficulties are going to continue, and it all means money out of the taxpayers of this country, to support the continuance of this Act. You have increased the burdens of the people until they are able to bear them no longer. The hon. Minister of Finance told us, the other day, that this country was prosperous and able to bear more strain, that the backs of the people were still not bent sufficiently, and so he proposed to put extra burdens upon them. Every now and then, when we on this side of the House sought to relieve the suffering people from additional burdens, the answer was given: that we must have additional money in the exchequer of the country. The other day, when we proposed to remove a tax involving $5,000 a year on the infirm and afflicted, the answer was given: that the money was required to carry on the affairs of the country. Why, Sir, if we abolish this Act, we could for fifty years allow surgical appliances and instruments, and articles of that kind, for the relief of a suffering community, to come into the country free. You propose to keep this Act in force at such an expense to the country, that you are obliged to tax people in every position of life.

An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not dispense until I express my opinion on this subject. For the information of the hon. member for Simcoe, I may say that words and language fail me in expressing all I desire to say on this measure, and if I cease to speak on the subject, it is not because the subject is exhausted, but because perhaps I may be.

House divided and amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object to the vote of the hon. Minister of Public Works, as he did not hear the question put. If the amendment is only negatived by his vote, as I believe it is, the vote should be struck out.

Mr. BARRON. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister, to the fact that under the income qualification, the income of a person to entitle him to vote, must be derived from some investment in Canada. It has come under my notice, where the income has been derived on investment in England and the money sent out here, that a gentleman having no other qualification, was deprived of his vote. I see no reason why this should be the case, or why a man should be deprived of voting who is a British subject and a resident in Canada, but whose investment is outside of the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In some of the revisions last year, the revising barrister held that every portion of the income of a wage-earner, must be earned in Canada, which I do not think is fair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order. It is impossible to hear what is being said.

Mr. BARRON. Has the Minister considered my suggestion?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He would be obliged to invest in Canada instead of in a foreign country.

Mr. BARRON. It is a great hardship that a person should be deprived of his vote under these circumstances.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend wishes to move an amendment he may move it. I do not think it is advisable to change the law in this respect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must again request hon. gentlemen to cease the noise in the chamber. It is utterly impossible to hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to see that the Chairman was looking in the right direction when he was reprimanding the members this time. He looked at the place the rowdyism came from.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to be able this evening to give that proper consideration to this important measure that it deserves, and if they feel disinclined to do so it will be necessary for us, I think, to move that the committee rise and postpone discussion until the House is in a better frame of mind to deal with it. Hon. gentlemen may as well understand that this Bill in all its phases is to be discussed seriously, and if they think that by making noises and rendering it difficult to have it properly discussed they are expediting its passage, they are making a mistake. There is no disposition on this side of the House to do anything else than to fairly discuss the measure.

On section 2,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the slight amendment, as I suppose the hon. Secretary of State will call it, that is made in this section?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. By the amendment last year the words, "or does not hold a location ticket on the said reserve," were inserted, and this part of the amendment made last year is to be struck out this year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then we adopt it last year and strike it out this year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Why not ?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is for the Minister to say why not and why for ?

Mr. DAWSON. As the amendment of last year was made at my suggestion, I may, perhaps, be permitted to make some remarks. My object in proposing that amendment was that the rights of the Indians should be clearly defined. It was intended to define more clearly the tract of land which an Indian should have in the reserve on which he voted. It did not alter the law one bit. So far as I could make out from the authorities I was able to consult, it really did not alter the law. Ermatinger, who I believe is a fairly good authority on this matter, says :

" By the Indian Act, 1880, section 17, no Indian shall be deemed to be lawfully possessed of any land in a reserve, unless he or she has been or shall be, located for the same by the band or council of the band."

Further on he says :

" On the Superintendent General approving of any location aforesaid, he shall issue in triplicate, a ticket granting a location to such Indian, one triplicate of which he shall retain in a book to be kept for the purpose ; the other two he shall forward to the local agent—one to be delivered to the Indian in whose favor it was issued, the other to be filed by the agent, who shall also cause the same to be copied into a register of the band."

My object, last year in suggesting this amendment, was to let the Indians understand that they should have their location tickets defining their rights to the land in their possession, before they could have the right to vote, because, I found from experience, that a great many Indians desired to vote on the same lot of land without having a separate tract at all. But I, for my part, have no objection whatever to this being repealed, as it does not alter the Act. The location ticket was just as much required before this amendment was made, as it was after it was made, and when this is repealed, the location ticket will be as much required as ever, unless some other amendment in the Act affecting it is made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is one feature of this clause which I am not sure was intended by the Minister to be here, but it is one that ought not to pass without the attention of the Committee being drawn to it. The beginning of the clause is :

" No Indian in either of the Provinces of Manitoba or British Columbia, or in the district of Keewatin or the North-West Territories of Canada, shall be entitled to be registered on any list of voters, or to vote."

I can well understand that provision as applied to the ordinary tribal Indians ; but it does appear to me that where an Indian is emancipated, resides among white people, pays his taxes, and is subject to the same regulations as any other citizen, he ought to be permitted to vote on precisely the same terms. I have always opposed the attempt to give the wards of the Government votes while they are wards of the Government, but I am not disposed to discriminate against Indians, colored people or whites. Whatever qualification is considered adequate for the one ought to be considered adequate for the other.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to ask a question in connection with this clause. Some of the revising barristers have held that there is a special qualification for the Indian, and only one, namely, that he shall have land on which there are improvements to the value of $150. My reading of the Act is that the Indian who possesses that qualification, or any other qualification under the Act, shall be placed on the list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is exactly what the section says and I do not think any revising officer has ruled the contrary. There is a special provision qualifying an Indian who holds property on the reserve, if he has no other qualification, but if he is a wage-earner or has any other qualification prescribed by the Act, he has the same right as other persons.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not quite understand the position which the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) takes with reference to this amendment. He holds that it makes no difference whether the words proposed to be struck out are struck out or not. I would like to have the opinion of the hon. First Minister or the Minister of Justice on that point. I think the hon. First Minister took that ground last year when discussing this question ; but, I think the revising officers have not taken that ground. I know they have not done so in my riding, but there was nothing said, and they went on as they had done before. The revising officers in both Haldimand and Brant, were, I think, guided solely by the consideration whether the Indians had land which they had improved to the extent of $150, and by that consideration solely.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They did under the general Act before it was amended ; but under the amended Act, the revising officer of Haldimand held, that without the possession of the location ticket, the Indian could not be put on the list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the point I want to have explained, because the hon. member for Algoma says that the provision is the same without these words in the Act. I do not know whether the revising officer in Brant held that that would be the strict interpretation of the law or not, but no objection was made and no attention called to it, and he went on and revised the list as before.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is because it was found almost useless that it was struck out. It has not been taken advantage of, except in some cases, and I do not think it is necessary to reserve that limitation for the qualification of the Indians.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It has this objection, in the minds of many of the Indians, that they are not prepared to have their reserves sub-divided, and leaving the words in the Act would look as if it was the intention to compel them to have something done which they did not want to do. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) says the effect is the same without these words.

Mr. DAWSON. In saying it was the same, I was giving the interpretation given of it by a very good authority, Ermatinger, whose work is here. The Indians, as a rule, have no objection to take location tickets if they could get them ; but the enfranchisement system and the granting of location tickets is so complicated, and the Act itself is so complicated, that it is impossible for them to get them. I have not the slightest objection to the amendment in this clause, although there are 12,000 Indians in Algoma and anything affecting them might be a

serious matter. But I do not think this will have any effect whatever, and I have not the slightest objection to its being amended as proposed in the Bill before the House.

On section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only difference is this: There was no provision in case the revising officer was taken suddenly ill and could not ask leave of absence; and we have provided that the Governor in Council may appoint his deputy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where the revising barrister is a judge there is no appeal, but where he is not, there is an appeal. Should the deputy who replaces a revising barrister who was a judge, not be a judge, would there be an appeal?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the successor be not a judge, there will be an appeal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On referring to section 11, sub-section 6, it will be seen that the deputy revising barrister shall be possessed of all the qualifications, and have during such illness all the powers of a revising officer; and if he is not a judge his decisions are subject to appeal.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would just suggest whether by repealing sub-section 5 of section 11, you are not raising serious doubts as to the power of the revising officer to take off any names at all. We are repealing the third section of the Act passed last Session and substituting a new section. The fourth sub-section of the section we are repealing authorises the revising officer to strike off the names of dead men and of persons who are not qualified under the statute and are objected to. That power is not re-enacted here, and the revising officers--at all events those with whom I deal—unless the words are explicit and plain, will not take a man's name off.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Section 4 provides that the revising officer shall

"Prepare two separate supplementary lists, one to be entitled 'names to be added and corrections to be made,' in like form as the original list, and the other to be entitled 'names to be removed' in the following form."

And in that he is bound to remove the names of those who are dead or otherwise disqualified.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says the revising officer is bound to remove these names, but the Act does not say so. There should be a distinct provision in the Act to that effect.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand the point taken by my hon. friend and I will see that the provision is made, because it would be clearer.

Mr. MULOCK. Where would the appeal lie in case of the illness or absence of the county court judge?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To any judge acting in his place.

Mr. MULOCK. It must be a judge of the county. Would a man acting in his place be a judge of the county?

Mr. TISDALE. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. For this purpose?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has been held to the contrary.

Mr. BARRON. If the county court judge is ill, to whom is the appeal to be made?

Mr. TISDALE. If the deputy was not a judge, there would be an appeal to the county judge. If the county judge was ill, you would have to wait until he got well.

Mr. MULOCK. How do you show that in the Act?

Mr. TISDALE. If you appoint any one to act in place of the county judge, he has the powers of the county court judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will find that, where one county judge has undertaken to discharge the duties of a judge in another county, it has been held that he is not the judge in that county, and cannot act outside of his district.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As I understand, the point taken is, that when the county judge is also a revising officer, and is ill, he appoints a deputy revising officer, and there is an appeal from the deputy revising officer, which must necessarily be to the judge. The appeal must either be to the judge himself when he recovers, or to the deputy judge while he is ill, or to his successor if he dies.

Mr. MULOCK. It is clear that the words "county court judge" mean the county court judge appointed permanently for a county. That is evident from chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes. The county judge is not a deputy or any one else, but he is simply the judge who is drawing the salary of $2,400.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The deputy judges derive their jurisdiction from the Ontario statute which provides for the appointment of deputy judges, and also provides that they shall have all the powers of the judges.

Mr. TISDALE. In one of the statutes of Ontario there is a provision for the discharge of the duties of a judge either by a deputy judge or some other official in case of the illness of the judge. You cannot always legislate for cases of sickness, but I know there is a provision for a deputy to take the place of a county judge.

Mr. BARRON. If it is necessary to provide for the contingency of the revising officer being sick, surely it is necessary to provide, in a similar way, for the sickness of the judge to whom the appeal lies.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the case of the judge's sickness, he is bound to nominate a deputy, and the executive always appoints the deputy.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose the county judge is unable to discharge these duties, who is to discharge them? The Minister of Justice says that the deputy judge is to discharge them, because powers are given to him by the Ontario Act. But we are now legislating for the whole of this Dominion, as every Province in the Dominion is included in this provision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have not provided deputy judges, but we have provided for the judge of another county being called in. I am not certain about New Brunswick, but it is so in Nova Scotia. In Manitoba and British Columbia there is a provision for a deputy judge.

Mr. MULOCK. What is necessary to be provided here is this: We are saying by this Act that an appeal shall lie to the county judge. It is clear

that under the Dominion Statute, the Act that I have referred to, chapter 138, respecting judges, the term "county judge," as used in the Franchise Act, would not include the judge of another county or a deputy judge. You have got to depend upon some other legislation in order to meet the case. The Minister says that there is local legislation in some of the Provinces, but it is doubtful whether there is in others; so it may be that in some of these Provinces, though there is a provision for the ordinary administration of the law by a deputy, yet under the wording of this Bill those officers would not come within the technical definition of this Act, and be deemed county judges in order to dispose of an appeal under the Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There may be something in that. It can be easily remedied by an additional section to the interpretation clause.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would move the clause which the Secretary of State intimated his willingness to accept, and which is as follows :—

He shall enter on the latter of such lists the names of all persons whose names appear on the original list, or who are dead, or who were not, according to the provisions of this Act, entitled to be registered as voters.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before we pass from section 3, I wish to say that I would like to see some clause introduced into this Act to direct the revising barristers to do the work which they now insist shall be done by the respective parties outside. The revising barrister in my county does not pretend to do anything about the revision of the lists; he waits until we put in declarations on both sides. The legal fraternity went to him almost in a body to remonstrate with him. He said: "Send in your declarations and I will do it." He throws upon us the great responsibility and trouble of putting in over 3,000 declarations in my county alone. I thought the Act was so plain that any reasonable man would accept the directions contained in it, but that appears not to be the case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Still we hear complaints that in some other districts they are doing too much.

On section 4, clause 4,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In the 12th line, after the word "stated," I wish to add these words: "distinctly in the body of the declaration." In many cases declarations have been made stating that the following names are duly qualified electors, and the declaration is signed and a schedule of names attached. Sometimes this is done in a loose manner. At the end of such declaration an appendix is added, to which the names are easily attached. But no error could arise if the qualification of each elector whose name it is sought to add, was distinctly stated in the body of the declaration.

Mr. BARRON. I must congratulate the Minister for acting upon the suggestion which I believe I made to him a few days ago. I think it is most necessary to make some such amendment as he proposes. Hon. gentlemen will hardly believe, though it came under my own notice, that I found that a declaration in more than one case was made with a schedule attached which purported to contain names to which the declaration referred at the time the declaration was made. But evidence came to my notice which was satisfactory to show that after the declaration was made by the declarant in all honesty, the person carrying round that declaration actually inserted in the schedule a lot of names purporting to give every one of them a qualification by reason of the declaration which in itself was perfectly honest. So satisfied was I that I brought it to the notice of the revising officer, and it was discovered that the declarant actually swore to names of persons being of age who where not of age, and whose parents came and proved they were not of age, and which names were inserted in the schedule after the declaration was made, and to all appearence before the declaration went before the revising officer, and being apparently honest. There is no amendment more necessary in the interest of justice, and for the purpose of preventing perjury.

On section 5,

Mr. TISDALE. Why not have an appeal?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. Minister is providing that if any mistake is made in the declaration, it may be amended by the revising officer at the revision court. We do not want the appeal.

Mr. TISDALE. This clause will provide for any mistake made, but if you are going further than that, you might as well say that the revising officer shall have authority, without any action on the part of any party, to compel us to go to trial on the point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have received from more than one revising officer the statement that in certain cases an error had been committed in placing a number of names in one polling district that should have appeared in another polling district. The clause suggested provides that this mistake may be corrected. The revising officer shall have no right to remove any names from the preliminary list, but if he sees a mistake has been committed he can give notice calling attention to it, and the revision court has the right to correct it after notice. The next clause dispenses with the printing of the supplementary lists at Ottawa. We have succeeded in getting the printing of these lists done at such a reasonable price that there would be no advantage, compensating for the disadvantage of having the list sent to Ottawa and returned, in having them printed here, and so we shall leave part of the printing to revising officers, but under instruction and according to the rates provided by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will they be printed in their constituencies?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As much as possible. This work can be done at any printing office, because it it does not require a large quantity of type.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood when the Printing Bureau was established the purpose was to print these lists, and thus to save expense to the country. By enacting this clause you duplicate the work. You first give the supplementary lists to be printed in a local printing office, and afterwards these lists are forwarded to the Government bureau here and they are reset. There will, accordingly, be two settings of type to accomplish one purpose. I do not see how we can reconcile this state of affairs with the statement made by the hon.

Secretary of State when the printing bureau was established, that money would be saved to the country by printing the lists at the Government bureau, because now the Government are going to give the work to local offices and reprint these lists in the Government bureau when they are returned.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Even if the supplementary lists were printed here, they would be printed separately from the main lists, and there would be the inconvenience and delay of having them brought here and reset. The only difference was the price at which they could be printed, whether it would not be too costly when done in the different constituencies as compared with the Government Printing Bureau. The difference in price is not such as to compensate for the inconvenience and loss of time in receiving the lists from the revising officer at the Printing Bureau, in sending them back and having them again forwarded to the bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These supplementary lists are to be printed in the local printing offices. They are to be sent afterwards to the bureau here. They will then be re-set. So the work will be done twice, first in the local printing offices, and afterwards in the Government bureau. The supplementary list is provided by the revising officer. If the copy were sent to the bureau here it would be set up here, and the lists would be sent back for comparison, and the type would not require to be re-set. All you are doing by this clause is to enable the revising officers to dispense some patronage among newspapers which support the Government, because, in any event they are sure to get the work. In order to carry out the promise made by the Secretary of State, that economy would be secured by establishing the printing bureau, the hon. gentleman, in order to be consistent, should insist that the supplementary list be sent down to the bureau and printed, so that the type will not have to be set up twice.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does not make a great difference. If you are obliged to take the original list and make a difference between the cost of doing that, and of setting up the whole supplementary lists.

Mr SOMERVILLE. But then they would have to be added again here, after they are printed. Why not do it here at once ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say, it will be possible to do a large portion of the work here in the printing office ; but to make it a law, that it shall be done in the printing office, has occasioned a great deal of delay and inconvenience, and has forced us to have a large portion of them printed outside, in spite of our good-will.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, I am to understand, that the Secretary of State admits, that so far as the printing of the voters' list is concerned, the Printing Bureau has been a failure ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am to understand that it has not accomplished the work for which it was established. That is the clear statement made by the Secretary of State. He says that it has caused a great deal of inconvenience and that it has been found necessary, even in the past year, to have some of these lists printed outside.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is only the supplementary lists, which I said would not be more than 10 per cent. of the revision every two years.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But the Secretary of State must bear in mind that the supplementary lists form a portion of the list as finally revised. And if these names are set up in the Printing Bureau here, it will save the expense of paying the local offices for the same work. After they have been prepared and printed by the revising officer, at the local printing offices, the same work will have to be done here again. What is to be gained by that ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is nothing to be gained if it were not for the inconvenience, the delay, the trouble and the mistakes which occurred of lists being mislaid on the way. If my hon. friend wants me to say that I was mistaken in thinking that the supplementary lists might be more economically printed here, and that it was better for the working of the law, I might say that I am wiser to-day than I was two years ago. My hon. friend is right ; if we could print them here it would cost a little less, but not much.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Secretary of State admits then, that so far as the preparation of the voters' list is concerned, the statements he made to the House, that the establishment of the printing bureau would be a saving to the country, were not correct ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They were correct and they are still correct.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How can that be so ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend, who is a printer, knows that if we were obliged to make complete lists everywhere in the country and print them outside of the bureau, we would have to pay 10, 12 or 13 cents per line, whereas, it does not cost us for the main list 3 cents per line.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By the provision of this section, the hon. gentleman says :

> " Immediately after the revising officer has completed and certified such supplementary lists, he shall have the same printed under instructions of and according to the rates to be determined by the Queen's Printer."

Now are we to understand from this that the Secretary of State undertakes to direct the revising officer, at what office the printing shall be done ? That, it seems to me, is an important point to consider, because while the Secretary of State has a right, I think, to fix a reasonable rate at which it is possible to have the work done, I do not think he has the right to say to the revising officer : you shall have the work done at this, that, or the other office. The Secretary of State claimed that power under the original Act, and it was resisted in some cases, and he admitted that the revising officer was right, and that his view of the law was not correct. The hon. gentleman admits that he is proposing to make this change as a matter of convenience, so that the work may be done under the immediate supervision of the revising officer, which seems to me necessary to avoid typographical and other mistakes which are likely to occur when the lists are printed at a distance. This is a very large country, and it is impossible for the Secretary of State to know which is the most convenient or efficient office, for Victoria or New Westminster,

or other places at a distance from Ottawa. While I think it is well that he should have the power to instruct the revising officer as to how the work shall be done, and at what rates it shall be done, it is not proper that he should instruct the revising officer as to what office the work should be done in, because, being on the ground, the revising officer is the best judge of that. I am anxious to know, and I am sure I am not alone in that respect, whether it is the intention of the Secretary of State to leave to the revising officer the freedom in this respect which he had under the law as it originally stood.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the intention of the head of the Department, in providing for this work, to follow the wise advice given by the revising officer; but it is not the intention of the Secretary of State, or of the Government, to leave it absolutely to the will or caprice of the revising officer. He who pays has a right to say who will do the work; the Government pays, and the Government will say it. Moreover, there is a stronger reason than this. Suppose we say that the revising officer may do the work according to his will or caprice, and suppose in some of the counties adjoining Ottawa, he refuses to have the work done in the Printing Bureau, but wants it done in some other office, I want to have the right to tell him that he shall have the work done at the bureau: and that right I shall keep, if the House allows me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman wishes to say, evidently, that this is regarded as a matter of patronage, and that the Government shall instruct the revising officers where the work is to be done, no matter if it is 4,000 miles away.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is an important fact to have before the Committee, and it goes a long way to take away any merit from the statement made by the hon. the Secretary of State, because the Secretary of State was very positive a year or two ago, that this work could be done very much better and very much cheaper here than it could be done in the various local offices all over the country. The Secretary of State has had the work done here, and now he says it is necessary to supplement this work, by having the supplementary lists printed in these various local offices. The Secretary of State must understand that it is the people of the country who furnish the money, and that it is not his money that is paid; it is the public money of which he is the trustee for this purpose. The people may say that the hon. gentleman is now deteriorating the efficiency of his former system of centralising this work, and that it is being done not as a matter of convenience, but as a matter of patronage.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That it is being done to increase the patronage and influence of the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am stating what an ill-natured and suspicious public may say.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot help that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman how he can help it, and that is by leaving the matter to the revising officer, who, if he is competent to discharge his duties as revising officer, is surely competent to judge as to where his list would be best printed. The revising officer is more competent to judge than the Secretary of State, because the Secretary of State is in Ottawa, and he cannot be everywhere, though he were a bird, and that being the case the Secretary of State ought to admit that a man who has necessary education and qualification to prepare the voters' list, is also qualified to say in what office he could have the work most satisfactorily done in his immediate vicinity. That, the Secretary of State denies to the revising officer, and he takes to the Government this, as a matter of patronage, all over the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My friend is mistaken, and completely mistaken. It is not a matter of patronage; it is a matter of economy. I have stated before, and I repeat, that all that can be done in the printing office will continue to be done; instructions will be given to that effect to the revising officers; and when my hon. friend supposes that the Government wants to keep a small piece of patronage, and that prices will be paid indiscriminately without any right judgment being exercised, I think I can calm his conscience by telling him that if the Secretary of State does not know, those who advise him know very well what should be done. The prices have been fixed by the Auditor General and the Queen's Printer, and the printers understand that they are not men to give patronage to the detriment of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that the Auditor General and the Queen's Printer have fixed the prices. I do not object to that; it may be quite proper, although the prices at Toronto and at Ottawa may be quite different from the prices at Vancouver or Halifax. But the hon. gentleman has not only claimed the right to do that, but he denies to the revising officer the right to say where he shall get the work done at those prices, and to that extent he is assuming patronage. He did not have it under the Bill as it originally stood, but now he claims that he must have it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are we to understand that if, in the locality where the revising officer resides, there is no printing office where a paper is published supporting the Government, the revising officer is to be instructed to take the list to some outside town to have it printed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hope not.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the hon. Secretary of State be kind enough to inform the Committee what is the price that has been fixed by the Queen's Printer to be paid for printing these lists?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have fixed 3 cents per name per line, and I propose to alter the form of one list so as to take away at least one-third of the cost. The interpretation of the Act had not been well understood, the first lists were bulky, and on those we paid 3 cents per name per line: but in this case I expect that 33 per cent. will be taken from the cost. As for giving instructions that the work should not go to papers published by opponents of the Government, I never said that, but I should not be bound to send it there.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see how the Queen's Printer can be said to have discharged his duties efficiently in the past, because we all know that before the establishment of the bureau, his estimate of the cost was 12½ cents per name, and now, after revising it, he has put it down to 3 cents.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The printers throughout the country have changed their prices willingly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, it must be acknowledged that when the Queen's Printer fixed 12½ cents, he fixed a very exorbitant price.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; because the first time the lists were printed, the printers were obliged to keep the type standing for four months, and to have sufficient of that special type in their establishments to keep the whole lists standing. This made the work one which all small country offices could not perform, and added greatly to its cost. The supplementary lists can be printed form by form, and the matter distributed as the work proceeds.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand the hon. Secretary of State to say that if a printing office in the electoral district is willing to do the work for the price agreed upon, in all cases the work shall be done within the electoral district?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say it will be so, although the Government cannot be bound by a rule of that kind and it cannot be put in a statute. That is exactly the disposition we have. Even if the office were opposed to the Government, if the revising officer suggested it as the cheaper way to do it, the work would be done there.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why not allow the revising officer to ask for tenders, and if possible get the work done for less?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When we have done it ourselves, we have done it well, and will continue to do so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see why competing printing offices should not have a right to tender for this work. Let the Government fix a maximum price to be paid, and let the revising officer ask for tenders in the town where he resides, not to exceed that amount, and I think it possible that the work will be done for a great deal less than the price fixed by the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If there are printers tendering at lower prices, I am perfectly sure the Auditor General and the Queen's Printer will be happy to give them the work; but if they can go under the prices fixed, they are more clever than I think they are.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They will not have the opportunity if the revising officer is instructed to pay that price.

Mr. BARRON. I must protest against the handing of patronage in this way to whatever printer the Government like. If this arrangement is carried into practice, it may end in one or more revising officers resigning because they are sent to a printing office with whom it might be unpleasant for them to have relations. Therefore, I think it should be left to the revising officer himself to say what printer shall do the work. I certainly think it is a very bad policy for the Government to take into their hands this paltry piece of patronage, when the printer may be one with whom the revising officer has not by any means friendly relations.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The suggestion of my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has the merit of economy, and that is the principal object which the hon. Secretary of State has, I understand, in this Bill; and does he not think it would be well to embody it in the Bill?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; I do not think so.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ask the hon. Secretary of State whether this change which is proposed is the result of the working of the Act, or is it the result of some demand on the part of the printers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the suggestion of the Auditor General himself; these prices have been determined by him, with the assistance of the Queen's Printer, at such an economical figure that the work can be done to the best advantage of the Government and the public.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask if it is intended to adopt a uniform tariff for the whole Dominion?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We will examine that question; we cannot pay the same price in Victoria as we pay in Toronto.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not? I do not think the Secretary of State has quite made out a good case. I made a comparison in my riding as to what the printing of the voters' lists costs under his Act and under the municipal system, which made the printing open to competition. The printing of the voters' lists in my riding in 1886, cost five times as much as it did under the municipal system.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Speak of 1889. The form is much simpler.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware of that, but unless the Government adopt some system under which there will be a public competiton, they may be led away by their own weakness and desire to benefit others.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We cannot make another rule. It is intended to print still a large number of those lists at the Printing Bureau when it can be done to accommodate the revising officers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They will be printed in the order they come in?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There will be no favoritism as far as dispensing patronage is concerned?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There will be no more favor in that than in the printing of the lists.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why should there be any necessity for giving any patronage out? Is it because the Printing Bureau is not furnished with material to do the work for the whole Dominion or because it cannot obtain a sufficient number of printers to do the work? We ought to know in what way this Printing Bureau has failed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have explained three or four times, and am not going to explain again. We spend more money in useless repeated discussions than in printing the lists.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The question I have asked is a reasonable one. The information I am asking for I do not ask with a view of annoying the Secretary of State at all, but for the purpose of obtaining information. Why is it that the Printing Bureau, which has at its back the whole Dominion and has sufficient funds to purchase all the material necessary to accomplish any purpose, in the way of public work, has failed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is on account of the difficulty and inconvenience of transferring the lists from different parts of the country. This has been pointed out to us by the revising officers, and we are taking power to do the work at local printing offices where it can conveniently be done. There is no question of patronage in this. At the same time, I must say that the work of printing this year 14,000 supplementary lists at the Printing Bureau was rather difficult, even if the establishment had been double, and if we could obtain the men to do it. Those lists which we can print at the Printing Bureau conveniently will be printed there, but I want to have the liberty to print some of them in the locality where the revision takes place.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, the contention of the Secretary of State, when he proposed to print these lists at the Printing Bureau, is proved to be incorrect, because the inconvenience of getting this work done at the Government printing office is so great that he proposes to have it done in different parts of the Dominion. That proves that our contention was correct, that the proper way is to have them printed—if they are to be printed at all—in the localities where the revision takes place, that it would be more satisfactory to the public and would be more likely to be a correct list if the printing were done in the place where the list was revised. This was the contention of many members of the House at the time, and that contention is established by what the hon. gentleman has said to-night. I hope that at some future time the hon. gentleman may agree to do away with printing these lists here in Ottawa altogether, and may give the patronage to the printers in the different localities in which the lists are revised.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At the maximum of 3 cents per name, which the hon. gentleman has fixed for outside work, I desire to ask if the bureau could do the work for less money?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, in that case, why do you not have all the lists printed in the different electoral districts? There is no object in having any of them printed in the Government bureau, if there is no economy in doing it there.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish my hon. friend would visit the Printing Bureau. All the lists that are printed there represent an economy of three-fourths of the printing, if such printing had to be repeated every year; those lists are kept standing, and the only change, if there were a revision every year, would be about 4 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). An hon. gentleman near me, informs me, that in his constituency, the changes amounted to 40 per cent. in the list.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That may be the case in some localities. In cities and towns no doubt there are great changes made, because workingmen move more frequently than do the residents in agricultural constituencies, but the general proportion is what I have stated.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the proportion of changes approaches nearly to 40 per cent., it would be better to have the whole list reset every time, than to have the corrections made—to insert new names in one case, and to strike out other names in another case. Every printer knows that it would be better to reset the whole list, than to make corrections of that kind.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been suggested to me, though I am not very strongly in favor of it, that we should add to this the words "to each candidate at the last election who shall have polled the largest number of votes after the candidate elected." I do not see why, when a candidate who does not poll half the number of votes of the successful candidate is punished by law by losing his deposit, he should be entitled by law to receive these documents.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If that amendment is carried, some people would not get these documents at all. In my county the Government candidate always loses his deposit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not see why that should be adopted. The unsuccessful candidate to-day might be the successful candidate to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the number of copies supplied to a member should be increased. I think at least half a dozen should be supplied for each polling sub-division. Two copies are not nearly enough.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Hon. gentlemen opposite preach economy in one place and extravagance in another.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the price which is fixed for these lists is extravagant. At present, 10 cents is charged for each polling sub-division. These lists do not cost the Government one-fourth of that amount. I believe they do not cost them 2 cents, and why should they charge 10 cents to the public? Do they want to make a profit?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When it comes from his own pocket, my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) is very economical. I say that 10 cents is not too much to pay for a list containing 250 names.

Mr. SOMERVIILLE. I think the price is extravagant, because it does not cost the Government anything like that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The price fixed in the original Bill was 50 cents for the whole list, and the hon. gentleman will see how wide this charge is compared with what was originally fixed. In my opinion, the list ought not to cost more than one dollar, but under this it will cost more than a Holy Bible.

Mr. BOWELL. You can get that for nothing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There should be facilities for obtaining the list in each constituency at a reasonable price, but, if it amounts to $7 or $8 for a constituency, I think that is an extravagant price.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Secretary of State ought to reconsider that proposition. I do

not think the Printing Bureau wants to make an income out of the members of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I want to reduce the expenditure.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the Secretary of State might give a little consideration to my suggestion. It is impossible for a member who has to look after the lists, or any one else, properly to attend to it with only two lists. I am not complaining of myself particularly, but I know from experience that more than two supplemental lists for each polling sub-division are absolutely necessary. I hope the Secretary of State will not consider this suggestion as made simply to annoy him; it is a *bonâ fide* suggestion which I make. I think it is due to each member that he should not be compelled to put his hand into his pocket to pay for additional lists. Somebody has to take an active part to see that the supplemental list is correct. In the more sparsely settled parts of the country a polling subdivision may embrance ten miles or more, and a member cannot work this on only two lists, and in a very limited period of time; it is absolutely necessary for him to purchase a lot of copies from the Department in order to have that list investigated properly.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When we had that beautiful municipal system, to which my hon. friends would like us to return, we had even more trouble. There are twenty municipalities in my county, and I used to pay $3 or $4 to each municipality; that made $60 that I had to pay for copies of the lists. At the present moment you get two copies for nothing.

Mr. MULOCK. In our Province we get twelve for nothing.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the Secretary of State ought to give us at least four copies.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it will close the discussion I will grant four copies.

Mr. MULOCK. Make it six.

Mr. DENISON. Two is quite sufficient. What is the use of increasing the number?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think six is not too many; last year we had eight or ten.

Mr. MASSON. Ten is quite little enough. I could never visit my riding with less than ten.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If four is not enough, you can borrow of the various other parties who are entitled to receive them.

On section 5,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We make it obligatory on each postmaster to post up the list and keep it posted.

Mr. MULOCK. If he has to keep it posted all the time no person can take it down to look at it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What will you do where there is no post office in a polling sub-division? Frequently you will find in some rural sub-divisions that none exist.

On section 7,

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it understood that all the final lists are to be printed at the Government Printing Bureau here, or will they be printed at outside printing offices?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the bureau here; they cannot be otherwise.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would suggest to the Secretary of State that more than one copy should be sent to members of the House of Commons. I think he should supply us with at least ten copies.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we should get three or four copies at all events.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think you better say two copies instead of one. My hon. friends do not know that a copy of all the lists of the Dominion, costs $400.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are counting something for the cost of the type setting. It cannot be possible that the printing of a few extra sheets will cost that much more. When you are printing one sheet, as you propose to do now, you have only the cost of the paper and the presswork to add. When you print one copy you can print twenty copies in less than two minutes. I am satisfied the Secretary of State is mistaken as to the cost of extra copies. The paper and presswork could not cost so much as he states.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is 7,000 pages.

Mr. DENISON. The copies will not be wanted every year, and if you are supplied with ten copies they will lie around for three or four years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We appropriate money for purposes that are not at all as necessary as the voters' lists, and we should make a liberal distribution of these lists to the members of the House. I do not say we should have ten copies every year, but certainly it is important that a considerable number should be placed at the disposal of members of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the Committee is willing to incur the expense, we will make it four copies to each member of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

On section 8,

Mr. MULOCK. There should be some provision here for formal notice to be given of the date to which the court is adjourned. How are people who are assembled in the court to know when it may resume its sitting? The people may disperse, and the revising officer may come to the court in the evening and continue the business. We know that at some portions of the day a person may be unable to do work which he may be able to do later on, and some provision ought to be made for giving notice to the public when the court resumes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is very seldom such a case happens, because the revising officer, although at home, may send a notice to adjourn the court. It is to prevent any claim of illegality for not holding the court that this provision is inserted.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is possible the revising officer may hold his court at some place, perhaps twelve or even twenty miles from the residence of the parties who are interested. In that case, they should not be detained from day to day until the revising officer holds his court. If they go home ten, twenty or thirty miles from the court house, how will they know when the court is going to sit

again, or will they be compelled to stay in the place until the revising officer sees fit to hold his court?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Suppose the revising officer should not be at the court, they would remain until the next day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the clause as it stands might be liable to great abuse, and I would suggest that it read:

Whenever from illness or from other casualty a revising officer is unable to hold any sitting at the time appointed therefor, such sitting shall remain adjourned to the following day, or until other provision is made for the holding of such sitting, of which due notice shall be given.

This would prevent the electors being taken by surprise. If the court were adjourned from day to day in a thinly populated district, the revising officer might hold the court without anybody knowing it.

Amendment negatived.

On section 9,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Must the lists referred to in sub-section 2 be certified to by the revising officer before they are sent out?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; I want to move an addition to the Bill, applicable to two districts, which are in this position. I speak of the lists for the County of Essex and the lists for the electoral division of New Westminster. In South Essex, Pelee Island, where the revision should have been made, was quarantined on account of a prevailing epidemic, and the officer could not attend to the revision. In New Westminster, the outlying districts could not, for some other uncontrollable reason, be visited by the revising officer. The amendment I propose is, that the revising officers for the respective districts shall make and send to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery supplementary lists for Pelee and Cassiar on or before the 1st July, 1890, and should any election be held in either of said electoral districts before the completion of the revision for Pelee Island or Cassiar, the persons entitled to vote shall be those whose names are now on the last completed revised lists for these districts. The last section is:

"It shall not be necessary that any revision of the voters' lists prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Franchise Act, shall be proceeded with during the present year, 1890, but the list of voters in force at the time of the passing of the Franchise Act or during the present year shall continue to be in force until the final revision, according to the provisions of the said Act, in the year 1891."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I suppose the House may accept that as a distinct understanding that the Government have no intention whatever of having any elections.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have no special interest in forcing an election this year.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister has made such exertions to cheapen the printing of these lists that we certainly thought we would be able to have a revision every year. His proposition now is a confession, that even with the economy in the printing of the lists, the Act is so extravagant that we cannot revise the lists every year; and consequently a good many citizens, who ought to have votes at the bye-elections, will be deprived of their franchise. Not only bye-elections but even general elections may occur before another revision takes place, for it may seem advisable to the Ministry to hold general elections at any time between now and 1891. They might even be forced by circumstances to resign as a Cabinet. Events we do not care to refer to, affecting the lives of members of the Government, might bring about a change of ministry. For all these reasons it is absolutely necessary that the lists should be revised every year, and although what the Minister proposes will no doubt be carried out, it will not be carried out without a vigorous protest from this side.

Mr. BRIEN moved that the qualification of voters under paragraph 6 of section 3 be reduced from $300 to $200.

Mr. MULOCK. In my opinion this is a very wise provision. There are many people who may work all the year round and not be able to make $300. Where wages are low, or through sickness or some other cause, a man may not be able to earn $300; yet he is disfranchised through no fault of his own, although he may have been just as industrious as the man who earns $300. The real object of this income qualification is to provide that if a man is industrious, if he is occupied during the year, he shall have the right to vote. It is a difficult thing sometimes for a man to earn $300 all the year round. In the course of my revision I was much struck with that; I came across a large number of cases of worthy men who could not convince the revising officer they had earned $300; and we came to the conclusion, in our revision, that in spite of the Franchise Act, we would take a liberal view and allow a man to be placed on the voters' list, without closely scrutinising his earnings, provided it was shown that he had been industriously employed during the year. Take the case of farm laborers. Even if a farm laborer is employed all the year round, if he is boarded where he works, it depends upon the opinion of the revising officer as to how much he should be allowed for board, whether that man is put on the list or not. Some revising officers, by straining the law, could exclude a vast number of laborers and wage-earners from the voters' list, when the test was $300. There is no desire, I am sure, to exclude that class of people from the voters' list, and this proposition of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Brien) will meet the case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think this amendment is a very proper one, and ought to be accepted by the Government. In my own experience I found the same difficulty, that many men, although they were very industrious and ought to have votes, would have been excluded were it not that we took a most liberal view of the circumstances, and of the amount that should be allowed for their board; and it was only by taking such liberal view that we could say they earned $300. If you place the qualification at $250, it will cover all such cases without any straining at all.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I cannot see what ground for objection the Minister can have against this proposition, if it is desired to place on the list those wage-earners who are entitled to be placed there. The Government have no right to object on account of the sum of $50, when it has been shown time and again that there is a difficulty in rural

sections of the country in placing a great many men on the list whom everybody admits ought to go on. Frequently we have to stretch the point a good deal, and take a liberal view of the case in order to make it appear that the applicant earned his $300 a year. Now, you will either deprive them of their vote, or, perhaps, compel them to take an oath that they do not feel justified in taking, all for the consideration of $50 a year. I hope the Minister will consent to make it $250 a year, then you will enable almost every laborer to be placed on the list. It is hard enough to be a laborer without being deprived of the right to vote.

Amendment negatived and Bill reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.35 a. m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 25th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Government business have precedence on Monday, after Questions put by members, for the remainder of the Session.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved third reading of Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Revised Statute, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. LAURIER. I called the attention of the Minister of Justice yesterday to sub-section 6 of section 3, with regard to voters who qualify themselves upon revenue. The hon. gentleman promised he would look into the matter. Is he ready to give an answer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I forgot until this moment that I had spoken of looking into it, but I remember that the subject was discussed last Session, and it has been called to my recollection since that the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Grandbois), who spoke to me about it. The difficulty, I think, arose from wage-earners—on railways, for instance—working in different places, and the solution I conceive to be a rigorous application of the law as to the place of actual residence.

Mr. LAURIER. As we are not to have a revision of the list this year, I do not see any pressing necessity to amend the Act. I had, myself, an amendment to suggest, but will defer that till another time. I am not sure that the law calls for an amendment, because a man can only have one domicile, and when he has made an application to be registered in one place, his application to be registered in another should not be received. For instance, if he makes an application at Lévis and then goes to Rivière du Loup, the two applications should not be granted, but a young man who has no house of his own and boards half the week at one place and half the week at another, causes a certain amount of difficulty in settling his case. I imagine that, when he has sworn that he is a resident at one place, he should not be permitted to swear that he is a resident in another place. I understand, however, that the jurisprudence in regard to this matter has not been settled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is almost impossible to settle this difficulty. The voter should be entitled to register only in the place where he make his application, and in my county the judge refuses to allow the voters to be put on the list if they had made application at any other place. It seems to me that it cannot be made very much clearer than it is, under this clause of the Franchise Act, which provides that the person claiming to be put on the income voters' list shall be registered only at the place where he is at the time of registration, and it is provided that he cannot be registered in two places at once.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. According to one of the amendments adopted yesterday, the revising officer would have no option to remove such a name from the list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think last night the Minister said he would give some consideration to the question as to whether an appeal could be had from the decision of a reviser, appointed by the judge in the case of the judge's illness.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is perfectly clear. In the first place, there is a provision, which I read last night, for an appeal from the deputy revising officer to the judge, and the only question raised by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was, whether the appeal could take place to the deputy judge. I have shown him the clause of the Interpretation Act bearing on that question, and I think he is perfectly satisfied in regard to it.

Mr. WATSON. Under the Act as it stands at present, has the returning officer power to issue more than two certificates to agents in one polling sub-division?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That comes under the Election Act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would ask the Minister of Justice, whether it is necessary that the whole of a man's income must be earned in Canada?

Mr. BRIEN moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by declaring as follows:—

Paragraph 6 of section 3 of the Electoral Franchise Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—

"Is a resident within the electoral district, and derives an income of at least $250 annually from his earnings in money or money's worth, or partly in money and partly in money's worth, or from some profession, calling, office or trade, or from some investment in Canada, and has been a resident of Canada for one year next before his being placed upon the list of voters, or the date of the application for the placing of his name on the list for voters."

He said: This matter has been frequently before the House and has been thoroughly discussed, so I do not desire to delay the House to any great length in discussing it. The only objection I have heard to this amendment is that it interferes with the principle of this Bill. Then, I think, it is not the amendment but the principle of the Bill which is wrong.

There is no party question involved in this. I know that the almost universal feeling outside of this House is in favor of this amendment. In my own constituency, there are about 200 votes polled in the Provincial elections which cannot be polled in the Dominion elections, and I have no doubt that is the case in the rest of the Dominion. It is useless to say that the laboring men as a rule receive $300 a year. There is a large percentage of the laboring class, which is a most deserving class, who are disappointed with this provision of the Bill. At the least calculation, between 40,000 and 50,000 men in this Dominion are disfranchised because the Government will not permit this change; and yet, to judge from the expressions of the supporters of the Government, the principal object in establishing the National Policy was to increase the industries of this country rather than to give an increased value to property. Property qualifications are practically done away with. I hope the Government will agree with this amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am well aware that in my own section of the Province of Ontario an income of $300 a year for an ordinary laboring man is in excess of the income commonly earned by that class of persons. I know places where laborers are hired for $20 a month and board themselves. That is only $240 a year. The ordinary laboring man can very seldom bring his income up to $300 a year, unless he places some fictitious value on some of his perquisites, such as the value of a garden and keeping a cow, or something of that sort. Farmers in Ontario are not in prosperous circumstances. The prices of farm produce are low, and I think the same statement will truthfully apply to the prices of farm labor. The tendency with regard to the price of labor is in the same direction as the tendency with regard to the price of produce. A qualification that was fixed some years ago, as the wages were then, is a qualification that scarcely would be accepted now in view of the remuneration that farm hands receive. If the Government desire to do justice to a large class of worthy, honest and intelligent laboring men, they have got to lower the amount of the qualification from the sum of $300 to the neighborhood of $250, or they will exclude a large class of deserving men. The amendment of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Brien) asks for a simple act of justice in placing the amount of the qualification at a figure that will enable the class of persons whom it was intended should have a vote, to obtain the franchise.

Mr. MITCHELL. When this Franchise Bill, on which the elections are now carried, was originally introduced, it will be in the recollection of every person that I thought the system was a very cumbersome and a very obtuse one, and I thought it would have been much better for the Government of the day, when they were giving the franchise, nominally to the workingmen, such as farmers' sons, and other classes of workingmen, that they should have adopted the principle of manhood suffrage. I contended that the principle of manhood suffrage would simplify our franchise laws very much, and it would have been more fair and generous to the large classes of laboring people who live in our community. But a different principle was adopted, to my mind a very cumbersome and expensive system was adopted; and every year since that Act was adopted to the present time, we have had amendments to that law for the purpose either of explaining it, or extending it, or of placing it before the public in a different light from that in which it was originally presented to this House. Now, I agree with the hon. mover of this amendment, that the object of extending the franchise was not to give the suffrage to property, but to give it to labor. In the county which I represent, there are a large class of laborers employed; perhaps there is in that county not less than 800 or 1,000 men who earn their living by days' labor. I agree with the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment that the limit is fixed just too high to permit the general class of laborers to come within the scope of the Act and be enabled to cast their votes for members of the House of Commons. Now, everyone knows that $20 a month is very good wages for a laboring man, and the man who can manage to secure from one year's end to the other $20 a month, does a great deal better than the average laborer of the community, particularly in the present hard times. If a man has to board himself with the addition of 4 cents a pound added to the pork, which will be the effect of the recent legislation by this Government, and 25 cents a barrel added to flour——

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). And have a dollar a day added to his wages.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not hear what my hon. friend says, but it would be much more to his credit if he would get up and advocate the principle that I am advocating now, than to sit on his seat muttering something that we do not understand. Now, I say that this amendment entirely meets my approval. I think we ought to go in the direction of manhood suffrage as fast as we can. If the right hon. gentleman would reconsider his decision about what should be the basis of the franchise, and adopt the simple and inexpensive principle of manhood suffrage, it would remove a great deal of the difficulties under which we labor, and a great deal of the expense which the public have to incur, and which, as the hon. Secretary of State pointed out the other day, he desired to reduce, and it would be in the direction of giving to a large and deserving class of thoughtful and intelligent people the right to vote for men to represent them in Parliament, and I think if we had a little more of that class we would find fewer men sitting behind the right hon. gentleman and voting for an increase upon the food of the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it be true that if there were an alteration in the franchise there would be fewer members sitting on this side of the House and more on that side, the hon. gentleman cannot expect us to vote for this resolution; but I do not believe that would be the case.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are not afraid of the laborers of the country, are you?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not a bit afraid of the laborers of the country, but I am opposed to this motion because, in the first place, as the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, shows, it opens the whole question of the franchise. The hon. gentleman avows that this would be a step towards manhood suffrage, or universal suffrage, in other words; to that I am altogether opposed. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot

discuss the whole question of the franchise at this period of the Session. It is out of the question, and we must leave the Bill as a whole. Now, we have just got through the settlement of a voters' list, and we know what the franchise is if an election took place to-morrow. It would answer no good purpose, it would waste the time of the House, to go into this whole subject and discuss the question of manhood suffrage and compare, as we ought to do before coming to an intelligent vote on the matter, the franchise in the different Provinces as well as the franchise for the Dominion. I hope this will be resisted, and I would ask all my friends to do so.

Mr. BURNS. The hon. gentleman for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is seeking to create the impression in this House that the people he represents are of a very poor class. Now, Sir, I have the honor to represent the adjoining county, inhabited by identically the same class of people, engaged in the same employment, and I utterly repudiate the idea that the hon. gentleman is constantly seeking to convey to this House. In point of fact, every man who is worthy of having the right to vote, enjoys that right in the hon. gentleman's county.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not so.

Mr. BURNS. I have as good a knowledge of that county as the hon. gentleman has, living as he does 700 miles away from that county, and only visiting it, perhaps, once a year ; I am in a position to speak with much greater accuracy of the condition of affairs in the hon. gentleman's county than he is, and I assert most unhesitatingly that every man in the county who is fit to enjoy the right of franchise, has it. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to create the impression, or, at all events, he has made the statement, that the average rate of wages in his county is $20 a month. Now, any man who is fit to do a day's work in his county will get at least $1 a day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does he get $1 a day for all the 300 days in the year ?

Mr. BURNS. I say in answer to the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that the average rate of wages in the hon. gentleman's county is fully $300 a year. There is, perhaps, no more industrious body of men in New Brunswick than the men the hon. gentleman represents, and there is no class of men in New Brunswick that better deserves a better day's wages than the men whom the hon. gentleman represents. It is quite in keeping with the usual tactics of the hon. gentleman in this House, notably on the cornmeal question. In relation to that question he has endeavored to create the impression that the men of his county use cornmeal very largely as an article of food, therefore he wants the House to understand that they must be a very poor class. He says that the price of pork, which is used by the poor people he represents, is increased 4 cents a pound by the operation of the present tariff. Well, if all the statements made by the hon. gentleman are as accurate as that, then I ask the House what reliance can be placed on them ? I rose for the purpose of asserting what I know, and that is, that the right of the franchise is enjoyed by every man in the hon. gentleman's county who should enjoy it—in point of fact, they have manhood suffrage.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would ask the hon. gentleman if the laborers in his county get $1 a day in cash. It is not a dollar a day in cash, and $300 a year would be the extreme wages, for the men are not employed 313 days in the year, because as a general thing in the greater part of the country, especially in the county which the hon. gentleman represents, the men do not get employment during that number of days. The statement that they get $300 or its equivalent is not the fact.

Mr. ELLIS. In the county represented by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), and in all the counties in New Brunswick on the Maine border, the average rate of wages is from $16 to $20 a month. That is the average rate of wages, and these men are not employed the whole season.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a class of men in the Province from which I come, school teachers holding third-class certificates, who are paid less than $300 a year, and they are altogether excluded by the Franchise Act. Any one who attends the revision court knows also that a very large class of intelligent workingmen, who do receive, when they are employed, $1 a day, are not employed for the 300 working days, and they also are excluded from exercising the franchise. It would be a graceful act for the Government to accept the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise for the purpose of giving an explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Burns) misrepresented me when he said that the laborers in my county were a poor class. I never said anything of the kind, and, on the contrary, I said they are a first-class lot of laborers, but taking their wages the year round they are very poorly paid. When they are employed in loading ships their labor commands a pretty good price at certain seasons ; but I tell the hon. gentleman that when he states that from one year's end to another the average rate is $1.50 per day, he states what is not true, and he is misleading this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He is going too far in contradicting statements made by an hon. member and discussing what an hon. member said.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman misrepresented me, I have the right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to state exactly what he did say, but he cannot go further and discuss statements made by the hon. member.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member has said he knew better the wants and necessities of my county than I did. I was born in the county and I was brought up in it ; I am not a casual in the county as is the hon. gentleman. He has stated to this House what is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. As there is evidently an attempt to choke off the hon. gentleman, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has chosen to take on himself to state what is the condition of affairs in my county ; he has stated that he knows better about them than I do. I have represented that county for thirty-five years, with the exception of one Parliament, and I have main-

tained the confidence of the people. I have a thorough knowledge of the wishes of my people, and it is a piece of presumption for the hon. gentleman to say that he knows better than I do in regard to my constituents. Why should he know better? Is it because he built a railway at the public expense, and paid in due bills those who were paid? Is that the reason he knows better about my county than I do? He got a subsidy of $170,000 from the Government to build a railway which cost about $27,000 to run, and which only earned about $14,000. The hon. gentleman had better turn his attention to something which he understands, and not attempt to misrepresent what I say.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If the hon. gentleman is going to make such references to an hon. member, I must, in fairness to that hon. member, put the question of adjournment, in order that he may have the opportunity to reply.

Mr. MITCHELL. Put the question of adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can now proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will speak after the hon. member.

Mr. BURNS. I desire to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. BURNS. I have not spoken to the motion for adjournment.

Mr. HICKEY. I wish to call the attention of the House to one of the arguments used by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien). It has been contended frequently by the Opposition in this House that the rate of taxes on food and other matters of that kind have made the cost of living very expensive to the poor man. The hon. gentleman, in speaking to this motion the other night, said there was another feature that struck him and that was the change in the value of money, that an income of $250 was worth as much as $300 when the Franchise Act was passed. If that were the case, the arguments of the Opposition in regard to the tariff and the franchise suffer a very severe rebuke from one of their own supporters.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Speaking to the question directly before the House, I must say that the last speech of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) was better than his first speech, because in his second speech he said nothing and in his first speech he said something that will not bear investigation. He told us that under the present Franchise Act every man entitled to a vote had a right to vote under the Act. What does the hon. gentleman mean by such a expression? Does he mean that in this country, where our revenue is raised by indirect taxation, Customs and Excise, in which the young men have to contribute to the revenue and in case of war to go first to the front, while others remain behind, that those young men, because they do not earn $300 a year, are not worthy of giving a vote as free men in a free country? That is his argument. Why should we entail political disabilities on a man who may be unable from special circumstances to earn $300 a year? It is easy to conceive a case in which men, as intelligent as the hon. gentleman and as well able to exercise a vote, might through illness or other cause fail to earn $300 a year, and yet they, forsooth, would not be entitled to vote. This amendment does not refer solely to the class of farm laborers. In towns and cities there are scores of young men, who are as intelligent as the great mass of the electorate, who under this Franchise Act will he unable to exercise the right of free men. I believe in the principle, although all members of this House and all the Provinces of this Dominion have not agreed to it, that in this country for elections of members to this House, where our taxes are contributed by the people indirectly through Customs and Excise, when military duty devolves on our young men, who will discharge it voluntarily if required, it is the right of a young man to vote when he is twenty-one years of age because he is a citizen of this country. I support the amendment because it goes in that direction. I support it because I believe that, while it does not go so far as I would go myself, it will yet be of great benefit, because if $50 are struck from the qualification, hundreds and thousands of additional voters will be admitted to exercise the right of the franchise in this Dominion. I hold it is in the interests of the country that the people of that country who ought to vote should have a voice in saying who their representatives will be. Not only in the case of our farm laborers, but in our towns and cities as well, there are many intelligent young men, mechanics and others, who, through the operation of this $300 clause, are prevented from exercising their franchise. It may be, and I believe it is the fact, that intelligent men will be excluded under the $250 qualification; I would go lower than that, but my hon. friend has proposed that amount and I will support the proposition, because it is in the right direction, and because it will give their rights to a great many men, which rights will be withheld from them if you maintain the $300 qualification as at present. I know it to be the case in my own city, and other gentlemen representing cities and towns in this Dominion must themselves know it, and if they would speak candidly they would admit that there are instances, not few or far between, in which intelligent men are debarred from exercising their right of franchise, simply because you maintain the qualification at $300 which my hon. friend now proposes to amend by reducing to $250.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what wages the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) pays his men, but I know that if he came into our section of the country and attempted to employ men at less than $300 a year, he would get a class of workmen who would not be worth putting on a farm or anywhere else. I have hired men from year to year, and I know that for a great many years past you cannot get suitable men to entrust with your work for less than $300 a year, and as a general rule you have to pay a great deal more. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said you could hire men for $16 per month, but he forgot to say that, in addition to that, you have to give them their board, which would amount to $25 or $26 a month. When this is taken into consideration, as it is in the calculation of allowing men to have a

vote. I think there is hardly a man in Ontario, at all events, who would not come under the present provisions of the Act.

Mr. MULOCK. I extremely regret to hear the reason advanced by the Premier, for calling upon his supporters to vote down this proposition. He told the House that it was a waste of time to consider the interests of the workingmen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the talk of the Opposition.

Mr. MULOCK. He said it was a waste of time to discuss this question in this House. Sir, we have come to a pretty pass, when it is to be considered a waste of time for this House to discuss how they can make the condition of the workingmen better than it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Bah!

Mr. MULOCK. Was it a waste of time on the part of the Administration, to discuss how they could increase the cost of food to the workingmen? Was it a waste of time to call upon this House to try to discover new methods whereby they might extract money from the pockets of the workingmen without any due reward? Was it waste of time for this House to spend, as it did a few nights ago, many hours in seeking how they might further tax the necessaries of life to the workingmen? I can understand now the policy of the Government, in the light of the transactions of a few days ago, even in presence of the hon. and garrulous member for Hamilton.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wonder at even the Secretary of State writhing after such remarks; but, Mr. Speaker, I can understand now that the Government having outraged the rights of the workingman, are now anxious to disfranchise him, so as to prevent him having an opportunity of expressing his opinions at the polls. I can understand hon. members opposite desiring to suppress discussion, and I can understand them, when there are election campaigns in the near future, desiring to tie down the workingmen of this country. We were accustomed to hear at election times, that they, and they only were the friends of the workingmen, but now they have succeeded, by this measure, in disfranchising a large number of them, so as to keep them from doing the Government harm. Do you think, Sir, that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), who has told us of the condition of the workingmen in his part of the country, desires to have the workingmen of his constituency entitled to vote? No, Sir. He says that he desires to have certain matters investigated before this House and the country. I will give him an opportunity at the earliest possible moment, and when that opportunity arises, I think we will find excellent reasons for the attitude he has taken upon this question. The hon. gentleman says that the workingman can make his dollar a day all the year round. He evidently wishes to deny to the workingmen a single day's relaxation. In order to be entitled to vote, a dollar a day does not allow the workingmen a fortnight's holiday throughout the whole year. He will not give the workingmen time to die soon. I regret that the Government have taken a stand against the workingmen, and that they have declared their policy to be to disfranchise the workingmen in order, if possible, to escape from the wrath to come.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have some amusing scenes in this House, but there is nothing more amusing than when certain gentlemen of the other side of the House get up to plead the cause of the workingmen. It is amusing in the extreme. Tell the workingmen in any part of this Dominion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is their special friend, and see what they will say to you about it. Why, Sir, he is nowhere the friend of the workingmen, except in this House, when he wants to make political capital. Now, Sir, while the hon. gentleman was talking about the workingmen, this thought struck me. A few days ago, I was speaking to a gentleman about the poor men and the workingmen, and he said to me: "I remember distinctly when a few years ago, from 500 to 700 men stood at the foot of the stairs leading to this building, begging that the Government of the day would give them some employment, by which they could earn bread to fill their hungry stomachs." They were without work, and themselves and their families were without food, and at that time the Reform Government, which the hon. gentleman supports, was in power. Where was he at that time? What was he doing for the poor workingmen at that time? Was he their friend? Did he bring them assistance? No, Sir; the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government came forward and proved to be the true friend of the workingmen. He took them out of the position they were in at that time, and placed them in the position they are in to-day, in which they can get fair wages to provide bread for themselves and their families, and to place themselves in a position to exercise the franchise—a position in which they would never have been, if the party which the hon. gentleman who last spoke supports had remained in power, and a position which they would cease to occupy if that party should return to power.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was in hope that the Government would accept the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, because, coming from one of the cities referred to by the hon. gentleman who has spoken, I am able from experience to state how the present provision of the Franchise Act affects a large number of working people. The people who work about the wharves at Halifax—and I suppose the same remark applies to St. John—are paid, not by the week or the month, but by the day; and as they only get their wages for the days on which they work, a great many of them do not earn the $300 necessary to qualify them to vote. The Local Government have so far recognised this condition of affairs that they have reduced the income franchise so that a very large number of the working classes of the city of Halifax are placed on the electoral lists for the Local Legislature. I hope, therefore, that the Dominion Government, who have always tried to persuade the public that they were desirous of adopting the largest and broadest franchise, will not be behind the Local Government in extending to that class of people the right to vote. It will only be doing an act of justice to them if the Government agree to the amendment to reduce the qualification from $300 to $250.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would like to say a word or two on this subject. Since coming into this Chamber I have heard it stated that men working on farms received $16 a month. That is very true with regard to the summer months of the year; but there have been as good men as you can find in Ontario working during the past winter for from $8 to $10 per month, so that they earn too small an amount to enable them to get the franchise. The amendment of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien) is in the right direction, and it ought certainly to receive the favorable consideration of the Government. I have been thinking while this discussion has been going on that the Government have at the present time in the city of Ottawa a candidate who claims to be the workingmen's candidate, and he has been telling them what he is going to do for them. I was reminded by a friend of the Government to-day that on the eve of an election the Government became the friends of the workingmen, and set a number of them to work in front of this building to pull out the dandelions, but the moment the election was over and they had voted, their usefulness was gone, and their services were not required by the Government any longer. I hope that the House will accept this amendment, and give a large number of intelligent and deserving men the franchise, in order that they may be able to go to the polls and exercise the right of citizenship at the next election.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Brien:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Landerkin,
Armstrong,	Laurier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lister,
Barron,	Livingston,
Borden,	Lovitt,
Brien,	Mackenzie,
Campbell,	McIntyre,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McMillan (Huron),
Casey,	McMullen,
Casgrain,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mitchell,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Corby,	Paterson (Brant),
Couture,	Perry,
Davies,	Platt,
Dessaint,	Rinfret,
Doyon,	Robertson,
Ellis,	Ste. Marie,
Fiset,	Smith (Ontario),
Gillmor,	Somerville,
Godbout,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Trow,
Hale,	Watson,
Innes,	Weldon (St. John),
Jones (Halifax),	Welsh.—51.
Kirk,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	LaRivière,
Barnard,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Bell,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Bowell,	McCulla,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Brown,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bryson,	McKay,
Burns,	McKeen,
Cameron,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carling,	Madill,
Carpenter,	Mara,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Marshall,
Chapleau,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Montague,
Cockburn,	Patterson (Essex),
Colby,	Porter,
Coughlin,	Prior,
Curran,	Riopel,
Daly,	Robillard,
Daoust,	Roome,
Davin,	Ross,
Davis,	Shanly,
Dawson,	Skinner,
Denison,	Small,
Dewdney,	Sproule,
Dickey,	Stevenson,
Dickinson,	Taylor,
Dupont,	Temple,
Earle,	Thérien,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Thompson (Sir John),
Foster,	Tisdale.
Freeman,	Tyrwhitt,
Gigault,	Vanasse,
Grandbois,	Ward,
Guillet,	Weldon (Albert),
Hesson,	White (Cardwell),
Hickey,	White (Renfrew),
Hudspeth,	Wilmot,
Jamieson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Jones (Digby),	Wood (Brockville),
Kenny,	Wood (Westmoreland).
Kirkpatrick,	Wright.—87.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Beauharnois has not voted.

Mr. BERGERON. I am paired with Mr. Langelier of Quebec. I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. FISET. The hon. member for Verchères has not voted.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I am paired with the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins).

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am paired with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer). I would have voted against the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to submit to the House a motion which, I think, ought to meet with its acceptance. It involves the principle that one man ought to have one vote only in an election. I think this is a proposition that will commend itself to the fairness and common sense of the House. In many constituencies in various portions of this Dominion a considerable number of names are on the list, but they are those of people who are not owners of property at all. They are not residents, and perhaps for years before the election have not been in the country, but have taken up their abode beyond the border. The result is that when an election is brought on, these parties are induced to return and record their votes, and there is no means of ascertaining whether they have been improperly brought back or not. It is of the first importance, in order to secure purity of elections and the free expression of popular opinion, that those parties should not be entitled to vote. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side formerly opposed having the elections on the same day, on the ground that it would interfere with parties who were upon the voters' lists in different constituencies. But those hon. gentlemen have since agreed to the principle of uniformity or simultaneous elections, and it is quite impossible, except when constituencies are lying immediately adjacent to each other, that a party can vote in more than one constituency at a general election. It is most unfair that those persons who have property in adjoining constituencies should have two or more votes, while those possessed of properties in constituencies situated further apart should be denied the right to vote in more than one

constituency. It seems to me, therefore, only just and proper that each elector should have but one vote, and that that vote should be recorded in the constituency in which he resides. I shall not detain the House by any discussion, as the proposition is so plain and simple that there can be no difficulty in apprehending it. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee to amend the same, so as to provide that no elector shall vote in any constituency other than the one in which he resides.

Mr. CASEY. Any fair-minded member of the House must see that this provision is absolutely necessary for a fair representation of the people. On the face of it, it is intended to give representation to the citizens of the country and Parliament, and there is no reason why one citizen should have any more voting power than another. Of course it is sometimes contended that, under the system of property qualification, property is represented in this House. That doctrine might have done very well in the good old Tory days in England when property was really represented in Parliament, but it is too late in the day now to put that forward in Canada. Every patriotic Canadian feels it is the people of the country who are represented, and not the acres of land or buildings. But even under the plea that property should be represented, the present system does not give fair representation. One man may own $100,000 worth of property all situated in one riding, and he only has one vote, while his neighbor may own $1,000 worth of property distributed over five ridings, in the proportion of $200 to each riding, and he has five votes; so that, under this system, neither is property represented in proportion to its value, nor are the citizens represented in proportion to their individual rights. The effect of the present law simply is to give the man who has money to buy votes in several distinct ridings, several times the voting power of the man who has not money enough to buy those votes, or who does not choose to do so. We take every pains to prevent candidates or others from buying the votes of electors. We look upon that as a corrupt act and punish it, and yet the law directly encourages those who have the money to buy votes in different ridings. I claim that the one practice is just as corrupt as the other; I claim that the man who buys land in a riding in which he does not live, for the purpose of obtaining voting power in that riding, is doing just as corrupt an act as the man who gives another money to vote. The one principle is just as destructive of fair representative government as the other. Let us compare the freedom allowed to the owners of property with the severe restrictions imposed upon those who are not owners of property. The latter are compelled to prove residence for a certain time before they can be put on the roll at all, while the former need not be residents at all in the riding or even in the country. They may live in New York all the year round and come here to vote, possibly in utter ignorance of the political issues of the day, and certainly in ignorance of the particular wants of the neighborhood where their property may happen to be. Yet the income voter who is an active, productive, and hardworking citizen of the country, must of necessity prove residence within the riding for a certain time before he can be put on the list, and if he is absent from the riding too long afterwards he is not allowed to vote. The same is true of the farmers' sons and the property owners' sons. These two classes of voters, the income voter and the owners' sons, really comprise a very large portion of the bone and sinew of the country; they are the really intelligent and really productive power of the country. They are all wealth producers, men who have a stake in the country, and are interested in having its affairs properly managed; yet they must be anchored down to one particular residence before they can have a voice in the election of members, while the man who has a few hundred dollars to spare with which to buy property, may live where he likes, and his vote cannot be questioned. I have known men to have been brought from Kansas to vote at an election in this country—men who had lost all interest in Canadian politics, and who, in all respects, save naturalisation, were citizens of the United States. All their sympathies were there, and the bulk of their property, but a little bit of property in Canada, gave them the right to vote here. Under these circumstances it is clear that justice and ordinary fairness demand that one man should have one vote and no more; and in departing from that principle, you are departing from the principle of representative government entirely.

Mr. BURNS. The principle involved in the amendment is not one which should be adopted in this House. I believe property should be represented. Property has its rights, and those rights should be respected. I rose a few minutes ago, after the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) had made certain statements to the House, for the purpose of refuting those statements, but, because of the strict enforcement of the rules of debate I could not then speak, I take the opportunity now of referring in the briefest possible manner to some of his statements. I have not the slightest desire to misrepresent that hon. gentleman. My only desire was to correct the statements he made to this House, statements which are repetitions of many he has heretofore made, statements calculated to lead this House and the country to believe that the constituency that hon. gentleman represents is a very poor one, so poor indeed that the mass of the people there cannot enjoy even the right to vote. I say that I am in a better position than that hon. gentleman to know the condition of affairs and the condition of the men in his county. The hon. gentleman may be excused to a certain extent for the misstatements and misrepresentations he has made from time to time in this House, on account of his absence from that constituency. I, representing a neighboring constituency, know what I am talking about. I am one of the largest employers of labor in that section of New Brunswick, and I assert as a fact, that every man who is of the required age, and is not worthless or a vagrant, can have the right to vote, and has that right under the present franchise. I did not say that the average rate of wages received by the wage-earners in the hon. gentleman's county was $1.50 a day; but I said, and I repeat, that it would be an average of $1 a day, which would give each of them more than the amount required to entitle them to a right to vote. So much in reference to that matter. I now come

to a most unwarranted statement which that hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) has made in reference to the Caraquet Railway, with which I am connected. I say it was unwarranted, unfounded and baseless. The hon. gentleman has imported into this discussion a matter which has no connection with it. He did it as part and parcel of a policy which some hon. gentlemen adopt of decrying that railway, and pretending that I had something to be afraid of, or to be ashamed of, in my connection with it. I have nothing to be afraid of, and nothing to be ashamed of; but, on the contrary, I have every reason to look for commendation in regard to my connection with that railway. I despise the threats of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and I challenge him here to formulate any charges he may have to make as to my connection with the Caraquet Railway Company. If enterprise is a crime, I am a criminal of the deepest dye. I have invested my means in that railway, and, with my means and means obtained elsewhere, a road has been built which is a credit to New Brunswick and a credit to Canada. The amount of subsidy obtained from the Government of New Brunswick and from the Government of Canada has not, as was stated by the hon. gentleman, been sufficient to build that railway. On the contrary, a large amount of other means was required and was put into that road. The hon. gentleman states that the workingmen were paid by what he calls due bills. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has a lively recollection of the days when he did business in New Brunswick, fortunately those days have gone by. I state, and I challenge contradiction, that every single dollar and every single cent earned by a laborer or a contractor on that road was paid in cash every month. I challenge the hon. gentleman to disprove that statement. On the 20th or 21st day of every month, the paymaster of the Caraquet Railway went along the line and paid the laborers in cash. Further than that, the company took a power in dealing with the contractors, which, I am sorry to see, has not been done in other cases, to appropriate money for the payment of the men employed before anything else was paid. I hurl back in the teeth of the hon. gentleman who made the assertion the statement either that the men were not paid or that they were paid in due bills. I say that every man was paid in cash. This is of a piece with the usual reckless statements made by that hon. gentleman in this House. I think I may be excused for speaking warmly on this subject. I do not speak often, and I have not laid myself open to the accusations of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have nothing to be afraid of or ashamed of in connection with the Caraquet Railway Company, of which I happen to be the president. From the Dominion, we received a subsidy of $3,200 a mile, and from the Local Legislature, a subsidy of $3,000 a mile, making a total of $6,200 a mile. I ask any man who knows anything of railway building, how far $6,200 a mile will go?

Mr. LISTER. You bonded the road, did you not?

Mr. BURNS. It has been bonded for less than $8,000 a mile for the purpose of procuring the rails and fastenings. I invested my means in that road, fully believing that my investment would yield me some return. Unfortunately, because of the large competition by water communication, that has not yet been the case, but we who have invested our means in the road look forward to the time when it will become self-sustaining and will also pay interest on these bonds. Last year the receipts were about double what they were the first year, and we hope that a dividend will in time be given to those who have invested their money in the enterprise. I say again that, if it is a crime to be enterprising, I have been guilty of that crime. I have not misappropriated any funds. I have not put a dollar of the money obtained from the bonds into my pocket, but, on the contrary, I have paid money out of my pocket to aid in the building of the road. Then I ask if I am open to the charges made by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who ought to know better and, I think, does know better. I think he knows that I would not be guilty of any conduct unbecoming a gentleman, a business man or a member of this Assembly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman commenced to make his remarks. As soon as I heard that he was directing his attention to me I came in. I did not hear the whole of his remarks, but I heard enough to lead me to believe that he stated that I made some misrepresentation in reference to the Caraquet road. Now, Sir, I was not the aggressor in this attack. The hon. gentleman chose to attack me about my statement in reference to my own county, and I simply defended myself by referring to the wages paid upon the Caraquet Railway, and asked whether they were paid in cash?

Mr. BURNS. I stated they were.

Mr. MITCHELL. I asked you if they were paid in cash, or if they were paid in due bills, and I repeat it now.

Mr. BURNS. The hon. gentleman stated that they were paid in due bills.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman now states that none of the work done on the Caraquet Railway was paid in due bills, then all I can say is that there is a very erroneous impression in that county about the manner in which the payments were made.

Mr. BURNS. I have stated so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Than I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, which is all that I wanted in reference to the Caraquet road. I merely called attention to the charge that he made in reference to the rate of wages in my county, by referring to the wages in his own county, in which he was a large employer of labor on the Caraquet road. Now, the hon. gentleman has chosen to assail me, to attack my standing in this House, and to speak of the knowledge he possesses, in reference to what my county requires, which he says he knows better than I do. Sir, the hon. gentleman has a good deal of assurance, and he has a good deal of assurance to make the reference he did about the Caraquet road. I am not going into that question just now, but I will reserve my remarks on that question for the motion which my hon. friend for North York (Mr. Mulock) is going to make, when the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity, perhaps,

of proving some of the statements he has made with reference to what he has done in the way of payments, and what he has received in the wa of benefit from that road. But since he has challenged me on this subject, I will say this: Has any hon. gentleman in the House read the prospectus of that hon. gentleman? The hon. gentleman went to England and tried to raise money upon that road. Will the hon. gentleman say that the statements in that prospectus were true?

Mr. BURNS. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL, Because if he does, I say they were not true, I say they were the grossest exaggeration. He led the British public to believe that it was going to pay a large percentage upon the outlay, that the amount of travel, the business traffic, and everything connected with it, would be something enormous. Why, Sir, in my opinion the statements the hon. gentleman made were a gross fraud upon the public, I have no hesitation in saying it, and perhaps when the matter is investigated, that will be seen to be the case. What are the earnings as returned by the Minister of Railways the other day? I speak from memory, but I think the earnings of the road were stated to be $17,000, and something like $27,000 were the expenses upon the road. He talks of the amount of road already completed. What rolling stock has he got upon the road? There are one or two old second-hand locomotives, very likely bought from the Government, cast-off locomotives of the Government, which he bought for half of nothing. God knows whether he paid anything for them at all—I should not wonder, from the zealous support he gives the Government, that they were thrown in along with the subsidy; at all events, they were bought, very likely, for little over the cost of scrap iron. Now, the hon. gentleman has certainly a great deal of boldness to challenge an investigation into the transactions in relation to the Caraquet road. He claims credit to himself for enterprise in building that road. Sir, I venture to say that every dollar that ever went into that road was public money; he never spent a dollar of his own on that enterprise, except such money as he got from the bondholders through the misrepresentations which he made in the prospectus. Sir, I will not enter into that matter because it will be dealt with elsewhere. But with regard to the condition of things in my own county, I repeat that what I said about the rate of wages paid to workingmen in Northumberland, is true. The hon. gentleman says I misstated the fact in saying they got $1.50 a day. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that in the summer season men can get $1.50 a day, but in the winter time they are idle for half of the season, and the fair average from New Year's to Christmas is about a $1 a day. I do say that $1 a day is the average earning of laborers after you have eliminated the 52 Sundays from the year. We know that $300 cannot be earned by the laboring men as a class. If any of them earn more, they are exceptional cases. Sir, the hon. gentleman speaks of the course he has pursued in this House. The course he has pursued in this House has not been any too creditable to him, and when he speaks about my making misrepresentations——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order. I say his course has not been any too creditable to him. On two occasions he has distinguished himself, in his own mind, when he attacked me, once two years ago, and again to-night, when he made an unprovoked attack upon me in reference to my statement about my own county. With reference to the Caraquet road, I had not assailed his conduct; I merely made an allegation of what I had heard as to the manner in which the men were paid. When he says that every dollar has been paid—why, Sir, it is not so long since the man who superintended the building of that road entered a suit against him in the courts for a share of the profits of that road, and yet he has the hardihood to get up in this House and say that every man has been paid in connection with it.

Mr. MULOCK. I believe the question before the House is whether an elector shall have more than one vote; I suppose, therefore, it will hardly be in order for me to say anything in reference to the Caraquet Railway. The Bill is a comprehensive one, and many subjects can be, and have been discussed heretofore under that question; but I hardly believe it is comprehensive enough to allow me to put in an amendment in regard to the Caraquet Railway. But, Mr. Speaker, if you rule that it is, I shall be discharging a public duty in discussing that question; if not, I shall reserve my observations on that question until a more fitting occasion. For the information, however, of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), let me say, that as I intend to bring the matter before the House, I will mention to him the points to which I shall call the attention of the House, in order that he may have an opportunity of answering them. They are not very serious, and I was not aware that so much importance was given to them as appears to be attached to them. Wherein the public are interested, in my judgment, in regard to the Caraquet Railway——

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will limit himself to the question now before the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I will. I intend to treat the hon. member with perfect fairness, and I want to tell him exactly what I have in my mind, so that he may be able to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has it any bearing upon the question?

Mr. MULOCK. If he does not wish to have the information now, I do not press it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills (Bothwell):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Laurier,
Armstrong,	Lister,
Bain (Wentworth),	Livingston,
Borden,	Lovitt,
Brien,	Macdonald (Huron),
Campbell,	Mackenzie,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McIntyre,
Casey,	McMillan (Huron),
Casgrain,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Mitchell,
Davies,	Mulock,
Dessaint,	Paterson (Brant),
Doyon,	Perry,
Ellis,	Platt,
Fiset,	Rinfret,

Geoffrion,	Robertson,
Gillmor,	Ste. Marie,
Godbout,	Semple,
Guay,	Somerville,
Hale,	Sutherland,
Innes,	Trow,
Jones (Halifax),	Watson,
Kirk,	Weldon (St. John).—49.
Landerkin,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	LaRivière,
Barnard,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Bell,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Bowell,	McCulla,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Brown,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Burns,	McKay,
Cameron,	McKeen,
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carling,	Madill,
Carpenter,	Mara,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Marshall,
Chapleau,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Montague,
Cockburn,	Porter,
Colby,	Prior,
Corby,	Putnam,
Coughlin,	Riopel,
Daly,	Robillard,
Daoust,	Roome,
Davin,	Ross,
Davis,	Shanly,
Dawson,	Skinner,
Denison,	Small,
Dewdney,	Smith (Ontario),
Dickey,	Sproule,
Dickinson,	Stevenson,
Earle,	Taylor,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Temple,
Foster,	Thompson (Sir John),
Freeman,	Tisdale,
Gigault,	Tyrwhitt,
Grandbois,	Ward,
Guillet,	Weldon (Albert),
Hesson,	White (Cardwell),
Hickey,	White (Renfrew),
Hudspeth,	Wilmot,
Jamieson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Jones (Digby),	Wood (Brockville),
Kenny,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Kirkpatrick,	Wright.—83.
Langevin (Sir Hector),	

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1890; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 25th April, 1890.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.—(Mr. Foster.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 52,

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to add the words "such notes to be redeemable at the office for the redemption of Dominion notes in the place where such specie shall be so exchanged."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do you always send Dominion notes to the city where they are redeemable?

Mr. FOSTER. At the present time such notes are redeemable at the offices in Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal and St. John; but they are not redeemable in Winnipeg, Charlottetown or Victoria. I propose to make them redeemable at the other three places as well as the four first named, which will be a great convenience to those who get notes in exchange for specie, and it will not be much inconvenience for us, as we have officers at these cities now.

On section 53,

Mr. DALY. Why has the penalty been increased tenfold?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason why the penalty was increased was because the former penalty was altogether inadequate. The former penalty for over-circulation was $100, up to a certain amount, whether the over-circulation was $5 or more. The penalty has been made much larger, and there is an additional reason now, above the fact that the penalty was too small before, why the penalty should be made larger, and that is, because the circulation of a bank that fails has to be redeemed out of the funds which have been contributed by the several banks; and although over-circulation at any time was a violation of the fundamental agreement of the law by which banks were to issue up to the amount of their unimpaired capital, it becomes still more dangerous when a fund is created out of which the circulation notes of the banks are to be redeemed. As the Committee will see, if the over-issue of a bank amounts to $1,000, the penalty is $1,000, or dollar for dollar up to that amount. From $1,000 to $20,000, the penalty is $1,000, and so on for the amount of excess in the proportion, as is stated here. The grade of the penalty now is just ten times as high as it was before.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have no objection to the penalties, provided that these penalties are only recoverable by the Attorney General of Canada. I do not think it should be in the hands of any common informer.

Mr. FOSTER. We will discuss that later on.

Mr. COCKBURN. I should not wish to see the penalty reduced in the case of an over-issue of which the bank was cognisant, but there are several banks which have thirty or forty agencies, and it is almost impossible for them to keep exactly within this limit. Perhaps, if the Minister thought proper, some provision should be made with regard to the recovery of this very heavy penalty of dollar per dollar. If, as in the United States, the bank were contained within the one building, and confined to the one office, it would have control of its issue, but it becomes somewhat difficult for banks with thirty or forty agencies to know exactly to the dollar the amount they have really issued. Perhaps this clause might be framed in a more lenient manner. While I have no objection to the penalties, I think there should be some safeguard with regard to the mode of their recovery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, I may point out to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Cockburn) that hardly any of our banks do put notes in circulation to any thing like the amount of what they declare to be their unimpaired paid-up capital. Although possibly there may be some question about the penalty, it must be remembered that you are altogether altering the status of bank notes, and a very great temptation is being put in the way of many banks, and especially the smaller banks, to exceed the legal limit. I must say that if ever there was a case made out for putting very heavy penalties on excessive circulation, it is under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The reason I called attention to the order of the procedure was, in such a case as alluded to by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). Of course where the Government have control of the penalty, in a case where the bank did not wilfully over-issue, they would find it was unnecessary to enforce it, but where the over-issue was a wilful violation of the law, then the Government would impose the enalty.

Mr. TISDALE. If we passed this section now, the discussion on the other sections may prevent us coming back to consider it. I certainly strongly object to these penalties, unless the regulation of them is placed in the hands of the Government. A Government would, no doubt, treat the banks fairly, if the over-issue was a mistake, and not a wilful violation of the law. If the Government are prepared to say that they will accept the responsibility of taking charge of the enforcement of the penalty, it would meet the objections I have to make. The hon. Minister might as well decide on this question now as later on. I think it is a most reasonable proposition that the Government should take charge of this, because they are the responsible parties to the people in seeing that the banking matters are properly carried out. In such a case the penalties after all, although they are very severe, do not amount to much, because the Government would apply them judiciously, and only where the banks have been guilty of wilful over-circulation would they inflict the penalty.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the temptation is given to common informers, as is done in the case of Customs matters, to watch and wait, it is very possible that some of the employés of a bank might lay a plan, and watch and wait their opportunity until circumstances placed them in a position to either blackmail the bank, or inform upon it. I think it would be very unfortunate to have any such powers placed in the hands of informers. The suggestion made, that the Government should take the matter in hand, is a reasonable one, and probably it will save discussion if the Minister of Finance now states that he will view the subject in this light.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is impossible to say at this stage that we will restrict the procedure in any way, so as to confine it to an officer of the Government to recover the penalties. That remark applies not only to this provision but to the other penal clauses of the Bill likewise. These offences will be always difficult to discover, and sometimes they can only be discovered by the aid of those who are immediately concerned divulging the offence, that the penalty can be enforced. But with regard to the informer endeavoring to blackmail, and with regard to the excessive penalties that are mentioned here, it must be borne in mind that whether the procedure is by one of the officers of the Government, or at the instance of a common informer, we are simply fixing a maximum penalty, and it is in the power of the Government to mitigate the penalty to any sum they please, even though informers receive a share of the penalty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Under any circumstances, the informer ought not to participate in any share of the fine. It is a most pernicious practice, and we have seen the evil effects of it in the Customs laws. I do hope it will not be engrafted in this Bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it is very important, in view of these heavy penalties, that the bank should not be in the hands of a common informer, or even of a dismissed clerk, who may give information which may turn out to be unfounded, after the bank is put to enormous trouble and expense, because these informers are generally worth nothing. In a case like this, where there is fair reason for exacting heavy penalties, I think it should be within the control of the Government to do so. I would ask my hon. friend where the Government take power to mitigate the penalties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the General Statutes, which says that we may limit or mitigate penalties. We will discuss that when we come to the clause about penalties.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is very important that we should discuss this matter in connection with the clause now under consideration. There may be a bank clerk who over-issued without the cognisance of the bank, and he may inform on the bank and levy blackmail. I can cite an instance of a late case in a railway company with which I am connected, where we dismissed one of the officers for malfeasance, and he gave information to the Customs that things were smuggled in, though it was without the knowledge of the company, and the railroad was seized. The very same thing might apply to a bank, and the discharged official might put the bank to a great deal of expense and a great deal of litigation. If the bank does wilfully issue beyond its circulation I think they ought to pay the penalty, and I do not say that, under present circumstances, the penalty would be too high; but I do think that this matter should be under the control of the Government, especially, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) points out, if the informer is to get a share of the fine.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If a dismissed official gave information that a bank exceeded its circulation, I think it is in the interest of the public that we should avail ourselves of any information in this way. If a bank official made the over-issue himself, there would be no penalty exacted at all, or the whole fine would be remitted.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not take objection to the Government getting any information from whatever source they like. That is not the point. What I take exception to is that any one—for instance, a discharged clerk—who may give information of some act which may have been a violation of the law, which he may have committed himself

for the very purpose of giving the information, may get a share of the penalty. Let the Government take information from whatever source they like, but do not let the informer get any share of the penalty.

Mr. TISDALE. There are two points that strike me in connection with this matter. First, the shareholders are innocent, and if these excessive penalties are inflicted upon them at the will of an informer, what will the result be? It will be to puuish these innocent parties. The second point is this, and I would like information with regard to it before I am willing to assent to the imposition of such heavy penalties: have there been any cases of over-issues in previous years on the part of any of the banks? If not, I think we should proceed with great caution in making any changes which are not called for. For one, I am not prepared to agree to the proposition unless some such necessity for it is shown. Officers may may make mistakes, and such mistakes are most likely to occur at a time when the customers of a bank call upon it to the utmost extent, as in a difficult financial crisis, and at such a time it may happen that a bank with numerous branches would make a mistake which would render it liable to these penalties.

Mr. McMULLEN. What the hon. gentleman has stated is quite true; but in cases in which excessive issues have taken place, as in the case of the Exchange Bank, to reach the guilty party it is necessary, not only to impose a fine, but to make him liable to a criminal prosecution. I quite agree that the innocent shareholders of a bank should be protected as far as the law can protect them, and that a man who exceeds the instructions given him by the directors and shareholders of the bank in the issue of paper, should be punished personally, instead of the stockholders who are not parties to the offence. I think, also, that some check should appear on the face of the bills themselves against an over-issue. I cannot understand why some means of sanctioning the issue by the Government could not have been devised. For instance, suppose a bank's capital is $1,000,000, and it has issued $750,000, leaving unissued one-fourth of the capital stock which is not paid up; I would like to know why the Government could not stamp every note that has been issued, with the words: "Sanctioned by Government," or something to that effect. If that were done, I cannot see how any bank could issue any notes that were not stamped. The Government would not be responsible, but would merely stamp the issue of the bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the Minister where the clause is that he states exists in the statute and allows the Government to remit any portion of the fine sued for; I have not been able to find it. That point should be decided before we pass this section. The hon. gentleman speaks of a distinction between the bank issuing the notes and the officers issuing them; but the section makes no such distinction. It makes the offence consist in the issue of more than the proper amount of notes, without reference to the person who issues them. The bank is bound to control its officials, and under that section it would be no answer to say that some official had done it. If a share in the penalty could be sued for by a common informer, there is no power vested in the Government to remit the fine in case the over-issue has been accidental. I do not think the Committee will be prepared to accept this clause, because the penalty is enormous.

Mr. BROWN. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The penalties are very excessive, and there seems to be no escape if there has been an unintentional over-issue; there is no provision whatever made for such a case, which may occur in the case of any bank that has a large number of branches. I think, in the first place, the penalty is too large, and, in the second place, there should be some provision with regard to an unintentional over-issue.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Act relating to fines and forfeitures provides how penalties will be recovered in cases not otherwise provided for, and it would apply to this Act, because I do not think there is any provision in the Bill with regard to that. In that Act I find nothing to show that the Crown has any power to remit the fine; it has only power to say what proportion should go to the Crown and what proportion to the informer; but I take it that the Crown could dispose of its moiety. As has been pointed out, there are cases in which persons would incur the penalty in strict law, but in which it would be unfair to impose it, because in large banks with many branches, sometimes offences have occurred without any intention on the part of the bank.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The penalties provided under the old law, which were very much lighter than those under the present clause—I think only about one-tenth—have proved during the last twenty years, in fact during the whole time we have had our present banking system, effective in keeping down the issue of notes, but, under the present law, it is thought there would be some inducement for the smaller banks to allow an over-issue to take place. If that should happen, it would be a very serious matter, because these notes are guaranteed by this guarantee fund, and the managers and directors, who are the guilty ones, should be made to pay the penalties and not the innocent shareholders. These penalties are so excessive that it would be a serious matter to one of the smaller banks, with a capital of $1,000,000 or $1,500,000, to have to pay them. It would be a serious matter for such a bank to have to pay $100,000. I would suggest that we should go back to the old penalties for an over-issue; and that we should further provide that if the over-issue continues for a space of thirty days, then we should impose the highest penalties upon the managers and directors, and also an increased penalty upon the bank. That would prevent any accidental over-issue. If there should be an over-issue, when it comes to the notice of the directors or the manager, they can correct it and bring it down to its proper limits within the thirty days; but if it continues beyond that time, it is manifest that it is the result of design and not of accident.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be well if the Minister of Finance would consider together these two clauses, 53 and 55. As I pointed out the other day, in my opening remarks on the second reading, we are altering the entire status of bank notes; we are going to put a

tremendous temptation in the way of the smaller banks to greatly extend their issue, and are giving them the means of doing it. I do not know whether the House have paid attention to the fact that all the large banks are enormously below their power of circulation, and a great many of the small banks are constantly close to the limit. For instance, in the case of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, with a paid-up capital of $6,000,000, the total circulation is but $2,733,000, on the day for which I have a return. The Bank of British North America, with a paid-up capital of $4,866,000, has a note circulation of $1,224,000, which is one-fourth of what it is entitled to circulate. The Bank of Montreal, which has a paid-up capital of $12,000,000 and a reserve fund of $6,000,000, has a note circulation of $5,446,000. Then, when I come to the smaller banks, I find that the Union Bank of Canada, with a paid-up capital of $1,200,000, has a circulation of $923,000. The Merchants Bank of Halifax, with a paid-up capital of $1,100,000, has a note circulation of $1,032,000, almost as large as that of the Bank of British North America, which has five times its paid-up capital. The Bank of Nova Scotia has a little more than its paid-up capital in note circulation. Its paid-up capital amounts to $1,114,000, and its circulation to $1,325,000.

An hon. MEMBER. That is under special arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that is under special arrangement. But the point is this: the large banks, with great means and resources, circulate very far below their right to circulate, and the small banks, even at the present moment, are close up to the amount the law allows them. And we are going by clause 55 to put the notes of the smaller banks on a par with those of the best, and, consequently, you are going to put, in the hands of the smaller, the power of enormously increasing their circulation, which, under your law, will not only be as good as gold, but better than gold, because, as I understand by your provision, if a bank suspends payment, 6 per cent. will be paid on its notes—a very good rate of interest as matters go. When you are going to give these small banks enormous powers and temptations in times of need, particularly those which, with a small capital, have many agencies, it is right there should be heavy penalties. If I may be permitted to comment on the two clauses together, seeing they are practically together, I will take the opportunity of repeating the caution—which is only a caution—which I gave the House the other day. I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that, in the case of banks falling into the hands of men like those who managed the Exchange Bank, the Maritime Bank, and the Central Bank, all of which have failed within a very few years, as this clause stands, there is an enormous risk entirely unprovided for, of people in such a position availing themselves of this clause to issue an enormous amount of notes in excess of what they are entitled to; and I tell hon. gentlemen they would find no difficulty, as things at present stand, in disposing of those notes to parties—probably at a discount—who would afterwards present them under the terms of the Act. Nor would any penal clause we could devise reach the case; because men prepared to do these things would laugh at your penal clause after they had cleared the country with large sums of ready money, which they would obtain under this provision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not able at the moment to put my hand on the penal clause I referred to, but I will find it this evening. I submit this is not a suitable time to consider the question of procedure with regard to penalties. At a later stage of the Bill we come to the chapter on penalties, and I propose we should then review the different provisions of the Bill as regards penalties, and say whether a general rule should be adopted with respect to all the matters or a different rule for each. It is quite clear that these penalties ought to be subject to the control of the Crown as to the remission of a part or the whole in view of the exonerating or extenuating circumstances I am inclined to think at present it would be likewise well to adopt the principle that they should be sued for by the Crown at the instance of a member of the Government, the Minister of Justice or the Receiver General; but that will be settled later on. I submit these penalties cannot be considered excessive unless members are prepared to say that in view of the increased facilities for over-issue and the increased temptation there can be no case imaginable in which so high a penalty ought to be inflicted. If we can imagine a case in which penalties so severe are called for, let us simply establish the maximum, and leave the prerogative to settle all circumstances in extenuation. I agree with the hon. member for Wellington that we should punish criminally the individuals concerned in the over-issue, and have in view a provision to that effect.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). That will be an addition to the penalties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That will be a penalty on the persons concerned in the over-issue. This will be a penalty on the bank. Notwithstanding I shall propose the imposition of a penalty on the individual, I think it will be likewise necessary to inflict a penalty on the bank, so that if an over-issue has occurred to the advantage of the shareholders, by the fault of any particular officer, the bank will have good reason to see that he is punished.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the hon. gentleman refers to the question of penalties in a subsequent stage of the Bill, would it not be well to leave this section to be discussed at the same time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The chapter I refer to is to the sections prescribing the mode in which the penalties will be recovered. Surely there is no occasion to leave over each section which has the penalty provided in it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The weight of these penalties has been objected to, and the latter part of the hon. gentleman's remarks seemed to me to be objectionable, because he said he would provide a penalty for the officer committing the offence and also a penalty for the bank. In that case, it is not the officers who suffer, but the stockholders, and they ought not to suffer when there are no laches on their part.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think, after the remarks of the Minister of Justice, this may be settled according to his suggestions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think section 78 of the Audit Act deals with this subject sufficiently.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Are you going to make any modification of the penalties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

On section 54,

Mr. ELLIS. The last clause of that section provides that the payment of any amount due to the Government of Canada, in trust or otherwise, shall be the second charge upon such assets, and the payment of any amount due to the Government of any of the Provinces, in trust or otherwise, shall be the third charge upon such assets. I propose to move an amendment to that. There does not appear to me to be any justice in allowing the Government, which deposits in the banks in the same way as any other depositor, to have a preference over the other depositors. Looking at the bank returns for December, 1889, I find that the Government has deposits in thirty Canadian banks—eight banks in Ontario, the amount being $194,276.54; twelve banks in Quebec, the amount being $3,587,598.85; seven banks in Nova Scotia, with an amount of $623,685.53; two banks in New Brunswick, with an amount of $117,360.92, and one bank in British Columbia, with an amount of $326,201.22. In all, there were thirty banks holding deposits from the Government amounting to $4,848,523.06. Deducting the amount held by the Bank of Montreal, which bears, I presume, a peculiar relation to the Government, there was still an amount of $1,758,976.41 deposited in twenty-nine banks in Canada. If the Government enter into financial operations, hold funds in trust and do business as merchants at banks, they should not have any privilege over any other depositor in a bank. I know that the old idea was that the priority of the Crown should be protected before that of any subject, but there seems to be no ground for that in a country like this, and certainly not in a case of this kind. I do not think there is any precedent for it in England. It is true that the Crown there has a lien on some taxes, but that is different from our enacting that the Government of Canada shall have the first lien and the Provinces the second in these cases. No reason can be assigned for it. The Government itself, as a depositor, is no more than any individual, and we know from experience that, where the Government comes in, in this way, as a preferential creditor, great injury has resulted to other creditors. I think the proposed legislation is different from any which exists within the British Empire, and certainly it does not exist in England itself. I move to strike out all the words in the 48th line after the word "insolvency," and to insert the following:—

"And the Crown shall have no priority as a creditor or otherwise over any other person."

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the proposition made by the hon. gentleman is a very prudent one. In the first place, if the law remains as it now is, it offers an opportunity for the Government to assist institutions that are becoming financially weak. The institutions will present their claim to the Government for assistance, on the ground that, in case of failure, the amount due the Government will be virtually a first lien after the payment of the paper in circulation. Now, I think this is unfair, because people investing money in banks on deposit, or otherwise, whether bearing interest or not, undoubtedly expect that the Government will protect the public as far as possible. Now, if this clause remains as it is, the Government may assist banking institutions that are getting into a hampered financial condition; they may advance money for the purpose of keeping them afloat, and in the end, if that institution should suspend, the Government is safe next to those who are bill-holders outside. The bill-holders outside are protected by the 5 per cent. that has been accumulated, contributed by the banks for the purpose of protecting any suspending institution. The result is that the Government is undoubtedly protected in the next place, because by this clause they claim the right to step in as preferential creditors over all other institutions. I do not think that is fair. I think the people of this country who are controlling money, and willing that it should be utilised in the general commercial transactions of this Dominion, should be placed upon a par with the Government of the country, and if the Government grant assistance to an institution that proves to be the means of carrying it along, and eventually it collapses, and then upon people stepping in and receiving their money in full, if other creditors that have not in their possession information necessary to enable them to take steps to protect themselves, it is undoubtedly an advantage taken over those people. I contend that the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman ought to be adopted, because it is only fair to those that are unaware of the financial embarrassments that may take place in the case of a bank, and the Government will lead those people for whom they ought to legislate. We are legislating for the public interest now, and the interest of all men who are interested in our banking institutions, and in adopting this amendment we shall place them on a par with the Government, so far as their claims would be concerned, if a financial disaster should overtake any of these institutions.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the amendment of the hon. member from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis), and with the utterances of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I think it is a most unfair thing for the Government to ask for any preference over the general public, and I think the depositors in a bank should not be placed at a disadvantage with the Government as creditors when the bank gets into difficulty. I recollect not very long ago, when a certain banking institution in the city of Montreal was getting into difficulties, that the general public knew nothing about it, and the Government advanced that bank a certain sum of money; they advanced them a second sum of money, I think—some $50,000 each time. When that bank failed the creditors found that the Dominion Government laid a claim before them for the money that had

been advanced. Perhaps the Government had no right whatever to make those advances, but, at all events, they did it, and the people found to their surprise that the Government put in a claim for preference over the ordinary creditors of the bank to the assets, claiming that they should be paid before the general creditors of the bank received any money. It is well known that the bank to which I refer was the Exchange Bank of Montreal. Now, there was but one outcry throughout the whole city of Montreal in regard to the action of the Government. Everybody looked upon it as an unfair position for the Government to assume in reference to the creditors of that bank. The Government are supposed to be legislating for the better regulation of the financial institutions of this country, and they ought not to place themselves in a position to take what is evidently an unfair advantage in claiming a preference over the general public. I believe the right of the Government to have the first claim upon the assets of that bank was contested ; I do not know what the result was, but I believe the Government never got the money. Whether they have made any efforts to collect it I am not prepared to say, but I understand the Government never got the money—of course, I speak under correction. I have nothing official to warrant me in saying so, but from all that I can learn outside, and from my knowledge of current events in relation to Government affairs, I believe they have not received a dollar of that money, but I believe that there was an opposition made to the bank going into liquidation. Now, I hold that kind of thing should be put a stop to. In this case it was an ordinary advance or loan to an institution that came to the Government and asked for their assistance. Some people were frank enough to say that there was some political influence at work when that loan was obtained. I am not prepared to say it was so, but there was one thing a little singular, and that was that the people connected with that bank, the leading men on the board, the president and the leading directors, and the men who had the largest investment in that corporation, were friends of the Administration, and perhaps if they had not been friends of the Administration, they would not have received that money. Now, for one, I do not want to see a repetition of that kind of thing. In this legislation the public should receive that protection to which they are entitled, and if the Government choose to make an advance of money to an institution and become creditors, they should only become ordinary creditors, and if any disaster happens to that institution they should only rank the same as general creditors of the bank. That is the position in which I desire to see this legislation completed. I think it would be very unfair, it would be unjust, it would be allowing the Government to assume the exercise of a power, not the exercise of a right, which this House possesses, and we should not endeavor to place upon the Statute-books of our land a law which will give them preference over all individuals who might be depositors in that institution. We know that the Government have means of information which the general public do not possess. They can protect themselves when the general public cannot protect themselves ; therefore, I hold that it is unfair for them to seek preference over the general public on the faith of the bank's assets being fairly divided, if any disaster should occur. It is unfair that the Government should be able, as in the case of the Exchange Bank, to set up a claim for preference over the general public. If that was the law, it ought to be altered, and if it was not the law, I think it would be a source of regret if it should be made the law now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the Committee will consider very carefully indeed before they adopt this amendment, and I hope the hon. gentleman who has moved it, and those who have advocated it, will think carefully before they press it. In the first place, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) stated that the legislation asked for here was without a precedent. I beg to say that, so far from that being so the clause which the hon. gentleman has now presented to the Committee is without a precedent in British legislation. The clause which is proposed by the Minister of Finance, excepting in one or two particulars to which I will call attention, is at present the common law in force all through the British Empire and is the law of Canada to-day. The hon. gentleman may ask me, why, under these circumstances, we seek to put it on the face of the Bill ? For two reasons. First, because we are endeavoring to adopt an Act with respect to banks and banking, which will embody as much of the common law was well as of the statute law as we can conveniently embody in a Bill of this kind ; second, in order that the public shall know what the law is with respect to the rights of the Government, what the rule is that prevails with respect to the prerogative of the Crown in relation to its debtors. It is better that it should be here patent to everybody who deals with banks, patent to every one who takes the trouble to examine the banking laws, than that it should be searched for in obscure decisions in the various courts in the country. Another reason why we desire to put it here is, that by the decision which has been arrived at on this subject it would seem that the law is not equal in the different Provinces of Canada on this subject now. We have undoubtedly a preferential lien in the Provinces where the common law of England prevails. The impression exists that with respect to the Province of Quebec our lien is not quite so extensive as in the other Provinces. Under these circumstances it is desirable, first, to declare what the law is and then to make that law uniform as to all the Provinces in Canada, because it is perfectly obvious that if our right in the Province of Ontario is less than it is in the Province of Quebec, in regard to our preference on the assets of a bank, we cannot, in fairness or justice, enforce against a bank in Ontario a greater privilege than we have in relation to a bank in the Province of Quebec. Another reason why we should put it here is, that there are conflicting claims under a system of government like ours, questions of conflict between the Crown in its right in relation to the Dominion Government and the Crown in its right in relation to the Provinces. We have, therefore, provided, to remove any doubt on the subject, that the Crown's right in relation to the Provinces shall be second to the right of the Crown in relation to the Dominion.

Mr. ELLIS. Do you think the common law allows the Provinces any such right ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think so. That is apparently settled by one consideration, whether the Provincial Government is entitled to exercise any of the prerogatives of the Crown; and I think that a Provincial Government is entitled to exercise the prerogatives of the Crown in relation to all those matters which are within its exclusive jurisdiction. It seems to me that the Queen is vested with the Government of a Province just as much as she is with the Government of Canada, only limited in extent as to those matters which are within Provincial control. The reason why the Province may fairly rank second in the preference, is explained when I state the general principle on which it is fair and just, irrespective of the question of existing prerogatives, that the Crown should have a lien. The Dominion Government, to drop for a moment the expression "the Crown" and the use of the term "prerogative," is obliged, in carrying on the affairs of the country, to have resort to the banks and to have moneys in all the banks of the country. We are collecting revenue in Canada under the authority of this Parliament over a very wide extent of country, by a large army of officers of Customs and Inland Revenue, from penalty collecting officers, from magistrates who collect penalties due to us, from agents collecting moneys to be applied to the Crown, and the only hands we have for the receipt of this revenue or any moneys payable to the Crown are the banks wherever they are established. It is impossible that Customs officers, and Inland Revenue officers, and the officers of the Department of Justice, and the officers of the other Departments, who are collecting officers, can have vaults of their own in which to store the money. We must resort to the banks, not only for the convenience of making deposits but for transmission, and to that extent necessarily the Government is involuntarily creditor of all those institutions—these banks which are the creatures of this Parliament and this Government. We are not in a position of ordinary depositors, we are not in the position of persons who select custodians for their moneys; perforce we are obliged to avail ourselves of these monetary institutions; and the same privilege should be given to the Crown in regard to its moneys as is given to the Crown in regard to the discharge of the duties by its officers, for the very analogous reason that the Crown being obliged to discharge its functions of government by a great army of officers throughout the country, the Crown is relieved of responsibility for the negligence of its officers. It is impossible in the selection of such a number of officers throughout the country that the Crown can be responsible in damages for the negligence of every one of them. It is impossible in the selection of such a great number of officers that we can have the exact knowledge and supervision of every one of them that a private individual may have over persons whom he selects as his servants; and, further, the selection of those persons and the entrusting of them with functions is all done for the benefit of the public, for the carrying on of the Government of the country, and in relation to those officers there is the analogous principle that the Crown is not responsible for their neglect. And as we are obliged to resort to the banks, and as we are obliged to put our money there for safe-keeping and for purposes of transmission, it is undesirable that while it is there we should have no lien or security, and it is fair we should have that lien and security on these institutions which are created by the act of this Parliament and by the act of this Parliament alone. Banking institutions are not at all in this regard in the same position as private debtors of the Crown, to whom we might lend money or make ourselves indebted; yet even in regard to them the Crown has the prerogative right of first preference, pursuant to the common law prevailing all over the Empire. Then the hon. gentleman spoke of the impropriety of adopting any principle or maintaining any principle by which the Government could do wrong; but surely for the sake of arriving at a sound principle we should distinguish between the Government as merely a political body and the Government as representing the public. It is the Government, as representing the public, that has to deal with these institutions; it is the money of the public which has to be deposited in these institutions; it is the money of the public that is made a preferential lien, and if the Government as a political organisation does wrong, as it would indoubtedly do wrong by merely lending money to support a weak institution——

Mr. MITCHELL. As they have done.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know. There are many facts in the history of this country of which I am not aware, and a great many statements of facts in regard to history I find controverted so often that I am not able to state a positive opinion in regard to them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the hon. gentleman venture to controvert the statement made by me, that the Government loaned money to the Exchange Bank.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To controvert it? No. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman's statement is freely controverted, as are all political statements made, so that it is not necessary I should say anything in regard to it in discussing a principle like that I am considering. I do not desire to assert, I do not desire to deny; I do not know anything in regard to the subject.

Mr. MITCHELL. You know nothing about it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not a member of the Government, or a member of this Parliament at the time; I had very little knowledge of federal public affairs when that transaction took place; and beyond a casual mention of it now and then, such as the hon. gentleman has made, I know nothing of the circumstance whatever.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then we will enquire from the Finance Minister.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Whether the facts are so or not, let us discuss and settle the principle on the question of abstract right. If the Government is reprehensible at any time for the way it discharges its duty, it is subject to the censure of this House in regard to that duty, as to the discharge of all its duties; but do not let this House, for the mere sake of attacking individual members of the Government, whoever may be the occupants of the Treasury benches, when for the time being they do wrong for which wrong-doing they are always amenable to public opinion and to the opinion of this House, do not let us sacrifice important public interests or jeopardise the moneys of the public

and the public rights we wish to conserve, for it is the public rights we wish to conserve and not the mere grasping of any kind of patronage in regard to means by which we can assist our friends or assist the banks.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With regard to the principle embodied in this section, I think it is very important, in view of recent events, that the law should be declared by Parliament, with regard to this priority, in whatever way it may be so declared. As the hon. Minister is well aware, this matter has been the subject of recent discussion in the courts, and a great diversity of opinion existed as to the relative position of the Dominion Government, the Provincial Government and the note holders, with regard to their priority. I must say that, so far as the decision of the court was concerned, the question is left in great confusion, and unless this Parliament deals with it, there will be, no doubt, considerable trouble. There is no question at all but that, as the Minister of Justice says, by the common law of the land, the prerogative of the Crown gave the priority over the other creditors. That prerogative originated from the principle put forward by the Minister of Justice that this was public money, and that the bank was the depository of the revenue and taxes collected, which were placed there for safe-keeping. By reason of the prerogative of the Crown, that money being placed, perhaps, somewhat different from other deposits, and being money used for the public benefit, priority was given. The Banking Act contains a clause, which is the first portion of the 54th section, making the notes the first charge on the assets of the bank. The question came up first with regard to the prerogative of the Crown between the Dominion and the Local Governments, but there was a difference of opinion among the judges, as my friend is aware, and in fact from the peculiar position in which the courts were placed with the two cases that came before them lately, there is really no binding decision with regard to that particular point. It is very important, now that we are discussing this Bill, that that point should be definitely settled. The decision of the courts has been understood to be with regard to the prerogative of the Crown, that it extended to the Dominion Government and to the Provincial Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. What case was that?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The case of the Maritime Bank. But, as I said before, there was a difficulty with regard to the priority of the Crown over note holders, and also a very important point with regard to the money held by the Crown in trust.

Mr. MITCHELL. How was it in the Exchange Bank?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I will refer directly to that and to the peculiar position of that bank, and the position in which the Crown was placed, as I understand by the law of Quebec. These difficulties have arisen as to priority between the Dominion Government, the Provincial Governments, and the note holders, and I think it is very important that the point should be settled now. When we come to deal with the question, and to make it a statutory one, and not relying on the principle of the common law, we have, I think, a right to discuss the matter with a view to see whether the Crown in all cases should have priority. My own opinion with regard to the revenue of the country, and to the moneys collected for the country, is, that the common law right should prevail. Although the hon. Minister puts forward the assertion that the Government are not able to choose a bank, yet, after all, the Government can stand in the same position as other individuals and have the same option as trustees have, and to a certain extent they ought to run the risk that other persons who have trust moneys are obliged to run. My view is, that where the Dominion Government is the guardian of public money, and where that money is placed in banks for the purpose of safe-keeping, that the prerogative of the Crown and the priority should still prevail. But the Crown have also become creditors of banks in other ways, and that is a much more important point, and one in which, I think, their right to exercise the prerogative is very questionable. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has referred to the case of the Exchange Bank. As is well known, that was a case in which moneys were advanced by the Government by way of loan. The money that the Exchange Bank owed the Government was not money that had been placed by the Crown in the vaults of the Exchange Bank, as the hon. Minister stated the ordinary revenues of the country were. It consisted actually of loans made to the bank, the same as an individual or any other bank might have loaned money to that institution. In reference to such deposits, I think the Crown, in justice to the other depositors, should not stand in any more favorable position than any other creditor. There is no doubt that in this case the decision eventually was against the Dominion, upon the peculiar law of Quebec, but I think I am correct in stating that in the case of the Prince Edward Island Bank the decision was in favor of the Crown, even to the extent of priority on money loaned. If the Crown chooses to come forward in the character of a lender, even with the intention of assisting the bank, it should not, in my opinion, have any priority. I know that upon the course taken by the Government in advancing money to that bank, there was considerable animadversion on the propriety of their doing so, but, be that as it may, I will not discuss that question now. I think there is a broad distinction in regard to the priority of the Crown, for moneys collected for the public revenues, and for the money which they choose to loan to a bank for the purpose of obtaining interest; because we know that in some instances Provincial Governments have made deposits with banks the same as an ordinary depositor receiving interest, and the Dominion Government have loaned money to institutions for the purpose of assisting them. I hold that a broad distinction ought to be made between money so loaned and the money deposited as the revenue of the country, and I do not think, applying the principle upon which the prerogative of the Crown is founded, that it is at all applicable to cases of that kind. It seems to me that in such cases the Crown should stand in the position of an ordinary creditor and come in, *pari passu*, with other creditors in regard to this particular money. I think the first clause of this section, that the note holders shall have first claim, is quite right. In view of the circula-

tion of the Dominion, the guarantee fund, and other circumstances, I think it is quite right that that point should be clearly defined, and that the note holders shall have the first lien upon the assets.

Mr. ELLIS. Does that come in before the priority of the Crown?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Yes. That is one of the difficulties that occurred in the late case I have referred to, and there was a difference of opinion among the judges of the Supreme Court as to whether the Crown had the priority, or the note holders. In the case of the Maritime Bank, the question was discussed in the courts of New Brunswick, and in the Supreme Court here, and, after a long deliberation, there was a great diversity of opinion. Some judges held that the note holders should have the first lien, whilst others held that the Crown should have the first lien. That point should be clearly and definitely settled, and so far as the position taken by the Government in this Bill, in regard to this matter, is concerned, I have no doubt that the principle that the note holders shall have the first lien will be assented to by the House generally. That, my hon. friend must see, is to a certain extent an invasion of the prerogative, because there is no doubt that the general opinion is that the Crown would have priority, and I do not think the priority of the Crown should remain as to the notes. Then, there is no doubt that at times the Government are given moneys in trust for specific purposes, which they are obliged to deposit somewhere, and in that case, I think, the same priority should prevail. But in cases where the Government chooses to become a voluntary creditor of the banks, advancing money to them in the same way as any other institution or an individual might do, I think the prerogative of the Crown should not apply. Any Government that puts itself in the position of a lender should stand in the same position as any other lender.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The effect of this section will be largely to reduce the security which the ordinary depositor has for his deposits in the banks. The proposition contained in the first part of the section, that the note holder shall have a prior lien for the payment of his note, is one which, I think, will receive the general assent of the Committee. The objection is confined to the latter part of the section, which assumes to declare what the common law right of the Crown is in those Provinces where the common law prevails, so far as the Crown is represented by the Dominion. I am free to admit that if Parliament comes to the conclusion that the right of the Crown should prevail over the right of the ordinary citizen, that right should be extended to the Province of Quebec, and should exist there in the same manner as it exists in other Provinces where the common law prevails. It would be monstrous that one law should prevail in the Province of Quebec with regard to Crown debts and a different law in the Province of Ontario. If the Committee are of opinion that the claims of the Crown should take priority over the claims of individuals, I think that should be the rule in all the Provinces. But that is the main question upon which the hon. Minister of Justice argues, and there is no doubt that his contention at first sight is a very plausible one, that inasmuch as the Crown is compelled as a matter of necessity to employ agents or officers in the different Provinces to collect the revenues of the country, and to make use of the banks for the purpose of depositing those revenues, they should not be placed in the same position as an ordinary creditor. There is something on the face of that; but we must remember that there is a large class of people doing business in the country who are essentially as much bound to make use of the banks as the Government: they cannot help themselves. The average man doing business, the trustee who has large sums of money in his care, municipal and other corporations, must make use of the bank safes for the deposit of their funds; they are, to that extent, in the same position as the Government. The effect of this provision will be that in the case of disaster, when the note holders, the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments are paid, the ordinary creditor of the banks will, perhaps, be left without any assets at all. I remember the case of the Bank of Prince Edward Island, which has been spoken of. There was no reasonable doubt that the prerogative of the Crown gave the Crown a priority over other creditors, but what was the fact? Even though the Government did not press their claim, hundreds of people were ruined; but if the Government had insisted on its strictly legal right, the ordinary creditor could not have got anything at all. We must not be carried away by such a large term as the prerogative of the Crown. The prerogative of the Crown arose centuries ago, and I doubt the propriety of applying it to the circumstances that exist in the nineteenth century. I cannot see why a trustee who deposits $100,000 in a bank on the same day as the Government, should, when the assets are divided, be required to stand to one side until the Government claim is satisfied. So far as the revenues received by the Government are concerned, a distinction might be made; but I see so many difficulties dividing the rights of the Crown *quoad* deposits from its rights *quoad* the moneys received for revenue, that I am disposed to accept the broad proposition of the hon. member for St. John who declares that the Crown in its commercial dealings, that is, in its deposits in the banks, shall stand in the same position as the average depositor. Our duty is to so guard the privileges which we grant to the banks that anybody who does business with them shall be absolutely safe, so far as legal checks and guards can make him safe; after that, we ought to leave those who deal with the banks on the same level; and it seems to me that even-handed justice will be dealt to all parties if we ignore what is called the prerogative of the Crown, which is really unjust priority over the subject. Then, when you come to the case of the Provinces, the argument which the hon. Minister of Justice urged with regard to the Dominion, cannot be urged with regard to them at all. They have not agents in distant parts of the country collecting revenues. If they choose to select a bank in which to deposit small or large sums, they are not in a different position from the merchant or lawyer or capitalist who deposits his money there, and in the division of the assets they ought to stand on the same footing. In view of the facts of which I have a personal knowledge with regard to the Bank of

Prince Edward Island, I cannot think that the acceptance of my hon. friend's resolution would be anything but doing fair and even-handed justice.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to say a word in reply to the insinuation thrown out by the hon. Minister of Justice. He said he had often heard of rumors in this House that appeared to have very little foundation in them. He said that with regard to a statement which I had made with reference to the Exchange Bank. The statement I made was not a positive statement—I said as much—that the Government were defeated in their attempt to enforce their claim as a prior claim against the general creditors. In place of the hon. gentleman throwing out the insinuation he did towards me, it would have been much more in keeping with his high position if he had informed himself on the matter, and then had at once asserted that the statement made by me was wrong, or had admitted the fact. Now there is a great deal said about the prerogative. I agree more with the hon. member for Queen's than with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon). The hon. member for St. John in one view rather sides with the Minister in the position he takes with regard to the prerogative. What is this prerogative ? The hon. Minister pointed out that he stood in a dual position—as a representative of the Government and a representative of the people. Sir, he stands in this position : that he is a member of a representative body to make just and equitable laws for the administration of the affairs of the country. The question is not whether such a state of things exists in England or elsewhere. The question is, what will suit the interests of Canada ? What will give the depositors in the banks confidence that they will be fairly dealt with, in the case of an accident to a bank in which they have deposited any money ? What is there about the sacred prerogative which is spoken of ? Does the hon. member for St. John think because it is a prerogative that there is anything very sacred about it ?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). To protect the revenues of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. We want to protect the individuals of the country—the people who, confident that the legislation secures them, put their moneys in the banks ; and we do not want the Government to have preference over these individuals. The Government have information and means of knowledge that individuals have not, and should take care, when they put money in the banks, that they put it in solvent banks. At all events they have their officers to look after that ; and I hold there ought to be no preference. Talk about the sacredness of the prerogative. Why, by this very section they have abandoned the sacredness of the prerogative. They say :

"The payment of the notes issued or re-issued by the bank and intended for circulation, and when in circulation, together with any interest paid or payable thereon, as hereinafter provided, shall be the first charge upon the assets of the bank in case of its insolvency ; and the payment of any amount due to the Government of Canada, in trust or otherwise, shall be the second charge upon such assets."

Where is the respect paid to the prerogative in that section ? They have abandoned the right of the Crown and the first preference, which the hon. member for St. John holds so sacred and the hon. Minister seems to hold so sacred. I admit, as the hon. gentleman stated, that when the Government have to collect revenue all over the country, they have to use the facilities the banks afford them. Have not individuals to do so ? Have not people who have the control of moneys for other parties to do so ? What argument is there that the Government should take precedence over individuals, trustees or merchants, or any class of people who have to use these same vehicles for the deposit and transmission of money just as the Government has ? There is no reason in the world for it. There is nothing to be said about the prerogative ; it is abandoned by the first section of the Act, and if abandoned in one case should not be retained in the other. Is it just that the Government, because they have the power of the majority behind them, should legislate in such a way as to do injustice to the people doing business throughout the country ? Why should the Government ask to be placed in a better position than the people of the country ? It seems to be an outrageous proposition and one we should not sanction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With respect to the hon. gentleman's personal observations against myself, I am a little astonished at the warmth of them. I made no observations whatever by way of insinuation against the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. You said something about rumors found to be untrue.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I never said anything of rumors. I said there were many facts with regard to the history of this country that I was not aware of—statements of facts which were so completely controverted that it was unnecessary for me to consider, in a discussion of this kind, whether they were reliable or not.

Mr. MITCHELL. And which were found to be untrue.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not objecting in the least that the hon. gentleman should apply that qualification to his remarks, although I did not ; I do not at all object that he should apply it now to the observations he made. I made no insinuations ; I am a little above doing that. If I thought that the discussion about the Merchants' Bank was pertinent, it would have been shorter and plainer to have said that I placed no stress or reliance on any statements of the hon. gentleman when made for the purpose of attacking the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are coming out in your true colors.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will come out just as often as I please, and without any regard to the hon. gentleman's disposition to bully me or anybody else here. With regard to what the hon. gentleman has just said with reference to the sacredness of the prerogative, I made no allusion, I used no such words with reference to the prerogative. I was answering the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), who said that the legislation we proposed had no parallel in the history of the British Empire, and I was endeavoring to show that it is the common law principle which prevails all through the Empire and which exists to-day for the benefit of the public and for the purpose of carrying on the Government of the country and securing the revenue of the country. Is it not vain

to talk about the necessity of private individuals trusting the banks of a country ? They trust them for their own accommodation, for their own business and profit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Just as the Government does.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government trust the banks for the purpose of carrying on the business of the country, and for the purpose of collecting and storing the revenues of the country. The distinction which the hon. the senior member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) made would not be applicable in practice, and would not cure the evils which he admits may arise. He proposes, that in view of the necessity we are under, to use the banks for the collection of revenue, and for its safe-keeping and transmission, we shall have a lien in respect of such revenue, but that in respect of moneys not derived from mere revenue, we shall not have a lien. But, I submit to his judgment, the Government stand in precisely the same relation, with regard to large sums and large classes of moneys of that description, as it does in relation to the revenue. How often does it happen that, for the purpose of carrying on a public work, we have to take large sums as security from the contractors ? How often does it happen that, in pursuance of the legislation of this Parliament in relation to insurance companies and other organisations, we have to take the deposits of large sums. In the case of the Maritime Bank, the sum of forty or fifty thousand dollars was placed on deposit with the Government ?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The court held there was no prerogative for that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But I say that for governmental purposes, and I mean purely for the purpose of carrying on public affairs of the country, it is just as necessary that we should trust that money to the banks as that we should trust the Customs revenue collected in Victoria or Charlottetown. We cannot store it otherwise. Parliament has declared that a company, before it enters on business, must deposit a sum of money with us. We have no place to store it, and must place it on deposit in a bank. Is that the case of a loan of money to a bank, in respect of which we ought to stand as a private creditor ? Surely not. What will the hon. gentleman's distinction lead to ? It will lead to this : that moneys of that description, collected in different parts of the Dominion from Customs and Excise and other sources of the revenue, and transmitted to Ottawa, must be deposited in the bank in which the Government principally does business : they must be deposited in the Bank of Montreal. We are not able to keep them out of the bank ; we must put them there for safe-keeping ; and in respect of all those we are to have no lien. Or if, on account of the accumulation of moneys in one of the banks, we deem it safer in the public interest that they should be distributed amongst several, although held by the Government as the proceeds of revenue, we are not to have any preference for them and are liable to loss from the disturbances which may happen to the bank in the ordinary course of business.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend has not entered into the position I took at all. I say there are three modes in which moneys can be placed by a Government in a bank. First, moneys collected from the ordinary sources of revenues of the country and placed there for safe-keeping ; second, the moneys the Government receive, under parliamentary authority, in trust, such as those my hon. friend has alluded to. With regard to those, I said there might be reason why the prerogative of the Crown should be extended to them. But there was another mode of dealing with the banks which my hon. friend has not answered. It is not the moneys they are obliged to deposit, but it is when the Government become a lender and put money on deposit, either with or without interest, in a bank for some purpose connected with the bank. I say that, when they do that, they stand in precisely the same position as if one bank went to another bank and applied for assistance to carry them through. If the Government lend that money to the banks they should be placed in the same position as any other creditor. Why should the Government stand in a different position to any other creditor ? Suppose that a bank applied for a loan to another bank in Ottawa or elsewhere, and applied also to the Government, and both were willing to lend the money, the one could lend the money with perfect security, knowing that they would get their money back with interest, while the other would have to come in with the other creditors. When the Government undertakes to become a lender of money, and, I may say, a competitor with the banks, the Government stand in the same position as ordinary lenders. I am familiar with the case of the Maritime Bank. There was a decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick which was sustained by the Supreme Court of Canada on the appeal. The result of the judge of the court of first instance would have been that all the funds, after payment of the notes of the bank, would have been swept away, and nothing would have been left for the depositors. I admit that it is very hard, but there is the law as to the money received by the Government by parliamentary authority. There may be some force in preserving that authority, but, if you take the case of the Exchange Bank and some other banks, you will see that there is no reason why this provision should be continued.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to argue this question from the legal standpoint at all, but there are two or three points which I should like to make, partly by way of reiteration of suggestions which have already been thrown out. In the first place, I cannot see the distinction which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) makes in regard to the position of the public moneys. He says that, firstly, there is the revenue, secondly, the trust, and thirdly, the loans. It seems to me that all that the Government derives in this way starts in as revenue. It is a case of money collected in outlying parts of the country, which, whether it be in the way of Customs, Excise, or other revenues, still it starts in the way of revenue. The only thing which is not revenue appears to me to be those sums which are put into the hands of the Government and which are obliged to be put in the hands of the Government by companies and contractors who have to make deposits ; but that is something which they are forced to do by the law, and that is different altogether from revenue, because it goes back into the hands of the contractor or the company after a certain time has elapsed.

What else is there besides that which is not a matter of revenue?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The difference arises from the fact that there is no priority in those cases.

Mr. FOSTER. If, in reference to deposits made by trustees, my hon. friend is willing that the first lien should be given to the Government, how does he make the distinction between the money so collected and that collected from the outlying parts of the country by the different officers, and stored by them in the vaults where alone the Government can store money for safety, in the different banks of the country? That is not a loan. A loan is made by the Government, say in the British market, and, if the Government does not use the whole amount derived from that loan, and deposits a portion of it in the banks where alone it can be properly kept, that is another matter. However, that is a loan which the revenues of the country afterwards must meet, and, if the Government are conceded a priority of claims on account of revenue and on account of trust funds, they should also be conceded a priority in regard to all these moneys. I do not know what my hon. friend means by loans or by advances to banks. Certainly nothing of that kind has taken place, as far as I know, during my connection with this Government. Nothing in the way of advances to banks has taken place in the same way in which a loan company or a bank would make an advance to other banks or companies. Would my hon. friend propose that the money of the people, collected from the individuals of the country, when that money is placed where alone the Government can place it, should be so placed that there should be no priority for the people from whom it was obtained? He admits that there should be a priority or a lien for the revenues when they are first collected. The Government has no choice of banks. The Government has its officers in different parts of the Dominion, and they have to make their returns to the banks which are nearest to them, for the purposes of safety. That is considered a better plan than that they should keep the money, where they probably have not the vaults properly protected, and necessarily in the collection of the revenue, the different banks of the country which have branches in every part of the Dominion must have a portion of the Government funds in their hands. We speak of them as Government funds, and refer to them as belonging to the Crown, but they are really the funds of the people, and are used for the benefit of the people. Whenever there is a clash of interest between individuals and the Government, it is natural that sympathy should side with the individual, but I think that in this matter the people as a whole ought to be considered first, and I do not think there is any injustice done to the people individually by this provision. Suppose that a portion of this revenue is lost, and that the people have no priority of claim, then the people have to make up the loss. We then have to draw upon the individuals of the country, and when we have a priority for the people collectively, in regard to their own money and their own funds, we have in reality this priority for the protection of the individuals who make up the body politic. The Government is not quite in the same position as a private trustee who may or may not use the trust confided to him. The Government must receive the revenue and store it and place it in safe-keeping, and it stands in quite a different position from an ordinary trustee. A person who takes the obligation upon himself, takes it voluntarily; he may take it or he may not, just as he pleases. The Government must collect the revenue and must store it, and it is responsible to the people for its safe-keeping.

Mr. MULOCK. I think this proposed legislation is of a retrograde character and is to be deprecated, assuming, as I do, for the sake of argument, that the Finance Minister desires to promote the public interest. Still, I think he may make a mistake, and that he is doing so in this case, in declaring that the Government shall have a first lien upon all the assets. In this way the Government is, in the first place, casting doubt upon the solvency of the banks. If the banks are absolutely solvent it would be wholly unnecessary for the Government to stipulate that they should have a mortgage. Let us see what this legislation involves. The Government shall have a first lien, after payment of the bill holders, upon all the assets of the bank, not merely upon the money paid into the bank by the shareholders, who are only a class of contributors towards the assets, but upon the money contributed by the creditors of the bank, the ordinary depositors. You ask, then, that the Government shall have a lien, in respect of its deposits, upon the deposits of the subject; that a subject, for example, who may make a deposit with the Government, and which the Government may deposit in a bank—that in respect of that money the subject shall have a first lien upon the assets of the bank, through the trustee, the Government, whilst the other depositor who takes the money straight into the bank, is to be a security and endorser for the Government depositor. Now you have set yourselves up as a Government Savings Bank; you have $40,000,000 of the people's money in the savings banks which you have voluntarily accepted from the people as a deposit. It is a voluntary transaction from beginning to end. We will say, for argument's sake, that there are $40,000,000 on deposit with the banks, deposited by the people themselves directly. The Government take their forty millions of deposit, or whatever they may have on hand—we will say, for the sake of illustration, that the whole $40,000,000 was a voluntary transaction on the part of both parties—and they deposit their money with the banks, and that moment the $40,000,000 placed there by the individuals directly become mortgaged to the Government for the money which the Government deposited. Now, that is simply the Government competing with the banks for the deposit business of the country. My hon. friend from Norfolk seems to disapprove of that.

Mr. TISDALE. Don't the banks want the deposit? They are mighty glad to get it.

Mr. MULOCK. The banks do not want to take the deposits, I presume, and have the Government take all the gilt-edge off from them. If the Government choose to set themselves up as a bank, why should they have any preference over any other banks? They are not engaging in this savings bank business out of pure regard for the interest of the depositors. The Government is extremely anxious to borrow money; looking at the

state of the finances of this country, we can understand why the Government is anxious to obtain deposits. Now, if we put this legislation through they can say to the country: Put your deposits with the Dominion Government and those deposits will have a first lien upon all the assets of the bank wherever they may be placed, in fact the private depositors' money is going to be security for the public depositor. This is a most inequitable principle, it is against the general trend of the age. The Minister of Justice seems to defend this on the ground that it is part of the tradition of the common law. We are engaging as a Parliament every day, by legislation, in infringing upon the common law, because the common law has failed to meet the requirements of the age. Whenever the common law requires to be varied, Parliament interferes, as we are doing every day, to make the change. The hon. gentleman says it ought not to be done in this case. The mere fact that there was some common law prerogative can in no way prevent the people from changing the common law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not contend that.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the hon. gentleman to argue in favor of this proposition because it had the support of the common law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That gives it some sanction.

Mr. MULOCK. Many changes have been made in the institutions of the country by the wisdom of the people to meet the changed circumstances of the age. The Minister and the Government defend the proposition on the ground of necessity. This is apparently the only defensible ground, the only strong ground, the Government can take, that necessity justifies this course. Now, I fail to see wherein there is any necessity for this on the part of the Government to utilise the banks, that is not in like manner a necessity under like circumstances, for the individual. It is true that the Government is a corporation, and to that extent no one person is individually charged with the custody of money, but the same argument applies to every great corporation. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with its ramifications throughout this continent. I presume that company is obliged to deposit its money wherever there happens to be banks. It must either deposit in the Government banks, or the ordinary banks, or in strong boxes of its own purchase. In either case deposits are made with some institution that has set itself up as qualified to take charge of valuable securities. I think all public and private moneys finds their way into the strong rooms of the banks for the purpose of safety, or on some other pretence. Now you are going against the trend of the age. The trend of the age is against priorities, the trend of the age is equality. It is good, equitable doctrine, equality is equity, and you are retrograding in this present instance, not only against the principle of the age, but, I submit, against the best interests of this country, and if you ask to have a claim above all others, it ought not to be a claim in respect of which you are competitors with the banks. If you want to have a special lien in respect of the revenues derived by taxation, that is one thing, but to have a special lien in respect of your own business wherein you are competitors with ordinary trustees, is a totally different thing. The Government are engaged in various classes of business, from which they are deriving a revenue. You are common carriers, you have the Intercolonial Railway, with its ramifications, from which you derive a revenue; you have your tolls from public works, and then you have the result of your taxation. Then when you set yourselves up as banks you are invading and curtailing various walks of life, and, therefore, so far as anything outside the ordinary collection of revenue is concerned, there is no justification for asking for a privilege different from that which the ordinary subject would have. I, therefore, strongly disapprove of the legislation asked for, and I think the Finance Minister would consult the interests of the country by abandoning this clause as one calculated to impair the credit of the banks, and to operate most injuriously towards private interests.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is a fallacy in the argument that has been addressed to the Committee by the Minister of Justice and by the Finance Minister. Both hon. gentlemen have referred to the prior rights of the Crown, and they seem to think that because, as a matter of convenience, the Government find it necessary to use the banks for the collection of revenue, and for the purpose of making deposits of money that may be in the hands of the Government for various purposes, and for future use, therefore, the Government ought, acting on behalf of the public, to have a priority of claim upon the moneys of the bank for the payment of any claim the Government may possess. It seems to me that those hon. gentlemen have, in a great measure, overlooked the very fact that we are engaged at this moment in discussing the incorporation of banks. For what purpose are they incorporated? Is it for the purpose of establishing institutions for the convenience of the State alone, for the deposit of public moneys, for the convenience of the Government, and for the safe-keeping of those moneys? Not at all. We are incorporating banks for the general benefit of individual members of the community. They are to be created to meet the wants of modern society. It is true that, in this country, the Government find it convenient to use these banks for the purpose of making safe deposits of money that merely come into the hands of their officers. But there are thousands of people engaged in business in various parts of the country who find it equally necessary, for their own security and safety and for the protection of their own interests, that they should daily use the banks for the same reasons of convenience and safety that the Government find it necessary to use them. We are considering now what may be the prerogatives of the Crown in this matter, but we are here for the purpose of legislating for the people, and if there is any ancient prerogative right which society has outgrown, it is our duty to adopt more rational rules than previously prevailed. The Government, having deposited their money in these banks for safe-keeping, should stand in exactly the same position as any other parties. I should like to know who feels the loss the most? The public at large, or the individual who, perhaps, in losing his deposit in the bank, loses all his earthly possessions? For

what purpose do insurance organisations exist? For the very purpose of distributing over a very large portion of the community losses which would be irreparable if they fell wholly on individuals whose interests they personally affect. Looking at the matter from an equitable standpoint, that of the interests of society, for that is what we are considering, the distribution of the loss over the entire depositors, the Government among the number, would cause the loss to be much less felt than if it were borne wholly by individuals who were made to suffer? Why should it not be so? Why should the Government, if they have a deposit of $500,000 in the bank, not share in the loss that may fall upon the individual depositors? I know of no reason. I know of no principle on which the ancient rule to which the hon. Minister of Justice has referred can be upheld. If the State suffers loss, the inconvenience is felt less when you distribute the loss than when it is confined to private individuals. "The safety of the State is the supreme law," is a maxim of the law, but the question of the safety of the State from pecuniary loss is not a question of the safety of the State; and there is no reason why the State should not share in losses sustained with other individuals who may be depositors. Certainly the larger number of persons over whom the loss is distributed the less it is felt; and so far as the Government are concerned, and they are simply trustees of the public in this matter, it is better that they should lose than that individual depositors should lose, for you distribute a large portion of the loss over the entire community, and it is not felt any more than a slight depreciation in the value of property is felt. When the rule to which the hon. Minister of Justice has referred, regarding the prior rights of the Crown, came into existence, it was when real property was the principal part of the wealth of a nation. It is wholly opposed to the modern conditions of society, and it seems to me, when we deal with this subject, we should deal with public rights and interests exactly as we deal with the interests of the rest of the community. If the Government choose to use the banks as a matter of convenience for the safe-keeping of the public moneys, then the Government, acting as the trustee of the public, should take their risk just the same as any other portion of the community which find it necessary to use the same institutions for the safety of the money that may come into their hands, whether their own or the money of other parties. When we have this question before us we should not establish any rule of priority in favor of the Crown, but we should place the Government in this respect on an exact footing of equality with private parties, and in doing so the community will feel any loss sustained very much less than if we undertake to concentrate the loss on a small portion of the community.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says it would be better on the whole that in any case of loss, the loss should be distributed over the whole of the people of the country rather than among individual depositors. But why should we suffer any loss? We are the representatives of the people, and we are now discussing the best means of preserving the money of the people. It is our bounden duty as representatives of the people to see that their money is stored in such a way as to prevent the possibility of loss, and when we have an opportunity of making arrangements by which the possibility of loss could be obviated, we would be wanting in our duty as representatives of the people if we failed to adopt those means. The hon. gentleman says that ordinary depositors should be placed in exactly the same position as the Government. As has been pointed out by the hon. the Minister of Justice, the two parties stand in an entirely different position. The Government is obliged to store its money in these banks.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has no option; it cannot keep the money in private vaults without special legislation. It is obliged to deposit the money in the banks, and at this moment when we are making arrangements with respect to our monetary institutions, we provide that the Government if they use these banks shall have a lien, so that the people will not suffer any loss, and it seems clear that we should take that lien. If any of the banks do not wish to receive the Government deposit under that liability, they can post up a notice saying that Government deposits will not be received on that footing; and no doubt at the next annual meeting the shareholders would say that the directors had been injuring the standing and prestige of the banks by refusing to take Government deposits. The banks no doubt would infinitely rather run the liability than lose the Government deposits. It is clear to me that if the Government should not press this claim of priority they would be failing in their duty. If there is no such protection the Government must, as a matter of course, refuse to give deposits to a number of small banks, because they must not run the risk, and one of two things must happen: the Government must make, say, the Bank of Montreal or the Canadian Bank of England, the sole depository of the Government funds in order to prevent the chance of loss. They must do so, asking the Bank of Montreal to give the necessary securities, or if the Bank of Montreal should refuse that—if they were unwise enough to refuse to give special securities to the Government, on their being appointed the sole depositary of the Government funds, then the consequence would be that we would be obliged to adopt a sub-treasury system. We would be obliged to say that the Government should be the keeper of its own funds, that it should not distribute money to the various banks, and that it should run no risk of loss of the public funds. I am quite sure that if the option is given to the banks of the country, they will accept the Government funds whether subject to this claim for priority or not. I am sure that every one of the banks will agree to accept the Government deposits and give a preferential claim.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not a question simply between the Government and the banks. The public at large, for whose benefit these banks are created, have an interest which it is the duty of this House to protect. The right hon. gentleman seems to think that the Government have no interest whatever, nor has the House any obligation resting upon it, to look after the interests of the great mass of the people in their individual capacity. I did not suppose that the Government

were here simply to protect the interests of the public collectively. I supposed that the public individually had some interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what I have been arguing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Mr. Chairman, the right hon. gentleman ignores the fact that we are creating these banks, not for the purpose principally of providing a safe deposit for Government moneys, but we are creating them in the interests of the commercial classes of this country, and for the purpose of promoting the commercial interests of the people. The right hon. gentleman says the Government could establish a sub-treasury department. Quite so, there is no doubt about that, but if the Government want absolute security, and if the public insist upon that absolute security, they should not obtain it at the expense of the individual depositors in the banks, but by paying for and creating these institutions of which the hon. gentleman has spoken. But, Sir, if the right hon. gentleman undertakes to submit such a proposition, he will find that these considerations will present themselves. Has the Government, or has Parliament, a greater interest in assuming the increased burden that would devolve upon it by the establishment of this sub-treasury department, or will it on the whole be in the public interest to take the risk with other depositors of the bank, and to rest satisfied with that cheaper system which the various banking institutions of the country afford to the Government. Sir, the Government, the right hon. gentleman, and the public at large, of which he is speaking, have just the same interest as any one individual, and there is no reason why the whole community in its collective capacity should not share in the risk and losses, any more than that a private individual should take that risk and sustain that loss. The question is not of more or less, in this matter, but of what is right or wrong, is not a question in which the whole public have a greater interest than any one individual. It does seem to me that if the Government chooses to use the banks, as any other corporation or individual may, for the purpose of depositing their money, they should take exactly the same risk any other individual or corporation takes in making its deposits.

Mr. MITCHELL. In addition to the points taken by my hon. friend, and which I had intended to refer to, there is another contention which the hon. gentleman makes, which does not seem to apply here. He says that if the banks do not want to take these moneys on deposit, let them put a notice up and you will see how soon their stockholders will find fault in them for doing that. It is not a question of the banks refusing to take deposits; the banks are ready enough to take deposits if the terms are satisfactory to them. It is not a question between the banks and the Government about this lien; it is a question between the Government and the general people of the country who make their deposits. The contention made by the gentlemen who are fighting this resolution and supporting the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), is that the Government should have no priority over the individual depositors in the bank. What right has the Government to any additional protection? They are in a position to get information about the position of the banks which the individual stockholders cannot get. The right hon. gentleman says he is protecting the public. There may be a thousand depositors of the laboring classes of this community having deposits in a bank amounting to a hundred dollars each on an average, and the Government may have loaned that bank $200,000 or $300,000. The bank fails. Does my hon. friend contend that it is not a hardship on these thousand depositors belonging to the laboring community, that the Government should step in and sweep away all the assets of the bank, by this claim of priority, and leave these thousand laboring people without a dollar of their money? The hon. gentleman wants to secure the funds of the Government at the expense of the funds of the people; that is what my hon. friend desires and that is the way he put his case. I say it is an outrageous thing that this should continue. All this talk of the Ministers about the character of the prerogative of the Crown is a delusion. We have abandoned it in the first clause of the section under discussion, and we have a right, as my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) said, to deal with this question practically, and to suspend the practice whether it prevailed for a century or ten centuries in England or elsewhere. It is our duty to legislate in a direction which suits the circumstances of the trade of the country. As far as I can, I shall try to deal with every legislation that comes before us in this light. We are responsible to the people at large to see that the men who are placed in power with a strong majority behind them, shall not come down to this House and, in ignorance of the rights of the people, or in disregard of the rights of the people, pass legislation which, while it protects the money which comes into the hands of the Government, does so at the expense of the depositors who have placed their money in the banks which have been created by the Legislature of this country.

Mr. TISDALE. One or two things strike me which may be pertinent to this question, and which hon. gentlemen opposite seem not to think of. In the first place, suppose the Government take the course the hon. gentleman suggests, do you not think that a great many more people in the country, both Liberals and Conservatives, will find fault with the Government, and properly so, for removing this safeguard of the public.

Mr. MITCHELL. It does not exist to-day.

Mr. TISDALE. The law already exists, and it has taken the hon. gentleman a long time to find out that it should be remedied. We have not heard of this objection before from them.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is the first opportunity we have had of discussing it.

Mr. TISDALE. There is no reason why the hon. gentleman should not have brought in a Bill to rectify this at any time, if it is such a grave grievance on the depositors. This Bill is not new law. It is quite true that the prerogative can be abolished, and the prerogative has been modified, as the hon. gentleman correctly said, but he finds fault with that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not find fault with that, I would wipe it out altogether.

Mr. TISDALE. Then he admits that the prerogative has been modified, and I think the

discussion has been largely misleading, because any one not informed as to the law would gather from the hon. gentleman, that this Bill was making it much harsher on the depositors than the law was before.

Mr. MITCHELL. So it is.

Mr. TISDALE. It is not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I beg your pardon.

Mr. TISDALE. I beg your pardon; it is precisely the same law, except that it is applied to the Province of Quebec in the same way as to the other Provinces. Note holders will have the same security that they had before. The dangerous thing, and I think the reprehensible thing, would be for the Government to remove the safeguards for the money of the public. As I said to-day, I propose to watch carefully any important changes which are proposed in the banking system which has worked so well; but if hon. gentlemen have a desire to consider what ought to be done, and not a desire to attack, I would ask them to look at our provincial laws. We find that, whether for municipal or provincial purposes, the lien for taxes overrides all other claims. No matter how poor a man is, or what goods he has in his house, they can be and must be sacrificed on the street if he does not pay his taxes.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is not a parallel case at all.

Mr. TISDALE. I think it is quite parallel. It does not matter how many liens exist, and whether the persons holding those liens are rich or poor, the lien for taxes overrides them all. Now, this seems to me to be an application of the same principle for the protection of federal funds; it gives the same lien to our revenues after they are collected as is given to provincial or municipal taxes.

Mr. MULOCK. Why should a man have a lien on another man's property?

Mr. TISDALE. You may have a chattel mortgage, a lien for rent, or many other liens.

Mr. MULOCK. Why should you give me one depositor's lien over another depositor's money?

Mr. TISDALE. They are public deposits. There is the distinction, and the hon. gentleman knows it very well. I think he is too well informed to say that there is no distinction between the public and the individual The rights of the public are superior to the rights of an individual; that is the idea, I think, of all sensible men. It is a fallacy to say that the public are not more than an individual of the public. If that is not so, we have no right to make such laws as we do. Many laws must be hard on individuals in order to protect the public. The argument, if it means anything, reverses the whole principle of the public being greater than the individual, because you say, in the case of a hundred depositors, that the whole public shall subscribe to prevent the hardship on that hundred. Now, in the discussion of this Bill so far, and in the discussion of other Bills, like the Franchise Bill last night, apart from the views of the parties, the Ministers and their supporters have endeavored to cultivate criticism and advice from the Opposition in order to get at the best legislation, and I think that is the proper course to take. But I regret to see this departure, this attempt to attack.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; no.

Mr. TISDALE. Not all; but at least two gentlemen have spoken of the Government coming down and forcing this legislation, as if it were a reprehensible thing. I regret that, because if we want to get these measures threshed out in a proper way, I believe we shall succeed if we are a little temperate and avoid discussions likely to stir up feeling. I think the Government are wise in waiving their security in favor of the note holders, but if it were known after this Biil passed that the safeguards that had existed for the public deposits had been done away with, our action would be challenged by both parties.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has stated two things, in regard to which he has directly pointed to myself. He asks, what harm has been done in the existing state of things? And he says, if things have been bad in the past, why have you not altered them? In relation to the first question, I have merely to point to the three instances which have been given, of the Exchange Bank, the Maritime Bank, and the Bank of Prince Edward Island, as instances of personal hardships to individuals who had deposits in those banks. In the next place, when the hon. gentleman referred to me as one who had introduced an element of warmth into this debate, he asked me: "Why did you not get this legislation altered?" Sir, it was not my business; it was the business of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches; but on the first occasion on which I had an opportunity of expressing my opinion on the action of the Government in giving the Exchange Bank a large deposit of public money which has been lost, I did so to-night. If I have shown a little warmth, I have been justified by the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice. He insinuated that my action was due to political motives. I tell him it was not due to anything of the kind. I have a duty to perform to the country as well as himself, quite irrespective of bullying—as he spoke of bullying from this side of the House—from that side of the House. The argument used by the hon. gentleman who last spoke was not a fair or just argument. The people of this country have suffered severely from bank failures, and I know of no right which the Government have for insisting on a preference over other depositors. If the Government had not such a strong majority in this House, they would be more amenable to the moderate criticisms which come from this side of the House, and if hon. gentlemen will throw out insinuations of political motives, they must take the consequences.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) stated that in the Province of Ontario the tax-gatherer could take everything belonging to a man to meet the demand for taxes. I am surprised that he should have made that statement. He does not seem to be aware of the amendments that have taken place in the law, imposing certain limits in regard to the collection of taxes. Now, the argument of the hon. member for St. John has not been answered. The hon. Minister of Finance cannot have considered the force of the statement that hon. gentleman made.

He has no objection to the Government having a first lien for the revenues, or for moneys deposited in the banks in trust; but the objection he makes is that when the Government deliberately lend money to an institution, as they did to the Exchange Bank for the purpose of tiding it over financial embarrassment, and, in case a failure takes place, the Government deposits should not be a first lien on the assets of the bank. We contend that if the Government, out of money belonging to the Dominion, lend to an institution deliberately for the purpose of helping it over financial embarrassments, the Government should not rank as a first creditor. They should rank as a first creditor in the case of deposits of revenue and trust funds, but not in the case of advances, because that would be a temptation to the Government to make advances. Those advances might be seriously abused as in the case of the Exchange Bank. In that case, the funds lent to the bank by the Government, in place or being used to help the institution through its financial difficulties, found its way into the pockets of the directors. Other funds may go in the same way in the future; and it is, therefore, right that we should protect the Government against being drawn upon by institutions in a critical position, because these institutions will present their claim for help with a great deal of force. They could say: We are in financial embarrassment, and we ask you under the law, as it stands, to give us the aid we require; you do not run any risk as you will have the first lien on the bank's assets, and we will pay you interest, say at per cent. It is not right that the Government should be subject to such a temptation, and the House should not place in the hands of the Government the opportunity of dealing with public funds in that way. It is right we should protect the revenue of the country; but in cases where the Government exercises its power of dealing with public moneys and hands over trust funds to an institution to tide that institution over financial embarrassment, the Government should not be placed in the position of first creditor.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I confess, after listening to the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), that I could not come to the same conclusion at which he arrived regarding these deposits in the banks. It is true that the Government have a first lien for purposes of revenue, and that, I think, is perfectly reasonable and just, but that they should have the first lien in regard to all deposits in a bank does not seem to me to be quite so equitable. I incline rather to the view of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that the Government ought, perhaps, properly to have the first claim for deposits of revenue, and, perhaps also, of trust funds, which may have been placed in their hands, and which they are obliged to deposit in the banks for safe-keeping; but I do not incline to the belief that the Government ought to have a first lien for moneys which they have deliberately placed in the custody of the banks, either for the convenience of the banks or the Government itself. And even supposing that the Government does come to this conclusion, and insist upon its right to have the second lien for all moneys deposited in the banks by them, as trustees for the people, I should like to know why they make the claims of a Province a third claim upon the assets of a bank, unless it be upon the ground of the prerogative of the Crown. If the right of the prerogative is given up, as to some extent it is, in the first part of the section, then, I say, that the Government, if they insist upon their claims being a second lien on the assets of the banks, ought not to extend that to the Provinces of the Dominion, except it be upon the theory of the prerogative of the Crown, because if it be for the purposes of protecting the interests of the people of the Provinces, then they ought to extend it still further, and say that moneys deposited by municipalities in banks ought to be a lien on the assets of a bank, and so on; it might be extended almost indefinitely. But if it be on the ground of prerogative, let the Government say so. Let them say that the prerogative of the Crown, as represented by the Dominion, shall be the first lien after the notes of the bank; and the prerogative of the Crown, as represented by the Provinces, shall be the second lien. That I could understand; but if the claim is that it is in the public interest these reserves are made and these claims on the assets of a bank are set up, the principle ought to be extended somewhat further than it is proposed in this section.

Mr. ELLIS. I think, Mr. Chairman, you will bear me out in saying that I made no reference whatever to the Government, and did not, by implication or in any way whatever, say anything that could be interpreted to mean that I had any feeling against the Government in the proposition I made. I say that because the hon. member for South Norfolk seemed to refer to me—I do not know that he did so—in the remarks he made. I also stated that the principle embodied in this legislation is not embodied, so far as I am aware, in the legislation of the mother country or in that of any of the colonies. While the hon. the Minister of Justice appears to controvert that, he does not really do so, but merely says it is part of the common law. I just point that out, because he has not been able to show to the Committee any legislation of this character. The effect it appears to me of embodying this in the statute law will be to make it harder in the future as against the depositors. It certainly does away with the right, or at any rate impairs the right which now exists in the Province of Quebec, where the law is not the same as it is in the rest of the Dominion. Further than that, in the conflicts which are carried on in the court against the common law, there is always an opportunity of broadening down from precedent to precedent the public right, but where you, by statute, fix a principle, it is almost impossible to overcome that principle unless by legislation itself, even though the injustice may become apparent to the court. With reference to the abstract right, the fact that the Government is only a depositor, the same as any other person, the fact that the Government representing the people is no more than a society composed of a certain number of individuals, and should have no more right in the distribution of the assets of a bank than a corporation or a single individual, is a question I will not enter into, because it has been ably discussed by the hon. member for Bothwell, and his argument has not been controverted. I do not see any chance of my motion being carried,

but it seems to me to be founded on justice. Any person who has come in contact with public opinion in the section in which I live, would soon become aware that the feelings of the people, especially since the Maritime Bank failure, is, despite what the First Minister may say, altogether opposed to the proposition of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Whilst I entirely disapprove of all these special liens, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether the argument in favor of a special lien by the Dominion Government against ordinary creditors would not apply with equal force in favor of a special lien being given a Provincial Government. Should not the Provincial Government, which has money deposited in a bank, have a lien in its favor as well as the Dominion Government.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FOSTER moved to add the following subsection :—

The amount of any penalties for which the bank may be liable shall not form a charge upon the assets of such bank, in case of its insolvency, until the other liabilities are paid.

He said: We have instituted a system of fines for over-circulation, and I wish to provide that, where a bank fails, these fines are not intended to obtain money for the Government, but are simply to prevent the over-circulation, which we regard as a grave offence.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that is a very objectionable position. When a banking institution becomes embarrassed, and its existence is a matter of doubt, if it issues more paper than it is authorised to issue, and then comes to grief, the assets of the bank are not impaired, and the fine to which they otherwise would become subject is in this case the last demand upon the resources of the bank. It is a temptation to a banking institution to issue a circulation beyond its necessity, because, if it has no means to meet its liabilities, it will be free under this provision.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—LUMBER DUTIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the chair, I desire to call your attention to a matter of great importance to one great business interest in this country. The McKinley Tariff, as reported from the Committee of Ways and Means at Washington, reduces the lumber duty to $1.50 per thousand feet, with the proviso that, if any foreign country imposes a duty upon logs, the import duty shall remain the same as the export duty imposed on logs by that country. It will be necessary, in order to obtain the advantage of that provision, for this Government to reduce the duty on logs by 50 cents to meet the reduction which has been made in the duty on lumber in the United States. Of course, the Bill introduced in the House of Representatives at Washington is liable to many changes before it becomes law. It has to pass the House of Representatives, and then it goes to the Finance Committee of the Senate, then it is reported to the Senate, and it is liable to be changed in all these stages, and the changes are as likely to be unfavorable to us as favorable. I think the influence of the export duty on logs that we have imposed has been unfavorable to our interest. Last winter the lumber trade asked the Government to remove that duty, stating that they believed the export duty which we imposed was standing in the way of a favorable change in the duty imposed on lumber in the United States, and I think they were right in that, and that our position would have been better if the request had been accepted. I rise now to suggest to the Government that they should make a proposition to the United States in which they might suggest a concession in view of the further reduction of the Canadian lumber duties, and that would advance the interests of that great business in this country. I think the Government might judiciously make a proposal, and with every prospect of its being accepted by the American Congress, to remove the export duty on logs if the American Government would reduce the duty on lumber to $1. That would not only relieve the lumber trade here by a reduction of $1 a thousand, but I believe it would lead to the more speedy removal of the lumber duty, as a great many people in the United States desire, and it would materially aid the efforts of those who ask for free lumber. The lumber export of this country is, in round numbers, 700,000,000 feet per annum. A reduction of half a dollar or a dollar upon the amount of this lumber, would be a very important matter indeed to the lumber trade. Hitherto, in the matter of coarse grades of lumber, it has been difficult to export it, under present circumstances, with any profit to the trade.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the condition of the log export trade as it exists under the duty at $1 per thousand upon pine logs. The duty stood at that rate from 1867 to 1885; it was changed, I think, to $2 in the spring of 1886. The export duty collected upon pine logs and shingle bolts from 1867 to 1870, was $61,187.19; average rate of duty per annum, $15,296.80. Duty collected from 1871 to 1880, $32,154.26, or an average per annum of $3,215.42. Duty collected from 1881 to 1885, $8,170.40; or an average per annum of $1,634.08. The average per annum for the entire period was $5,342.64. The trade it appears from these figures, was an inconsiderable one, and the export of pine logs was continually decreasing. Now, the advantage of exporting logs to the United States, when the export duty was $1 per thousand, and the American import duty $2 per thousand was apparently $1 per thousand feet, and this advantage produced but a very trifling export; and if the proposition which I think might be made now were made and accepted by the American Government, the advantage of exporting logs to the United States would be, as during the period I referred to, $1 per thousand, for the logs would be free, and the American duty would be $1 per thousand. Now, the actual advantage and disadvantage to the parties exporting logs would be about as follows: A party exporting logs, say from the Georgian Bay to Michigan, would save the duty, which is $1 per thousand. He would save difference of the cost of freight upon sawn lumber as between the Georgian Bay point and the Michigan point to the eastern and western market, which varies from 25 to 50 cents a thousand during the season, and probably averages 35 cents a thousand; so the advantage in exporting logs would be $1.35. The disadvantage would be as

follows :—The cost of rafting the logs, 25 cents a thousand; cost of towing them, $1 per thousand, and the allowance for risk, which those who are engaged in the trade say is equivalent to 10 per cent. would be about $1 per thousand ; making the advantage on the one hand $1.35 per thousand, and the disadvantage on the other hand, adding to the cost of towing the cost of rafting, and the allowance for risk, $2.25 per thousand, leaving a net balance of disadvantage of 90 cents per thousand against towing logs. I do not think we need fear that, under the circumstances, the trade will become a very large one in the export of logs, I think the advantages that would accrue to the lumber interest of Canada would be very great, and that if this could be secured by the Government, and I have every reason to believe it could be secured, it would be universally acceptable to the lumber trade of this country, and the Government would by this means be conferring upon that interest a very great advantage indeed. I make this statement for the purpose of bringing it under the attention of the Government, hoping that it may be pleased to make such an announcement with reference to the matter that it can be acted upon by those at Washington who may desire to get Canadian lumber admitted at a lower rate of duty than that now provided by the McKinley Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are obliged to the hon. gentleman for bringing up the question and for his suggestion. The hon. gentleman must know, of course, that we have been watching carefully the fiscal legislation in the United States. He states truly that before the measure known as the McKinley Bill gets through the House of Representatives, it may assume various different shapes ; it may be altogether changed, and a regular metamorphosis of it may take place in the Senate. The hon. gentleman knows that the export duty put on is about equivalent to the import duty that is paid on Canadian lumber now. Therefore it is quite fair, and in talking to the Americans they say it is quite fair, and in reality that proposition has been made from sundry quarters, that if the export duty was taken off, there might be a reduction on the import duties on the lumber to the United States. I think, however, if I am not mistaken, the provision is that there is to be a reduction on lumber, but when lumber comes from any country which imposes an export duty, the export duty will be added to the reduced rate under the new Bill. If that be the case, and if the measure goes through Congress in that way, and with that provision, we can at any time take off the export duty. That would give us the advantage of the reduced import duty imposed by the new tariff. It is hardly worth while discussing the question now. I can assure the hon. gentleman the Government are considering it most carefully, and are watching the different moves in Washington just now, and we hope and believe that they will take such steps as will greatly advance the interests of the country, especially in regard to the lumber trade.

Mr. CHARLTON. With the permission of the House I will refer to one feature of the case that the First Minister has referred to. If the eventuality which he contemplates becomes a fact, if the Bill finally provides that the export duty shall be added to the import duty in addition to the duty now fixed, and if that duty shall be left as it is now, which is $1.50, we will be in a much worse position than the one contemplated, because the export duty would be added to the $1.50, which would still remain on the lumber. I would strongly urge upon the Government that we had better, if possible, put ourselves in a position where we can secure our lumber duty at $1 by the abrogation of the export duty.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Compilation and preparation of Civil Service List..... $237.50

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is there no officer in the Department of the Secretary of State who could prepare this list without extra expense?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have a gentleman paid extra for the preparation of that list. Last year the Under Secretary of State who had been in the service for over 50 years, Mr. Powell, was absent on leave, before taking his superannuation, and another officer was obliged to replace him for five months, and we had to have two persons to make that list on account of the absence of Mr. Powell.

Department of Queen's Printer:—To provide for payment to Mr. J. G. Barrette, extra clerk, for extra hours in office-work, $92.00; additional contingencies, $2,000.00; reading proofs of French and English editions of Civil Service Lists, $121.20—total..... $2,213.20

Mr. McMULLEN. This calls for some explanation. I have always taken exception to these extra payments for extra services.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This officer last year was appointed as second class clerk and accountant in the Department, but unfortunately after he had been appointed there was no vote taken to pay him, and he was only paid according to the rates fixed per day for his work. These extra hours were given to him as compensation for the six months during which he had not his increase of salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is our duty as an Opposition, to press on the Government the necessity of checking this pernicious system of payment of extra services to civil servants. Last year, there were 481 such cases, but this year there are 600 odd.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I challenge the hon. gentleman to find in my Department during the last six years more than $100 paid for extra work to my officers.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are these contingencies?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year $8,000 were voted for my Department. Unfortunately, I was absent when the Estimates were prepared and submitted to the House. By a detailed account I have before me, I find that during the six months the necessary contingencies amounted to $5,025, instead of being $4,000. In these contingencies are salaries for the printing establishment, which should appear, as they do this year, on the regular staff. For instance, there is an item of $1,200 for cartage in the name of John Donovan. At an earlier period of the Session, attention was drawn

to an item in the Auditor's Report, that a man with a horse had been allowed $1,200 during the year. That is a mistake. The item of $1,200 is for two teams and an extra man employed. This expenditure now regularly appears on the item connected with the Printing Bureau. Then we have the salary of a man named Barrette who is now on the regular staff; then there is an item of $365 paid to a person named King, whose name should have appeared on the regular staff. The whole expense connected with the charwomen for the printing establishment during the year, $1,500, appears under contingencies, being $750 for the six months. Accordingly, there is an amount of $2,637 for the half year. This amount added to $8,000 voted gives more than a difference of $2,000 on the contingencies, and no less than $4,674 was really for the regular staff and not for temporary work which might appear under the head of contingencies, and half of that sum may be placed to the six months.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the cause of this expenditure for proof-reading?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The work was done by those who made the compilation; these parties did the work and were paid according to the regular rates.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister must know that when copy is furnished to the Printing Bureau, it is the duty of the proof-readers to read it by copy.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The proof-reading done at the bureau is different from that recognised by publishers of books and similar authorities. It must be done by the party who has prepared the work, and it comprises a revision of the proofs after they have been read at the bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are all the departmental reports read by the parties who have prepared the documents?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; but they are not paid for the work, because they are officers in the Departments.

Contingencies, Railways and Canals... $1,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the cause of this extra expenditure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not extra expenditure, except in a certain sense. The collection of tolls on the canals was formerly under the Department of Inland Revenue, and it has been transferred to the Department of Railways and Canals. It is absurd that two officers should be on duty, one to assist in getting the vessel through the locks and another to collect the tolls. So the whole matter has been transferred to the Department of Railways and Canals in order to cut down the number of servants required in connection with the canals. In order to make the transfer, this expenditure was necessary, for the transfer has only taken place this last year. It is a special warrant to meet the expenditure on stationery, &c., required in transferring the collection of canal revenue to the Inland Revenue.

Amount required to defray cost of changing the calculations of interest in the depositors' accounts in the Post Office Savings Bank on the 1st October, 1889, caused by the adoption of the new rate (3½ per cent.)..... $574 38

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Could not this work be done by the regular officers?

Mr. FOSTER. We discussed this question a good many times.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You promised to amend this system?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but we found that the way we had been in the habit of doing it was the most economical. It could not be done during office hours, as the books must be kept there for the regular transaction of business, and it has to be done after office hours. We have either to employ the clerks who know the books, and who understand the methods of the calculation, and who can do the work rapidly and well, or we would have to get in outside help, which would be more expensive and I do not think so satisfactory.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the hours of work from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. as before?

Mr. FOSTER. From half past nine or ten o'clock.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be well to make a change and let them do a day's work from nine to five? You will find plenty of men willing to do the work on such terms.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid we would lose our officers.

Mr. CHARLTON. You could lose half of them and put more efficient men in their places.

Salary of Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, Prince Edward Island, from 13th November, 1889, to 30th June, 1890..... $378 75

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This requires some explanation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island is the Judge of the Admiralty Court, and heretofore no salary has been provided.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why should there be now? He is Admiralty Judge, *ex-officio*, by virtue of his office.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is just the same as in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A salary has always been allowed in Nova Scotia, but it has never been allowed in Prince Edward Island before. I understand the duties are very light in Prince Edward Island. Has the present Chief Justice had any case before him during this period?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand none at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He holds his office in precisely the same way as the other judges of the Vice-Admiralty Court. He has not received a salary heretofore, but he has called our attention

to the fact, and it seems to me that he has just as good a claim as the other judges. We do not enquire of the other judges the number of cases they have had, and I do not see why we should make that enquiry in this case.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In New Brunswick, this is a special appointment. In Nova Scotia, the Chief Justice acts as Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court; but I am not sure that he does so *ex-officio*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The matter stands in this way: that the Chief Justice is, *ex-officio*, judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, unless another appointment is made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are two observations I would like to make in regard to this vote. The late Chief Justice Palmer filled the position for fifteen or sixteen years. The Chief Justice of the Island was also, *ex-officio*, judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court. During his term of office he had not anything like the amount of work to perform which is performed at Halifax by the Chief Justice there; but he had a great deal of onerous and responsible work under the Treaty of 1818; a great many cases were heard before him, and he never received anything for those services. If the Government have come to the conclusion that the Chief Justice should be paid in his capacity as Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, something should be done for the family of the late Chief Justice. I am sorry to see the hon. gentleman shake his head, for I think it is a case worthy of consideration. The circumstances are peculiar, and if I had the opportunity of speaking to the hon. Minister privately I think I could show them to be such as would commend themselves to him. The late Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island performed his duties at a lower salary than was paid to any other Chief Justice in the Dominion. He was a very learned and exemplary judge, and was exceedingly prompt in the discharge of his duties, and I think some allowance should be made to his family. I will say no more on that matter, which I mentioned privately to the hon. Minister of Justice, and which I hope he will consider. I also wish to say to the hon. Minister of Justice, and the Government, that if they have come to the conclusion to increase the salaries of the judges of Prince Edward Island, they are only doing what is right, as there are no judges in the Dominion of Canada who are so poorly paid as they are. The Chief Justice only receives $4,000 a year, and the assistant judges only $3,200 a year. Judge Hensley has sat in the Chancery Court in addition to discharging his duties as judge of the Superior Court, and his salary is perfectly absurd in view of the services he performs. I have urged on the Government, time and again, the propriety of increasing the salaries of the judges on the Island. It does not involve increasing the salaries of the judges in the other Provinces, as the salaries of the judges on the Island were, for some reason or other, placed on a lower scale than those in the other Provinces. Mr. Justice Peters has sat on the bench for over forty years. He happens to be a very wealthy man, and he does not care for the salary; but, with regard to Judge Hensley, I am satisfied that his salary is not sufficient for him to live upon and properly support the position he occupies. I do not object to the increase of the salary of the Chief Justice; but to increase his salary and leave the salaries of the assistant judges at $3,200 is an unfair proposition; and I do urge the hon. Minister, with all the strength I can command, to consider the claim of these two judges to be placed on a par with the judges of the other Provinces. I have known them to be engaged nearly the whole year round, doing work from day to day in the months of June, July and August, when other judges were having their vacation. Their work is very hard, and their responsibilities are very great. I have no personal interest in the matter, for it is not likely under existing circumstances, that I shall have a chance of occupying the place of any of them; but looking at the question on the broad ground of justice, I hold that these officials are greatly underpaid. They have been, unfortunately, singled out from all the other judges in the Dominion, and their salaries have been placed at a sum far below what is adequate for men in the positions they occupy.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I would like to add one word in support of what the hon. member for Queen's has said. The case is peculiar. The Island is small; but those who have had occasion to read the volume of law reports that comes from Prince Edward Island, have reason to speak very highly and respectfully of the judges there. An increase in their salaries would be, as the hon. gentleman says, a matter of justice; and seeing that it is so small a matter, I think we can afford to be generous to them. I heartily support the hon. gentleman's reasonable request.

Mr. HESSON. I understood the hon. member for Queen's to say that the judges of the Island are paid $3,200 a year. I do not mean to say that that is enough, but I may say that in the county I represent a judge is discharging the duty for 65,000 people for a salary of $2,200. I wish to point out a few of the inequalities that exist in reference to the County Court Judges. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the Superior Court Judges. I do not know anything about them, but I believe they are better paid for the work they do, although it may be more important in one sense, than are the County Court Judges for the work they have to perform. The work of the former may be more important, but they have not such large dealings with the mass of the people as have the latter. There is considerable disparity in the salaries of the County Court Judges. For instance in some counties, which have a population of thirty-five thousand to forty thousand, the County Court Judges get $2,600 a year, while in Perth, which has a population of 65,000, the County Court Judge is only paid $2,200 a year. This is an unfortunate state of affairs. Many of our best men, who have practised a number of years at the bar and would like to be promoted to the bench, cannot afford to give up their practice, as they will then be put on a starvation allowance. This will be seriously felt in our not being able to obtain the class of men whom we would desire to see made County Court Judges. A more liberal salary should be paid them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is to provide a salary for the Judge of the Admiralty Court till the 30th of June. Will the salary then cease or be taken

to establish any vested right entitling him to a salary for the future ?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My impression is that before Confederation these judges were paid. Mr. Hensley was Judge of the Admiralty Court of New Brunswick, also Sir William Young, and after Confederation their salaries were continued. When Sir William Ritchie acted as judge, I do not think he received pay, because he acted, *ex-officio*, as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. When the successor of Sir William Young was appointed, the salary was continued. This is something entirely new. I would ask whether the Imperial Bill to abolish these Admiralty Courts has become law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill has not yet become law, but I fancy it will. The estimate came down before the Bill came to our knowledge. The Bill is intended to take effect the 1st January next. The scheme proposed was that we should give a salary of $600 a year to the Vice-Admiralty Judge of Prince Edward Island. As to whether this will be a vested right or not, there is in the British statute a provision that the claims of officers holding offices affected by the abolition of a court shall be considered. He would have a right to be considered in relation to his fees if this vote were not passed. In the early legislation, the appointment of the Vice-Admiralty Judge in Nova Scotia came from the Imperial Government. Judge Stewart was the Vice-Admiralty Judge down to the time of his death. It was after Confederation that Chief Justice Young became a Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Judge Stewart died before Confederation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think Sir William Young was appointed under the present Imperial Statute, which provides that the Chief Justice, *ex-officio*, shall be the judge unless a special appointment is made.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Government is going to make this appointment, and the court is to be abolished, and the judge will be entitled to superannuation without, perhaps, having tried a single case.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is not entitled to it as a matter of right. I do not know whether he has performed any duty as Vice-Admiralty Judge or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He could not very well in the winter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He would be entitled to have something by way of compensation ; but it is to be understood that no one is necessarily to receive compensation for the performance of the duty for so short a time.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has the hon. gentleman considered the question of the jurisdiction of the courts with a view to making it more extensive ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a special provision, and there is no claim established on the part of the judge by voting for this. The other judges are paid by statute, and this does not establish any right in the future, as it is a mere vote.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it would be very important to extend the jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This appears to be simply a proposal to increase the salary of the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island, and I do not think this is a good practice to follow, particularly if the office is about to be abolished. If the Government think the salary of the Chief Justice is not sufficient, would it not be more consistent with the dignity of the office to propose that an increase should be made to his salary ? If the Government are simply passing this vote for an increase in connection with his services in regard to the Court of Admiralty, they are giving the increase upon a condition of things which is about to pass away, and which cannot be continued after the office is abolished. If the Government desire to increase the salary of this officer, they should say so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the Government will propose an increase to the salary of this judge. I do not think there is any man in this House who will object to the increase of his salary in this form or any other form, but, while it is quite right to increase the salary of the Chief Justice, I appeal to the Government to increase the salaries of the other judges in Prince Edward Island. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) speaks of the salaries paid to County Court Judges, and compares them with the salaries paid in Prince Edward Island. That is a different thing altogether, and I hope the First Minister and the Minister of Justice will see their way to recommend an increase in those salaries. The judges in the other Provinces do no more than the judges in Prince Edward Island, and the expenses of living in the Island are just as great as they are elsewhere. I rejoice to learn that the Chief Justice of the Island will, under any circumstances, receive an increase to his salary, but I want the other judges to get an increase also.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has urged this matter upon me privately as well as publicly. He must be aware that the Government are of the opinion that an increase should be made in the judicial salaries. I do not think that we should distinguish between the judges in one Province and another ; but this must be dealt with when we are dealing with the whole subject.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), must go a good deal deeper than he has gone in regard to this matter. He will have to take a bigger piece of tobacco before he chews it out. The salaries of the judges are not fairly arranged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They were fixed in your time.

Mr. MITCHELL. State what my opinion was then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Your opinion was expressed in the resolutions adopted by the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Our opinion was overruled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not say much about it, but we know that Mr. McMullen, of Pacific scandal fame, said he did not think it was necessary to pay any attention to the unimportant members of the Cabinet, of whom I was one. If

the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) wants to get the judicial salaries of his Province placed upon an equality of those of other Provinces, he has got to change the mind of the right hon. gentleman, who believes, that small places produce small men, although they may do just as much work as the judges in the larger Provinces.

Manitoba Penitentiary—to pay the expenses of transfer of convict Maurice Blake to England..... ..... $284 46

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Maurice Blake was a prisoner who had been convicted of manslaughter, and shortly after his conviction he was found to be mad, and was sent to the Kingston Penitentiary for the purpose of treatment. He was afterwards removed to Manitoba under peculiar circumstances. The warden of that prison had been in the service with him, and in consequence of their former companionship in arms, exercised a good deal of influence over him. His condition became less violent, and considering that he had undergone something like ten years of imprisonment, it was deemed proper and merciful to pardon him. He had no relatives in this country. He had come out as a soldier, but he had relatives and friends in Ireland. This sum was an extra allowance for travelling expenses. Under ordinary circumstances, by statute, we pay the discharged convicts' expenses to the place from which they come. Therefore, we paid the expenses of this man home to Ireland. This sum includes the care of the man while he was travelling.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think in this case Mr. Bedson, the warden of the penitentiary, travelled with him, and he had considerable moral control over him. I recollect seeing the party at the Windsor Hotel, and he was practically under no restraint as, owing to Mr. Bedson's influence over him, it was not necessary to keep him in duress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Bedson accompanied him over to Ireland, because he could not be trusted alone amongst strangers.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did you pay the travelling expenses of Mr. Bedson?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I explained to the House the other evening that Mr. Bedson went home on three months' leave. While in England he desired to visit some prisons in which he could get information as to prison management and discipline, and I paid his expenses while visiting those prisons, under the authority that he got from the Home Secretary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has he made any report of these visits?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. I expect he will make a report.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me this man Bedson is a great expense to this country. Every Session of Parliament he figures for an enormous amount of money.

For purchasing in England and distributing in Canada two-rowed barley for seed purposes.... ..... $25,000

Mr. CARLING. The amount of barley purchased is 10,000 bushels; it has all arrived and is being distributed. I think about $11,000 have been paid to the Receiver General, having been received for this barley. I think all the barley will be taken up by the farmers, and paid for at the rate of $4 a bag of 112 lbs. The barley costs $2 per bushel delivered in Montreal.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do you expect the amount received will recoup the money expended?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; for the cost of the barley. But the Department will defray charges of freight and handling.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do the Government pay the carriage to the residences of the parties who purchase it?

Mr. CARLING. We deliver it from Montreal to the parties who purchase it.

Mr. TROW. What was the original cost of barley, and what was the cost of transportation to Montreal?

Mr. CARLING. The cost was 60s. a quarter in England, and the freight was about 15 cents a bushel from London to Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. What percentage of the barley has been distributed?

Mr. CARLING. I think about two-thirds. All that has been asked for has been sent out, and Professor Saunders informs me that the whole of the consignment will likely be taken by the farmers.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it considered that the class of soil favorable to the growth of two-rowed barley is very much the same as that on which we now raise six-rowed barley—a heavy clay loam?

Mr. CARLING. I think so. We have experimented with two-rowed barley at the Central Farm and experimental stations, and a similar soil to that on which we grow six-rowed barley will grow two-rowed barley. All experiments tried by farmers from seed sent from the Experimental Farms support this statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then the experiments of last year has been such as to give encouragement for this year?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Patent Record..... $8,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the *Record* printed at the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CARLING. Not now. It is printed by the Burland Lithograph Company at Montreal. The contract expires 1st January next.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then it is intended to print it at the Government office?

Mr. CARLING. It is intended to be printed by the Printing Department here.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If it is the intention of the Secretary of State to have the *Record* printed at the Government bureau, he must intend to put in a lithographing plant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman and his friends are pleased to vote a sufficient amount this year we would be able to do so. If not, we would not.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to know if it is intended to put in a lithographing plant?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That will be shown by the Estimates which will be brought before the House.

Immigration and immigration expenses $15,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the Minister will give some explanation in regard to this item ?

Mr. CARLING. This amount is required for the year ending 30th June, 1890. Our immigration vote has been reduced year by year. Last year it was $95,000, and the expenditure for the previous year was $126,000. This amount will bring the vote up to $110,000, or $16,000 less than for the previous year. We have been curtailing our expenditure very largely, but we found a large quantity of printing material was required, as represented by the High Commissioner in England, and items connected with advertising and other expenses bring the amount up to the sum I have stated.

Quarantine..... $9,875

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire some explanation in regard to $475, quarantine, Chatham, N.B. I find in the Auditor General's Report an expenditure of $999. In the ordinary Estimates for this year there is an item of $900, being $300 increase. I do not know for what this extra sum can be required.

Mr. CARLING. It is for boat service at Chatham, paid for by the Department as it is required by the quarantine officer.

Mr. MITCHELL. The boat service is already provided. I find in the Auditor General's Report the following:—"J. Macdonald, inspector, one year, $300; R. Stapleton, steward, one year, $300; boat, one, $23; boat hire, $15.25; boatmen, two, $351." The amount cannot, therefore, be required for boat service. In addition to the ordinary item of $900, it is proposed to add $475. I think the hon. gentleman had better enquire into the matter.

Mr. CARLING. This boat service previously had been charged to public health and paid from that vote. It is, however, now proposed to have it charged to the quarantine service, to which it properly belonges. There was no item in the Estimates for boat service last year, and this item was placed in the Estimates to pay for the boat service of 1890-91.

Public Health..... $2,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the explanation with regard to this?

Mr. CARLING. Last year we voted $15,000, and this year we voted $10,000 in the main Estimates. We find that $2,000 more is required, which will make the total amount $12,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How much of this goes to the little monthly journal which we all receive ? I think it is called *The Health Journal*.

Mr. CARLING. That matter was fully discussed here the other night. Dr. Playter has been receiving for a great many years, $1,200 a year for the publication of this journal. I believe it has a large circulation and is well thought of, and its articles are quoted by the different papers throughout the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think it is a sheer waste of money. The *Health Journal* is of no use, I believe, to the medical gentlemen who receive the regular medical journals. This journal is sent to the members of the House, and I do not know to whom it is sent besides. But there is nothing more in it than can be found in the papers every day. Occasionally there is an original article in it, but the journal is made up principally from selections which are to be found in all the weekly and daily journals throughout the country. This expenditure is not in the public interest. It is not for the benefit of public health, and it is for the benefit of no other person than Dr. Playter. If the Government wish to make a pensioner of Dr. Playter, they should do so at once, and not give this money for publishing a journal which is of no benefit to the public, or the medical profession.

Mr. SPROULE. I think when the hon. gentleman says that this journal is of no use whatever, he does not know what he is talking about. He is a journalist himself, and he says there is nothing original in the journal, and that the same information can be found in the daily or weekly papers of the country. In that he is mistaken. There are valuable original articles in the journal, and there are articles culled from other journals equally valuable, but there is not an issue of the medical journal, which does not contain a great deal of valuable information on the subject of health.

Mr. PLATT. I may say that this is about the only portion of the money we expend on health matters which I am willing to support. I think this money is not by any means thrown away, nor do I think *The Health Journal* useless, as has been stated by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). He forgets, I think, that most of these extracts which he sees in the ordinary press of the day are invariably taken from that journal, and the regular newspapers have not the opportunity of making such valuable selections as are contained in that journal. A great deal of useful information appears in it; and so long as we are to spend money in connection with health matters, I can see no better way than to educate the people on this subject by such a newspaper as this. I am willing to support this expenditure, because I think it is very useful.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know where this journal is circulated ?

Mr. CARLING. I believe the members of the House, the Senators, the health officers of the country and others receive it, and it has a large circulation besides. I think the hon. gentleman was mistaken about this journal, because I have seen dozens and dozens of letters from medical gentlemen speaking very highly of it and urging its continuance. It was first started, I believe, at the suggestion of a deputation of medical men of this House and it has met with very general approval in this country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How many numbers of this publication do we get for this $1,200?

Mr. CARLING. We do not expect many numbers, as this is a subsidy to the paper to continue its publication. I have already stated those to whom it is distributed, and I may also say that it is largely circulated throughout the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Oh, it is a subsidy.

Mr. McNEILL. I, for one, receive a copy of this *Health Journal*, and I read it with a very great deal of interest and a great deal of benefit, I think. I believe that it is exceedingly valuable that such a journal should be in circulation in the country,

and I would be sorry indeed if the Government should discontinue this grant.

Mr. HESSON. I have heard *The Health Journal* very highly spoken of, and from the copy which I received to-day, I am glad to see that it has much improved since it was first issued.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I may just mention that I think it published a speech delivered in this House by the hon. member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt), I think that probably did it good.

To pay sessional indemnity to J. S. Thompson..... $1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Thompson was formerly member for Caribou. This $1,000 was voted before but not paid, because there was some difficulty as to the proper person who should receive it. That difficulty has now been got over.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When was it first voted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ten years ago. When Parliament first voted this, there was a difficulty as to whom it should be paid. It now goes to the niece who is found, and is living in Ottawa.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Where is she found? I would like to know where she lives?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In Ottawa.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I thought the hon. gentleman said it was in California.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. the First Minister will remember that my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was kept out of his indemnity for a Session because a gentleman came here and occupied a seat that he was not entitled to. The courts decided that he was kept out of his seat improperly and that he had a right to sit here all the Session, but he never was allowed anything for the Session.

Mr. FOSTER. Wait till he dies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, that is all nonsense; but I think it is unfair that the Government should recognise the claims of one member and not those of another.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I could understand the vote if Mr. Thompson had a wife and family, but it seems to me that there is no precedent for paying this money to his niece ten years after his death.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that when this man died he left a widow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. She died too.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I believe that is the truth of it—that there were two widows; and they could not decide which was entitled to the money.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With respect to the hon. member for Bothwell, he came here in the middle of the Session by the decree of the court, which held that he had a right to be here the whole Session, and the Government only allowed him for the time he sat here. But in the case of Dr. Jenkins, of Prince Edward Island, who sat here for a week or two when he had no right to sit, and in the case of Mr. Brecken, who took his place in the last week of the Session, the Government allowed each of them the whole sessional allowance. I think that was a case of gross injustice, and the hon. Minister should consider it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it there has been no application made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think this is a matter in which there should be any application at all; but whatever the rule is, it should be uniformly applied. I do not say that the department acted improperly in my case, but they paid me for the time I was actually here, and not for the full Session, although the court decided that I was all the time the legal member. In the case of Dr. Jenkins, or when the court gave Mr. Brecken his seat, and he came in the last week of the Session, he was paid $1,000 for the whole Session. What I claim is that it ought not to be in the discretion of any Minister or any one else to say that one man should be paid on one principle and another man on another principle; but whatever rule is adopted, it should be uniformly applied. We have another case, the case of the mileage of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie). He has charged mileage from some point in England. I do not say it is an illegal charge, but it seems to me that the House ought to settle whether that is a proper construction of the statute or not, and whether he is entitled to be paid from Timbuctoo or from some point within the Dominion. Whatever rule is adopted, it should be uniformly applied to members on both sides alike.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same principle should be adopted in all such cases; but the cases vary in their circumstances, and since I have been in Parliament, the course has been that when any case is brought before Parliament in which it is thought the strict rule of the statute respecting the indemnity of members should be varied, Parliament has acted, refusing it in a very few cases, and granting it in others. It is Parliament that grants the exceptional sum; the Government have nothing to do with it; the vote is brought down to Parliament, and if Parliament approves of it, it is granted; I must say that generally Parliament is very liberal. When Mr. Thompson's case was brought up, there were several other cases of hardship or supposed hardship, and votes were asked not only in Mr. Thompson's case, but in the other cases. They were all paid except Mr. Thompson's, because there was a dispute as to who should get it. But now the dispute is ended, and the money is voted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to know on what ground the hon. Minister can justify this payment to the niece of Mr. Thompson, who never sat in the House that Session, and withhold a similar payment to my hon. friend, who was improperly kept out of his seat by the action of a returning officer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no recollection of hearing his case brought up before. Now that the hon. gentleman has made the suggestion, we will take an opportunity of looking into it, and conferring with the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. First Minister has informed us that variation of circumstances often

govern the cases. It seems to me that the two cases from Prince Edward Island, varied from the case of the hon. member for Bothwell in one sense, that the two who received the sessional allowance belonged to the hon. gentleman's party, and the gentleman who failed to get it belonged to the Opposition ; that is the only variation of circumstances I am able to see. If the others were entitled to the full sessional allowance, the hon. member for Bothwell was also entitled to it, and ought to have received it. While on my feet, I wish to enquire as to the claim set up on behalf of Mr. Thompson. I understood the hon. First Minister to inform us that he had two widows. If so, why pass over their claims, and pay the money to the niece ?

General LAURIE. The hon. member for Bothwell has referred to my case of travelling expenses again. I spoke in the House before, and explained the course I took when I came here, and I can only repeat it. It was necessary that I should sign a form stating where my residence was in order to draw my travelling expenses. I could not state an untruth ; I had to state where my residence was ; and I asked the accountant to decide then what travelling expenses I was entitled to. If there was any other course for me to take, I should like to hear what it was. I could not certify that I lived where I did not ; I could not state that I had come from my constituency, because I had not done so ; I could only state where I lived.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the gallant General to state that he now resides in England permanently ?

General LAURIE. I have already stated so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has he absolutely changed his residence ?

General LAURIE. No ; I stated that I proceeded there after the last Session, that I took my family there, and that I am there domiciled for the present.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the Committee to confine itself to this item.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are now discussing the indemnity of Mr. Thompson, which brings up every question of indemnity or mileage to any member of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I cannot agree with him there. I have every disposition to allow as much latitude as I can while acting as Chairman ; but that is travelling a little too far.

Mr. McMULLEN. On two separate occasions, I have been prevented from offering any remarks with regard to the travelling allowance of the hon. member for Shelburne. He was allowed to-night to offer an explanation, and I think, seeing that my name has been mixed up in it, that I should be allowed to make a remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no disposition to shut off discussion at all. The procedure provides more than one way by which the hon. gentleman can make his remarks. If some hon. member moves that the Committee rise, he can do so. I make this suggestion now in order that the rules may be observed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I move that the Committee rise.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a few words in regard to this matter. It came to be currently reported in the corridors of the House that the hon. member for Shelburne had drawn $630, I think, for mileage. I intended to embrace the first opportunity of bringing the matter before the House, and as a matter of courtesy to the hon. gentleman I sent him a note to that effect, as I considered that when a man is elected for a constituency, that constituency sanctions his drawing mileage thence to Ottawa and return, during his term of service, and that it is unfair and unjust, if he removes to foreign parts, that he should draw mileage to Ottawa from his foreign residence. I took the opportunity of dropping the hon. gentleman a note that I intended to bring the question up, and in place of treating me with the courtesy I considered I deserved, he, no doubt under previous arrangement, caught the Speaker's eye, and volunteered his explanation. Afterwards a difficulty arose between him and me with regard to that matter. The hon. gentleman took advantage of the circumstances in which he was placed to draw out of the treasury a sum of money to which he was not entitled. He may possibly, by a strict interpretation of the law, be entitled to it, but according to the spirit of the Act he is not entitled to draw mileage from the city of London to Ottawa ; and he will probably be known in Canada in the future as the gallant general—not of the six hundred men—but of the $600 which he charged for travelling expenses. It now devolves upon the Government, under the existing condition of things, to remove all doubt by introducing an amendment to the law, which will prevent the repetition of a gross fraud practised on the revenue of the country.

General LAURIE. I must decline to be drawn into a controversy which will lead to personalities The hon. gentleman may if he chooses apply soubriquets and nicknames to me, and I could, if I chose, retort in a similar manner, but that would be neither parliamentary nor is it necessary. I have given a statement to this House of the way in which I placed the matter before the proper authorities, who, I understood, had the decision as to what I was entitled to draw. I was told, when I first came here, that I must draw mileage from where I reside and not from my constituency. This year I resided in England, and I had to sign a declaration to that effect, which I submitted to the proper authorities for them to decide what, under the circumstances, I should draw. I was told what I was to draw and drew it. I could not do anything else. I certainly could not sign a false statement. As to the statement of the hon. member for Wellington, that I took an unfair advantage of him, I stated to the House that I intended to bring the matter up as soon as I saw the reference in the newspaper, but I was unable to obtain the newspaper the first day, and on the second day, when I obtained it, I brought the matter before the House. I should be glad to see under the circumstances, some other provision of the law made, which would enable a member residing out of Canada to draw mileage from his constituency, which I think would be fair, but whilst the law stands as it is, I am bound to comply with its provisions.

Mr. AMYOT. It is my duty to state a matter of fact, which very probably the hon. and gallant

member for Shelburne does not wish me to declare, but which I feel bound, under the circumstances, to make known. Whilst in Europe last summer, I was twice invited by the hon. member for Shelburne to dine with him at his home in London, and on my return to Canada I received, in October or November, a letter from him telling me he thought it would probably be impossible for him to attend the Session, and that he would certainly not come if he could find a pair.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was no difficulty in the case of the hon. gentleman, who no doubt intends to make his home in Canada, and is now but temporarily in London. He could have easily drawn his mileage from Oakville without making a declaration. If he had not broached the question of a declaration, there was no necessity for it whatever, and the clerk would have paid him his usual allowance. But it appears he was anxious to get his mileage all the way from London ; and in order to press upon the clerk his claim, he proposed to be paid from London. If the proposition had not been made by himself, he never would have been entitled to the money.

General LAURIE. The facts are not as stated by the hon. member for Wellington. He was not present when the conversation between myself and the accountant took place, and I really do not know how he can make the statement he does.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is due to the Committee that the First Minister, or the Minister of Justice, should give an interpretation of the law and state whether it is right and proper that an hon. member should draw mileage from London to Ottawa if he resides in London.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is an important matter, as there is no knowing how many members of the House may be called to visit some dying parent in some distant part of the world or to pay visits to distant relatives, and, under the interpretation of the law in the hon. gentleman's case, be entitled to mileage from those foreign parts. If that is the law, it ought to be changed, and the Government are assuming a serious responsibility if they are going to retain the law in its present shape, which permits frauds of the kind to be perpetrated.

General LAURIE. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. He has no right to apply the word "fraud."

The CHAIRMAN. I must request the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Mr. McMULLEN. I withdraw the expression simply because it is not parliamentary, otherwise I would not withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. If the hon. gentleman will look into the procedure, he will find that no hypothetical withdrawal of an unparliamentary expression is a withdrawal, and I must ask him in justice to make a proper withdrawal.

Mr. McMULLEN. I withdraw the word, and the House understands and the country will understand ; but I say the Government ought to inform the House of the course they intend to pursue on this point. Should any hon. member be called to the Cape of Good Hope during the coming summer, and have to remain in attendance on an aunt or uncle or some particular relation, who is in such a condition of health there that they require to be waited upon, he will be entitled to claim mileage from that country. The Government should introduce an amendment so as to prevent a repetition of that kind of thing. Is it the intention of the Government to make a change in the law ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will put the question at the proper time, no doubt he will get an answer, but all this discussion is irregular.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I will take another occasion to put the question. We know that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was unfairly kept out of his seat, and there is no provision made for him during the time that he was unfairly kept out of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already said that that will be taken into consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire further to call attention to the fact that another hon. gentleman was unseated and drew two sessional allowances in one Session, and, I have no doubt, two mileages also. I refer to the hon. member for West Northumberland. I think the law should be changed in that regard.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think there must be some mistake in that, or the hon. member must have drawn my indemnity. In 1883 I was kept away from the Session in consequence of illness. I was here for four days, and I was paid $32.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I congratulate the Secretary of State on the fact that he was not so guilty as the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie). I should not say guilty, because if it is within the law, I suppose the hon. gentleman had a right to take the money. The Secretary of State I believe was in France at that time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU, I was in California.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. At all events, he did not display the same desire to draw his mileage as the member for Shelburne. He might have drawn his mileage on the same ground, all the way from Paris. He missed an opportunity there, which I do not think he is in the habit of missing.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister is going to deal with the question of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I think he should also deal with the question whether a member is compelled to draw his mileage.

Extra French translators between 1st July, 1889, and 15th January, 1890.. $1,557

Mr. LAURIER. Who are the translators ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I could not give all the names. This is for translation when the ordinary translators had not the time to do the work. I think Mr. McMahon was one. We had a similar item last year, and I then suggested that perhaps we had better have another translator added to the regular staff, but it was thought that perhaps the regular translators could do the work. I suppose the question will come up again as to whether it would not be better to add another permanent officer to the staff. The work has so much increased that it is necessary to have an additional officer.

Mr. MULOCK. I think this item should stand over until the hon. member for North Simcoe

(Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) are here. I would ask the Secretary of State if he has settled the *casus belli* which arose in regard to the late French translators who left office shortly after the last general election in consequence of some discussion with the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and the Secretary of State. I think they claim for services up to the time of their dismissal, and that they were given to understand that their claim would be paid or some fair settlement would be made with them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it depends upon me, I would say that no indemnity was due or should be paid to them, I never agreed to any such arrangement, and I say that, if anything is paid, it is unjustly paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Secretary of State say whether, after their dismissal, there was not some arrangement made that they should be paid? Was not one of the Tremblays given to understand that they would be paid?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not by me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know something about this. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) spoke to me about that claim, and, when I spoke somewhat in the same sense as my hon. friend the Secretary of State has spoken, my hon. friend from Montmagny said there was a misunderstanding, because these translators came to Ottawa before they were notified that their services would not be required, and went to the expense of coming here before they received that notification. As I understand they applied for remuneration, and I told my hon. friend opposite that I would speak to the Speaker and have the matter brought up before the Committee of Internal Economy. From some cause or other that Committee has not met, but we are going to meet Tuesday, I think, and it is arranged with the Speaker that we shall discuss the matter and see whether there is a claim under the circumstances mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It was understood that a certain indemnity would be paid. I may add that the Secretary of State told me, though he did not promise anything himself, that if something had been promised he had no objection that the promise should be fulfilled. I did not bring the matter before the House because I understood that an indemnity of $175 would be paid to each of the translators. Now, however, a misunderstanding seems to have occurred on the part of some members of the Government, and during the recess I was informed that the matter could not be settled. I spoke to the Speaker about it and he said that on account of some misunderstanding the matter could not be settled as it had been promised last year. Under the circumstances I shall accept the promise of the Prime Minister that the question will be considered on Tuesday next. I may say that it was disagreeable for me to bring this matter before the House, and I would not have done so could I have received an assurance from the Secretary of State, or from any member of the Government, that the indemnity would be paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot go quite so far as the hon. gentleman says, and acknowledge that there was a promise. What I told the hon. gentleman was this: That if it should turn out on examination that the parties came here without any notice that their services would not be required, and that they were here for some time before they got notice of dismissal, I thought is was a fair case for consideration, and that I would bring it before the Committee of Internal Economy.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As we say in French: *Il ne faut pas confondre autour et alentour*; there must be no misunderstanding between the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) and myself. When he spoke to me I told him that I could give no consent, I was opposed to it; but that if an agreement had been entered into between the Prime Minister or the Speaker, and the hon. gentleman, I had nothing to do with it. But I must say that I think there was no claim. I know those gentlemen came here without any reason, as they had understood previously from the newspapers that they were not to be employed, and when they came here they were told that they should not have come. Therefore I think they were not entitled to any indemnity whatever.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope this matter will at last be settled. I do not want to open up old sores, but I must take issue with the Secretary of State. These men came here while they were permanent members of the staff of this House; they came just as the translators come now at the opening of every session. I must say, without desiring to open up the old question, that in my judgment, if they deserved dismissal upon that occasion, there are members of that staff at present who also deserve dismissal, because they are doing the very same thing for which those men were dismissed, that is to say, engaging actively in politics. I do not complain of that at all.

Mr. BOWELL. On your side also.

Mr. LAURIER. No; not one on our side at this moment.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. What the Secretary of State says is perfectly correct. He said they were not entitled to any indemnity but that if an agreement had been made that they should receive an indemnity, that agreement must be carried out. Last session I put a motion on the Order paper about this matter. I saw the Prime Minister himself and he told me that he would try and arrange it with the Speaker, and he told me that if I came to a settlement with the Speaker he would stand by it. I told him that I did see the Speaker and that it was perfectly understood between the Speaker and myself that these men were to receive an indemnity of $175 each. I think the Speaker said that to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). I expected the money would be paid during the recess, but owing to some misunderstanding it has not been paid, and that is the reason why I bring up the question now. I sent a notice to the Prime Minister saying that they were dismissed only after they arrived here to enter upon their duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I got that note.

Mr. MULOCK. It would, perhaps, simplify the matter if we had the statement of the Speaker with regard to what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Montmagny. The Secretary of State seems to argue that these men should not

have come here, on the ground that they received an intimation through the public press that their services would not be required. Surely he does not seriously pretend that information through such a channel as that is to be accepted by persons who are employed by this House as a reason for assuming that the House has come to a decision to dispense with their services? I think I can discover on the part of the First Minister, and, perhaps, of the Secretary of State, a disposition now to overlook the past, and to come to some settlement with these translators.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no resentment against these men. A complaint had been lodged with the Speaker against these gentlemen during the Session preceding the one when they were dismissed. I say that unless they received a notice to come, they were to understand that they were not to come.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These gentlemen were engaged by the *Hansard* Committee. I know they were present in the early part of the Session for a very considerable time.

Express service between House of Commons and Government printing office..... $600

Mr. MULOCK. Has this express service been established since the Printing Bureau was inaugurated?

Mr. SPEAKER. It was found necessary by the Clerk of the House that we should either increase the number of messengers or establish a service of this kind, and it was doubtful whether a messenger service would have been sufficiently prompt for the work. These expresses are on the way all the time between the House and the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, this extra expense is in consequence of the Printing Bureau being placed so far from the House.

Newspapers, additional amount..... $250

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are these papers for which $250 is asked required for the reading room?

Mr. SPEAKER. For all the different rooms. Additional newspapers have been asked in connection with the reading room. The amount was cut down last year, and this sum is found to be necessary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the rule with respect to the newspapers sent to the reading room? Is it supposed that every newspaper in the Dominion is at liberty to send a copy to the Senate and Commons reading rooms?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; we take every newspaper in Canada.

To provide a gratuity to the family of the late Mr. Wilson, Law Clerk of the House of Commons.....$1,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not object to this item. I think, however, some principle should be laid down on which gratuities and compensation should be given. During two Sessions I brought forward the case of a post office railway clerk, who was burnt in the discharge of his duties, and I have been unable to secure more than the usual two months' gratuity.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will give me the name I will call the attention of the Postmaster General to the case?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). John Campbell was burnt on the Maine Central, in 1889, I think. He had been in the employ of the post office for 14 or 15 years, and was a faithful officer.

MILITIA.—The estate of the late Major R. S. King, Welland Field Battery:
—Rent of building to store guns, &c., of the Battery, from 1862 to 1883, 22 years, at $100 per annum... $2,200 00
Transport of ammunition, stores and arms of the Battery (O. C., 6th January, 1890)..... 102 53

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This expenditure occurred before Confederation, and we from the Maritime Provinces protest it. What is the meaning of the item?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The meaning of this amount which appears in the Estimates is simply this: Major King was in command of the Welland Field Battery. The Department had no drill shed and no accommodation for the storage and protection of the guns. Major King erected a building, which he placed at the disposal of the Government, in which he stored the Government ammunition. The claim was submitted to me when I first took charge of the Department, and I had the case investigated several times. It was placed in the hands of the deputy adjutant-general of the district. Reports were made to me, and I satisfied myself, after fighting the claim a very long time, that Major King had really incurred this expense for the building, and that it was an expense incurred for the protection of property belonging to the State—the guns which were entrusted to the battery of which he was in command.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When was the claim put in?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was in the Department before I came into it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Where was the building erected?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. At Welland.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is the building there yet?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; if it had not been for this building the Government would have been under the necessity of erecting a building themselves, and it would certainly have cost much more than the amount of money now to be voted.

Mr. MULOCK. How has the property been dealt with since 1883?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have made other provisions for the protection of the guns.

Mr. MULOCK. What provisions?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Now, there is a shed for the protection of the guns. I cannot tell exactly the date when it was built. Judging from the item which appears in the Estimates, I suppose in 1883, because the claim was made up to that date, and no claim was made subsequent to it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no recollection of any such claim being before the Department

when I was head of it. It looks very much like a trumped-up claim.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no trumping up about it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Part of the claim belongs to the old Parliament of Canada, and the rest may be right or not. The Minister should be able to tell us when the claim was first put in, and when the drill shed was built by the Government to replace the one belonging to Major King. I am certain this claim was not in the Department in my time. It appears to have been an afterthought, and I should like to look into it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The claim was in the Department before I came in as Minister.

Mr. DENISON. I heard of it years ago, and I was surprised it had not been paid.

Mr. LAURIER. When a claim of this nature is made, all the papers connected with it should be submitted to the House.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Part of this claim belongs to the Government of old Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am inclined to dispute the contention of the hon. gentleman for St. John (Mr. Weldon). We must remember that all the buildings belonging to the old Parliament of Canada for the militia of Canada were handed over to the Dominion, and all the guns belonging to old Canada were also handed over to the Dominion. In this case instead of there being a building to hand over, this building was furnished by Major King, and he ought to be paid for it, it seems to me. This is one of the burdens which goes along with the assets that have been handed over.

Mr. MULOCK. The member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), I suppose, is interested in the pressing of this claim, but the member for Welland, on a former occasion, presented the claims of the veterans who fought for some of the Provinces which now form the Confederation, and I think I heard the First Minister reply to the application that, although these veterans had done a great deal for the preservation of British institutions in America, yet their claims were against the Provinces and not against Confederation as a whole.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a different question altogether. It is a matter of simple honesty to pay this.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume we have a right to consider it. There is no uniformity in the decision the First Minister arrives at in these matters. But he has said that some reports were against the claim and some in favor of it, and as he has promised to bring down the papers, I would suggest that he should bring them all down, those in favor as well as those against it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The item stands.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Construction.. $20,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When will the award be made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell; I do not know.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose we will have to pass another vote then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely. When I say very likely, I do not know.

Intercolonial Ry., St. Charles Branch...$300,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This should be $200,000 instead of $300,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will that be the last of it for the St. Charles branch?

Mr. LAURIER. He cannot tell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Could the hon. gentleman state how much has been spent on the St. Charles branch?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The cost of the St. Charles branch, up to 1st March, 1890, was $1,628,392.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are there some claims still standing?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will be a possible requirement of some $200,000 more.

Dartmouth Branch.....$6,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For this $4,000 has already been granted in the main Estimates, and this is the balance.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is there not some claim on the part of the town of Dartmouth for money paid on this branch?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a claim against Dartmouth. A demand has been made against which there have been strong representations, but the Government have not surrendered their claim.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the town of Dartmouth claims that the railway was not constructed according to the proposal which it made when it undertook the guarantee, and that it is not liable to pay this amount.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is that claim. The argument of the town is that the road has been of much more advantage to the manufacturers and private business people who use it than to the town as a general accommodation to its population.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I hope under the circumstances the Government do not propose to exact that small amount from Dartmouth, when they are spending millions of money for railways all over the country. This is really a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, and I think it would be unfair for the Government even, if they had a right, to insist on payment for this road, which I think they did at one time volunteer to construct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was the only condition on which they agreed to build it, that this money should be paid. It was a solemn agreement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Times have changed since.

Increased accommodation at Moncton. $20,000

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am informed that a bonus of $10 per month is paid to the conductors on the express trains from Moncton to Halifax, while last year, or the year before, the salaries of the conductors from Quebec to Campbellton were reduced. They are now paid not by the month, but by the trip. The conductors complained of that, and I am told sent petitions to the Department; and the answer

was that the bonus was granted while Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, and that it was only for conductors from Campbellton to Halifax. I do not think that is fair, because the conductors from Quebec to Campbellton have much more to do ; they have to travel during the night and with a great deal of snow, while the conductors from Campbellton to Halifax travel during the day, and have very little snow. I do not see why there should be this discrimination. I was told this by some of the conductors, and I asked them to send me letters, and they refused, saying that if they put their names to letters they would be dismissed. I enquired as to the matter from the superintendent at Quebec, Mr. McDonald, and he told me that he would call the attention of the Minister to the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is twofold—first, whether the men from Quebec to Campbellton get too little, or the men from Campbellton to Halifax get too much ; and it may be that the proper way to equalise them would be to lower the wages of the latter. But the case as I understand it is this, that the wages of four or five conductors who had been employed on the road from 1872 were raised for long service, and it was understood that as they disappeared their successors would not get the advance.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I know one man who was a conductor for twenty years, and he is not on the same footing as those from Campbellton to Halifax. When the salaries were reduced all the conductors complained, but the Nova Scotia men were given a bonus of $10 a month to shut their mouths, or to please them, perhaps, before election time, and those from Quebec to Campbellton got nothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are elections in Quebec also. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that there are an infinitude of applications for increases of salary, and wherever there is one application for an increase, there are always two complaints of being left out. If I live, and we get through this Session comfortably, I have promised several of these people to look into the whole question of the service, and I intend to carry that out. I think the service is too expensive. I think the staff is pretty large, and it could be simplified very much, and I am going to try to effect that simplification. If I do not know much about railways, I know something of salaries, and how they should be divided.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend has put a question, and I do not think it is answered. His question is whether it is a fact that some of these conductors receive in addition to their salaries a bonus of $10 per month?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are four or five old officers who get $10 a month more than the others.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Why do not the conductors from Quebec get the same? They are older than the others.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will look into the matter and see.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. A lot of complaints have been made, and I made the complaint myself that there is not a single man in the office at Moncton who can understand French, although the railway passes through a great many French districts. People who have claims to make are obliged to make them in English, and when we receive the answers and wish to send them to the claimants, we have to translate those answers into French. There should be an employee there who could use both languages. I am in favor of the dual language. The year before last I sent a petition, signed by people from Cap St. Ignace, about ditches and culverts along the side of the line. That petition I drew up as well as I possibly could and sent it to Moncton, and never heard a word about it after. That was in October. During the session I asked Mr. Schreiber about it, and he telegraphed to Moncton, and the reply he received was that they could not read it, and the petitioners never got an answer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that at Moncton, where there is a French population not far off, there ought to be a person who could read letters and answer them in French. The hon. gentleman knows that I am not in favor of the abolition of the French language. It is really an error if there is no person there who can understand both languages.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have a man in my county who will take the place at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has more than once expressed want of confidence in me, and I must, therefore, have want of confidence in him.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am quite willing to give the right hon. gentleman a mark of my confidence by sending one of my supporters to his office.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Moncton is not without officers who read, write and speak French perfectly.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Why do they not send an answer to petitions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not suppose any such answer was ever sent.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I sent the petition in October, and during the Session, in February, I came here and found the petition was never read and not sent back to the Department.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was not for that reason.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. They ought to give a reason.

Mr. AMYOT. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that at St. Charles, in Bellechasse, there is a very long high fence on both sides of the Intercolonial and the public highway crosses the same square. It is a most dangerous spot. Last summer there was a man killed, and there were very often people killed there. For many years the people have been sending petitions to have that changed, and they offer the necessary land to put the highway elsewhere in a better position, but for one reason or the other nothing has been done. There are accidents constantly happening there because the fence is covered like a shed, and you cannot hear the whistling of the engine, and very often the engine does not whistle at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, If the hon. gentleman will send me a note, I will make immediate enquiries.

Construction of the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway..... $220,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) How much of this is for construction and how much for equipment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The appropriation already carried is $300,000; the appropriation now asked for is $220,000. There is an expenditure from the 30th June, 1889, to the 1st March, 1890, for the purchase of 8 first class cars, 8 2nd class cars, 68 box cars, 140 platform cars, 6 conductors cars, and 6 snow ploughs, making a total cost of $223,899.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much has been spent on that branch up to the present time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was expended up to the 30th June, 1889, $1,289,254; from the 30th June to the 1st March, 1890, $296,101; to be voted in the Supplementary Estimates for 1888-89, $223,899; Estimates for the coming year, $30,000—making a total of $1,831,254.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the whole expenditure on capital account?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the capital account is closed both for construction and equipment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So I understand.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does that include the award made the other day by the Court of Exchequer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it does not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will a vote be brought down for that purpose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason why it is not brought down is that it is under consideration whether there will not be an appeal against it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am afraid the Government have got into the position which we apprehended when they enabled the company to bring a suit against the Government. At that time, it was pointed out on this side of the House that such a provision would probably lead to this result. It would appear now that the consequence of that alteration in the Act is that the country is to be saddled with an additional expenditure of $110,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was nothing in the Act prejudicial to the Government. The only alteration was that if a judgment were given against the Government, we should be allowed to retain $150,000 for the payment of the workmen. The only change made was favorable to the Government. What the hon. gentleman predicted was that we would be liable to damages, but this judgment is based on the value of the property taken by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. When the Act was introduced, we pointed out that the preamble admitted the claim of the parties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The judgment is given on the value of the expropriation, as to the actual value of the work done and the property taken. The company claimed loss on prospective profits, and that is not taken into consideration at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is not this Col. Snow's claim?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the company's claim. Col. Snow is the engineer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The recital in that Act admitted the claim, and we predicted that the effect would be that the court would be unable to ignore the fact that there was a claim, and that the only question would be how much of the claim should be admitted. Sir Charles Tupper stated that there was not a shadow of a shade of a claim on the part of the company, but the preamble admitted that there was a claim, and I said at the time that the Government would be estopped from denying that there was a claim, and that, if it went before a court, the only question would be the amount of the claim.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was never the slightest question as to the company having a claim; on the contrary we paid $150,000 on account of that claim.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That was for the workmen.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; because we had expropriated the work, and Sir Charles Tupper's view was that that amount was the full amount we should pay for the work done. The question submitted to the court was whether that was or was not sufficient to pay for the property expropriated and the work done, and the court found that the amount should be $250,000, from which there is to be deducted $150,000. There is no admission in the Act that there was any claim.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The fact is that the company could not have brought any claim but for that Act. The company said there was a claim. The Government said the company had no claim, but, in order to allow them to air the claim they thought they had, this Act was passed. The explanation given from the Government side the other day went to bear out my contention, that, but for the introduction of the Bill by the Minister of Finance the company could not have got a cent. We predicted the result at that time which has now come about.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in his recollection. The $150,000 was secured by a mortgage on the property. There was a dispute about the validity of that mortgage. We endeavored to foreclose the mortgage, and we did forecolose it, and advertised the property for sale. We were endeavoring to make a title under the mortgage, and the object of the Act was to enable us to expropriate instead of going through the process of getting the title under the mortagage which was then in litigation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great distinction between the payment of the amount which we make to the workmen, and the payment of the claim which was preferred by Col. Snow, or the county he represented. The one was a claim which Parliament voluntarily acknowledged under which the Crown was under no liability to pay.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before we foreclosed under the mortgage the property must have been put up for sale, and we would have had to buy it in and possibly to compete with somebody else, in which case we would have had to pay the difference between the $150,000 already paid, and the purchase money. By taking the short cut, which ended all litigation, of expropriating the property, we had to go through the process of ascertaining

what the value of the property was over and above the $150,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In expropriating that property you made a declaration on the face of that act which was an acknowledgment of the claim they made, and which reduced the matter to one of assessment of damages.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; acknowledging your liability.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will show the hon. gentleman the judgment, and there is not from top to bottom of it the slightest allusion to any such ground.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may be perfectly right, but there need have been none. The Government was estopped; there might have been no question raised. I remember reading the Act and submitted to the then Finance Minister that he was estopping this Government and he paid no attention to it, and said there was not the shade of a shadow of a claim, and he was willing to refer it.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand there is an application before the Government to have additional lines built alongside this line on account of its being crooked, that it lengthens the distance between those points and has not served the purpose for which it was intended. Originally when Parliament was asked to go into this scheme the inducement was held out that it would be a short line from point to point, and would be of great service, but when it was in course of construction it was diverted, going around from one town and village to another, and that lengthened the distance. Now there is a movement on foot to have a straight line; I would ask the Frst Minister if he knows anything about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know whether there is a movement or not. There has been no application to the Government in that connection.

Construction and equipment of Cape Breton Railway.....$150,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much of this is for construction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An appropriation has already been granted of $700,000 and this supplementary of $150,000 is principally for rolling stock. The hon. gentleman would like to know what the estimated total cost is. The expenditure up to the 30th June was $1,849,223; the expenditure to the 1st of March was $535,765. The estimates yet to come down will probably have $50,000 more. The total estimated expenditure is $2,584,993.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have got the Act here to which I referred just now. The Act recites, in the first place, the amount of subsidy, and recites in the second place the voting of a sum of $150,000, and the granting of that sum by Parliament constituted the first charge on the subsidy, and then comes the preamble to which I referred just now, and which committed the Government to the expenditure on this matter, and which settled the question of liability and reduced the question in dispute to one of assessment of damages. The preamble reads as follows:—

"Whereas the company with whom an agreement was entered into aforesaid, for the construction of the said line of railway, having represented that they had expended a considerable sum of money in prosecuting the said work prior to failure in carrying out the agreement, it is desirable that they should be reimbursed such sum, if any, as they shall establish in court that they are entitled to for the present value of the work done on the said line of railway by the said company."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If any.

Mr. DAVIES. I contended, as a matter of law, that that preamble settled the question of liability entirely and reduced the question simply to one of assessment of damages, and to what amount. You would not contend in the face of that Act that the company were not liable at all. The only question the judge had to determine was what amount, if any, they were to be paid. The question of our liability to pay them was placed beyond doubt by the statute, and the judge, therefore, did not refer to it because he had no reason to do so. That question was settled by a statute, and it was a gross imposition upon the people of this country that we should have had to pay that money, and I contended so at the time. And at that time the Finance Minister said it was all a farce, that there was "not the shade of a shadow of a claim," to use his own language, but it turned out there was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say the preamble does not contain the acknowledgment of a claim of a single dollar against the Government, and so far, as the hon. gentleman supposes, from precluding the Government from disputing the liability, it was not so regarded by the counsel of the company nor by the Government. The liability rested on the fact that under that Act we expropriated the works of the company, and it became a simple question of value, and the question of value was whether the $150,000 already paid was enough.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Act does not say the amount of liability; the Act says it is desirable they should be reimbursed such sum, if any, as they shall show they are entitled to, for the present value of the work done. Therefore, the liability of the Government was acknowledged, and the only question for the court was to assess what the present value of the work was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The liability was not admitted at all, and when we expropriated the property, of course, we had to admit there was a liability, not for any further sum of money, but for the value of the works.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They could not have proceeded against the Government without that Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we took possession of their works, but we could have taken possession of their works without that Act, I admit. We tried to foreclose under the mortgage, and there was litigation. Whether we would have succeeded in that was a question.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The judgment was in favor of the Government at that time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only as to whether an injunction should be granted to prevent the sale. There the matter stood. In order to get possession we expropriated under the Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The liability was admitted; there was something to be paid. I see

that during a debate attention was called to this very point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a mistake. It was decided the other way.

Grand Narrows Bridge.....$115,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this the final amount?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it will make up the full contract amount.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) What is the whole cost?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. $515,000.

Railways, Surveys and Inspections.... $15,000

Mr. CASEY. What is the nature of this expenditure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspection is merely on subsidised roads. An engineer is sent to inspect the road for the purpose of ascertaining whether the contract with the Government for its building has been carried out, in order that the subsidy may be paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Will any part of this go towards surveys on the Harvey and Salisbury line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, No; that is a special item.

Mr. MULOCK. We have paid for that; but this vote is not limited to any particular line or route. No portion, then, will be spent on the Harvey and Salisbury line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

To provide a special car for His Excellency the Governor General..... $14,300

Mr. CASEY. There have been several Governors General here since Confederation, and there never has been any trouble in obtaining the use of official cars on any of railways when His Excellency desired to make a trip. I do not see any necessity for this expenditure, and I do not understand why the country should purchase a special car for His Excellency the Governor General when he can always obtain the use of a director's car.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has forgotten what took place last Session. The Governor General could not have the continuous use of a car when it might be required for other purposes connected with the railway. Besides, the car he did use was a very old and shabby one, and a disgraceful one to carry the representative of the Sovereign. It was, therefore, thought necessary that a new car specially for his use should be built.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Where is the "Jamaica?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was burnt. But His Excellency did not wish to be considered as using this car for nothing, and he very sensibly said that if we would build a decent car he was willing to pay a reasonable amount of interest for it during the time he was here. He is the first Governor General who has so offered. He will pay the 3 per cent. on $14,000, and his successor will pay the same sum, *ex necessitate*, when he arrives.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will it be for the Governor General exclusively, and will it be stabled when he is not using it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not understand why the Government cannot have the use of it as well.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I moved at a very early period of the Session for a return showing the number of special cars owned by the Government, their original cost and other details, but this return has not been brought down, and I have had a great many applications for it. I should like to have these facts, because they are very useful in election time, the same as the Bridges' car was used some years ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The information had not yet been received from Moncton, but it will be brought down shortly.

Mr. CASEY. Is there not an official car belonging to the Government used on the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; there is a car to be used by the superintendent or by the Minister if he goes over the railway, but that is wanted for the purposes of the railway. This other car is fitted according to the plan of the Governor General and to suit his taste, and it is as much his own as the hon. gentleman's hat is his own.

Mr. CASEY. How many official cars belonging to the Government are there in connection with the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is one here and there is one at Moncton.

Mr. CASEY. Are these cars not fitted up in such a mannner as to be suited for the use of the Governor General?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are wanted for other purposes. They are plain business-like cars, and if the hon. gentleman goes down to the station he can see for himself.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no objection to the Minister of Railways having the use of a private car, but when it comes to building a car for the Governor General another question arises. The Minister says that this particular transaction has taken the form of an ordinary investment, and, therefore, that there need be no discussion on the subject. He says that the nature of the investment is that the Governor General is to pay 3 per cent. on the capital invested. Who keeps that car in repair and who insures it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The interest includes repairs as well.

Mr. MULOCK. I disapprove of that. I am willing to have the country provide the working portion of the executive with all facilities for carrying on their business, but as to investing capital for the purchase of a palace car for the Governor General of this country I wholly disapprove of it. I consider it is a misapplication of public money, and it is a transaction that cannot be condemned in too strong language. You know very well, Mr. Chairman, that the cost of maintaining the Governor General and his institution in Canada is making that institution unpopular here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not believe that.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister may not believe it, but I am willing to say that I believe it,

and whether the First Minister disapproves of it or not, I may express my opinion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh ! yes.

Mr. MULOCK. It is my honest opinion. If you desire to have any unpopularity attaching to that office, you will not do anything to make the people dissatisfied with the arrangement. I assure the First Minister that this transaction he is entering into to provide at the public expense a palace car for the Governor General and his family, is a transaction which will not receive the endorsation of the people who have to pay the bill. The Governor General is going to pay 3 per cent. on the capital invested, but the country will have to keep that car in repair. On that growing capital we have only 3 per cent. interest, and that only during the term of office of the present Governor. It would be better if you took the $14,300 you propose to invest in this and throw it into the sea, than to invest it in a matter which is going to be an additional and growing expense. As soon as this Governor General's term of office has expired, you will have a new Governor coming along who has not been a party to the agreement and he will know nothing about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He will not get the car.

Mr. MULOCK. It will be called the Governor General's car, and the new Governor General will walk into it just the same as he will walk into Rideau Hall. He will ask for improvements and titivations, and the bill will be paid, probably out of some general item, and we will know nothing about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have only got to tell the hon. gentleman that he has forgotten altogether what happened last Session. This is not a new matter. It was stated to the House last year, and it was approved by the House, and there was not one single objection made to it. On the contrary there was very complimentary language used about the offer of the Governor General to take this step rather than to have the charge made that the car was specially used and furnished without his paying any of the cost. That was fully agreed to last Session.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not care who agreed to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I tell you the House agreed to it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not care whether the House agreed to it or not. The House in my judgment made a mistake in agreeing to it. I did not hear the discussion last Session, but whatever decision was come to, I think it is an unjustifiable expenditure of public money. If the Governor General makes a trip through the country he is well paid for it. He gets a large income and in my opinion the Act passed by this legislature to reduce the salary of the Governor General from $50,000 to $25,000 a year, and which was vetoed by the Imperial Government should not have been vetoed.

Mr. HESSON. Where is your loyalty going to now ?

Mr. MULOCK. I am considering that we are not justified in this expenditure at all.

Mr. HESSON. That is a fraud.

Mr. MULOCK. What does that gentleman say ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He says you are a first class fraud.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I trust the hon. gentleman will withdraw that expression.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was some one over the other side of the House who said that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. And you voted for the loyalty resolution ?

Mr. HESSON. Yes ; I did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then you must be a first class——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. All right.

Mr. HESSON. I have nothing to withdraw. I said the hon. gentleman's loyalty resolution coming from him was a fraud.

Mr. MULOCK. Never mind him, Mr. Chairman, it does not matter much what the hon. gentleman says anyhow. I am more consistent in my loyalty than the hon. gentleman is. I want to have the Governor General's office so conducted that it will in no way lose the affections of the people, and if transactions like this take place the public are likely to seek for a change. I think it is my duty as a member of this House to say that this investment will prove wholly illusory. It will not realise the 3 per cent. interest, and as I said before, we would be far better off if we threw this money into the sea in the first instance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was a pretty close attendant of the proceedings of the House last Session, but, like my hon. friend, I never heard of the proposition made by the First Minister, which he says was introduced, and that the whole House agreed that this car should be built at the expense of the public.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Look at *Hansard* and you will see it there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With respect to the hon. member for North Perth I can only say that if he sanctions extravagant expenditure his loyalty is but little loyalty.

Mr. CASEY. I should rather say, in regard to the interruption of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), that according to him loyalty would appear to be a question of dollars and cents, because he appears to think it disloyal to speak of a reduction in the Governor General's salary. I do not think our loyalty depends on the amount of salary we pay to the Governor General. In regard to the car, the hon. Premier says the " Jamaica " was a car he used to borrow from the Canadian Pacific Railway whenever he wanted it. Is it not probable that this Governor General's car will be equally convenient for the head of the Government to borrow at any time.

Mr. DENISON. Why should he not ?

Mr. CASEY. Because the Governor General is going to pay interest on the cost of it. Will it be strictly for his own use, and not to be lent to any member of the Government ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The car belongs to the Governor General, and is strictly to be used by himself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But he is to be at liberty to lend it whenever he pleases ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says the Governor General is to pay 3 per cent. on the cost, and 3 per cent. on repairs. But when the car is repaired again, is the next Governor to pay interest on the repairs that will then be made, until the capital value of the car runs up to $30,000 or $40,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall have to make an arrangement with the new Governor General.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Precisely so. I think it is illusory to suppose that there is to be interest on the repairs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend forgets that if the cost of the car is increased, our loyalty, on the theory of the hon. member for North Perth will be increased also.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the enquiry of the hon. member for Bothwell is not pertinent, because it must be evident to everyone who takes notice of public affairs that the life of this Government is going to be cut short before long, and another Government will have the arrangement of affairs with the new Governor General.

Mr. CASEY. I think the fact is, as we have supposed all along, that the car "Jamaica" having been burned, this is an arrangement to have a new car constructed which will practically be at the disposal of the members of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have told the hon. gentleman more than once that it is not to be at the disposal of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I think I have the floor that this is practically to be a new car which will be at the disposal of the hon. gentleman and every other member of the Government whenever the Governor General chooses to lend it. In fact, it will be a car for the use of the Governor General and Council rather than for the personal use of the Governor General, and will therefore admirably replace the burned "Jamaica," although the interest on the repairs will be paid by the Governor General.

Mr. MULOCK. Who has the contract for building this car?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think Mr. Crossen, of Cobourg.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 141) to facilitate the purchase by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the branch line of railway between Hull and Aylmer.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 119) for the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.) (On a division.)

Bill (No. 120) for the relief of Christiana Filman Glover.—(Mr. McKay.) (On a division.)

WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make the public pay for the use of the wharves in the parish of Berthier and on Crane Island, in the County of Montmagny? If so, who are the persons employed to collect the tolls; and upon whose recommendation were they appointed?

Mr. COLBY. In regard to the wharves at Berthier and Crane Island, in the County of Montmagny, rules and regulations for the use and management of wharves, piers and breakwaters now the property of Canada, together with a tariff of tolls and dues, were approved by Order in Council of the 12th of June, 1889. By Order in Council of the 17th of February last, Mr. Joseph Painchaud was appointed wharfinger at Crane Island, and by Order in Council of the 24th ultimo, Mr. Charles Bouffard was appointed wharfinger of the Government pier at Berthier. The appointment of these gentlemen was made upon the recommendation of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

INSPECTION OF THE MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. DENISON asked, Is the rule in force, and acted upon, contained in clause 45 of Regulations for Military College, stating as follows:—"An independent inspection by a Board of Visitors, appointed by the Governor in Council, and reporting to the Minister of Militia, will be made once a year; such Board will not be a permanent body, but will consist of five members, of whom three shall be members of the Militia Staff, not less than two to retire annually;" and if so, when will next inspection take place?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to my hon. friend, I beg to state that the last inspection that was made of the college was on the 18th October, 1881. It has not been deemed necessary since to continue the inspection. Everything connected with the college passes through the hands of the President of the Board, who is also the Adjutant General of the forces. The General officer commanding also makes periodical and minute examinations of the Royal Military College.

ELIE TASSÉ AND L. D. DUVERNAY.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether Elie Tasse, 1st class clerk, on the staff of the House of Commons, is absent from duty? If so, does he draw pay, and for what length of time has he been absent? Whether L. D. Duvernay, 3rd class clerk, on the staff of the House of Commons, is absent from duty? If so, does he draw pay, and for what length of time has he been absent?

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to say to the hon. gentleman that the two gentlemen referred to in his question have reported to me during the Session, and they have been given leave of absence since on

account of the state of their health. They are still under pay.

THE OUTRAGE ON THE *BALTIC*.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to ask my hon. friend the acting Minister of Marine, whether a report has been presented with reference to the outrage upon the boy Hambley, and whether we shall have an opportunity of discussing it during this Session? I do not, of course, wish to discuss it at this moment, but the matter is one of the utmost gravity. There is no doubt that a very horrible outrage was committed which resulted in the death of this boy, and there is no doubt also that Captain Robertson, who was in command of the vessel, after the boy had leaped overboard in his desperation, did not do anything to rescue him. There seems to be no doubt at all that while the vessel was stopped, she was not stopped by the order of Captain Robertson, and that, on the contrary, he, after the vessel had lain there for a short time, steamed away, and the boy was left there to drown in Colpoy's Bay. It was a beautiful summer's night, and nothing prevented any one from rowing along the wake of the vessel—a child could have done it. But no boat was lowered, no effort was made, and the boy was left to drown. I do think that we ought to have some information with regard to this matter, and if a report is made, that we should have an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. COLBY. This very sad case has been investigated by Lieut. Gordon, R.N.; full testimony has been taken, and his report suspends the certificate of Captain Robertson, as he finds that the captain was not altogether free from blame in the matter. The evidence has just reached the Department, but it has not been examined by the Minister, who is now absent. If the hon. gentleman wants any further information, of course the whole evidence can be laid before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman cannot be aware that it is the wish of every member of this House to have the report of that investigation laid upon the Table as early as possible. As we are nearing the close of the Session, the evidence should be placed at once on the Table of the House, so that we may have an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. DAWSON. I think it is highly desirable, seeing that the matter is under investigation by the Government, and there are different opinions with regard to Captain Robertson's conduct, that no decided opinion should be passed upon it until the report of that investigation has been laid before the House. I believe Captain Robertson is not so culpable as some people suppose, that the matter has been greatly exaggerated, and I think the better way is to defer expressing any decided opinion upon it until we have the result of the investigation.

Mr. BLAKE. I see by the press that the report has been sent in, and that the decision of the tribunal was to suspend the certificate for twelve months. If that fact reached the public by the press in due order, it is simply fitting that the House should be possessed at the earliest moment of the materials upon which that result has been reached.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. COLBY. I suppose that the reason why that result reached the public is, that the judgment was rendered in open court, and was made known to the public at the time it was given. The testimony has just reached the Department, but it has not received the attention of the Minister on account of his absence, and I believe that, under the statute, this judgment of the court is subject to the revision of the Minister.

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Order for the House in Committee on Bill (No. 116) respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. On three occasions I have brought the case of the *Baltic* before the House, and I have given members who desired to discuss the matter an opportunity of discussing it then. I did not wish to go further in the matter after the Government informed me that they had appointed a commission to investigate the case, and to determine what should be done with reference to the conduct of the captain.

Mr. SPEAKER. This question is disposed of, and we have passed to the Orders of the Day.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It may be disposed of so far as others are concerned, but not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER. But the Order of the Day has been called.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend did not hear it, but certainly the Order of the Day was called before he rose. My hon. friend will have an opportunity of speaking on going into Supply.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will probably take an opportunity then.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 116) respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAWSON. Before the Bill is further proceeded with, I desire to remark, that I understand a number of members who take an interest in the Department of the Geological Survey are absent to-day. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) are among those members, and as they have been studying the matter, it is advisable that the Bill be postponed until they are present.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I saw the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) within the last ten minutes, and he told me he was satisfied with the Bill and he had nothing to say with respect to it except words of commendation. With respect to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), I had also a conversation with him, and he, also, is perfectly satisfied with the Bill. Those are the two hon. gentlemen who have taken greatest interest in the matter.

On clause 4,

Mr. DAWSON. I gave notice some time ago of an amendment to this clause, and I may offer some explanation in regard to it. Clause 3 of the Bill gives the Government full power to make appointments and arrange the Department as it seems fit. The next clause (4) limits the authority

of the Government, and gives certain power with respect to appointments to officers of the Department; it provides, indeed, that these appointments shall be entirely under their control. That clause says:

"4. No person shall, after the passing of this Act, be appointed to this Department under class (*b*) of Schedule A of '*The Civil Service Act*,' unless,

"(*a.*) He is a Science Graduate of either a Canadian or foreign University, or of the Mining School of London, or the Ecole des Mines of Paris, or of some other recognised science school of standing equal to that of the said universities and schools, or a graduate of the Royal Military College, and in each case only after having served a probation of not less than two years in the scientific work of the Department; or unless,

"(*b.*) He had served a probation of not less than five years in the scientific work of the Department; or unless,

"(*c.*) He has had experience for the same number of years in similar work elsewhere."

This is very indefinite. There are graduates in different departments of science. This provision does not say that they should be science graduates in geology. Geology is a comparatively new science, and the fact is, that until recently, there could have been no science graduates therein. I think it would be bad policy to place it within the power of the officers of the Department to say who should be appointed and who should not; and by this clause we practically exclude the Government. Science graduates in the schools of London and Paris are to be admitted. But are there not science schools in Germany, Russia, and Italy and other European countries, and in the United States, and why should we make a distinction in favor of the two schools mentioned? So long as people possess the necessary qualifications they should be allowed to come from any school whatever. It is further provided that they shall serve a probationary term of five years before they are employed on the survey. Geology, as I have said, is a comparatively new science, and the fathers of it were not science graduates. Going back less than half a century we find Hugh Miller, who was, if not the father, at least one of the most distinguished explorers of the time; he was simply a stone mason, and his name is heard the wide world over wherever true science is honored. But such a man could not, under this Bill, have succeeded in obtaining employment from this Government, although he was a thorough scientist. Another eminent man was the late Sir William Logan. Did he choose graduates from the schools of London and Paris as his assistants? No. He chose men from this country. And whom did he choose? Men many of whom have since become distinguished scientists themselves. Take, for example, Mr. Billings, of the Geological Survey, who has long since departed this life, but who has left works behind him which will live for ever. Was he a science graduate? Certainly not in geology. He was a law student at Ottawa, and during his inspections of the rocks here he was very much struck with the fossils of the lower Silurian deposits, which are so very common here. He thoroughly studied them, and he became one of the most distinguished paleontologists in the world. Such a man as Mr. Billings would, however, be completely excluded if you adopt this clause. Then again, Sir, we have another very distinguished geologist, who was a great friend of Hugh Miller. I refer to the Duke of Argyle, father of our former Governor General the Marquis of Lorne. He was a distinguished geologist and he made wonderful discoveries in his researches among the leaf beds of the Island of Mull; his writings on geology are highly interesting. If he were to come to Canada, or if some person like him were to come to Canada now, he would have to serve five years' probation before he could get any employment in the Geological Survey of this country. The present Director of our Geological Survey, had not, I am told, scientific titles from high universities when he took charge of the Geological Survey in Australia, but very much to his credit be it said, he has since become a very distinguished geologist. He did not know so much about it when he was first placed in the high position of a Director of a Geological Survey, but he has studied the science and mastered it, he is a self-taught geologist, and it is very much to his credit that he is so. Now, Sir, I would ask the hon. Minister, have we at the present moment, no persons in the Dominion who take an interest in geology; and who are skilled and practical geologists? The fact is that the study of geology has become very general throughout the Dominion of Canada. The discoveries of valuable minerals in various sections has opened a vast field for geological research throughout the Dominion, and we have in different parts of Canada men who are very well up in geology. As one instance, I might mention Mr. Peter McKellar, who lives at Port William, on the shores of Lake Superior. This gentleman is a very clever geologist, and he has made the subject the study of his life. He has explained the relations of the different groups of rocks in his district the one with the other; the Aminikie with the Kewenian, and both with the Nipigon group. He has explained and investigated the relative ages of the trap overflows and beds of land in his part of the country, and your Geological Survey is indebted to him for much information. He has gone to great pains in posting your officials, and putting them right on the question of the relationship of the one set of rocks to the other. He is a scientific man, although self-taught, and his writings are considered worthy of a place in the records of our Royal Society. Why should a law such as this be enacted to deprive the country of the services of such a man, and to put it in the power of others who have got into office to keep him out. I say that the whole system as proposed in the fourth clause of the Bill now before us, is wrong. Geology is a new science, and there are new discoveries made in it every day and new theories advanced. It is not so very long ago since we were told that coal could only exist in a certain horizon, that it must belong to the carboniferous period, and that it must have a more recent formation above it and a formation of Devonian age below. But, Sir, quite recently, coal has been discovered where it had no business to be. It has been discovered in very much more recent formations in the Rocky Mountains than it was supposed it could exist in and at Nanaimo, it has been found in a horizon much above where coal was formerly supposed to be, and where, according to the doctrines of the geologists of a generation ago, it had no business to exist. Why, Sir, new discoveries are being made in geology every day. It is not a fixed science as some other sciences are, and the country ought to be glad to avail itself of the researches, and knowledge, and experience of such men as Mr. McKellar. Again, Mr. Richardson was for a long

time attached to the Geological Survey, and although he was not a science graduate by any means, he rendered good service to the country. In view of all these facts, I would move :

That the fourth clause of this Bill be expunged.

In my opinion the third clause gives the Government all the power they require, and the effect of this fourth clause, if it is continued in the Bill, will be to give power to the officers who are at present in the Survey to make a monopoly of it and to shut out all others.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has taken exception to this clause, as it is one which was well considered and which was thought would be beneficial in raising the standard of the employés in that very important department. The hon. member (Mr. Dawson) objected to this clause, because it referred only to the Mining School of London and L'Ecole des Mines of Paris, but he forgot to see that it also referred to other recognised science schools of equal standard. Consequently, any student from any of the universities of Russia, or of those other places which he mentioned, would be quite eligible for appointment under this clause. When this Bill was first presented in the Senate, a very large deputation waited upon me and raised the very same objections which the hon. member has raised this afternoon. The representations of that deputation resulted in sub-clause *c* being added to clause 4, by which it was thought the difficulty was got over. No doubt there are some self-educated geologists who are quite capable, and would be most useful servants of the Geological Survey ; but it was thought that they ought, at any rate, to have a certain amount of experience before the Government should be asked to appoint them. Consequently, sub-clause *c* was added, which provided that when a person should have had the experience for the same number of years in similar works elsewhere, although he was not a science graduate, and had not the qualifications mentioned in sub-clause *a*, yet he would be eligible for a position in the Department. I think this is as far as we ought to go, and I hope the hon. member will not press his amendment. I am sure the only object he has is to keep up the standard and importance of the Geological Survey, and that really is also the object of presenting this Bill to the House. I think the amendment made in sub-clause *c* is really sufficient to carry out the hon. gentleman's wishes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is intended by sub-sections *b* and *c* to meet the suggestions made in the amendment of the hon. member for Algoma, but I very much doubt, whether they are sufficiently comprehensive to accomplish that object. Sub-section *c* reads :

"He has had experience for the same number of years in similar work elsewhere."

Does that mean engaged in some official work elsewhere, or engaged in the employ of some large company in mining operations ? The phrase might be held to mean, similarly employed in some Government Department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is certainly not the intention. The intention is, that any one found qualified for any branch of the Department will be eligible. I would, of course, be very glad to make that clear if it is not clear now.

Mr. DAWSON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest, "similar work, official or otherwise, elsewhere."

On section 5,

Mr. DAWSON. I think science graduates might have worded this clause in a somewhat less clumsy form. It says, that the object of the Department shall be :

"To make a full and scientific examination and survey of the geological structure, mineralogy, mines and mining resources of Canada, and of its fauna and flora."

"To make a scientific examination and survey of the fauna and flora" is a rather strange expression.

Mr. DAVIN. If the words ran thus, I think the exigencies of grammar would be met : "and to enquire into and classify its flora and fauna."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not find that the Bill makes any provision for the continuance of the Museum. The hon. gentleman provides by section 11 for repealing the law by which the Museum was created, but he makes no provision in this Bill for its continuance, while he assumes that it is to be continued. The same provision must have been left out of the Revised Statute, which provides for classifying and arranging specimens for exhibition in the Museum, but omits the authority for its existence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a part of the general system to have a Geological Museum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The original Bill provided for the formation of the Museum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No ; the Museum was in Montreal, and was moved here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was a geological collection in Montreal, but not a museum.

Mr. DAVIN I think the objection is met by section 7, which provides, that the Governor in Council may from time to time cause the enlargement of the Museum. How you can cause a museum to be enlarged, if you have not provided for its continuance, I do not know?

Mr. BLAKE. It has been suggested to me that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) ought to move an amendment to provide for an additional gallery for antiquities in this Museum.

Mr. DAVIN. That is provided for. You cannot have geological specimens without having antiquities.

Mr. BLAKE. But these are of brass, not of stone.

On section 5,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a very general desire for reports which would have reference to particular counties. The Geological Report is a very full and expensive work, and now when there are so many parties interested in boring for gas and oil, a small condensed report of each locality is much desired.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In 1885, the recommendation was made that the report should be published in parts, and that is now done. There is a very large number of them on hand, and they are sold from 10 to 30 cents.

Mr. BLAKE. The exploration of any one engineer for the season would be confined to some one locality, so that his report would give what the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It would be hard to make a system much more convenient than it is. Thirteen distinct reports have been printed this year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be impossible to have printed reports for each county in the Dominion, as the different geological appearances do not run within the boundary of the county. There are separate reports of the different engineers for the year's work, and those reports are always available. Parties can always refer to the general report, and then, if they require more particular information, they can get it on applying to the Geological Department. They can always get the particular report of the engineer who has explored any particular portion of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) suggests that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in violation of the principles of the Liberal party, is proposing to the First Minister that he should gerrymander the report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I expect to get a strong support from the gerrymander in 1892.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest in clause *b* of section 5, to add the words at the beginning, "To afford a museum of geology, natural history, and to collect."

Mr. DEWDNEY. I second the hon. gentleman's views with regard to that, because I find natural history has been left out altogether from this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Act of 1877 provides that the Museum shall be open to the public from ten o'clock till four o'clock in the afternoon, Sundays excepted, and shall be furnished with such books and specimens as are necessary for scientific reference in the object of the survey. This is omitted in the Bill and in the consolidated statute.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The latter portion, with reference to instruments and so forth, is in the Bill. The question of keeping open on Sundays was considered a departmental matter, which it is not necessary to mention.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In this clause it is provided that they are to collect and publish full statistics of the mineral production of Canada and to collect and preserve all available reports of artesian or other wells and of mines and mining works. There is no mention in the latter about publishing.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the intent. That would be absolutely necessary, and I do not think there is any occasion to provide for it, but I have no objection to doing so. There has been some question raised by the Assistant Directors that this Bill might interfere with their standing, and I, therefore, propose to add the following clause:—

It is provided that nothing in this Act shall be understood to invalidate or interfere with the commissions as Assistant Directors previously issued by Order in Council to the scientific staff.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 132) to amend the Indian Advancement Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. This is the section which was suspended. I would have hoped that the hon. gentleman would have seen his way to strike it out altogether. The hon. gentleman is exacting from the Indians what no legislature would dare exact from any municipal council of white men. If, for any cause whatever, an Indian chooses to absent himself from the council, I would have no objection that, after a certain time, he should forfeit his office. We have a provision of that kind in the Province of Quebec in regard to municipal matters. If any municipal councillor absents himself without reasonable cause for two months, he *ipso facto* forfeits his seat. But I cannot see why either the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs should have the power to hold a sword over the head of such a man and compel him to act according to the will of the Superintendent General. If we look at the circumstances which caused this section to be drafted, we find that it has reference to the case of the Indians of Caughnawaga, a certain number of whom chose to absent themselves from the meetings of the council because the by-laws they had passed had not been sanctioned by the Superintendent General. It is known that the Indians passed a by-law to appoint a new constable, thereby making a saving of $150 a year, and the Superintendent General, because an agent——

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will agree to the withdrawal of that clause.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like the Minister to make an amendment to the fourth section, which requires that the reserves shall be divided into wards. This provision has proved to be a nuisance, and I know that, in my reserve, they have asked to have it done away with. In many places in Ontario, the ordinary municipal councils have ceased to divide the townships into wards.

Mr. LAURIER. At the first blush, I would be disposed to agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague). I cannot see any reason why that should be done in rural constituencies, though there may be a reason for it in cities.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In a small reserve like that in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that may not seem necessary. But in a reserve like that of South Brant, about ten miles by twelve, a very large township, if it could be made permissive in some way and let the Indians have a determination of that matter, I think it would be desirable.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I referred particularly to the Mississauga Reserve, which is a small reserve. I would be willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Haldimand, provided it was made permissive.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GRANTS OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Bill (No. 138) respecting grants of public lands, was read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee. He said:

The object of the Bill is to establish a uniform system with respect to grants of public lands in the North-West Territories, where the Torrens system has been established. In the Province of Ontario, by a statute passed in 1886, real estate, although held in fee, passes to the personal representative of a deceased person. So it is also in Manitoba, where the Torrens system is in force, and also in the North-West Territories, where the same system is likewise in force. The practice, however, has not yet been changed in the Department of the Interior, so far as regards the form of patent, and the form of patent is issued with the usual words of limitation, that is "A. or B. and his heirs." In some few cases which have occurred, perhaps through inadvertence, but as to that I am not able to state positively, patents have been issued to individuals without these words of limitation. It is proposed by the first section of the Bill to provide for these cases, by enacting that the patent shall issue to an individual, and that such will have the effect of conveying an estate in fee simple or an equivalent estate. It often happens that after a patent has been issued, the person to whom it was decided to issue it is dead. Under the circumstances the question has arisen as to how the patent should issue, and we desire, in order that the course may be in perfect harmony with the system adopted in the Provinces, that it should be issued to the executors or administrators as the case may be.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I presume at the present time we have statutory provision for these different dispositions?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. Provincial legislation accomplishes the same object by giving construction to the words we place in the patent; but we think it is better that these patents should coincide with the Provincial legislation.

Mr. BLAKE. The object of the hon. gentleman is, in effect, to take statutory authority to deal with these matters in accordance with the law of the Province to which the Act applies?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 126) to amend an Act concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Have the Legislatures of the other colonies, which have passed laws on this subject analogous to ours, embraced this degree of relationship in their Acts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am unable to say that. My impression is that they specify the remotest degree within which a marriage should take place.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sidney South Post Office, Custom House, &c $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is supposed to be the entire cost of this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The cost of this building, when completed, will be about $26,000. We will require an additional amount of about $500 more after this vote, to complete the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much is the revenue from that place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue from the post office is $2,738; money orders issued, $53,000; Customs duties, $6,646; other revenues, $1,100.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the total?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From post office, Custom house and other public sources, about $10,500 altogether.

Coaticook Post Office, Custom House, &c. $3,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How much is required to complete this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount will be $28,522. Up to the 31st December last, the expenditure was $25,656.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the receipts of the office are only $3,500.

Montreal Post Office—Granolithic pavement, &c., the city authorities contributing one-half the cost of the pavement $1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that to be put on both streets.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary $13,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for the boundary wall and the dormitory wing.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it to replace the wooden wall by a stone wall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I think so.

Brampton Public Building $6,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to provide funds for carrying on the works up to the 1st July. The contractor pushed operations more rapidly than was anticipated. After this is expended, about $2,000 will be required to complete it. The total will be $32,095.

Napanee Post Office, Custom House, &c. —To complete $5,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount expended and to be expended, with this vote, is $43,182.

Mr. MULOCK. Why is it that Napanee gets $11,000 more for this class of work than Brampton? The towns are about the same size.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the reason must be that the chief architect found that the wants to be provided for required a larger building at the one place than at the other.

Mr. MULOCK. That is a mere supposition. We are not inclined to be very particular, but that is a very weak explanation. What was the cost of land in each place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Napanee the land cost $3,000 and at Brampton $4,000.

Mr. MULOCK. The cost of the building at Brampton is $28,000 and at Napanee $40,000, a difference of $12,000 in favor of the latter. In this day of equal rights we ought to have an explanation. How comes it that Napanee is so highly favored, since both constituencies have been equally grateful towards the Administration?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The one place does not complain of the other. They both consider they are properly treated.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the postal receipts of each place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The postal revenue for Brampton is $5,025 and for Napanee $6,536.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is only $1,000 difference in the postal receipts, while there is $11,000 difference in the cost of the building. I find that for putting down and preparing ground in front of the building at Napanee it cost $893, and that putting down the pavement in front of the post office it cost $1,509.59. I suppose those items put together explain the reason why $11,000 have been virtually squandered there.

Strathroy Post Office, Custom House, &c. $5,000

Mr. CASEY. What will be the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The probable cost will be $27,500.

Mr. CASEY. What is the postal revenue?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nearly $5,000.

Mr. CASEY. I would like seriously to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the claims of the town of Ridgetown, in my riding. It is somewhat a smaller place than Strathroy, but is in the same class of towns. It is not a county town, and neither is Strathroy. Not knowing this estimate was to come up to-day, I did not prepare myself with figures as to the postal and Customs revenue, but I know that last year I found, on looking through the reports, they were both very considerable. Ridgetown is a place of 3,000 inhabitants or so—a good deal larger than Amherstburg or Aylmer, and several other towns where public buildings have been constructed. It is the centre of what may be called the garden of western Ontario, the district it serves in postal and Customs business, comprising a part of the Counties of Elgin and Kent. Its population is very enterprising and progressive, and I would urge on the Minister its claims to be considered in his next estimates for public buildings. I brought up the matter once or twice before, but perhaps did not impress its importance sufficiently on the hon. gentleman's notice. Of course Ridgetown suffers from the disadvantage of being represented by a member of the Opposition, but there is no knowing what effect the hon. gentleman's benevolence and generosity might have on the county. However, I do consider this place has a claim for public buildings in the amount of postal and Customs revenue collected there, and in the population of the town itself and surronnding country, and the enterprise of its people. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to give this matter his serious consideration.

127½

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I certainly will do that.

Departmental Buildings, Ottawa—Increased and improved vault accommodation in Eastern Block for Finance Department..... $45,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government found that the vault there was too small and not safe enough, and, therefore, ordered a new vault, which will be completed probably in three months.

Mr. CASEY. This is a very large sum merely for increasing the vault accommodation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman knew what similar accommodation cost at Montreal and Toronto, he would not find this beyond the ordinary.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the work given by tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; and we took care the tenderer was a man accustomed to such work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who has the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some one from Ontario, Messrs. Goldie & Co.

Pembroke Post Office, Custom House, &c..... $4,000

Mr. CASEY. Will the Minister state what is the population of Pembroke, and what are the postal and Customs revenues collected there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The population in 1881 was 2,820. I suppose it is about 4,000 now.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The population is 4,500, according to the census taken last spring.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The postal revenue is over $4,500; money orders, $4,000; and savings bank deposits, $53,000.

Mr. CASEY. This is another instance of generosity, no doubt well bestowed, on the part of the Government. I would not say a word about it if it were not for the case of Ridgetown, to which I have already called attention. Pembroke seems to correspond to Ridgetown in almost every particular, except the population of the district which it serves. Ridgetown has a very much larger and richer district to be served, with more population, than Pembroke. I hope Ridgetown will be attended to next year.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). A census was taken last year in Pembroke to see whether any additional licenses could be granted, and the population was ascertained to be in the neighborhood of 4,500. The amount derived from the sale of stamps in that vicinity is about $6,000; the amount from Customs is about $25,000, and there is another service to the accommodated in this building, the Inland Revenue service, which collects about $20,000. I do not think any generosity has been displayed in that matter by the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I do not say Pembroke should not have the accommodation, but I say that other places should, and my figures in regard to Ridgetown are based on old returns.

Brandon Post Office, Manitoba..... $10,000

Mr. CASEY. How much has been spent on this post office, and what is the estimate for the future?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount expended up to the 31st December last is $16,919. When the work is completed, it will have cost between $45,000 and $48,000. After this vote is taken, we will have only about $550 to ask. The postal revenue there is $11,099, and the Customs revenue $7,725, making altogether about $19,000.

Mr. CASEY. That is a large sum for a place of the size of Brandon.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a very growing place.

Mr. CASEY. It has not been growing so very much of late years. I do not think the population can be more than 4,000, and about $30,000 appears to be the amount spent in places of that population in Ontario and Quebec, while about $50,000 is to be expended in Brandon.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend has no idea of what Brandon is now. It is one of the most advanced towns in the North-West Territories and has a population of about 5,000. In two years it will probably have twice that number, and it is surrounded by a very thickly-populated country.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... $4,000

Mr. CASEY. What is that for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the cottages and outhouses for the chaplain, &c.

Mr. CASEY. Two years ago, I think, there was some difficulty as to the yard for the convicts to work and take exercise in. Is that provided for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; there is no wall there yet; there is nothing but a fence.

Mr. CASEY. Then the convicts are confined to the building?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; they go out of doors, but, strange to say, there are very few escapes. It involves, of course, a little larger force of guards.

Public Buildings, N.W.T.—Calgary —Court-house, Jail, &c..... $10,000

Mr. CASEY. What is the estimated total cost of this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That will cost between $40,000 and $42,000. This will complete the work, with the amounts that were voted in the ordinary Estimates.

Mr. CASEY. Are they now in a position to be used?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; they are going on.

Regina—Residence for Lt.-Governor... $12,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to carry on the work of construction, to pay the contractor, and the amount now due, $5,190.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to impress upon the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the importance of pushing forward the jail at Regina. It is going to be a fine building, and has been under construction for some time, but a great deal more money is needed to complete it, and I hope the Minister will see his way to have the works pushed on and the Regina jail completed. Before leaving this topic I may say that I hope that, in the Supplementary Estimates that are coming down, provision will be made for what is a dire necessity in the North-West, at the present moment, at Medicine Hat, at Maple Creek, and at Moose Jaw, all three of them thriving towns, and all three of them with a considerable population around them. For instance, around Moose Jaw you have got one of the finest farming countries in the world, and a large farming population. Then south of Maple Creek you have got a large ranching country, nearly every ranche having been taken up, and you have cow boys, ranchemen, horse dealers and cattle dealers, constantly in Maple Creek. In Medicine Hat, you have again, the centre of a large farming population, and it is also the end of a railway division. It is an absolute necessity for the proper administration of justice in Medicine Hat, at Maple Creek, and at Moose Jaw, that there should be a court-house and a lock-up. It is not consonant with the dignity of justice that the Judges of the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories should hold their court in——

Mr. CASEY. A school house.

Mr. DAVIN. It is worse than that—they have got to hold their court in a tavern. In the Estimates for 1889 we had a sum for Moosomin, Wolsely, Maple Creek and Medicine Hat. Although these sums have not reappeared in the Estimates that have thus far been brought down, I do hope that the sum I see for similar purposes will be expended in these quarters, and that a further sum will appear in the Supplementary Estimates, so that we shall have structures in those three places I have mentioned that will answer the purpose to which they will be devoted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say to the hon. gentleman that this matter has not escaped the attention of the Government.

General repairs and improvements, Harbors and Rivers, Maritime Provinces..... $3,000

Mr. KIRK. Can the Minister give us an idea where this money is to be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to cover an over-expenditure, partly up to the first of March of this year, and the balance is in connection with a similar service up to the end of the year.

Quebec—Rivière du Lièvre..... $20,000

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very large sum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; I think this will complete the work. The total cost will be about $200,000.

Rivière Nicolet..... $1,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to cover the work of the year.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... $6,469

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will this amount of $4,200 complete the dredging at the River Thames entrance channel?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount of $4,200 is to cover the warrant of the Governor General for that amount issued in order to cover the amount expended to open the channel, which had been blocked. In regard to the general work of deepening the entrance, that may involve a

large sum or it may be possible to carry it out with a moderate sum. The question is one which will require close study. If a large sum should be needed, it would become necessary to consider whether a still larger expenditure should not be made in order to build piers to scour the channel and prevent bars forming.

Telegraph Lines—Nova Scotia.—To pay the Dominion Telegraph Company for the additional length of line from Canso to Dartmouth, built in 1879-80..... $2,500

Mr. KIRK. When was that line built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was built at the time stated. The account remained for a long time in abeyance, the company claiming between $5,000 and $6,000. Finally, this amount was offered to the company, and accepted.

Fisheries..... $1,945

Mr. KIRK. What did the herring delegation cost? A sum appears in these Estimates for $1,800.

Mr. COLBY. That is the entire cost of the commission. Of that sum only $530 was allowed for remuneration to the two commissioners.

Mr. LAURIER. I should like an explanation of this item under this head of fisheries: "To pay the reward to Charles Adams for procuring in Lake Huron a true specimen of the Salmo Salar."

Mr. COLBY. The officers of the Department were desirous of ascertaining whether a certain quantity of fry which had been deposited in the Saugeen River had been successfully planted, and a reward was offered by the Department for a specimen of salmon that could be identified as being the product of that fry. A small sum of $20 was offered as a reward.

Tidal Observations..... $2,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this a new item?

Mr. COLBY. It has been found that there are a great many uncertain and unknown currents on the coast which were dangerous to navigation, and it has been thought necessary that tidal observations should be made in the interest of the safety of life and property.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this intended to cover political currents?

Mr. COLBY. I do not think so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who is this work done by?

Mr. COLBY. Lieutenant Gordon, R.N.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is a feeling among many people interested in navigation that it would be very desirable, if possible, to obtain information as to the change of the currents along the coast and on the Lower St. Lawrence. I know an influential petition was sent to the Government asking for this. It is of course only an experiment, but the vote is a very useful one if the money will be properly expended.

To provide for the claim of Jotham O'Brien for extras in connection with the building of the steamers *Princess Louise* in 1883, and *Lansdowne* in 1884, as per O. C., 9th December, 1889..... $8,844 32

Mr. COLBY. These claims have been pending for several years, but the Department could not agree to the views of the claimant. There has been a good deal of inter-communication between the claimant and the Department, and a very considerable abatement of the claim has been effected. The original claim on account of the steamer *Princess Louise* was $8,500, and it has been reduced to $4,100. The matter was submitted to Mr. Croker, the English Lloyds' surveyor, under whose instruction the vessel was built, and the Department settled the claim at somewhat less than he estimated should have been the proper allowance.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman, before he asks us to agree to this vote, should bring down the papers connected with it. This transaction has been standing for seven years, and if Mr. O'Brien had any claim it should have been paid before this. It looks now as if some extra pressure had been put upon the Government to cause them to keep Mr. O'Brien out of a contract on which I understand he suffered loss. I have heard that Mr. O'Brien and his friends had been urging this claim for a long time, and now it would appear successfully. Is this for extra work, or on what account? The hon. Minister should give us more information.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the Minister will be able to give all that information. I may say with reference to this claim that the fact of its being in the Estimates now does not prove that any extra pressure was brought to bear on the Government. The claim was before the Department in my time as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The reason, both in Mr. McLelan's time and in my own why it was not paid was that Mr. O'Brien would not accept the sum offered. I went through the papers very thoroughly, and I offered Mr. O'Brien what I believed was a fair sum, about $8,000, in final settlement of his claim, but he refused to accept it. I believe the sum offered by Mr. McLelan was the same.

Mr. LAURIER. Did you offer that out of good nature only?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it was after a thorough examination of the papers. I think the amount he claimed was $14,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister has not told us what this was for.

Mr. COLBY. It was for extras and for additional outlay on the hull.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I really think the hon. Minister should give us a statement of the claim and a copy of the contract, and let us know what the contractor did and what he did not do, what he asks for extra services, and so on? because, in the very nature of the case, after having stood for such a number of years, the matter would require explanation.

Mr. COLBY. It stood, not because the Government did not recognise that Mr. O'Brien had a claim, but they were not prepared to pay as much as he thought he was entitled to. The delay has been on his part; but, finally, he agreed to accept the Government's offer. The correspondence is quite voluminous, but it is open to the hon. gentleman, and if he desires the whole or any part of it, it will be laid on the Table. If he gives me a memorandum of the particular information he

desires on the subject, I will bring it down before concurrence.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee,)

To pay gratuity of two years' salary to Dr. P. A. Wells, his services as secretary of Quebec Marine Hospital being dispensed with owing to abolition of office..... $1,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you give this gentleman two years' salary and the rest of the officials only one?

Mr. COLBY. On account of greater length of service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long has he been in the service?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At least 20 years.

Indians, B.C.—To assist in erection of buildings in connection with school for Indian girls to be conducted under auspices of Church of England at Yale..... $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the particulars connected with this grant? What is the cost of the buildings, and how many Indian girls are being educated in this institution?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This school was established about two years ago by the Bishop of New Westminster. He has purchased the house and grounds for it, but there is a small piece of ground adjoining the building which he is anxious to add to the site. When I was in British Columbia last summer, I inspected the school, and I saw that it was a very well conducted institution, being carried on under the auspices of the Bishop and Protestant sisters, who came out from England to take charge of it. When I was there fourteen or fifteen girls were in attendance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do we contribute to the annual expenditure?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the first application. The item is $1,500 towards the assistance of the college and $500 to purchase a small piece of ground adjoining.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to contribute to the annual cost?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; so much per head for a certain number of children.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to bring down in the Supplementary Estimates a further vote for next year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not know what proportion the schools will grow to. At present there are fourteen there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I do not think the establishment will cover much more than that at resent.

Mr. BLAKE. Has an arrangement been made for an annual grant for pupils?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; this is an application made to me by the bishop for this year, when I was over there.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he an Equal Rights bishop?

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is one of the objectionable grants we should not allow to pass without protest. This is a denominational school to every intent and purpose. We will possibly next have an application from the Presbyterians for assistance for their schools, and from the Methodists and Catholics for similar assistance. This is putting in the thin end of the wedge. The other denominations will claim grants on the ground that they have an equal right to them as the English Church. This system should not be introduced into the North-West. If any religious denomination wants to establish a school, which is to be a sectarian school, they should establish it out of their own contributions. I have no objection to our assisting non-sectarian schools for the instruction of the Indians in which they can get a general education; but I object decidedly to the system the hon. gentleman is introducing, and shall offer a resolution, when we go into Concurrence, in opposition to this item.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Methodist body have already applied and have had a vote this year for a school in British Columbia. This vote has been pressed upon me by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and I received his thanks and those of the people interested, only last Friday. We have also, this year, voted grants towards aiding the industrial school in British Columbia, carried on under the auspices of the Catholic Church. The denominations have already spent a great deal of money for education, and this will be really a small grant annually towards carrying on these institutions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What the hon. member for North Wellington says just amounts to this, that these Pagan children are not to be educated in Christianity. It is wrong, according to him, to teach these Pagans to become Christians. That is a new version of right and wrong, which is not in accord with any theory ever promulgated in this House before. The Government is perfectly right. The position of these children is altogether different from that of the children of white people. The hon. gentleman's argument might possibly apply to the latter; but in this case, where it is simply a question of leaving these children as Pagans or bringing them up as Christians, the course pursued by the Government is the right one, and has also the advantage of being extremely economical. It is a mere perversion of terms, for which nothing but the most extraordinary partisanship can account, for an hon. gentleman to take the stand which the hon. member for North Wellington has taken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I take no such grounds whatever. If the hon. gentleman understood me as taking such grounds, he is mistaken.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I understood you perfectly.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say it is wrong to make denominational grants. If it is necessary to have an institution in that section of the country to

educate Indian girls, which will be non-denominational, I have no objection to the Government granting its assistance; but when the school is absolutely denominational, I object to its being given a grant, as we would be then laying down a system which would be pernicious in itself and which should be opposed certainly by my hon. friend.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It never will be.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps it will.

Wages of crew of steam launch, British Columbia, from October, 1889, to June, 1890..... $1,080

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is in order to enable the agent to visit the Indian reserves. Heretofore it was difficult for him to get around as often as he should in canoes, being often delayed for weeks at a time.

Cost of building Kuper Island and Kamloops' Industrial Schools.....$17,277

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was commenced about two years ago, Last year some eight thousand or nine thousand dollars were devoted for a building, and it was found, when completed, it cost some $9,000 more, which we are asking for to-day. The institution will accommodate from sixty to eighty pupils. The principal has only just taken charge, and the other officers are not yet appointed. It has only just been finished.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman estimate will be the annual cost of keeping up these two schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The annual cost of the Kamloops school will be about $5,000, and the other about the same.

Kootenay Industrial School—To complete buildings.....$4,500

Mr. McMULLEN. What church is this school under the control of?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Kootenay, Kamloops and Kuper Island schools are all under the control of the Roman Catholics. The Indians there are entirely Roman Catholic.

Interpreter, acting also as teamster, for the Fort Pelly agency..... $480

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What tribe is that for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are Crees. They have had an agent appointed there recently who attends to all the farming, and this is the only other officer there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the interpreter a Half-breed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Maintenance of twenty pupils at $100 each per annum, at the Elkhorn Industrial School.....$2,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister promised, when the principal Estimates were under consideration, to bring down a detailed statement, showing the number of schools, and the amount of money voted for the maintenance of each, and the denomination to which each of these schools belonged. I am not at present questioning the propriety of this policy being pursued among the Indians. That is a subject that may very fairly be discussed at some other time. I only now repeat what I said on a former occasion, that, when this system was introduced—and I think it was by the Government of the right hon. gentleman who is now the Prime Minister, and was continued by us—it was understood that no engagements would be entered into which would tie the Government down to the maintenance of these schools permanently, but that the Government would be at liberty to establish secular schools whenever they thought proper, instead of aiding denominational schools among the Indians. But I do not understand the position of the hon. gentleman, who has on more than one occasion maintained that it is wholly at variance with the principles of our Constitution to recognise any connection between Church and State. I think the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), in discussing a certain question here last year, read extracts from the Act secularising the Clergy Reserves in order to show that it was settled that there should be no connection between Church and State in any form. If the doctrines which was laid down by that hon. gentleman and by those who supported him in and out of this House was correct, it is clear that these schools should be left to the maintenance of those who hold the religious views which are taught in these institutions. Schools may be supported among the Indians in the same way as any other schools in the country are supported. I am not saying that this would be the best or the most efficient system to be adopted under present circumstances, but I do say that it is the only one consistent with the views which were maintained by these gentlemen last Session in this House, and which have been maintained by them out of the House between last Session and this. It is, therefore, very important that the Minister should lay before us a full and detailed statement in order that we may know how the principles and the practice of these gentlemen coincide with each other. It would be only fair to the country that this should be done, so that these gentlemen might have an opportunity of either sustaining their views or abandoning the doctrines which they laid down.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I will not now enter into a discussion of the question of the connection of Church and State in the abstract, but the principles involved here are so different from the general principle, that I do not think it is involved. When it is considered that these Indians are Pagans who have to be converted to Christianity, the country has to adopt the best, the simplest, and the most economical mode of converting them. I do not care whether these votes have anything to do with the question of Church and State or not, if they are carrying out the great object of converting Pagans into Christians.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. O'Brien) would undertake seriously to maintain that it was a portion of the duty of Government to convert Pagans into Christians. I did not suppose that he would seriously argue that the Great Commission was issued to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. I supposed that the instruction to go into all the world and preach the gospel to

every creature was given to clergymen, called to the work, and I expected that the hon. gentleman would say that that applied to upholding the principles of the gospel among the Indians as well as among the white population. I am not sure that there are not as great sinners in the neighborhood of these Parliamentary buildings as there are among the Indians on the plains of the North-West, and the hon. gentleman might find it as necessary to call in the aid of the State to work amongst the white population as amongst the Indian population. If the hon. gentleman is right in the views which he has put forward, and if the vast majority of this House are wrong, if we are in such benighted condition, it seems to me it would not be less meritorious for the hon. gentleman and those who approved of his views to devote a portion of their attention to converting those who are opposed to him and them as well as to the conversion of the Indian children. There was a time when the vast majority of mankind was pagan, but I never heard that there was an appeal made to Cæsar to devote a portion of the public funds to educating the pagans of the Roman Empire in Christianity, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman should contend that it should be done now. I am not saying that this is not the best mode to adopt at the present moment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That is all I say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, well, but the hon. gentleman argued here last year, and appealed to the country, and sought to inflame public passions on the subject, that it was in the public interest that all connection between Church and State should be severed, and that every appropriation in aid of any church enterprise was a violation of the principles of the Constitution.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may say to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as I said the last time the hon. gentleman brought this subject up, that I was not aware that any decision had been arrived at by which a change might be made against the system on which we have been carrying on Indian schools in the North-West Territories and Manitoba. I thought the law was so distinct with regard to it that we had very little discretion in the matter. However, the hon. gentleman asked me to prepare a memorandum, and I have it here in detail, with regard to every Indian school in British Columbia, North-West Territories, Manitoba and the older Provinces. There are in all 223 schools, and I have here the information which he asks showing the financial aid given by the different denominations towards those schools. Besides, they are assisted in many ways which we cannot calculate, in the shape of contributions of clothing, of which immense quantities have been sent to the North-West. By looking over the salaries paid to the school teachers, the hon. member will be convinced that they must receive other support besides that which they receive from this Government. It would take me some time to go over the whole of this return, but if the hon. gentleman wishes I will hand it to him across the floor, or we will agree that it shall be published in the *Hansard*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Lay it on the Table.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. McMULLEN. It must be understood that if it is laid on the Table it can be inspected by anybody who desires.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let it be published in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reference to this matter. It was very much desired last year by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that there should be entire separation between Church and State. In so far as that hon. member went on that occasion, I quite agreed with him, but I could not understand at that time how an affair of another Province in payment of an old debt, should be any connection between Church and State, yet the hon. gentleman could see in that any amount of connection between Church and State. But on this occasion when money is granted to the Church to which the hon. member belongs, he sees no connection at all between Church and State. Apparently the Government in this case have spiked the hon. member's gun, and he has not a single word to say, because it is going to Christianise those Indian children. But, then, again he is willing to allow a grant to be made to the Catholic Church because, at the same time, he gets a grant for his own church, and then, of course, there is no connection between Church and State. He cannot see, his eyes, apparently, are blinded to the fact, that this is a connection between Church and State that we on this side of the House have contended against, although there may be exceptional cases where it may be very desirable that such a thing should be. But the general rule we have always upheld; if my hon. friend sits on this side of the House he must uphold that rule too, he must uphold the entire separation of Church and State; otherwise he will have to go back and sit with his Tory friends on the other side of the House, because we cannot permit him to come here and go there just as it suits his peculiar views. Now, last year when he took this exception I quite agreed with him. I wanted to see the fullest and most pronounced separation between Church and State—I hope the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will not go out, I would like to hear his views on that question too; I do not want him to give any uncertain sound—I want them all to take their stand along with me, because, ever since I have been in the House, so far as I know, I have always supported this principle. Possibly sometimes some of these estimates have slipped through that I did not notice, but whenever my attention was called to them, I never gave an uncertain sound. I am sorry to see that the liberal views that the hon. member for Muskoka espoused last year, have all vanished now, and that he is prepared, as he was the other day, to rule in the lower regions with his Tory friends rather than serve with us in Heaven.

Mr. DAVIN. In this case, as it seems to me, there is no such *crux* as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would lead us to suppose, and my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), from whom I differed last year, is not in the illogical position that the hon. member for Bothwell thinks he is. My hon. friend from Muskoka can maintain that it is quite improper to have any connection

between Church and State, and yet maintain that it is quite right that this Government should take some charge of the religious culture of these Indian children. What are the facts? When we talk of the State we talk of that which is made up of free citizens. These Indians are in the position of children, and the Government is—the State—towards those Indians *in loco parentis*. It would be quite improper if the Government did not take some cognisance of the religious teaching of these Indians. When, prior to any action on the part of the Government the Catholic Church in one place, the Presbyterian Church in another, the Methodist Church in another, had gone in and converted some of those Indians to Christianity, why, the Government would be wanting in its duty, wanting in its position as guardian of these Indians, if it did not join hands with the various bodies in attending to their religious culture. The fact is that there is no such *crux* in this matter; it is a confusion of language, and the eloquence of my hon. friend here (Mr. Landerkin) which is always amusing, and the logic of my hon. friend from Bothwell, which is always irresistible, at the present time are both at fault.

Mr. BLAKE. I find in this return just placed in my hands, that there are 84 Church of England schools, 33 Methodist schools, 80 Roman Catholic schools, and 10 Presbyterian schools throughout the Dominion, which are assisted by Government grants. To all this the advocate for the separation of Church and State sees no objection; but I am sorry to grieve his soul by telling him that there are 16 non-denominational schools which he ought to move should be abolished in face of the equities as applied to the Red population, as compared with the equities as applied to the White population.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The theory that this Government should undertake the religious care of the people of this country, which has been propounded by the hon. member for Assiniboia——

Mr. DAVIN. No. I distinctly said that the Indians are not of the people at all; they are outside the people of this country, they are the wards of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood the hon. member to say that it was the duty of this Government to take care of the religious culture of the people of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe the Church is the legitimate agency to look after the religious culture of the people of this country. I think it would be lamentable for this Government, or for any one on the floor of this House, to give expression to any idea that would lead the people to believe that the functions that belong to the Church can be arrogated by the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the explanation of this item of $300 for four working oxen for the Sarcee reserve.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These cattle were purchased in 1888-89, but the vouchers were not presented in time fer the accounts to be paid out of the vote; in consequence, I am obliged to ask the money now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes it that the price reaches $100 per acre for 3 acres for St. Paul's Industrial School?

Mr. DEWDNEY. An examination was made of the site, and it was found that if three acres in question could be obtained a very large extent of drainage would be obviated. It was high land, and it was found more economical to build the institution on it. After consultation with the Public Works Department and the agent of the Interior Department it was thought desirable to procure it; and we saved money by doing so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of St. Paul's Industrial School?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This amount will complete it; I think the total cost will be between $12,000 and $13,000 The institution is about twelve miles from Winnipeg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long have any of these schools been in operation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Qu'Appelle school has been at work for four years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have any Indians been turned out yet?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, several; and several of these are now working their own farms on the reserve. The other day I received a letter from one of these Indians, a nicely written epistle, referring to some matters of his own. Several girls have also left the institution and gone into domestic service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the special object of the institution was to train them so that they might afterwards be employed in teaching and educating their own people.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The argument adduced when the subject was brought up was that the girls should be educated as well as the boys, in order that the Indian boys when they left the institutions would be able to marry Indian girls who had been equally well educated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A return brought down does not give any further information than financial particulars as to salaries and votes of money. It would be convenieut to have a statement submitted containing all the information on this subject.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will attend to the hon. gentleman's request.

Mr. CHARLTON. How long has this institution at Regina been in operation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The principal was appointed at the end of last summer, and the school has merely gone into operation?

Mr. CHARLTON. How large a quantity of wood did this individual guard, for which I find an item: "John Russell, guarding wood, &c, on St. Peter's reserve, $442?"

Mr. DEWDNEY. Several thousands of cords of wood were cut on the reserve, on the road allowance on the south side of St. Peter's reserve and on the east side of the river. After it had been piled it was found to be disappearing very rapidly, and it was necessary to employ men to watch it. Two or three prosecutions occurred, and then the thieving stopped. Not only was that timber watched, but also timber on other parts of the reserve. I made special enquiries in regard to this matter, and I found we saved money by having this timber watched, or it would have disappeared altogether.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a point to which I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention. It is quite right to guard the interests of the reserve, but, as the hon. Minister knows, there are sometimes cases where, in consequence of the Indians, white people suffer. There is at present at Medicine Hat the case of Saunderson, which I brought before Mr. Hayter Reed recently, and I sent to him the full papers, which he no doubt sent to the hon. Minister. I had several cases, before the hon. gentleman became Minister, in regard to these matters : and what I find is, that whenever a white man suffers at the hands of the Indians there is from the Department of Indian Affairs—whether Mr. White is Minister of Indian Affairs, or Mr. Vankoughnet is Deputy Minister, or Mr. Hayter Reed is communicated with—a *non possumus* always ; there is great unwillingness to acknowledge that they should pay for any depredation on the part of the Indians, or any loss whatever suffered in consequence of the Indians. One of the arguments used does not strike me as altogether conclusive, although I admit to some extent the force of it. One of the arguments is, that if we once admit there is a claim, we open a gate through which improper and unjust demands will enter. I grant the danger that if we admit claims recklessly we shall have a sufficient number of claims, but I think, in the case of Saunderson, and in one case which happened at Touchwood Hills, there was a *primâ facie* case made out. All I would at present urge on the attention of the Minister is this, that, if I may use a word which has become classical in this House, some *modus vivendi* might be arrived at, some means whereby we might ensure the repayment of the loss of a white settler, when he really suffered loss, and also guard against unjust claims being presented and prosecuted and made effectual. I do not want at present to press this matter more than merely to call the attention of the Minister to it.

To pay the over-expenditure as per statement attached in passing Robinson Treaty annuities during five years, from 1884 to 1889..... $2,620 76

Mr. DEWDNEY. It appears that a census is taken of the Hurons every five years, and during some years we required a little more money than we voted and some years a little less. In 1884 and 1885 we did not expend all the vote, but in 1886, 1887 and 1889, more Indians came in and we over-expended. The total amount expended was $4,799.76, and the total unexpended, $2,179, leaving this balance of $2,620.76.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is about time that this little difficulty should be settled between the Governments. My impression is that the Ontario Government is responsible for the annuity. That is my contention, and I think it has been adopted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are quite right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance whether these long-pending disputes between Ontario and Quebec are in process of settlement ?

Mr. FOSTER. They are in process of settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have heard the statement for the last eight or ten years, that they were going to be settled within a year.

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Mr. FOSTER. They are in satisfactory process of settlement. The case is being mutually made up for final settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time do you expect to complete it ?

Mr. FOSTER. I hope before the 1st July next.

To enable Department to pay certain amounts for medical services (Indians, Nova Scotia) which the appropriation for 1889-90 was insufficient to cover..... $500

Mr. KIRK. Can the Minister tell us who received this money ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I recollect at this moment only the names of two. They are both Drs. Allison, father and son, I think, but they live at different parts of the Province.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In what county ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Digby.

Mr. KIRK. Could the hon. Minister tell me whether there have been any changes made in the physicians appointed to attend to the Indians in Antigonish and Guysborough ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are no changes that I know of.

Mr. KIRK. There used to be a physician at Guysborough and one in Antigonish, and I hold in my hand a letter from the Indian agent actually dismissing one of these physicians, and the agent informed the other physician that he could not guarantee any payment for medicine given to the Indians, because the Department comtemplated a change. This was some time in May last, and that is the reason I asked the Minister whether a change had not been made. I will read the letter of the agent, which is as follows :—

"HEATHERTON, 8th May, 1889.

"J. C. MACKINNON, M.D.,
"Antigonish.

"DEAR SIR,—At the request of a large number of the Indians of this district who wished to have Dr. Cameron attend to them in their physical infirmities, I have consented to their wishes, and have this day wrote to Dr. Cameron to attend to the Indians. As it does not make much difference to you, you will, therefore, after this date not attend to the Indians. As I have to refuse them so many things, I did not feel like refusing this request of theirs, as I have no doubt you do not care.

"I am, yours truly,
"W. C. CHISHOLM."

This is the letter to the doctor at Antigonish, who had been attending the Indians for many years. He wrote to the doctor in Guysborough, from whom he received a reply, dated March 31, 1890, as follows :—

"We have a number of Indians here who require medical treatment, and I think it is very unfair that they are deprived of medical aid. I have had to refuse them treatment for some time past, as the Indian agent at Heatherton wrote not to give them anything further. He said he could not guarantee my bill, as the Department at Ottawa contemplated making a change."

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I may be able to explain that. My deputy did contemplate making a change, with the object of reducing the medical expenses in both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. He submitted his proposition to me, and after consulting the gentlemen from that part of the country, I considered that it was not practicable, and I so informed my deputy. Probably that might have been the change intimated to the

agent. I may state that we have a good deal of difficulty in regard to medical services in both of those Provinces. The Indians wander about a good deal, and when they are away from home they go to a doctor without having received any order from the agent; so that bills are forwarded to us from medical men in different parts of the Provinces, without any certificate from the agent, and we have to take a round-about way to get the certificate. The medical service in both those Provinces is very unsatisfactory, and I hope to get it on a better footing. With regard to Dr. Cameron—I do not recollect his name—I will enquire into the matter if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. KIRK. I have only this to say with regard to the reduction of expenses, that I am sure the Minister could not contemplate making much reduction in the district I refer to, because the medical officers in that district, which comprises two counties, and in which there are 168 Indians, were confined to $80 a year.

Towards cost of artesian well at Deloraine..... $2,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How many artesian wells have the Government aided in being sunk in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and to what extent have they been sunk?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There has been very little done in Manitoba. The only work of any magnitude in that respect has been at Deloraine, where a well is now sunk to a depth of something over 1,400 feet, and it is confidently anticipated that the same current of water will be reached there that was reached at Devil's Lake, 60 miles to the south, where a very powerful well, one of the most powerful, I think, on the continent, has been struck. It was visited by Dr. Selwyn last year, and we find that at Deloraine the boring is through exactly similar strata. The borers have reached the stratum next above the gravel from which the water was obtained at Devil's Lake, and we anticipate with great certainty that we shall get a powerful flow of water.

Mr. CHARLTON. How copious is the flow at Devil's Lake?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know exactly, but the stream which is from a 7-inch pipe, is thrown about 15 feet in the air.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was put down by private enterprise, I believe?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

North-West Mounted Police—further amount required..... $30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does this come to be required?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, the estimate was rather too moderate last year. In the second place, in consequence of the failure of the crop, there has been an enormous rise in the cost of forage for the whole force. This amount of $30,000 in excess of the original estimate, has been rendered necessary in consequence of the failure of the crops in certain portions of the Territories, particularly in the northern districts, owing to drought. In the fiscal year of 1888-89 oats cost 37 to 38 cents per bushel, while those required for the current fiscal year, 1889-90, cost $1.25 per bushel. At Regina, oats this year cost 54 cents per bushel, against 20 cents last year; and hay has also been scarce and expensive throughout the Territories. Potatoes were a total failure at Battleford, Prince Albert and Edmonton. Despite this rise in prices, the police force has not cost more than in former years. In 1887-88, it cost $862,965; in 1888-89, $829,701; in 1889-90, we voted last Session $723,000 and are now voting $30,000, making a total of $753,426. Thus the expenditure for the fiscal year 1888-89 was $32,364 less than in 1887-88, and the expenditure for the fiscal year 1889-90 is $76,000 less than 1888-89, even with this additional $30,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that, both in explanation of this item and of the item passed to provide seed grain for the Indians, great distress is laid on this drought. Over what area did that extend?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That extended pretty generally throughout our reserve, but more along the line of railway in the south than in the north. Potatoes, which were put in later than the grain, were put into dry ground, there was not sufficient moisture to start them, and the potato crop especially, and the root crop generally, was a total failure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far east did it commence?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It commenced west of the western boundary of Manitoba, and extended along the railway, principally south of the railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. South of the railway covers what used to be described as the arid belt, and, I am afraid, only too truly. This is not the first, nor the second, nor the third time in which we have had droughts prevailing over great portions of the Territories, east and west, along the Canadian Pacific Railway in that region.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of the small arms with which the Mounted Police are armed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You will find all that in the report. There are a great many Winchester repeating rifles, which are found to be very efficient.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have precautions been taken to prevent the Indians from obtaining these improved arms? It has been found in the United States that the Indian warriors obtained the best class of arms and ammunition, and the Indian wars cost the United States Government many millions of dollars. If our Government are not alive to the importance of this matter, it may result in great trouble to ourselves in the future.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is possible to prevent traders crossing the line at all points and bringing in arms. I will, however, remind the hon. gentleman that, when I made the proposition some time ago, and asked for a vote of money in order to get a supply of fowling pieces, so as to induce the Indians to exchange and give them a sum of money, there was a great deal of laughter on the other side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far did the projected exchange with the Indians work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it was successful.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the number of Mounted Police ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One thousand men.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman anticipate being able to reduce that number ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand, when we have a railway from one end of the country to the other, why it is necessary to have a thousand men there at a cost of a million dollars a year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, there is a railway running from opposite Dover right through Europe, and I do not think that decreases the number of police in Russia or Germany or any of the countries on the continent of Europe, and we have a country to look after as large as any of them and a little larger. The one thousand men here are doing the work it takes twenty thousand men to do in the United States.

Mr. McMULLEN. What number of arrests were there last year, and convictions ? What particular work have they done ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would recommend my hon. friend to read this little volume, which is the yearly report, and he will find all he wants there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman read it himself ? I think he confessed last year to not having read it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not read it last year, but I did this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman were disposed to be economical, he might fairly hold out some hope for this House and the country that, at no very distant day, he would be able to reduce that enormous expenditure on the Mounted Police. The people are paying a million dollars a year to support the Mounted Police, and a million a year to feed the Indians. The hon. gentleman told us, some years ago, that we were going to have a mine of wealth in that country, that we were going to have some $60,000,000 out of it by the year 1890. In place of that we are spending enormous sums there and getting nothing back. We are burying money there. I suppose the hon. gentleman anticipates a return at some future day, but it will be long after he has ceased to sit here and many others of us I am afraid, judging by the way it is being administered now, what with Indian reserves, donations to church schools, and all that sort of thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says we are spending a million dollars a year upon the Indians, and that that is a very great extravagance. If he would suggest a mode of decreasing that expenditure, we would be very glad to carry it out. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has read Dean Swift's suggestions as to the best means of reducing the expenses of the people in Ireland. He suggested that, by judicious training, the people might eat one another up, and so the expense would be saved. As long as the Indians are in the North-West we cannot allow them to starve.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not give us ancient history ; give us something modern.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has been making modern suggestions, and I am giving him ancient illustrations. As to the thousand men in the Mounted Police, I say that is a very moderate force for that country. I believe we will have to increase that number. I believe there will be a great body of miners coming in from the United States. The hon. gentleman is not ignorant, I hope, of the large mineral resources which are being developed in the North-West and in British Columbia, not to speak of Ontario and the eastern part of Canada. I believe there will be a large influx of population there, and perhaps it will be an unruly population. Of course those people will be a great source of wealth, but the law must be maintained, and we must not have scenes in that country such as we read of in Bret Harte's works and elsewhere, as having occurred in California during the mining craze. I cannot hold out any hope of reducing the Mounted Police force, at all events for some time to come.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DAVIN. I desire, Sir——

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I have the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has the floor.

Mr. DAVIN. For once I have repressed the irrepressible. I am sick——

Mr. MITCHELL. I know you are.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sick of hearing such remarks as have fallen from the hon. member from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in reference to the North-West. He comes here to tell us in doleful tones that we are spending a million of dollars a year on the Mounted Police, and spending a large amount of money on the Indians. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, has properly stated that that country has been taken from the Indians and that we cannot allow them to starve, and, at the same time, that there is a necessity for keeping up the Mounted Police force. When the hon. gentleman speaks of getting nothing from the North-West, let him talk to the merchants in his own part of the country ; let him talk to the merchants in Wellington or in any part of western Canada ; let him talk to the merchants in Toronto —as I talked to them no longer ago than Saturday last—and they will tell him, that among their best customers now are the people of the North-West. We are paying taxes, we are consuming goods on which we pay taxes which help to support the country, and it is an unstatesmanlike view to take this position, which I have known taken by children —I have known children sow seed in a flower pot and expect it to germinate in a few hours, and that is the position taken by the hon. gentleman. The North-West is a country possessing vast wealth. You must not only look to the present and to what is tangibly before you, which is a very large matter even now, but you must look to the country as it will be in the future, which will repay a hundredfold all you are expending upon it to-day.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have heard such statements from better authorities than the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Years ago we heard statements from the Government benches as to the enormous wealth we were going to receive from that North-West. We have to express the regret that we are compelled to expend the enormous amount of money which we have to expend there. The right hon. gentleman asks me if I have read Dean Swift. I did read Dean Swift years ago, but of recent years I have been studying the political history of Sir John A. Macdonald, more particularly in regard to the North-West, and I say that the money he expends there is enormously extravagant, and is a great drain upon the people of this country. I am sure that that country could be administered far more economically if another Government were in power. If the hon. gentleman desires me to suggest, as he says, the way to reduce the expenditure in that country, I would suggest that he should cut off his inspectors of ranching lands, his inspectors of colonisation companies, his inspectors of timber limits, and other persons of that kind. Let him cut off the enormous expenses now incurred for supplies for the Indians. Not 40 per cent. of the amount expended for the Indians goes to them. About 60 per cent. goes to the officials of the hon. gentleman. If the right hon. gentleman would study economy, he might easily reduce the expenditure; but that is a thing he never gave any attention to, at all events politically.

Mr. MITCHELL. I only desired to say that I thought it extremely hard on my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to have to take the course he has done to-night. He occupied the time of the House for two or three days in endeavoring to get justice done to the North-West and to regulate the Mounted Police, and I confess I am a little amazed now that he should quietly and tamely submit to swallow everything he said, to swallow all the charges he brought against Colonel Herchmer, that he should trample under foot all the positions he then took, and should renounce that independence which many of us thought would place him in the foremost ranks of the members of this House. But we find that he has had to swallow all that, as we have found other members have had to do in this House, and that he has had to come back under the crack of the party whip. That is what my hon. friend from Assiniboia has done. To-night he had an opportunity of showing whether his independence was simulated or real, and I am afraid he has shown that it was simulated. An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House said to me: "What will you do with Davin now you have got him?"—that was just after his independent speech. I said: "I do not know whether we have got him."

Mr. DAVIN. It is sure you have not got him.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is a man I admire very much. I admire his ability and his eloquence, but Davin has not any staying powers about him. That is what is the matter with Davin.

Skeena Expedition $5,441 08

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the entire cost of that expedition?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the entire cost as far as this Government is concerned. A very much larger claim was submitted by the Government of British Columbia, and when Mr. Robson was here a year ago, this was gone into, and this was the compromise arrived at. I think their claim was nearly double this amount, but this was the arrangement arrived at. A Governor General's warrant was obtained for the amount, but the Auditor General thought it would be better that the amount should appear in the Estimates, and it is there for the purpose of being paid through British Columbia. It has not been paid yet, but will be when this vote is passed.

To pay the cost of the suit of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. *vs.* The Queen $1,800

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman give us some explanation with regard to the gross amount paid out in this connection?

Mr. LANDERLIN. In the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) don't you think, Mr. Chairman, this item should stand? He will probably be able to give explanations better than any one else. He will be able to tell us the full amount that has been expended by the country in this suit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount expended on this up to date?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The total amount paid, including this vote, is $14,152.67.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am informed that, in addition to this large expenditure which has been inflicted upon us in this matter, this company have actually entered a suit in the Exchequer Court for the purpose of recovering a very large sum of money from the Dominion of Canada, by reason of having been induced to make arrangements and expend moneys for the purpose of carrying on works on the land which was granted to them. Is the Minister of Justice aware that that is the case?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount they claim?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I stated to the House, last Session, in answer, I think, to the hon. gentleman himself, the amount of their claim, which I do not remember at present. The claim was reported on by myself, and I gave an assurance to the House that it would not be paid without the House being consulted. The claim, in consequence of my report, was not paid, and it is in controversy now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is really a little too persistent. It is a very delicate subject that he is trenching upon just now. After the election of Saturday last in which the Equal Rights party have shown such a tremendous strength, a strength that appalls the whole of us—perhaps the right hon. gentleman not less than some of the rest of us—I think my hon. friend is, perhaps, pressing the Government a little unfairly, I do not think, if the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) adheres to his present course, this thing is likely to occur again. He may be condoned for the past, but I do not think he will get many more briefs of that kind. I think that after the demonstration of Saturday last, which showed

that the Equal Rights party, that have been so much laughed at, have proved themselves to be a factor in the elections of this country, my hon. friend might let this thing quietly rest.

Mr. LAURIER. Notwithstanding the suggestion of my hon. friend, I would like to get a little more information. The Minister of Justice told us there was a claim. How much is it? In the neighborhood of $100,000, I suppose.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a general claim for damages. The claim is still in controversy.

Mr. LAURIER. What stage has it reached now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The greater part of the evidence, I think, has been taken, and it now stands for hearing, I think. It is before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. McMULLEN. What lawyers are acting on behalf of the Dominion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have Mr. Hogg, our regular agent, and Mr. Christopher Robinson.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the Minister of Justice kindly inform us who are the members of the St. Catharines Milling Company?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. To whom are the payments made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The lawyers get it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Ferguson is the solicitor of the company, and, I think, the payments have been made to him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to say to the Minister of Justice that there appears to be a mistake in the return brought down by the Government, in 1889, with reference to the fees paid on account of this company. According to the returns brought down the fees paid at that time amounted to $16,152.67.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that was an estimate of the whole sum.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; that is the return. I will read the order of the House:

"Return to an Order of the House of Commons dated the 8th February, 1889, for a return showing:

"1st. The full amount of legal and other expenses paid in connection with the suit 'The St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company *vs.* The Queen,' from the commencement of the suit up to the first of January, 1889.

"2nd. The party or parties to whom paid, and date of payment."

I understand the Minister to say that there was $14,152 paid, whereas the returns give $16,152.67.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was a vote last Session, which I do not remember. I think it is included in that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But that is only to the beginning of last Session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know an amount had been paid before that. I think that included the money that we voted last Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were there ever any dues collected from the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company on the timber they cut?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think there was some collected, I do not recollect the amount. They had some timber cut, I know.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman does not know whether those dues had been paid here or over to the Ontario Government, or if the Ontario Government claimed them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think not. There has been no negotiations so far with reference to that matter with the Ontario Government. Everything is in abeyance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the Ontario Government put in any claims for damages.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not that I know of.

Amount required to pay the cost of the suit of the Eau Clair and Bow River Lumber Company *vs.* The Queen... $1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A suit has been brought in the Exchequer Court against both this Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, after a lease had been granted, considered they had a right to cut timber, and they did cut timber on this limit; and there has been a claim pending during the last year or two. A suit has now been entered for $50,000.

Mr. LAURIER. For what is this money required?

Mr. DEWDNEY. To carry on the suit.

Mr. LAURIER. In a case of this nature, when the Government are asking money to carry on a suit, the papers should be laid before the House. It is only an act of simple justice that no grant should be asked, or vote passed, until full particulars are supplied.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The particulars are detailed in a paper which I hold in my hand, and which I will read.

Mr. LAURIER. Lay it on the Table. In the meantime, let the item stand.

Amount required to pay expenses in connection with the collection of seed grain advances in the North-West Territories..... $250

Mr. CHARLTON. What success has been met with in collecting amounts due for seed grain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In some parts of the country the efforts have been satisfactory, and in others not so. I do not exactly recollect the figures, but the returns have been more satisfactory with respect to the late issues of seed grain than with respect to those of former years.

Mr. CHARLTON. About how much has been advanced altogether in furnishing seed grain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. During the last twelve years about $140,000, of which we have received in repayment between $40,000 and $50,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume the present supplies of seed grain are purchased in the North-West out of the 640,000,000 bushels, which form the annual crop of that country.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the system of distributing seed grain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Applications are made for the grain to the party who is authorised to issue

it. In this case the party is Mr. McKay, manager of the Experimental Farm. The seed is delivered at the most central points of the districts from which applications have been received. Applications are received, and a lien is taken on the homestead for the value of the grain advanced.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the granting of a loan of seed grain depend at all upon the character of the applicant?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It does.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the principles which govern the agent in refusing or granting an application?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The agricultural societies, which know the position of every settler, make representations, and these grants are made on the recommendations of the agricultural societies, or of the president or secretary.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the invariable rule?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; wherever there is an agricultural society. That was the rule this year.

Mr. MULOCK. Was it the rule in 1886?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not sure; I do not think so. I had nothing to do with the matter then.

Mr. MULOCK. It was stated, perhaps incorrectly, and, therefore, I do not in the slightest degree corroborate or endorse the statement, that prior to the elections in the North-West applications for seed grain were made through prospective candidates for Parliament. I should like to know whether the present members are to have a hand in the granting of these applications? I should like to know if the granting of these applications is to depend entirely on business principles, or if political influence is to be a factor in the transaction?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Only on business principles. I do not think a member from the North-West has been consulted by his constituents in a single instance. The action taken by the members is in bringing pressure to bear on the Government in the interest of their district obtaining seed grain.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the security is ample, if the Government chose to force the claim? What is the rate of interest charged on these advances?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The rate is 6 per cent.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose it is not intended to specially favor the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) by placing special patronage in his hands?

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to seed grain that has been distributed this year, all I can say is this, that if I had to express my feelings about it my sentiments would be that my constituency had been treated badly; but I have no doubt it was purely accidental that parts of my district which required seed grain have not got it. In fact we did not at first think that Western Assiniboia needed much grain, and one portion of it, Moose Jaw, boldly stated that none was needed, and around Regina they have not needed any; but some has been required at Maple Creek, and I believe they have received a quantity. I am also glad to know that some has been supplied to Dunmore. So far as I am concerned, I have found that the whole matter of distribution has been placed entirely in the hands of Angus McKay, and the grain is to be distributed according to certain rules laid down, and in fact my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) may possess his soul in peace. I have had very little to do with the matter, and the amount that has been distributed in my district is, I believe, infinitesimal.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not believe that it is otherwise than germane to the occasion to enquire whether, after favoring the giving of seed grain to the settlers in the Territories, the hon. gentleman is also going to give them the benefit of the ballot?

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), when the Territories Act comes down from the Senate in a few days, will propose a clause in favor of the ballot, I will support it.

Mr. MULOCK. Will you vote for it?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; I will vote for it.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid I will lose the motion then.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. Minister say that the amount advanced to these people for seed grain is recorded against the land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any parties who have received grain more than once?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The instructions given to Mr. McKay this year were to issue no seed grain to parties who had already received some, and who had a lien on their property. He found when he looked into the matter, that there were some who had already received seed grain who were just as much in want of it as those who did not receive any at all. On representation to me, I authorised him to give a small amount of seed grain to some who had received it before.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, in some cases, there are two seed grain encumbrances on the locations of these people. Are there more than two in any case?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Have all the amounts borrowed by the Province of Manitoba in regard to seed grain, been paid, or what percentage has been paid?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is quite a large amount that has not been paid off. I find that about $140,000 worth of grain has been distributed, out of which we have received back between $40,000 and $50,000. The largest amounts that have not been paid are for the advances made in the early days of Manitoba.

Mr. MULOCK. At what price do you sell this grain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The settlers receive it at the cost price. This year they only had to pay the actual cost of the purchase, as the Canadian Pacific Railway transported it free of charge.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where was this grain purchased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. McKay purchased every bushel of it. He purchased the wheat at different

points in the Territories, and he purchased the oats in the neighborhood of Toronto. I think he paid 40 or 50 cents a bushel for the oats, and it had to be extra clean for the purpose of seed.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many bushels of wheat were purchased, and at what price?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There have been $31,500 for seed grain; 12,000 bushels oats, and the balance was expended for first class hard red Fyfe wheat, extra clean, at 85 cents a bushel.

Mr. BLAKE. Could the hon. gentleman say what acreage in wheat and what acreage in oats, he has provided for in this way? Or can he tell us the usual rate per bushel to the acre?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think about 2 bushels to the acre of oats, and about the same for wheat. If it is sown by the drill it takes a little less than if it is sown broadcast.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the Minister say over what extent of country it was distributed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. From the western boundary of Manitoba as far as Medicine Hat, an extent of about 400 miles east and west; and a small portion was distributed in the neighborhood of Prince Albert.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose it was distributed on account of the failure of crops the previous year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; because some localities were much more seriously injured than others, and in some districts the crops were destroyed more by gophers than by drought.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any concerted action been taken by municipal or local organisations with reference to the destruction of these gophers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. For a year or two the municipality offered a small bonus of a cent a tail, but it amounted to so much that it got beyond their means. This year the Legislative Assembly voted $1,000 for the purchase of strychnine to poison them.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand it was stated, that when the tails were taken off, the gophers were allowed out to breed again.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was stated.

Mr. CHARLTON. They do not retail.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall ask an appropriation later, for the purchase of traps to destroy the gophers. The settlers pretend that the Government land unoccupied, affords breeding grounds for these gophers, and while they might destroy them in their own fields, they cannot get rid of them on the Government lands. I think the traps would be better than the strychnine; or at all events they would be safer.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it not a fact that these gophers have been increasing rapidly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. During the dry seasons of the last two or three years, they have increased rapidly. The wet seasons seem to drown them in their holes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state what quantity of grain was distributed, and among how many settlers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The return has not yet reached me, but the largest amount given to one man, I hear, was sixteeen bushels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have the settlers recently arrived in the country, or are they old settlers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have been a year and over in the country.

Mr. BLAKE. They are all persons who have raised—or tried, at any rate, to raise—one crop?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. How were the oats purchased? Was a tender asked?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No. We were pressed for time, and Mr. McKay went around and got samples. They were extra good oats, and they were bought at the lowest price at which they could be obtained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister if any farmers have succeeded in raising crops in the vicinity of Medicine Hat, or within 200 miles to the eastward?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, yes; excellent crops. The best barley which is grown in the whole of the Territories was grown within a mile or two of Medicine Hat last year. It was superior to the sample of barley sent from England to the Minister of Agriculture to be distributed this year; and some of the finest wheat fields I have seen in the country have been in the neighborhood of Medicine Hat. The fact is that even the driest soil in the country, when ploughed, affords a kind of reservoir to hold the moisture, and the country improves every year that it is cultivated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When I was in Medicine Hat, I did not see any vegetation more than a foot high. I understood that the soil was good, but that the rainfall was not sufficient, and I am asking for information, whether several dry seasons do not succeed each other in succession, and whether a crop is not the exception rather than the rule?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman did not go very far north or south of the railway. The land along the rivers is drier than it is a few miles back. Although it has a dry appearance, if the rain comes at the proper time, it is all right.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand, however, that there have been three unusually dry seasons there lately, and that we may expect a cycle of damper seasons. For instance, I was told by a friend of mine who not long ago visited the thriving settlement of Moosomin, where a lake, which I have seen marked on the plans and maps as Moosomin Lake, existed no longer, that during the last three years it had dried up. Therefore, it is to be supposed there has been an unusual drought, and that the country will be better in the future.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that is very likely, because I have seen roads made by Half-breed carts crossing lakes in which there was several feet of water, but which to-day are thoroughly dry.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see the hon. First Minister looking very earnestly at me, and I will bring to his recollection the fact that when reciting the history of the evils that befell the people of this country at the time the hon. member for East

York was in power, he stated that they had first the Colorado potato bug, and then the weevil in the wheat, which he attributed to the reign of my hon. friend. I would like to ask him to what he attributes the enormous swarm of gophers in the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It shows that the country is a splendid country for the development of animal life, and it will be so when we have a sufficient number of two-legged animals called men up there.

Mr. McNEILL. I may say to my hon. friend from North Wellington that we have some reason to believe that the gophers were starved in Dakota, and went over to our North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of the Interior has stated that 20,000 bushels of oats were bought at 45 cents a bushel. I know a little about the price of oats, because I sat in the train with a man a week or two ago who was coming to the Toronto market to sell 100,000 bushels of oats, at 35 cents a bushel, half of which he had selected for seed. In the town where I live the highest price oats have reached is 30 cents, and it is surprising to me if the hon. gentleman was in such a spirit that he had to run for these oats to the first man he could find. I would like to know the name of the party from whom they were bought, and the particular kind they are.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall be glad to bring down the return as soon as it reaches me; but I may say that if ever a country was cursed Ontario was cursed with the kind of oats that were sent out in 1886. They were half mustard seed; and I was determined that the oats I got this year should be perfectly clean seed, even if they should be a little more expensive; but at the same time that we were making enquiries about oats, Sir John Lister-Kaye was here making enquiries for 20 carloads of oats which he was to take to the North-West, part for feed and part for seed. That was some six weeks or two months before we bought our seed; and if I am not mistaken he paid nearly as much as we did, although we went to far greater trouble in making a selection. If we have the seed grain Mr. McKay says we have we have got it cheap.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe the statement made that Sir John Lister-Kaye, in connection with the company, is likely to cease.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That does not hurt the oats.

Mr. BLAKE. The oats might have hurt him.

Mr. DEWDNEY. From the correspondence I have had with him, he is in this position: that, if he has now severed his connection as manager of the company, he has taken the management of a company far more extensive; and if he does not carry out the programme he has in view with regard to a scheme of colonisation, he will return as manager of the company.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If the hon. gentleman wants to get the best seed oats growing in British North America he has only to come to Prince Edward Island. I can substantiate my statement by referring to exhibitions to which oats were sent, both in this and the old country, and they were found superior to all others.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am exceedingly sorry the Minister of the Interior should have cast the reflection he did upon the farmers of Ontario, when he said he had to use a great deal of care in selecting oats so as to avoid mustard, and that a large amount of the seed got from Ontario in past years was full of mustard. I have travelled a good deal in Ontario, and so has the hon. gentleman, and there is very little mustard to be seen there. It is unfair for the hon. gentleman to cast such a reflection upon the Ontario farmer. I do not know in my section, of one field where there is mustard among the oats. The hon. gentleman has no right to decry our country in the public prints by telling the people who are about to emigrate from the old world and come to Ontario, not to come because it is full of must. Every Canadian knows that must is a hard thing to get in Ontario. In justice to our country the hon. gentleman ought to retract that statement.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I travelled through Ontario a little last summer, and while I did pass through some sections where we saw no mustard, I passed through others where I saw none thicker.

Expenses of Government in the North-West Territories:—To pay for the construction of a bridge across Sturgeon River, Edmonton, North-West Territories..... $5,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is about the length of this bridge.

Mr. DEDWNEY. About one-eighth of a mile. Some six or seven years ago the North-West Government bought the bridge across the Sturgeon river at Battleford. It had been built by the church authorities as a toll bridge, and as the settlement increased on the north side of the river the Government bought it. It gradually fell into bad repair, and last summer settlers were unable to bring any heavy loads across. Application was made for a new bridge. A strong appeal was made early in the winter for relief for some distressed people in that neighborhood, especially among the half-breed families, who were very destitute. I recommended to my colleagues that we should agree to build this bridge in order to give work to people who were anxious to work and had no means of sustenance. An offer was made to build the bridge for $5,000, which I knew was very cheap, and the Government sent our timber inspector, Mr. Addison, to superintend the bridge and to see that work was given to these destitute people.

Mr. BLAKE. I received a letter from that quarter about this matter, representing some of the hon. gentleman's benevolent operations not to have turned out exactly as he desired. The statement is made in this letter that the bridge was not worth what it cost, that it was built on what is called a store pay, and that the supplies given in lieu of wages were charged for at very extravagant prices, and that the transaction involved an enormous profit for the contractors, through the price being so extravagant, and the wages being paid in kind at unduly exorbitant rates. Would the hon. gentleman state whether the contract was ordered by competition, or what steps were taken in the matter?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The position was urgent, and there was not time to call for tenders. An offer was made by Mr. McKenna and Mr. Brousseau,

the one a half-breed and the other the gentleman who had charge of that bridge. I knew them both to be capable and straight-forward, and considered if we could get a substantial bridge built for $5,000 that would be very cheap. Consequently, I recommended that the offer of these gentlemen, which was also pressed upon us by people who lived in the neighborhood, should be accepted. Our officer reported it as excellent work.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps, as this transaction has been very exceptional, no tenders having been asked for and the work having to be done in a great hurry, the hon. gentleman will lay on the Table the contract and all the correspondence and reports, so that we may look at them before concurrence.

Mr. CHARLTON. What kind of timber will there be in the bridge?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The timber up there is principally spruce and pine. The bridge is on piles. A heavy pile driver had to be brought up from the railway. It is a bridge about 500 feet long with a 16-feet span.

Further amount required to defray the expenses of examining lands in the C.P.R. belt which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have proposed to class as lands not fairly fit for settlement.....	$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad if the hon. Minister of the Interior would inform us, as nearly as he can, what percentage of lands west of Regina, along the Canadian Pacific Railway up to Medicine Hat, the company propose to accept, and what percentage they intend to reject?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About this time last year, I think the hon. gentleman asked for the same information. At that time the Canadian Pacific Railway had selected some 8,400,000 acres. They had intimated their intention of selecting that amount, and last year I asked for a vote for the purpose of employing one of our chief officers with a small staff to go over and inspect the lands, some of which the Canadian Pacific Railway had indicated they would not accept. We have had a full and complete return in regard to that, and since that time the Canadian Pacific Railway have selected more lands in the belt, making up nearly 10,000,000 acres. They admit now something over 9,000,000 acres, and they expect before the inspection is concluded to select the rest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is from the base of the Rocky Mountains to the old western boundary of Manitoba.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It includes more than that. It includes their reserve to the south in Manitoba and along the railway belt proper from Winnipeg to within 30 or 40 miles of the summit of the Rocky Mountains.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does that mean in reference to Southern Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The reason for the extension of the limit south in Manitoba was that, when they commenced the construction of the road, so much land had been granted within 20 miles of the railway that there was virtually nothing there, and therefore the land from which they could choose was extended to the southern boundary.

Mr. BLAKE. What we want to know is what is the difference between what they take and the total amount they could take in the railway belt.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think there are about 12,000,000 acres in the railway belt proper.

Mr. BLAKE. So there will be 2,000,000 acres more?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very important item. I understood from the statement of the Minister, that there has been a report made already. If there has been a report, I think the House would be very much interested in having that report, and seeing what progress has been made, and how the matter stands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall be very glad to bring all the information down with the plans.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the company have selected all the lands in the railway belt, where is the tract which the Government bought from the company at $1.50 an acre, amounting to over $6,000,000?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As the hon. gentleman is aware, the amount of land to which the company were entitled was 25,000,000 acres. Of that, 6,000,000 or more were taken back, leaving about 18,000,000 acres for the company to select from. There have been some negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the retention of the land which should revert to the Government, and the negotiations are, I think, very near completion: and I believe a very satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at, satisfactory in this regard, that we shall be able to come to an agreement in the near future and settle the whole question of the railway lands, and throw open any portions of those lands which are now locked up.

Mr. BLAKE. There is, or there used to be, a very large block reserved to the north in the Saskatchewan district for them to make a selection out of. Is it in reference to that area that the hon. gentleman means arrangements are being made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; there are some 19,000,000 acres in that northern block, in the best part of the Territories.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the hon. gentleman does not expect to take any land back of the 10,000,000 which have been selected in the railway belt?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think we shall take any of that land in the railway belt proper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not answer the question which I asked, as to how much of the land from the western boundary of Manitoba as at present constituted up to Medicine Hat, the company had agreed to accept and how much they propose to return in that tract.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Unless I had the plan before me, I could hardly state that definitely. There is a very small portion which they have not selected—certainly not over 500,000 acres.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman be able to lay on the Table the plan of which he speaks?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Certainly, I will do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you could do it to-morrow?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It will be the original, which I will have to take away again, but I think I could do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will place the original on the Table, we could obtain an idea of this matter.

Relief of distress among Half-breeds in the North-West Territories..... $1,000

Mr. LAURIER. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Relief was asked for some Half-breeds who had left the Cumberland district on the Saskatchewan, and had moved up towards Prince Albert. Most of these were Half-breeds who had left the treaties some time before, and they followed some Indians who were going up to Fort à la Corne. They were in a state of destitution, and this is to recoup the amount of the assistance which was given to them by the police.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says that these Half-breeds were in a state of destitution. I understand that destitution has been prevalent amongst the Half-breeds in more districts than one. I am not quarrelling with the hon. gentleman for this vote; it may be all right, but I would enquire if there were any petitions from these Half-breeds, and if they were supported by missionaries or agents or other parties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot recollect at the moment from whom the applications came, excepting that I know they were recommended by Superintendent Perry, a superintendent of the Mounted Police, and by Mr. Macdowall, who was then in the north, before he came down, and there may have been others.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall)?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. How is this distribution to be made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Mounted Police were instructed to issue it from their stores. That was the only way we could get supplies to them.

To pay for 25 copies of Taschereau's Work on Criminal Laws for Library exchanges, $10..... $250

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is the second edition of Judge Taschereau's work on criminal law, and I must say that this book is found not only useful but necessary for the Library. It was bought two years ago and delivered, and this vote should have been in last year's estimates. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that it is a most valuable contribution to the legal literature of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is supposed to be the judge of these books that are bought?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In this case I, myself, gave the order, as it was a work on criminal law.

Mr. LAURIER. I may remind my hon. friend that there is a standing rule of the Library which authorises the Library Committee to purchase valuable books published in the country for exchanges with foreign libraries. I can add my testimony to what has been said by the Secretary of State that the book is a very valuable one. It is in English.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was an order that these books should be bought by the Librarian.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In the future the Librarian will buy such books as these, but these were bought before the order was passed that such books should be bought by the Librarian.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not suppose, surely, that the Library Committee are to buy these exchanges out of the ordinary vote given to them. The matter was brought up in the Library Committee the other day, and it was referred to a special committee to examine into the question. We understood that these books had to be purchased heretofore by the executive, and after examining into the matter we thought we would let it rest where it was. We did not think that out of the grants to the Library for ordinary purposes, we could appropriate money for exchanges.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The result will be, in the future, that the Government will be less able than in the past to encourage literature of this country by purchasing works even on scientific questions, because the Librarian will have to buy them, or they will not be bought at all.

Mr. DAVIN. As a member of the Library Committee, I must endorse what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says. Our grant at present is barely sufficient to meet the wants of the Library. If the Library Committee is to buy works for exchanges, we have no objection to assume the responsibility, but the House will have to give us a larger grant, we cannot make bricks without straw. That is an Egyptian task.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The question is: Who is to select these books for exchanges? It may be proper to leave it to the Library Committee because they would be advised by the Librarian. The matter came up the other day, in a meeting of the Library Committee, with reference to a work that has been highly spoken of by hon. gentlemen, that is, Mr. Kingsford's History of Canada. I am not in a position to give a personal opinion about it, because I have only glanced at it, but we were not in a position to contribute anything towards purchasing that book, because we had no funds. I extremely regret that, because, from all that I can hear, the book deserves encouragement at the hands of this House, and we have been in the habit of purchasing a large number of books from year to year, written by native Canadians. I should like to have some expression of opinion on that matter from this Committee, because the Library Committee were in the unfortunate position of having been obliged to refuse the offer made by the author of the book.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think there is something indefinite in regard to this matter. I understand, that an Order in Council was passed several years ago directing that for the future the Library Committee should provide for these exchanges.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Only some months ago.

Mr. SCRIVER. I may have misunderstood the Librarian, but I understood him to say it was a year or two ago. In support of what my colleagues

on the Library Committee have said, I may say, that if this Order in Council is enforced, the Committee must have a larger grant than we have had heretofore, because we spend more than sufficient to provide for the yearly additions that the Librarian considers necessary for the Library.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the members of the Library Committee will not object to this.

Mr. SCRIVER. I certainly am not disposed to object.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the subject ought to receive very careful consideration, because the appropriation for the purpose of exchanges ought to depend upon what we receive from abroad, and our appropriation should be made in some degree adequate to fairly meet what we receive. It has been stated again and again by the former Librarian and by the present Librarian that we receive works of very considerable value from abroad, and that there were not amongst our own official publications anything that could be regarded as an adequate return for what we got. If that be so, then I think some little attention should be given to such works as that of Mr. Kingsford and this of Judge Taschereau. But the whole subject ought to depend upon what we get from abroad, and it should be carefully considered by the Library Committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may state that there are two more books which will probably be submitted to the Government, and which will come before the House for an appropriation, I mean the book of Dr. Bourinot, and another book by Judge Burbidge. I have heard Mr. Kingsford's book mentioned, but I am not so well acquainted with it as with the others. I understand these books mentioned are costly, and as we shall require 30 or 40 copies, and the Library Committee have not sufficient funds to purchase them, the House will have to grant a vote for that purpose. I think the Order in Council was passed chiefly to control the purchase of ordinary current literature.

Mr. BARRON. If possible, this work of Mr. Kingsford should be purchased. I have read the first volume, and I certainly think it is a very excellent literary effort, besides being a most excellent history, written on the line of Parkman's history of Canada. As to recognising literary talent, I think the time has come when some recognition should be made of a gentleman who has certainly developed most wonderful literary talent, I refer to Mr. Lampman, whose literary attainments have been recognised among the very foremost literary people in the United States. As one who knew him as a boy, and attended school with him, I am glad to be able to testify to this work, and I hope the Government will try and recognise Canadian talent at the right time; and the sooner, rather sooner than later, the hon. the First Minister is able to place Mr. Lampman in some position where he will be able to develop that wonderful literary talent given to him, not only to his own advantage but to the advantage of Canada, the better, so that the world may see that we recognise talent, as is done in other countries.

Mr. DAVIN. I quite see the difficulty that led the Government to transfer this duty to the Library Committee. The difficulty is palpable,

namely, the pressure that is put on a Minister of the Crown to buy books that are, as the Secretary of State indicates, really not books of that permanent character which should be bought by the Government. I am not sure, however, that the tribunal before which a book is now brought, namely, the Committee of which I am a member, is the most perfect tribunal for deciding as to whether a book should or should not be purchased at the public expense. But I will say this, and I believe I express the opinion of the Committee when I say that if we get the funds we are quite willing to undertake the duty, and to do it to the best of our ability. In regard to this book of Mr. Kingsford, I have read the first volume, and I must say that I regard the book as one that ought to be encouraged. However, I found when others and myself brought it before the Committee that a distinguished member of the Committee rose and spoke from the most stringent standpoint of supply and demand, as though you could apply the doctrine of supply and demand to literature in a country like this. If literature in a new country like Canada is to be encouraged, it will have to receive some encouragement from the Government. I found some hon. gentleman thought, and I have heard the opinion expressed in this House by hon. gentlemen who are not members of the Committee, that this history did not take the view—because I will not use the language they used—of certain events they would take. If you are going to say you will have nothing to do with patronising a history that will not satisfy everybody, where will you be? The one question which we must ask in regard to any literary work is this, is it of genuine literary value? If you are to say that a history must please everybody as to its opinions, who is satisfied with Macaulay, who is satisfied with Froude? Mr. Goldwin Smith will tell you—and I am not misrepresenting him because he has written it again and again—that Froude is a fabricator from beginning to end. Others will tell you that Macaulay is utterly unreliable, that he is a Whig the whole time, that when he paints the Tories he does so in the darkest hues, while when he pictures the Whigs he does so in bright colors and presents most charming features. I am very glad this subject has been brought up, because I may say that it would be a disgrace to Canada if a work so large in conception, so admirably executed, so universally recognised that the caustic *Saturday Review*, forgetting, when it took up that volume, its natural tendency to condemn, declared it was a most valuable contribution to historical knowledge, it would be a disgrace to Canada, I say, if such a work were not purchased for purposes of exchange and with a view to its encouragement. Under these circumstances, I am very glad the subject has been raised, and I hope the result will be that before this Parliament rises we will be placed in such a pecuniary position as to be able to buy some of these volumes. I may say in regard to Lampman: that I have read Lampman's works. The fact is he is a genuine poet. His song is not the mere echo of high poetic culture, he has a genuine note of his own; he has a genuine inspiration of his own; and so far as we can encourage him we ought to encourage him in the interests of Canada, because you may be sure of this, that the life-blood of a people is its literature, that the life-blood of a people is the genius that is put into

books. There is the life-blood from which statesmen, and merchants, and lawyers, and others draw their nutriment, and that is the centre and source of all the power.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think I am prepared to say like my hon. friend that literature is the life-blood of the people; but I am prepared to say that there are no people without literature; and if we have the ambition to form a nation, as we have, we cannot choose a better mode of promoting a national sentiment among us than by fostering, as much as possible, native literature and native talent. I do not know, however, how we can do it by the very inadequate measures we have taken so far. The most we have done has been to purchase books of our authors, and sometimes we have purchased several volumes. This, however, is not doing very much. But so long as we are not prepared to do something more in the way of grants, we cannot adopt any other policy other than that we have pursued thus far. The librarians are authorised to select one or two copies of all works published in Canada. The Government may also consider the propriety of selecting a few copies, twenty-five or fifty, of the more valuable works for the purpose of distribution abroad. The distribution of such a work as Mr. Kingsford's, if it were distributed for example to foreign libraries, would certainly increase public interest in Canadian history, because, although I have not read the whole work, I have read one or two portions, and the work has impressed me as one of more than ordinary value. So it is in regard to the poems of Mr. Lampman. If such volumes were purchased for exchange and circulation in foreign libraries, they could not but have the effect of recommending Canada, and of showing that we are a civilised nation if nothing else. I would go much further, though, perhaps, this is not the proper time to say so; and I would be disposed to favor a liberal expenditure for a proper encouragement not only of literature but of art, and of everything that would develop a national sentiment among us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When this conversation commenced across the floor, I was of the opinion that the Government were asking a sum to purchase books for the coming year. I am given to understand I am wrong in that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. With regard to the first three items the works have been purchased.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was on the Sub-Committee appointed by the Library Committee, and we found that in December, 1888, an Order in Council was passed, providing that thereafter books of that description were to be purchased by the Library Committee. That we thought was a very good Order in Council, and I hope it is going to be carried out. There is one exception to be taken to it. The Library Committee is the proper tribunal to select the books. I think that the amount given to the Library Committee ought to be slightly increased. I would like to know whether these books were purchased before the Order in Council was passed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. With the exception of the *Débats Parlementaires de Québec*, these books were all purchased before the Order in Council. If the duty of making the choice of books is tranferred from the Secretary of State to the Library Committee, or to the librarians themselves, I will certainly not complain of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me ridiculous that we should pay $8 a copy for forty copies of the Quebec Debates.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We were obliged to pay it. It is the current price and that is what the Quebec Government pay themselves.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I find that the report of the sub-Committee on the Library concludes by stating that the sub-Committee is of opinion that the grant for the Library is not large enough to justify the purchase of books of current native literature, and that money should be applied to purchase books for exchanges of a similar character to the exchanges we get from other countries. I hope that the Order in Council will be adhered to and that the Government will vote a reasonable sum for the Library Committee to carry it out.

The Committee rose and reported progress.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

(In the Committee.)

On section 55,

Mr. FOSTER. In that clause and in the three clauses succeeding, there are some provisions which it would be much better to leave out. I propose that after the word "mentioned," in the twenty-first line, and down to the word "thereafter," inclusive, in the twenty-fifth line be omitted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What the gentleman proposes now to do, is to reduce this from an unlimited liability to the amount of 13 per cent. on the whole circulation?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman considered the point to which I called his attention more than once, as to the possible risk which may be incurred? I have myself considered the fact, that there will be penalties provided, as was stated by the hon. Minister of Justice, but I fail to see that they will guard against the particular danger to which I called attention.

Mr. FOSTER. The attention of the Government has been given, both before and since my hon. friend's observations, to what he thinks the added risk in this matter. I am inclined to think that the added risk will not be probably so great as my hon. friend has thought. We must bear in mind that under the law as it now stands the notes are a first lien on the assets of the bank and on the stock double liability of the stockholders; and that was certainly—arguing from this standpoint—a temptation to an over-issue. I grant that the provisions of the guarantee fund add to the inducement, if any existed before; but I do not think it adds so greatly as to make it a matter of first rate importance. To guard against that, however, we propose to have a clause preventing the pledging, assigning or hypothecation of the notes of a bank, under heavy penalties, and also making any transaction based upon that illegal. Then, you have to take into account the supervision which we have

in the returns which the banks are required to make, with additions in the line of greater detail. Another factor in the scheme as brought down to the House, and as it will be worked, will be found in the careful and active co-operation of the banks with each other, as being now far more interested in the good management of each other and of the whole as contributors to a common guarantee fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Committee will observe that I am not of opinion that in the ordinary working of the banks much risk will arise. The case to which I allude is no doubt an exceptional case. It is a case of distinct fraud, arising when a bank has got into a thoroughly bad condition, such as has not infrequently taken place in the history of banks, notably in the case of two or three banks to which I called the attention of the hon. gentleman the other day. There such a risk will arise, for the parties managing the banks may commit acts, as I think they did in the case of at least two of those banks, which would bring them within the purview of the penal law. In such cases men are not likely to be deterred, if there is a reasonable chance of escape with a large amount of the plunder, by any penalties you may impose. No doubt, the particular clause to which the hon. gentleman alludes, rendering hypothecation penal, will go some way, but it will not go the whole way. We are doing a thing now which has never been done before in the history of banking, so far as I know ; we are giving to the notes of the smallest and least well managed banks, to the extent of about $2,000,000, precisely the same security as the notes of the best managed banks possess. The system pursued in the United States is wholly different from ours. There, as the hon. gentleman knows, the banks are obliged to deposit Government securities for all the notes they issue. With us, and the same is the case in all other countries which have a bank circulation similar to ours, there has been no security hitherto, except the assets of the banks, and the public knowing that, it has been impossible for the banks to issue too many notes. But you have altered that entirely. This is a totally new experiment. As I said, having called the attention of the House and the Government to it, and having expressed my own opinion, I am not particularly concerned further, except that it appears to me that if such a fraud were committed, your whole guarantee fund, during a period of five or ten years, might be destroyed by a single over-issue, and in that case the supposed guarantee for our note circulation might prove worthless. As the clause first existed, the danger was greater, but the security for the note holder was also greater. I have my doubts, under the circumstances, whether the guarantee proposed is worth the alteration we are making in the basis for the security of the notes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that whatever danger may be apprehended from the view taken by my hon. friend, might be minimised, if not altogether obviated, by the action of the Government, if they would be disposed to adopt a more stringent course. The banks having come forward to guarantee the circulation and to assist the Government in framing a measure which will be satisfactory to the country, as I think this measure will be, now that they have eliminated one or two clauses to which exception was taken, and after they eliminate another, as I hope they will, that is the one with reference to lapsed balances, I congratulate the Government on having adopted the best means of arriving at a conclusion, which is no doubt based on a very correct principle, and which I think will work satisfactorily. But I think they might go a little further, and I venture to offer a suggestion which I think would minimise the risk my hon. friend refers to. The Government should put the printing of notes by any person in this country on the same ground as counterfeit money, with the same penalties, and prevent notes being introduced into the country at all or manufactured in the country except on the condition that they go directly into the hands of the Treasury Board ; and when this act goes into operation, all the banks affected should return to the Treasury Board all their unissued notes and a statement of their circulation. The Treasury Board should be custodians of the bank notes, the banks should apply to them whenever they require circulation, the notes should be issued to the banks by the Treasury Board when required, and when the banks desired to destroy any of the old notes not fit for circulation, they should be destroyed by an officer of the bank in the presence of a person appointed by the Treasury Board for that purpose. Government would then be able to keep an account exactly, from month to month, of the position of the banks with regard to their issue. It would be a strong check on the banks if they were disposed to exceed their issue, because the Government would have full knowledge of the position of the banks from month to month. If the banks wanted notes, they would apply to the Government and the Government would give the amount required, which would be entered to the debit of their circulation, and in that way the Government would from time to time be perfectly aware of the exact position. If the Minister would introduce a clause to this effect, it would very materially assist the banks and offer additional security to the banks, because, look at it as we may, there is a contingent possibility of danger from the system being abused by those banks which might be disposed to make an over-issue under fraudulent circumstances. A system of the kind I propose could be very easily worked, the Government would then have the matter under their own control and the banks would have additional security in knowing that the Government were exercising this control over the issue of notes.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose what my hon. friend desires is to avoid the danger of over-circulation, and he proposes to do this by giving the Government control over the issue of notes to each bank, so that each bank's issue will be limited to the maximum circulation allowed it by law. I see the point my hon. friend suggests, and it is certainly worth looking into, taking care that the Government does not assume too much responsibility.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They would only be the custodians of the notes, which they would distribute to the banks according as they would be applied for, making it a penal offence for any one to print, engrave or import a note. The Government would be assuming no responsibility.

Mr. FOSTER. I will think it over. I propose to add to sub-section 4 the following :—

And the Minister of Finance and Receiver General shall, with respect to all notes paid out of said fund, have the same rights as any other holder of the notes of the bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the effect of that?

Mr. FOSTER. To enable the Minister of Finance to rank with the other creditors in regard to the assets of the bank.

On sub-section 7,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the question whether it is or is not desirable to fix a period within which notes may be presented for redemption by the holders of—what do you call it?—the bank circulation redemption fund. If that is not done, you may have claims at a very long date. I think it would be well to fix some reasonable time within which the holders of these notes should present their claims on this fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be a pretty good limit when the interest ceases?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not necessarily. I am speaking from some knowledge of this matter. I know of notes of suspended banks that have been held for a long time, and sometimes in considerable quantities, and I think it would be for the public advantage, under the somewhat extraordinary provisions you are now adopting, that some limit of time should be adopted in regard to this circulation. I am not at all referring to the claims against the bank assets.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I quite agree with my hon. friend. I know that in the case of the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick, which suspended in 1867 or 1868, they got an Act passed some years afterwards by this Parliament providing that, by giving a year's notice in regard to all notes called in, they should not be compelled to pay them. Although a period of about eleven years had elapsed from the time of the suspension of the bank, I know that four or five years afterwards notes came into my hands to be presented, and on application to the gentleman who wound up the affairs of the bank, he informed me that notes had come in about sixteen years after the bank suspended.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the provisions of the Winding-Up Act are sufficient for this purpose. Under that Act, the court may fix a date, and after that date the assets are to be distributed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the case in the Winding-Up Act. The judge may make an order that the final assets remaining shall be distributed unless the claims are presented before a certain day, and if they do not come in, no assets are distributed afterwards. But I cannot see any great necessity for this, because the notes in the hands of the parties who hold them do not bear any interest.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The assets might be distributed and the notes come in afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The funds ought not to be liable after the assets are distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. To this clause I wish to add:

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impose any liability on the Government of Canada or on the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, beyond the amount available from time to time out of the said fund.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is not one day's notice rather a short time? The holder cannot possibly get the notice if he lives any distance away.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) The notes of a bank get scattered round a good deal. Suppose a Nova Scotia Bank has a large quantity of notes in Vancouver.

Mr. FOSTER. We will give six days' notice.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland.) It occurs to me that another question might arise with regard to the practical operation of the principle adopted by the establishment of this fund. In the case of the failure of two or three banks the same year, would the notes be paid indiscriminately as they were presented? If you take from the amount of circulation which each of the banks of the country are authorised to have under this Act, the circulation of any two or three of the larger banks, you would exhaust the fund, and considerably more. Would the banks which have first failed be paid in full, and the others not receive any?

Mr. COCKBURN. I think we might put in a clause with reference to suspended banks. It appears to me that the banks which are guaranteeing this fund have a certain interest in it, since they are taxed to support it. I would suggest that in the event of the suspension of a bank and a liability thereby attaching to the guarantee fund, then the banks contributing to this fund shall nominate a representative to co-operate with the directors in providing for the speedy redemption of the notes, and he shall be clothed with such powers as the Treasury Board shall designate.

On sub-section 8,

Mr. FOSTER. After the word "shall" put in the words "after the amount of such excess has been made good as aforesaid." To the end of that I wish to add this sub-section:

The Minister of Finance and the Receiver General may permit any bank to make good its share of such excess, by payments of 1 per cent. per annum of the annual average circulation of its notes, such circulation to be ascertained as the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General shall decide.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The understanding of the House was that in no case should more than 13 per cent. in ten years of the average circulation be exacted from the banks, 5 per cent. in two years and 1 per cent. for each of the remaining years. This statement was repeatedly made by the Minister of Finance across the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the intention of this clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the wording of the clause leaves it in doubt.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We thought it better to leave a little elasticity in case of emergency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If so, it is quite conceivable that cases of emergency might arise, when 50 instead of 13 per cent. might be required.

Mr. COCKBURN. And the banks would not know when they might be called upon.

Mr. TISDALE. The banks might be called upon to an unlimited extent.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Committee will permit, I will let the clause stand for the present. I now propose a new clause, as follows:—

The bank shall not pledge, assign or hypothecate its notes. No advance or loan made on the security of the notes of a bank shall be recoverable from the bank or its assets. Every person who being the president, vice-president, director, principal partner, *en commandite*, general manager, manager, cashier, or other officer of the bank, pledges, assigns or hypothecates, or authorises or is concerned in the pledge, assignment or hypothecation of the notes of the bank, and every person who accepts, receives or takes, or authorises or is concerned in the acceptance or receipt or taking of such notes as a pledge, assignment or hypothecation, shall be liable to a fine of not less than $400 and not more than $2,000, or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Suppose a bank manager, instead of issuing notes in the ordinary fashion, was to issue a larger quantity of notes for the purpose of buying exchange—which is not quite the same thing as putting them into circulation in the ordinary way—does the Minister of Justice hold that such a transaction would come within the scope of this clause?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I do not think so. This is to meet the distinct offence of hypothecating.

Mr. HALL. I understand the clause to read that notes hypothecated shall not be charged against the banks.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is that advances or loans made on such security shall not be recoverable.

Mr. HALL. But the notes will be valid against the bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to the question put by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), it is quite clear that once the notes get out of the hands of the party to whom they were hypothecated, there must be a claim on the circulation fund and assets of the bank. It would not be possible to distinguish between one set of notes and another.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The question raised by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) is one deserving of consideration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would not the last portion of clause 56 be a hardship upon the banks? The Government may designate any number of places and put the banks to inconvenience, which would fall more heavily on the smaller banks, as they would have to make arrangements for agencies at any place designated, while the larger banks would have agencies established there already? I think it would be better to confine it to the places already mentioned in the section.

Mr. FOSTER. This power would be in the hands of the Treasury Board, and I do not think it would be liable to be abused. It would be well for us to have the power of opening up other agencies, if deemed necessary. As some of the Provinces are very large, it might be considered that more than one agency should be opened up.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Even in Ontario, it occurs to me in Toronto it would be quite sufficient.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If in the Province of Quebec we designate Montreal, it might be necessary also to designate Quebec. In Ontario, which is extending so rapidly, it might also be necessary to name another place than Toronto for redemption.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). To banks like the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of British North America, it would make very little difference, as they have agencies established all over the country, but to smaller banks like those of the lower Provinces, the provision might cause a good deal of difficulty.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It would seem to me that the difficulty could be got over by arranging with the bank which would have branches in all these centres.

Mr. COCKBURN. It would be better, I think, to provide that the bank "shall make arrangements," instead of as the Bill says, "establish agencies."

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same thing.

Mr. COCKBURN. Establishing an agency is one thing, and making an arrangement for the redemption of your notes is another. The smaller banks could make arrangements to take up their notes with the other banks. If they had to establish agencies it would be a somewhat difficult thing.

Mr. KENNY. I do not think there will be any difficulty in this. Banks in the Maritime Provinces have now made arrangements for the redemption of their notes all over the Dominion, and the notes of most of the banks of the Maritime Provinces are redeemed at par in Victoria, B.C. I think we may safely leave the matter to the Treasury Board.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me there is some little confusion between clauses 56 and 57. I do not quite see, at the outset, how clause 57 comports with the provisions in clause 56.

Mr. FOSTER. Clause 57 is payment on account; it is the same as in the old Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the two appear to contradict each other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it works out in this way. The bank is obliged at every place to receive its own notes in payment at par; and, under the section, arrangements are to be made, at certain designated places, for the redemption.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am very much inclined to think with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) that a provision stating that the banks should make arrangements for the redemption of their notes at different places, should be inserted instead of the requirements that they should establish agencies.

On section 57,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has been suggested to me that a provision should be inserted in this clause that it should not be lawful for any bank or branch of a bank to charge a discount on the notes of any other bank. Some of the banks may refuse to take the notes of the smaller banks except at a discount, and I can see no possible harm in providing that it shall not be lawful for them to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. I will let section 54 stand for the time being. I think the proposal of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) would make every bank take the notes of every other bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Nobody asks that they should be compelled to take them. I propose that if they take them they must not take them at a discount.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the proposal would defeat the object the hon. gentleman has in view. In the Province of Ontario, you cannot compel the branches of the different banks to take the notes on a gold basis, because they arrange to do that at their head offices.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman misunderstands my suggestion. The whole scheme of this Bill is to make all bank notes redeemable at par in any part of the Dominion. If Toronto is the only place in Ontario where the notes of the banks of the Maritime Provinces are taken at par, outside of Toronto they will not be taken at par. The larger banks may still refuse to take the notes of the smaller banks except at a discount, and the result will be that one of the cardinal objects you have in view will not be carried out.

Mr. TISDALE. At present all Ontario money is taken at par in Quebec by any bank, although the bills have to be sent to Toronto to be redeemed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the scheme proposed by the hon. member for Queen's would work unless he combines with it a provision that the banks must take the notes. His object is to make the notes current everywhere at their face value. As the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says, that is secured by arrangements being made for their redemption at head-quarters in each Province. But even suppose it is not secured, the hon. gentleman's proposal will not secure it any better. For instance, if I go to Port Arthur with $500 of the notes of the Bank of Nova Scotia in my pocket, and present them to the agency of the Bank of Montreal there, assuming that the arrangement for their redemption is made at Toronto, and that the branch at Port Arthur cannot take them at par, what could they say? They would decline; they would say: "If it were not for the provisions of that section, we would cash them at one-half per cent. discount, but we are not allowed to cash them at a discount, and you must get them cashed by a broker on the street." It seems to me that the proposal would not improve our provision.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The practical result, then, will be that the notes will not circulate at all except at a discount.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I am assuming that the hon. gentleman's own argument is correct, namely, that the arrangement made at the head office of the Province is not sufficient to secure the payment of the notes of the smaller banks at par. Experience will show that suitable arrangements have been made in the different Provinces, and the result is that the notes are as a rule circulated at par.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am obliged to adopt the view of the hon. the Minister of Justice in opposition to that of my hon. friend, for if we adopted the amendment proposed we should have to compel the banks to take the notes.

On section 57,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this section you declare expressly that the banks shall not be bound to redeem notes.

Mr. FOSTER. Its own notes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so. I do not see in that case how you can compel them to pay in specie or in Dominion notes at these other points.

Mr. TISDALE. We have to be careful and not impose burdens on the banks, not necessary to accomplish the object we have in view. By redeeming at par, I understand that the bills of one bank may be replaced by those of another, so as to make them a circulating medium; but if you want gold, which rarely happens, you go to the head office of the bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the payment at par?

Mr. TISDALE. The idea may not be expressed, but does not the hon. gentleman agree in the view that it will be sufficient to meet the difficulty by making the notes of one Province redeemable in the bills of another Province?

Mr. COCKBURN. Put in the word "circulation at par" and you have it all right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The practical result will be that the banks in one Province will give their bills in exchange for those of the banks in other Provinces.

Section allowed to stand.

On sub-section 2,

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to move that we add to this sub-section what we insert in the incorporation of railways and other private companies:

And each bank shall be deemed to have a legal domicile at every place wherein it has an agency, branch or office.

Suppose parties have a difficulty with a bank in the city where it has not its chief office, they cannot serve an action excepting at the head office. If the difficulty arises at Three Rivers, they will have to bring suit at Montreal.

Mr. MULOCK. The Local Legislatures can establish what shall be good service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You do not make more than one domicile to a railway company.

Mr. AMYOT. Most decidedly, legal domicile for the service of actions. Suppose there is a bank which has its head office in Montreal and a branch office in Quebec. I have a difficulty with it in Quebec. Under this section I would have to take my suit to Montreal.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is provided to a large extent by provincial legislation. The Bank of Montreal does business in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it can be sued in either Province on a contract made there. If you choose to make a legal domicile wherever it has an office, a bank doing business in Halifax might be sued in British Columbia and *vice versa*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), whether he would like to make more than one domicile in one Province?

Mr. AMYOT. Certainly; but I would not change the place where the action could be proceeded with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It seems to me to be open to this inconvenience, that a company would be liable to be served wherever it had a clerk carrying on a small branch business, and I think it would be better to have the company served at its chief place of business in the Province.

Mr. MULOCK. The Provincial Legislatures can settle the procedure in this matter.

Mr. AMYOT. We have the power here to settle the procedure in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not for a moment doubt that we have the power, but the Provincial Legislatures regulate the procedure.

Mr. MULOCK. Neither do I deny that we have the power, but in regard to the service of all corporations, the simplest way would be to leave the Provincial Legislatures to provide for it.

Resolutions reported.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CUSTOMS' COLLECTORS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Finance when he will give us that explanation with regard to the tariff respecting the different classes of pork ?

Mr. FOSTER. Just as soon as the Bill is ready I shall take it up. It is being printed now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is one thing more. I have heard complaints that the collectors at the different ports still exact duties under the original tariff. I have a great many letters from Halifax about it. They say that the Tariff Bill having finally passed there appears to be no good reason why the duties could not be collected under the rates which are finally agreed to. For instance, the collectors are still collecting duty on both liquors and packages under rates entirely different from the rates of the revised tariff. If the collectors were advised to act under the tariff as finally passed, all the difficulty would be avoided.

Mr. BOWELL. Instructions have been given just in the line which the hon. gentleman has suggested, that is, to accept duties upon the amended resolutions, and not upon the resolutions as they were first introduced, nor upon the old tariff. Of course, the moment the resolutions were introduced they took effect, and instructions were given to accept all entries under the new resolutions, subject to amendment. As soon as the liquor resolutions were changed, instructions were also given to act under these, and not under the resolutions as first introduced.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY—THE POWER OF DISALLOWANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. AMYOT.

Mr. BLAKE. Pursuant to the notice which I gave some days ago, I rise to move in amendment:

To leave out all the words after "That" and insert the following:—"it is expedient to provide means whereby, on solemn occasions touching the exercise of the power of disallowance, or of the appellate power as to educational legislation, important questions of law or fact may be referred by the Executive to a high judicial tribunal for hearing and consideration, in such mode that the authorities and parties interested may be represented and that a reasoned opinion may be obtained for the information of the Executive."

At this stage of the Session I shall endeavor to comprise within the briefest possible limits those observations which I have to make in support of this proposition. I would say that recent, current, and imminent events have combined to convince me that it is important in the public interest that this motion should receive attention during this Session, else I should not have propounded it at this time. I propound it, as its language implies, and as, I think, you will observe before I sit down, in no hostile spirit towards the Administration; and its form is one which is not necessarily hostile, but which I have adopted on this occasion, not with any view of precluding an amendment, but because it is the only available method by which I can now hope to bring the matter under your consideration at all. Now, Sir, the federal constitution of Canada specially demands our attention to the legality of its legislative Acts. We have within our borders seven Provincial Legislatures, one Territorial Assembly and this Parliament, all and each with limited powers, all and each hedged in by limitations—with reference to the Provincial Legislatures and the Parliament, as between these two, and with reference to both the Provincial Legislatures and the Parliament, as between them both and the reserved powers of the Imperial Parliament—with limited powers, I say, any excess, or attempted excess of which in legislation is absolutely void. Our several constitutions are partly unwritten and undefined; they are also largely, perhaps, I may say, mainly, written and defined. And so it has happened that we have fallen into the use of the word constitutional in two very different senses: one, the only sense in which it is used in the mother country, whose constitution, being the growth of customs, precedents, practices and principles, and not being a written instrument, unalterable by the Parliament, Parliament being itself supreme—whose constitution, I say, is a thing elastic, plastic, changing, of the spirit, not of the letter; and so, when we speak, in the English sense, of an Act being constitutional or unconstitutional, we refer to its spirit, we refer to the question whether it is in accord with, or in violation of, the spirit of the constitution. But we have another sense in which we use the word in a sense peculiar to ourselves, or at any rate, distinct from its use in the mother country; we use it also to express an Act in excess of our legal powers, In the first class of cases, however obnoxious may be the Act that we condemn, it is nevertheless indisputably valid; in the second class of cases, however useful we may consider the Act we are discussing, it is null and void. The first class of cases depends on political considerations entirely outside the judicial domain, which is quite unfitted for their disposition; the second class depends upon legal considerations fitted for the judicial domain, and which ought, as

far as may be, to be kept within it. Yet, Sir, no Legislature or Executive can, any more than any private individual, act at all without considering, and in a sense deciding for itself, the legality of its acts, and so in some sort, entering upon the judicial department. But not upon the domain of the judicial power; because our opinion that our acts are valid does not make them so; their validity depends upon the decision of the judicial authority, and upon that alone. Now, Sir, the general notion that the executive, the legislative and the judicial departments of government ought to be, so far as practicable, separate and apart, is one held by many of the most eminent constitutionalists as a fundamental principle. There can be no doubt that the absolute union of these departments is neither more nor less than absolute despotism. Unite in one hand, I care not whether it be the hand of an autocrat or the hand of a Council, the power of legislation, the power of adjudication, and the power of administration, and you make the most absolute despot that is conceivable. The separation, therefore, of these departments, the degree to which, without over-weakening or over-complicating the action of the machine, you can separate them, marks the degree to which, in this aspect of a constitutional system, you have attained perfection. I do not say that they can be absolutely and always separated. It is not so. Now, my object is to apply these general views, which I have briefly stated, to one important class of public transactions so far as may be found practicable; and that class of public transactions is divided, as you will see by my notice, into two subject-matters, in which the Dominion Executive, itself a political body, has a constitutional duty, the discharge of which involves the interpretation of statutes, and thus the solution of strictly legal questions; and in which also this Parliament, which has the right to advise, to condemn or to approve, has, or may have, duties of its own. I by no means propose to withdraw from the Executive its duty; my object is to aid it in the efficient execution of its duty. I make no attempt at this time to discuss the propriety of these constitutional provisions, or, in any general sense, the executive, the parliamentary or the party action which has tended more or less, to elucidate the generally accepted or the generally opposing views upon these subjects. My only wish is, without discussing how far these provisions are wise, taking them as they are, to facilitate the better working of them. The first of the two classes to which I allude is that in which the proposal comes before the Executive, to disallow an Act of a Provincial Legislature on the ground that that Act is *ultra vires*. If it be so, the Act is void; and I think I may say, that it is now generally agreed that void Acts should not be disallowed, but should be left to the action of the courts. It is, nevertheless, and I think with sound reason, contended, that circumstances of great general inconvenience or prejudice from a Dominion standpoint, and involving difficulty, delay, or the impossibility of a resort to law, may justify the policy of disallowance, even in cases in which the Act is *ultra vires*, and therefore void. In that view there would arise two questions, the question of policy, and the question of legality; because the question of legality leaves untouched the question of policy, which is, "even if the Act be void, shall it be disallowed or no?" The other class to which my motion alludes, is that of the Educational appeal, which arises under section 93 of the Constitutional Act, and under the analogous provision of the Manitoba Constitutional Act. Under these clauses a limited power to make Educational laws is granted to a Province, provided, amongst other things, that nothing therein contained shall prejudicially affect any right, or privilege, with respect to denominational schools which any of the Provinces had by law, or, in the case of Manitoba, by practice, at the Union. There is another class of restrictions, which I do not in terms touch here, but to which, in cases in which an appeal is raised upon them, my observations would equally apply. This limitation upon the power of a Province is made more effectual by a special provision, giving an appeal to the Dominion Executive from any Act or decision of the Provincial Legislature or Authorities affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in relation to education; and whereby also, in case of the non-execution by the Province of the decision of the Executive, this Parliament may make remedial laws for the purpose of effectuating that decision. Those members who have long been here will well remember the New Brunswick school case, which was agitated for many years; in the course of which agitation I have hoped that some political aspects of that and of analogous questions were finally settled —settled, at all events, for the bulk of the party with which I act, and for the humble individual who is now addressing you. I regard it as settled, for myself at any rate, first of all, that, as a question of policy, there shall be no disallowance of Educational legislation, for the mere reason that, in the opinion of this Parliament, some other or different policy than that which the Province has thought fit to adopt would be a better policy. I hold it to be settled, in the second place, that no Address to the Crown shall be passed by this Parliament asking for a change of the Constitutional Act as affecting any Province, at any rate against the will of that Province, in this particular. And I hold it to be settled, thirdly; indeed it follows obviously from these two propositions, that the only questions which can practically arise within our domain are such as may be raised, by way of appeal, under section 93 and the analogous section of the Manitoba Act. The events which took place in connection with the New Brunswick school case afford, to myself at all events, a strong proof of the expediency of what I now propose. Let me enforce the three propositions which I have stated by a brief reference to the votes upon that occasion. In part those votes were taken when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, in part they were taken when the Liberal party were in power. The first stage in the transaction occurred when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power; and in May, 1872, I voted with the majority of the House against a motion to regret that the New Brunswick school law had not been disallowed by the Government to which I was opposed; although I was, and expressed myself, of the opinion that some of the changes which had been made by that Provincial law were harsh changes. At the same time, I seconded a motion, which fortunately also prevailed:

"That this House deems it expedient that the opinion of the law officers in England, and if possible of the

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be obtained as to the right of the New Brunswick Legislature to make such changes in the school law as deprived Roman Catholics of the privileges which they enjoyed at the Union, in respect of religious education in the common schools, with a view of ascertaining whether the case comes within the terms of sub-section 4 of section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867, which authorised the Parliament of Canada to enact remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions respecting education in the said Act."

At that time, I need hardly remind the House, there was no Supreme Court in existence. The advice of the law officers was obtained, and it was, as it had been on prior, and as I am afraid, if I may judge by a notice on the paper, it has been on subsequent occasions, not perhaps very satisfying; and there was no mode of approach apparently to the Judicial Committee. In the end we had to get up a suit in some way or other, about some assessment or other, in order to obtain, by a clumsy and expensive process, a judicial decision, not reached for some years afterwards, of the question involved and stated in the motion which I have just read. The second stage of those proceedings arose in 1875, when the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan), whom I regret not to see here, being then in opposition, gave notice of a motion for an Address to the Crown praying for an alteration in the Constitutional Act as it affected the Province of New Brunswick in this regard. Upon that notice being given, I put upon the Votes and Proceedings notice of an amendment, which I take leave to read as expressing the views I then entertained, and still entertain on that aspect of the question. This was my notice:

"That prior to the Union, New Brunswick had sole and exclusive control over its educational system.

"That under the Union Act, as construed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, such control was reserved to, and has ever since been retained by New Brunswick.

"That New Brunswick has not signified any willingness that the Union Act should be amended in this particular.

"That any encroachment made against the will of New Brunswick, on the powers so reserved, would, by diminishing the security now enjoyed by each Province for the maintenance of its provincial rights, tend to subvert the constitution.

"That whatever may be the opinions of members of this House on the educational policy of any Province, this House deems it inexpedient to address the Crown in favor of any amendment which would, against the will of the Province, encroach on the powers reserved to it in respect to education."

When the motion of the present Minister of Inland Revenue ultimately came on, my hon. friend from the East Riding of York (Mr. Mackenzie), then First Minister, moved the following amendment:—

"That in the opinion of this House, legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, encroaching on any powers reserved to any one of the Provinces by the British North America Act, 1867, would be an infraction of the Provincial Constitution, and that it would be inexpedient and fraught with danger to the autonomy of each of the Provinces, for this House to invite such legislation."

This amendment, for which I voted, was carried, with the addition of an amendment inviting the friendly intervention of the Imperial authorities with the Government of New Brunswick for some change by their own voluntary action; the opinion of the House continuing to be as it had been in the previous Parliament, that the legislation which was the subject of agitation was in some particulars harsh, and might better have been otherwise; but that this was a question for the Province freely to decide. I have, I think, proved my case.

Now, Sir, in the exercise of this power of disallowance by the Government, political questions will, or at any rate may, probably, always arise. Questions of policy may present themselves, that is questions of expediency, of convenience, of the public interest, of the spirit of the constitution or of the form of legislation. All these are clearly, exclusively for the executive and legislative, that is for the political departments of the Government. But it is equally clear, that when in order to determine your course you must find whether a particular act is *ultra* or *intra vires*, you are discharging a legal and a judicial function. What do you do? You proceed to interpret the Constitutional Act, and to declare its meaning; you proceed to interpret the Provincial Act under consideration and to declare its meaning; you proceed to compare the two statutes so interpreted and declared; and you proceed, finally, to conclude whether or not the law conflicts with, or transcends the powers which are conferred upon the Legislature which passed it. Nothing that can be conceived partakes more exclusively of the character of a legal and judicial operation than what I have just now described. Again, when you act on the appellate Educational clauses; as, for example, in the case of Manitoba, the very case which is now in a sense pending, as to whether recent legislation be within the limits of the rights of the Provincial Legislature, and whether any relief is due under the appellate clause to those who claim it, you have a legal question, or rather, in this case, a mixed question of law and of fact; which circumstance it was that induced me to insert the word "fact" in my motion, conscious as I was that it was only on the rarest occasions that any references of that description would be necessary. Yet it seemed to me that, in this particular instance, I was constrained to provide for an emergency which may arise. Now, what is the process to be gone through in order to reach a conclusion? The first involves that very question of fact, or rather a mixed question of law and fact. You have to find whether any class of the population had by law or practice, at the time of the Union, any, and, if so, what right or privilege with respect to denominational schools. Secondly, if so, you have to find whether that right or privilege has been affected, and how it has been affected, by the legislation complained of; and thirdly, if so, you have to find what legislative action is required to redress the wrong. The first two questions at any rate are legal and not at all political. Now, I aver that in the decision of all legal questions, it is important that the political executive should not, more than can be avoided, arrogate to itself judicial powers; and that when, in the discharge of its political duties, it is called upon to deal with legal questions, it ought have the power in cases of solemnity and importance, where it may be thought expedient so to do, to call in aid the judicial department in order to arrive at a correct solution. The decision that an Act is *ultra vires*, and its consequent disallowance by the Executive are incidents peculiar in practice to ourselves. They do not exist in the great example of the Republic to the south of us. It is a most delicate function, and its exercise involves most serious ulterior consequences. The question is by the decision of the Executive finally decided, and the Act is obliterated and annulled. The question whether it was or was not valid is so

removed from judicial cognisance for ever. And thus by repeated exercises of the power of disallowance, in respect to repeated provincial legislation, the Province may practically be deprived of that which all the time may be a real right;—a right claimed, which may be a right justly claimed. Thus, one of two limited Governments, of which it may be said in a general sense that the sphere of the jurisdiction of the one is limited by the sphere of the jurisdiction of the other;—one of these two limited Governments, may practically decide the extent of the limits, of what in a sense, is its rival Government. That is a very delicate position. It is a little like the position which a great many very good and wise persons contemplate with grave alarm, as to the pretensions of one church to decide what are the limits of power, as between Church and State,—to decide for itself these limits and thus, if that power be admitted, to arrogate such rights as it pleases to itself. A decision under such circumstances is almost necessarily a suspected decision. There is a sense in which it is the decision of a party in his own cause. And therefore, for that reason only, if for no other, it should be fortified as far as possible by neutral, dignified and judicial aid. So, in the case of an Educational appeal, analogous results at any rate, may ensue; because here also the decision would bar judicial action, and produce coercive legislation, imposing that decision on the Province; and would thus, according to the opinion of the Dominion Executive and Parliament, and to that alone, end the question. Now, do I say that in all cases the Executive should refer? I do not say so; my motion does not say so; my opinion is not so. I have referred—using language for this purpose which is recorded in the constitutions of some of the most respected States of the Republic—to solemn occasions and to important questions; but my motion is framed in this regard in what I conceive to be the spirit of the British and of our own constitution. It is elastic; it leaves a responsibility to the Executive to decide on the action to be taken in the particular case; it deals with the case as exceptional. My own opinion is, that whenever, in opposition to the continued view of a Provincial Executive and Legislature, it is contemplated by the Dominion Executive to disallow a Provincial Act because it is *ultra vires*, there ought to be a reference; and also that there ought to be a reference in certain cases where the condition of public opinion renders expedient a solution of legal problems, dissociated from those elements of passion and expediency which are, rightly or wrongly, too often attributed to the action of political bodies. And again, I for my part would recommend such a reference in all cases of Educational appeal—cases which necessarily evoke the feelings to which I have alluded, and to one of which, I am frank to say, my present motion is mainly due. Our present powers, Sir, are wholly inadequate for the effectual execution of the project in hand. There is no certainty—there is in ordinary cases rather an improbability—of our being able to reach the Judicial Committee; and as to all the three possible appeals or references, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Supreme Court, and the Imperial law officers, the machinery is extremely defective. There is no provision for the representation of the different interests; there is no provision for the ascertainment of facts; there is no provision for the reasoned opinion of the tribunal. Now, even where under special provisions on our own Statute-book, the first of these three requisites did exist—as in the case of the Liquor License Act, where we made a special provision for a reference to the Supreme Court, and for the appearance of and argument by opposing parties; as in the case of the Manitoba Railway crossings matter, where under a general law the Railway Committee of the Privy Council referred an important constitutional question to the Supreme Court, with provision, which the law allowed, for the argument by opposing parties—even in these cases, which come nearest to that degree of perfection to which I desire to attain, the results were not satisfactory;—why? Because the remaining requisite did not exist, in such form, at any rate, that it was used. There was no reasoned opinion; no grounds were stated by the tribunal for the conclusion which it shortly gave in reply to the Executive. The hon. First Minister will recollect expressing his own dissatisfaction with the opinion of the Supreme Court in the liquor license case, on that very ground, and he will remember that that circumstance involved a prolongation of the struggle and further proceedings; until in the end, the question was deemed settled by an argument and a reasoned judgment of the Judicial Committee which had earlier occurred; and by an unreasoned opinion of the same tribunal on appeal from the Supreme Court. I say, the lack of this last requisite deprived those proceedings of their chief value; they obliged us to resort to other methods; they left only as their result the disposition of an isolated case, with no general application, and of no permanent use. It was as if some Delphic oracle had spoken. We could not tell, beyond the limited disposition of the case in hand, what was actually meant, and not always even that. For my own part, I attach little comparative importance to judicial solutions, reached without argument, and announced without reasons. This, Sir, is only common sense. The experience of mankind has established, as the essential ingredients for the attainment of justice between man and man, the opposing arguments of the parties before a tribunal, and the reasoned judgment of that tribunal upon the arguments so addressed to it. The acutest minds are but too apt to err unless so aided in the formation of their judgment, and so checked in the announcement of it. Which of us, I ask, would submit, in any important case of his own, to such a method of reaching a conclusion? And how can we expect that the community at large will submit to such a method in the public cause? Let the opposing views be stated, presented and sifted in public, and in the presence of the parties; so the best materials for consideration will be obtained. Let the conclusions themselves be reasoned out; so will the judgment itself be best tested and sifted, and its soundness ascertained. It may be said that these views, applicable to private causes and to the ordinary transactions of mankind, have less application or none to constitutional questions. I should deny, on reason, any such view; and I refer, in the contrary sense, to a quotation from Bryce's recent book upon the American Constitution, which shows, what one would have expected, that if there be a distinction, it is in favor of the application of these principles to this class of cases. Speaking of the illustrious

exponent of the United States constitution, Chief Justice Marshall, that author says :

"Chief Justice Marshall's work of building up and working out the constitution was accomplished not so much by the decisions he gave as by the judgments in which he expounded the principles of these decisions, judgments which, for their philosophical breadth, the luminous exactness of their reasoning, and the fine political sense which pervades them, have never been surpassed and rarely equalled by the most famous jurists of modern Europe or of ancient Rome. Marshall did not forget the duty of a judge to decide nothing more than the suit before him requires, but he was wont to set for the grounds of his decision in such a way as to show how they would fail to be applied in cases not yet arisen."

A noble function, which I wish we could see applied in Canada ! Now, for want of this, as I have said, our occasional efforts to obtain light have resulted less satisfactorily than I could wish —sometimes in clumsy, slow, expensive, and but slightly fruitful proceedings ; sometimes in absolute failure ; and always with loss, for the want of the adequate provision to which I invite the attention of the House. I, myself, have objected on former occasions to the reference of unargued, abstract questions for an unreasoned opinion. I think it is objectionable. It is better than nothing in some cases ; in some cases, I would adopt it if the only resort. I have advised it before, and would advise it again. But, as a rule, I still adhere to that view ; and because I adhere to it, I propose a more excellent way. But though some theoretical objections may still remain to the guarded plan which I propose, the main objections are most unquestionably removed by the adoption of these precautions. The balance of advantage is decidedly one way, and that is all that in human affairs we can expect to attain. Now, Sir, our present law provides a power to the Executive to make such a reference ; and such a reference may, at this day, be made without any of these precautions, while it cannot be made with them. My proposal, therefore, involves a check and a limitation, as well as an added power. With reference to the theoretical objections to which I have alluded, and which have been pressed very much in the United States—where, however, there is this cardinal difference, that they are not at all called upon to deal with this question of disallowance or of appeal—with reference to the theoretical objections there raised on the question as there presented, Mr. Bryce, in the work to which I have alluded, points out the corresponding disadvantages, even there, of the absence of some such provisions. They are :

"To settle at once and forever a disputed point of constitutional law, would often be a gain both to private citizens and to the organs of the Government. Under the present system, there is no certainty when, if ever, such a point will be settled. Nobody may care to incur the expense and trouble of taking it before the court ; and a suit which raises it may be compromised or dropped. When such a question, after, perhaps, the lapse of years, comes before the Supreme Court and is determined, the determination may be different from what the legal profession has expected, may alter that which has been believed to be the law, may shake or overthrow private interests based on views now declared to be erroneous."

But, Sir, besides the great positive gain of obtaining the best guidance, there are other, and in my opinion, not unimportant gains besides. Ours is a popular government ; and when burning questions arise inflaming the public mind, when agitation is rife as to the political action of the Executive or the Legislature—which action is to be based on legal questions, obviously beyond the grasp of the people at large ;—when the people are on such questions divided by cries of creed and race ; then I maintain that a great public good is attainable by the submission of such legal questions to legal tribunals, with all the customary securities for a sound judgment ; and whose decisions — passionless and dignified, accepted by each of us as binding in our own affairs, involving fortune, freedom, honor, life itself—are most likely to be accepted by us all in questions of public concern. The great Bill for Local Government in Ireland, introduced by Mr. Gladstone in 1886, and which, despite its defects—and I am amongst those who have always thought they were very serious—is, considering the conditions of its preparation, one of the most wonderful productions of its kind, made provision for the establishment of this principle of reference in this class of cases. It arranged for a reference, either by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland at his option, or the English Secretary of State at his, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of all questions of *ultra vires* arising on legislative Bills and Acts of the Irish Legislature, and it provided that the decision should be final. The Legislature of Ontario has passed two general statutes, providing, in the one case, for the institution of declaratory actions—actions for judicial declarations upon such subjects ; and in the other, for a reference to the courts of such questions ; and in each case with those securities which I am anxious we should provide for ourselves. The hon. the Minister of Justice is at this moment availing himself of the earlier of those Acts, for the purpose of testing before the law courts, a very important constitutional question as to the extent of the Executive power. Several States of the Union have, in their constitutions, taken the power of reference, without these securities. We ourselves, as I have pointed out, have taken the power generally, without these securities. We took it specially in the Liquor License Act, with a portion of these securities ; we took it generally in the railway cases, with a portion of these securities. Thus, it is beyond our power to urge any longer the theoretical objection ; while by the proposal which I advance, we can minimise those objections, and at the same time advance the practical utility of the procedure. If you grant me a definite issue, a full argument, and a reasoned judgment, in my view the objections almost vanish, while the advantages enormously increase. But, my proposal is by no means radical or revolutionary, compulsory or general. It is but an enabling proposition ; it but empowers the Executive to obtain —by a procedure replete with the essential requisites for the production of a sound opinion— the views on legal questions of legal authorities, leaving to the Executive, so aided, the responsibility of final action. I have an absolute confidence that, if my proposal should be declined, the first persons to regret that decision will be hon. gentlemen opposite. My opinion is, that this is a proposal eminently helpful to the Executive of the country at this time ; but it is eminently helpful to them, because it is eminently helpful to the good government of this country ; and it is in this spirit that I move the amendment which I now submit to the judgment of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, I accept in the fullest sense, the assurance

of my hon. friend that his motion has not been laid before the House in any spirit of hostility to the Administration of the day. On the contrary, I am grateful to the hon. gentleman for having brought forward this subject in the very careful resolution he has prepared, and still more, for the able speech in which he has enforced the various paragraphs and the main object of that resolution. It is gratifying to know that we have now in the House of Commons of Canada an hon. gentleman who is able to give his time and talents to bringing before the representatives of the people important questions of this kind. When I first read the hon. gentleman's resolution hastily, it occurred to me, as, I dare say, it occurred to many hon. gentlemen who hear me now, that it was an advance towards the American system, and proposed to transfer the responsibility of the Ministry of the day to a judicial tribunal; but on scanning the resolution in its carefully prepared terms, that impression was dissipated, and I saw that the principal object of the resolution, as I read it, is that the questions submitted by the Executive to the judicial tribunal should be enforced, sustained and presented to Parliament, to the public and to the Crown by the fact of this legal decision having been given. As the hon. gentleman has stated, when a question is submitted by the Crown to the courts, the simple answer "yes" or "no" is most unsatisfactory. It is a *pronunciamento* of the court without giving any reason for the decision on the decision which has been given. The proposition in this resolution that the courts could be required by the Executive to hear counsel, to take evidence in questions where facts form a portion of the subject to be decided, the fact that it is provided that the courts can and must give reasons for their answer, is sufficient, in my opinion, whether there was or was not any other excellence in the resolution to warrant this House to adopt it. I am strongly of the opinion that this resolution should meet with the favorable consideration of the House. The only objection really that I see to it is the fear that, the power being so emphatically given to the Crown to insist upon reasons being given the Parliament of Canada, and especially the House of Commons, may be continually pressed and urged to refer Bills, whether passed by the Dominion Parliament or the Provincial Legislatures, to the judicial tribunal. We may have very unimportant questions which we would be urged by certain interests to refer to the court. However, the Government of the day must have force enough to resist any such pressure. That is an evil which is comparatively unimportant when you consider the great advantages of the adoption of this resolution, the principle of it being that power is to be given to the Executive—an enabling power, as the hon. gentleman has truly said—to submit any important question to the court, and specially on these two points—the question of disallowance, and the question which may—and I am afraid will—assume large proportions—the educational question. Whenever the question of disallowance is raised on important matters and the reasons alleged for disallowance are that the Act itself was *ultra vires*, that is, that it was beyond the competence of the Legislature which passed it, I coincide with my hon. friend in believing that the Crown should have the power of submitting such a question to the courts, and give the opportunity to the authority — be it legislative or executive, which has passed the statute, to appear before such tribunals, and that all parties interested, or that the court should think were interested, should have the opportunity of being heard. Of course my hon. friend (Mr. Blake), in his resolution, has guarded against the supposition that such a decision is binding on the Executive. It is expressly stated—and that is one of the instances which shows that this resolution has been most carefully prepared—that such a decision is only for the information of the Government. The Executive is not relieved from any responsibility because of any answer being given by the tribunal. If the Executive were to be relieved of any such responsibility, I should consider that a fatal blot in the proposition of my hon. friend. I believe in responsible government. I believe in the responsibility of the Executive. But the answer of the tribunal will be simply for the information of the Government. The Government may dissent from that decision, and it may be their duty to do so if they differ from the conclusion to which the court has come. There is another point in regard to which the court must be guarded in the measure which will be introduced—not this Session but I hope next Session—based on this resolution, and that is, that the answer, whatever it may be, should be considered in the nature of a judgment so far as to allow of an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. With these remarks, I will only say further, that I thank the hon. gentleman for having brought this resolution before the House, as I concur with it generally, though holding the right with a free hand to frame the measure which will have to be brought down to Parliament in accordance with it. I do not think there can be any doubt as to the meaning of the motion of my hon. friend. I think it is so explicit in its terms that no questions can arise as to what its meaning is, and, if there were any doubts as to its meaning—there were none in my own mind—those doubts would be removed by the lucid speech of my hon. friend. That speech is of record in *Hansard*, and will throw a clear light on the objects and the aims of my hon. friend (Mr. Blake) in introducing the resolution.

Amendment of Mr. Blake agreed to.

SUPPLY—SAWDUST IN RIVERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EISENHAUER. Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will wait until the second motion is made that I leave the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I have a matter to bring before the House, which is of great importance to my county—I refer to the prohibition of the throwing of sawdust into the LaHave River. The mill owners on that river were so threatened and fined that they finally decided to close down, in consequence of which hundreds of people are deprived of the means of earning a livelihood and are drift-

ing away to the United States for want of employment. There are thousands of logs laying in booms which will soon become useless unless they are cut. The trade of the town of Bridgewater is being crippled for the want of the circulation of a large amount of money which heretofore arose from the proceeds of some fifteen or twenty millions of lumber cut in the mills on the LaHave River and exported. The proprietors of these mills are fully convinced that the enforcement of this Sawdust Act by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was for political reasons, on account of the mill owners being Liberal in politics. They believe they are being persecuted on account of their politics from the fact that other mills in the adjoining counties are allowed to operate unmolested, being neither threatened or fined. In fact all over the Dominion very few fines have been imposed, and nearly everywhere else the mills are allowed to run all the season, especially so on the Ottawa River. If the Minister persists in the course he has adopted for the last two years, the trade of the thriving town of Bridgewater will be crippled, and the effects generally in that section of the country will be very serious indeed. Seeing that the Bill introduced by the Minister, proposing to treat all mills alike and giving the Government no discretion, has been dropped, I would suggest that henceforth all mills be treated alike under the present law, and that those mills on the LaHave River should be allowed to operate until a different law is enacted. I have here a report from Mr. Rogers, who has been inspector of fisheries in Nova Scotia for a number of years, and in whom the Government had full confidence while he was in their employ. I will read some portion of that report:

"Question.—Of course, sir, you have read the defence of Minister Tupper, published some time ago, justifying the enforcement of the Sawdust Law on the LaHave River. Would you have any objection to giving your views to the public?

"Mr. Rogers.—None whatever. The public have, I presume, a right to know all that I have learned while in their service, especially since my efforts in that direction, while a responsible officer of the Fisheries Department, failed to make such information available to the public.

"Question.—You are a supporter of the present Government, are you not?

"Mr. Rogers.—Yes, and have been ever since 1867, and while in office I was often imprudently active even while the Liberals were in power, as is well known.

"Question.—What have you to say to an extract from a report made by you in 1879, and published by Minister Tupper, wherein you admit that the navigation of the LaHave was being injured, and the Davisons also admitted it?

"Mr. Rogers.—I have to say, among other things, just this, that a more dishonest and untruthful handling of so important a public matter, I have seldom ever witnessed. Mr. Tupper had before him all the reports, which I had previously made upon the subject, the dates of which I had given in my report on the Sawdust Question, yet he dishonestly and designedly leaves out my last full report, which would have fully explained the matter to the public. If you wish I will give you the substance of my last report dated 14th May, 1881. It is here in my letter-book.

"REPORT.

"BRIDGEWATER, 14th May, 1881.

"To W. F. WHITCHER, Esq.

"SIR,—I yesterday took two men and a boat and carefully examined this river at low water with a pole and found it as free from sawdust in the channel (and it is nearly all channel for a mile below the bridge) as it was a century ago, and it always will be so no matter how much sawdust is thrown into it. Below the point just where the ship *Scotia* grounded four years ago, of which I then informed you, there is still considerable sawdust but no more than there was then. I found by testing with a pole at every ten feet or so across the channel (which I did at five or six different points where the sawdust is found, and at two-thirds ebb tide and in the shallowest water) that there was from twelve to fifteen feet, and this is where the most sawdust is found.

"The captain of the tug, who is continually towing vessels up and down the river, still assures me (and in politics he is a friend of Mr. Kaulbach's) that the harbor is not filling up nor does he believe it ever will. He says the channel is something narrower at the point referred to but not shallower. Mr. Gow, of the bank here, who is one of the strong men financially of the place, to whom the Hon. Mr. Owen referred me as being a good person to accompany me in the exploration, respectfully declined, saying that he most unhesitatingly accepted the statement of the captain of the tug as being correct, and considered any further trouble unnecessary. (I may add that Mr. Gow was not only one of the most respected men in the Province, but was as much interested in preserving the harbor as any man, being himself a ship-builder, and he was also a supporter of Mr. Kaulbach's.)

"I have conversed with all Mr. Kaulbach's leading supporters here; and while some of them believed the channel was filling up, not one man in the community has taken the trouble to examine the river, except myself; yet some of the most untruthful statements are made by interested parties, and retailed to Mr. Veith, who is simple enough to send it to your office for fact.

"Mr. Veith did not attempt to examine the river for himself, as is well known, but in this case made himself (though paid by the public) a retailer of other men's falsehoods and ignorance, as I will demonstrate later. And yet, such fustian as this was printed at public expense and quoted by the Minister as true, while my truthful reports—reports made by a responsible officer of the Department, who not only knew from long experience what he was talking about, but who did not mislead the Department in any matter—were suppressed or misrepresented.

"At the time I wrote the letter in 1879, from which the Minister quotes, there had been much talk upon the subject. Mr. Kaulbach and his friends were blaming me. And though the captain of the tug assured me then, that the deposit of sawdust on which the *Scotia* touched at low water, had been there for years, and, in his opinion, would increase no more; and that had not the stern of the vessel swung in a little too far through careless steering, she would not have touched at all; still I insisted upon it that Mr. Davison should keep his sawdust out, and I did so not because of my personal views but to silence public clamor, and to quiet the feeling at Ottawa that I was favoring the Davisons—a feeling created by Mr. Kaulbach's falsehoods, as I will explain further on. Mr. Davison promised to do his best, and I gave him six months to prepare. He went to the United States and Canada to get information on the subject. On his return he bought a large steam boiler and with it erected a furnace to burn his sawdust; but it was not a success. Meanwhile we found that the view of the captain of the tug as expressed from the first tallied not only with my own, but was fully substantiated by subsequent experiences and facts as set out in my last report as above. Why Veith's falsehoods and ignorance were published at public expense, and since Mr. Whitcher's time are quoted by the Department, I will fully explain further on; also why my report was suppressed by Minister Tupper, last winter. And when I come to that, matters are likely to grow interesting, I fancy, as several public men are likely to get their feelings hurt, before I get through.

"Reporter.—'What is your idea of Mr. S. Wilmot's report, referred to by the Minister, particularly in regard to that other mill driven by water power, and whose sawdust was so easily disposed of?

"Mr. Rogers—'Well, as to that matter I scarcely have the patience to explain it. The matter is so fully understood by everybody in that neighborhood that one wonders that any man of even ordinary intelligence should publish such nonsense. I was there with Mr. Benjamin when the mill was first projected, and a dozen times since, more or less, and had it not been that nature had provided a basin into which to deposit the sawdust, the mill would never have been built. There was no stream of water there. The mill was located upon dry land like a steam mill, and the water brought from a distant lake by a wooden sluice much of the distance. It was then carried down over a bank some fifty feet high in an iron tube. Thus a small wheel of some eighteen to twenty inches over (perhaps two feet), under a fifty-foot head, drove the machinery, which took some fifty men to attend. And, as is well known by all practical mill men, the stream running from such a wheel would create a very small brook, and the whole concern, practically, so far as disposing of the sawdust was concerned, was in a position of

a steam mill. The machinery for concentrating the sawdust and passing it by spouts into horse carts, was built with the mill, and was estimated in the cost of the enterprise before starting to build. The mill was located in a large cove on the side of the estuary, and when the tide is out the flats become bare over several hundred acres. Every square foot of the cove was needed for booming the logs. Had they put their sawdust into the water, it would have cost as much as to put it where they did, besides destroying the whole enterprise, as not one pound of it would move, because there was no current, converting in a few years their whole booming water into acres of sawdust.

"To compare the sawmills built on dams and over rivers, such as exist on the LaHave River, and to intimate that the sawdust can be as readily disposed of as in the other, is what one might expect from men like S. Wilmot, Lieut. Gordon, or C. H. Tupper. To put these matters in such hands is like putting razors in the hands of children; aye, worse, for the children would only cut themselves, but in this case other and more honest people are getting cut, and the industrial interests of a whole section of country is being paralysed. The reason why this public outrage is being enforced upon the La Have River, I will make as plain as the nose on your face.

"The Minister seems to feel the deepest sympathy for the poor coast fishermen about the mouth of the La Have, and is determined to compel the mill men on that river to cease their fish-destroying business—though hundreds of poor mill men are thereby thrown out of employment. But his bowels of compassion cease their function when he goes only a few miles away. Into the Medway and Liverpool he allows the sawdust to run unhindered, destroying the fish and bringing starvation to a much larger number of poor fishermen, about the mouths of those rivers, which he allows to be cursed with Conservative (hence, of course, harmless) sawdust."

I wrote to the Minister last year, but he gave me no reasons why this distinction was made, no reasons why the mills in Queen's and other counties were allowed to run while the sawdust was allowed to go into the rivers. It is evident that the channel of the river is not seriously interfered with, and pilots and others employed on the river state this to be the fact. I will read a report from the captain of a steamer plying on that river. It is as follows:—

"BRIDGEWATER, 22nd Nov., 1888.

"C. H. DAVIDSON, Bridgewater.

"SIR,—I am in receipt of yours of the 20th instant. You wish me to inform you by letter how the depth of water in the channel of the LaHave compares now with the time I first took charge of the tugboat; also if I can or cannot now bring as large vessels to the wharves as I could years ago? In reply, I may say that I have been towing on the LaHave every season since 1878, and have noticed but little variation in the depth of the channel during that time, and I find no more difficulty in bringing large vessels to, or taking them from the wharves now, than I did when I first took charge of the tugboat. I took the barque *Montreal* from the wharf this season, drawing over 17½ feet, the greatest draught I have taken down the channel since I have had charge of the tugboat.

"Yours truly,
"W. H. CASHON."

I think it is the bounden duty of the Government to ascertain whether there is any serious hindrance to navigation. I know the river very well myself, and, if my statement is worth anything, there is no hindrance to navigation on that river on account of sawdust. It is true, that sometimes sawdust may be found where the bottom is uneven, particularly in the summer season when the current is slack. Some of the mill owners have a considerable number of logs in their booms on LaHave River, but they will not start their mills, and, in fact, they say they will allow the logs to rot rather than be subjected to heavy penalties, when the law is not enforced generally. I hold that mill owners, on the different rivers of the country, should be all treated alike. I am aware that political friends of the Government have considerable weight with them, and that it is easy to write to parties calling upon them to make reports that certain mills are injuring the fish, or are causing hindrances to navigation. It is most unfair to single out one county, as my county has been singled out, for the enforcement of the Act respecting sawdust, while in adjoining counties the mills have been running ever since 1888. A gentleman who was here the other day, and who is a mill owner in Halifax county, said he would not stop operations, and he did not expect to be fined. It is most unfair to cripple the lumbering industry in certain parts of the country by which hundreds of people obtain their living, and if this policy is continued, it will lead our people to go to the United States and get employment there, and the town of Bridgewater will be ruined if this law is carried with a high hand. There has been a good deal of controversy between the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the mill owners at LaHave. He stated that they have shown a spirit of defiance. But any member of this House, if he considered he was being persecuted for his politics, would resent it, and on that score, therefore, the mill owners are not much to blame. It is a very serious matter that the Department and the Government should have enforced the law in certain sections of the country while they have allowed other sections in the Dominion to go free.

Mr. COLBY. I regret that the hon. gentleman was somewhat inaudible, and I was able to catch but very little of what he stated. I think it would have been well if the hon. gentleman had been good enough to have communicated to me, as representing the Minister in his absence, his intention to bring up this subject to-day, for it would have led me to make some enquiries into the subject to which he has referred. I am in a blissful state of ignorance in regard to the details of the Department which for the moment I represent in the absence of the Minister, unless my attention has been specially called to a subject, and it has not been called to the circumstances mentioned by the hon. gentleman in such a way that I have felt called upon to give the matter my special examination. The law regulating the sawdust question in navigable streams permits the exemption of certain streams by Order in Council. Whether in this instance the Order in Council has been sought for, whether the attention of the Government has been directed to this case or not, I am entirely unaware, and if I am unable to give the hon. gentleman any explanation or any defence of the position of the Government, I hope he will not consider it is from any discourtesy to him, but simply that I was not aware of his intention to bring the matter before the House to-day. I can hardly suppose that whether the stream be a navigable stream, when the action of the Governor in Council would be required to suspend the operation of the law, or an unnavigable stream, when an exception might be given by an order of the Minister, I cannot suppose that in either case any decision would be arrived at upon any other than fair and public grounds. Of course streams differ very much. Some streams, owing to the rapidity of the current, might wash away sawdust so that it would not seriously impede navigation, while in others, owing to the sluggishness of the current, there might be considerable

accumulation of deposits which would seriously injure navigation. I can only suppose, in the absence of any special knowledge of the facts, that the Minister, if he has taken any action whatever in the case, has been guided, as is the usage of the Department, by the reports of his responsible officers. I do not state that to be the fact, because I do not know, but I assume it to be the case that if the Minister's attention has been expressly called to the case to which the hon. gentleman has referred, he has been guided by the reports of the officers who are responsible to the Department for the correctness of their opinions. I regret I am not able to give information or explanation on the subject, because, unfortunately, I have not any to give.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I waited a considerable time in the hope that the hon. the Minister of Marine would return to the city, but it is now so near the end of the Session I felt obliged to bring the matter forward. I understand it is doubtful whether the Minister will return before the close of the Session.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Hon. gentlemen who have taken an interest in this subject will remember that on several occasions when it has been before Parliament, I have gone to a very considerable length in supporting the Administration for the time being in endeavoring to provide such regulations as would appear to be necessary for the protection of the fishing interests of the country in this regard. During the time the Mackenzie Government was in power, we imposed rather severe regulations on the country in this respect. On one occasion, I was called upon by a large mill owner in my own county, who remonstrated in most indignant terms against the Act then put in force. I listened to him for some time, and then I said it was a serious matter no doubt. He assured me that the Government would be ousted in consequence of this interference with the right of the mill owners. I told him it would be a very unfortunate matter for the country if the Government were ousted. But no doubt the people could get another Government, probably not such a good one, but if they allowed the fish in the streams to be destroyed, no Government for a very long time could devise or carry on means to bring back the fish to our rivers. I mention this to show that I have always, to a certain extent, sympathised with the efforts which have been made to preserve our fisheries along the coast, and that I have cheerfully listened to any representations which have been made with reference to the injury said to be caused by the sawdust and other mill *débris* finding its way into the stream. On several occasions, when this matter has been discussed, I have listened to the explanations given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I regret very much is not in his place to-day, because I am fully aware that the acting Minister cannot be quite so familiar with all these details, although a gentleman of his very great capacity should be able in a short time to manage the details of a small question like this. I was rather surprised that the hon. the President of the Council, having been so long in charge of the Department this Session, did not remember that there is a Bill on our fyle from the Department which he represents, purporting to deal with the question this Session. I supposed the hon. gentleman would have made himself acquainted with the nature of that Bill, and the effect it was going to have on the question just now before the House. The hon. gentleman is doubtless aware that the House has been placed in possession of a very exhaustive report from Mr. Sandford Fleming, on this question, with reference to the Ottawa River, and the hon. gentleman, if he has read the report, is also aware that Mr. Fleming's recommendations went very far to carry out the idea which Mr. Rogers, the late fishery inspector of Nova Scotia, imparted to the Government in a communication, which, as my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) says, was suppressed, and was not placed among the official representations from the officers of the Department. These two considerations taken together would lead one, not very familiar with the question, to suppose that the public opinion and the public anxiety with regard to the obstructions of the rivers, have not been well founded. But, Sir, the difficulty to my mind has been, and I confess it still exists, that the Government, in taking these powers to themselves, have not, so far as I have been made aware, exercised them judiciously. I am well aware, that in my own Province of Nova Scotia, there are mill owners who have purposely set the Government regulations at open defiance, and these are gentlemen who have been friends and supporters of the Administration who have not shut down their mills. I know that in the Counties of Queen's, Shelburne, Annapolis and Digby, there are men who have relied upon the influence they and their friends had with the Administration, to continue to operate their mills, whereas, only quite recently, as has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman here, has permission been given to any proprietor to operate his mill. I do not say it was an improper regulation at all. But, on the contrary, I hope and believe that the Government, in doing this, have investigated the matter and were satisfied that in the public interest they were doing what is right. But what I do complain of is that while many of these mill owners throughout the Province of Nova Scotia have been allowed to set the Government regulations at open defiance, another party like the large firm to which my hon. friend (Mr. Eisenhauer)makes particular reference, the firm of the Messrs. Davison, the largest and most important milling establishment in Nova Scotia, and I might say, without any disrespect to the others, not only the largest but the most influential and most wealthy, employing more men than many of the other establishments put together—I complain that this firm, from the fact it would appear of disagreeing with the Government, having been opponents of the Government for a long time, having been drawn into a controversy with the Government, respecting the position of their mills, and the position of the LaHave River which they claimed to be an exceptional one, and which fact has been borne out, apparently, by the report of Mr. Rogers, and by the report of the captain and by the report of other people familiar with the river, with which I do not pretend to be familiar, have not only been hampered, but that they have been closed up for some time, for refusing to go to the expense which the Government insisted they should comply with, while other mill owners in the Province have been

allowed to go scot free. That is what I complain of, and that is a very serious charge. I am informed, on what I believe to be the most creditable and reliable authority, that in the counties of Shelburne and Annapolis, friends of the Administration have been running their mills and allowing their sawdust and *débris* to run into the stream. I am not going to argue now on the main question as to whether it is right or wrong to allow the sawdust to go into the streams. That is a question which I confess is a very difficult one to deal with, and I confess that it would take a very considerable proof to relieve my mind of the conviction which I have long entertained, that sawdust and *débris* in a stream must be dangerous to the fisheries. I appear to be contradicted in this belief by evidence of a professional character which I am disposed to pay considerable deference to, such as it is. At all events I merely rise now for the purpose of protesting against the Government carrying out this law as they have been doing, in the interests of their own friends, and subjecting such a large, and important, and influential firm as the Messrs. Davison on LaHave River, to the restrictions of which they have complained, and on which their complaint is well founded. I do think that the Government should look into this matter, and not allow the controversy which has taken place between that firm and the Minister of Marine, to any longer interfere with their giving the same privileges to the Messrs. Davison, which they have accorded to other people in the Province of Nova Scotia. On that ground, I most heartily sustain the view taken by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) reserving, as I said, my opinion as to the expediency of the question on other grounds. So long as that law is allowed to be placed in operation at all, all should be treated alike and the opponents of the Administration, who are working in the public interest, should not have their operations interfered with by local political jealousies or animosities. The law should be made applicable to friends and enemies of the Government in the same spirit, and all should feel that they are governed by the same law, and are alike entitled to the protection which it affords.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) and my hon. colleague (Mr. Jones), in referring to this question, which is a very important one to the Province of Nova Scotia, have carefully, and, I think, very wisely, refrained from expressing any opinion as to the effects of sawdust on fish life. The duty devolves on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see, as far as lies in his power, that no injury is done to our river fisheries. It is also his duty to see that the navigation of our rivers is not obstructed with refuse from the sawmills. My hon. friend from Lunenburg confined his remarks, chiefly, I think, to the seeming injustice which is done to his constituents living on the banks of the LaHave River, the largest and most important river in the Province of Nova Scotia. I do not think there is a firm in the Province connected with the important interest of lumbering who have shown more enterprise or more ability, or who have been more useful in the locality in which they have conducted their business, than the Messrs. Davison on the LaHave River. Whatever the politics of those gentlemen may be —I believe on political questions they are opposed to my views—still it is a simple matter of justice to them that, as their name has been mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, I should here express my opinion as to their usefulness in the great industry in which they are engaged in that locality. So far as I know—and I have some slight knowledge of the LaHave River, from the fact that vessels in which I am interested occasionally visit that river to load lumber—I do not believe that any very great injury has been done to the navigation of the river by the sawdust which has been thrown into it. I cannot express any opinion as to the effect of the sawdust on the fisheries of the river; but to-day the fisheries of the river are comparatively insignificant; the people mainly depend on the lumber industry. My hon. colleague has referred to a Bill which is now before the House by which it is contemplated that the Minister of Marine shall be deprived of the very unenviable authority which he can now exercise of granting special privileges in one river and refusing them in another. I think my hon. colleague has gone a little beyond the mark when he has insinuated that the reason why these privileges have not been afforded to the Messrs. Davison is the fact that they happen to be political opponents of the present Government. If my hon. colleague will appeal to the representative of the County of Lunenburg, I think that hon. gentleman will tell him that the Messrs. Davison are to-day conducting their lumbering operations in other rivers in the Province of Nova Scotia, where, as far as my information goes, they have not been obstructed in the management of their business. If I am misinformed, I should like to be corrected. I understood that they were conducting operations on the Port Medway River and also on the Nictaux River. On that point I do not pretend to speak positively; but the industry in which the Messrs. Davison are engaged is a very important and very valuable one to the locality in which it is conducted, and I can only repeat what I said before, that, to the best of my knowledge, so far no great injury has resulted to the navigation of that river.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has stated that the Messrs. Davison operate mills in other counties. That is true. They have mills in the County of Kings, where they have been allowed to operate them. If they were not, the distinction would be too marked.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not rise to speak on the sawdust question, but I wish to contradict a statement which has been made with regard to the part of the country to which I belong. We have in that neighborhood four large mills, three of which belong to strong supporters of the Government, and one to an opponent of the Government; and yet the Government have fined all the parties for putting sawdust into the river. I may say that the river has been practically almost ruined by sawdust. It was once full of fish; but that is a very small matter. But the fact is that the hon. Minister has enforced the law against all parties, irrespective of their politics. I dare say he has done so very reluctantly, because one of the owners of these sawmills was my predecessor in this House and a friend of the Minister; yet he was one of the first men fined. So that there is no foundation for

the insinuation that has been made that the hon. Minister puts the law in force only against his political opponents.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I know that great complaints have been made in the Province of New Brunswick, of the manner in which these Orders in Council have been enforced. Last year I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister in regard to a gentleman who had mills on a river that was not used for navigation at all. The prohibition was rigidly enforced against him, and he was compelled to stop his mills. He was a strong opponent of the Government. At the same time other parties in other counties, and in that same county, were allowed to throw sawdust into the river. As to the effect of sawdust in the rivers, I am not prepared to speak. The edgings, I believe, are very injurious, but as to the sawdust, there are really very great doubts. This regulation, carried to the fullest extent, would very seriously affect what is perhaps the most important industry we have in the Province, that is, the lumber industry, which produces the staple article of exportation.

General LAURIE. I wish to call attention to a statement made by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that the law is broken in Shelburne County, and that its infraction is connived at, because those who break it are supporters of the Government. I have no doubt, my hon. friend refers to the remark in this sawdust report, so-called, in which it is stated a large amount of sawdust has been dumped into the Clyde River, which is in Shelburne County. I wish to say, that one of the mills on that river was burnt down two years ago, so that certainly no sawdust from that mill at present goes into that river. The owner of the other mill on the river is a strong opponent of the Government, and if he is allowed to do this, it is not because it is winked at on account of his supporting the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is much to be regretted that this discussion should take place in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because I know he has given close attention to the subject, and has examined all the evidence bearing on it to be procured both in Canada and the United States, and if he were here to present his views, not only the House, but the hon. member for Halifax as well, would be completely relieved from the suspicion that, in endeavoring to enforce the law as he has done in Nova Scotia, and in Ontario as well, he has been actuated by any party considerations whatever. In the very case referred to by the hon. member for Halifax, that of a gentleman from Halifax who visited Ottawa some time ago, and gave my hon. friend to understand that he had obtained permission for the exemption of his mill from the law, I enquired of the Department—having heard a similar statement by the member for Lunenburg —and I understand that is not the case, that no such permission was given by the Department. That gentleman produced, however, at the Department a permit from the late Sir Albert Smith, given when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that permit had been allowed to continue. The action of the Department was simply that in view of the permission granted by the late Sir Albert Smith, the officers of the Department have been called on to report, I am quite aware, from my conversations with the Minister himself, that, so far as the operations of the Messrs. Davison Bros. are concerned, the law was applied as leniently as possible. The Messrs. Davison are, and always have been, so far as I know, active opponents of the Government, but they have never done anything that I know of to induce exceptional treatment, they being men of the highest respectability both in business relations and otherwise. With one active member of the firm I had the pleasure of sitting for a while in the House of Assembly, and I am sure that no member of this Government would, on account of that gentleman's politics, or the politics of his associates, make any distinction in the treatment of him, and that given to others. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a mass of evidence in the line in which the hon. member for Halifax indicated that his own opinion tended, namely, in the direction of the injury done by the refuse sawdust being permitted to be thrown into the streams ; and, as regards the LaHave River, where Messrs. Davison Bros. do business, it has been well established, that the fish have been nearly all exterminated there by means of the sawdust, and it is because that is so that it can now be said that the lumber interest is the greater of the two. The navigation of the river, which ought to be most serviceable for all the purposes of commerce in that county, has been seriously affected by the quantity of sawdust thrown into the stream. It is true that the operation of the penal provisions concerning sawdust is unequal. It has been the policy of this Parliament that they should be unequal, and that all rivers should not come within the penal provisions of the Act, for the obvious reason that streams vary a great deal in character. Some streams are very rapid, and the sawdust is carried away by the current, so that it is of very little prejudice to navigation or to the fish. Others, on the contrary, are slow, and more likely to suffer from the accumulations of sawdust. There are cases of streams in the County of Queen's in which there is only water to operate the mills during a very few months of the year, and in which fish life is almost impossible and navigation is out of the question, so that the injury by sawdust is practically nil. Still it may be a very grave question whether it would not be better, in order to inspire public confidence, that the law should be applied without exception in all cases. As soon as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can present the result of his investigation, I am confident the House will be under no suspicion that he has been over-zealous in enforcing this provision or actuated by any desire to make any invidious distinction.

Mr. MITCHELL. I regret very much that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here to deal with this question. The course which he is inclined to pursue, judging by the legislation he has introduced, is one that commends itself to my judgment as being the proper one. The Minister of Justice has correctly stated that there are conditions and circumstances of mills and rivers which call for different treatment; and the questions that come up in relation to this matter are, first, as to how mill owners can keep out the sawdust and carry on their lumber business, and next,

as to the effect of the sawdust upon the rivers. I admit that it is difficult to work these little one-horse sawmills which exist on many of the smaller rivers, and keep the sawdust from falling into the water. But the Government, I think, should not fail to carry out their policy in reference to the larger rivers. Take, for instance, the River Ottawa. Everybody knows that sawdust dumped into a river both destroys the fish and impedes navigation. For twenty-five years we have had a law making it a punishable offence to put sawdust into the rivers, and I must say for the mill owners in my county that they have fairly tried to comply with the law and have largely met the difficulty of carrying it out. Where there are steam saw mills of course these mills can burn their own sawdust, but I find the Ottawa River, one of the great arteries of the country, on which are many large mills, suffers most from this evil. Fortunes are being made by the mill owners on that river. In a recent case, that of a gentleman who occupied a position in this House as a representative of the city of Ottawa, and who died the other day, I find by the papers that he left behind him a fortune of $1,250,000 earned on this river. Is it right that these wealthy mill owners should be permitted to go on from year to year and block up one of the greatest rivers of this country, 700 to 800 miles long? You go down in the summer season and you will find hundreds of acres on the flats near the Grenville Canal covered with sawdust. An explosion took place opposite this city last winter, which, if any people had been crossing the ice at the time, would, no doubt, have resulted in loss of life. We have had a report made by Mr. Sandford Fleming on this subject, but, though it is not altogether in favor of stopping the practice of putting sawdust into the Ottawa River, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has proposed this Bill. I entirely agree with the policy of the Minister of Marine on this subject, and think a stop should be put to this practice. I regret that it is not carried out everywhere. In the river which runs through my county, they do not put sawdust into the river; they burn it. But here, at the Chaudière mills, they dump the sawdust into the river. When I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, we endeavored to put a stop to that practice, but it was very difficult. I do not reflect upon the present Minister of Marine, but I am sorry that he was not here to push through the Bill which he placed on the files of the House, because I believe it would be beneficial to the country. It might be a little expensive to the lumbermen, but it would prevent the great Ottawa River from being obstructed as it is to-day. We have spent millions of dollars to make our rivers navigable, and yet we allow these wealthy mill owners to throw their sawdust into the rivers and obstruct the navigation.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am sorry to differ with my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I have had some experience in regard to sawdust, and I cannot understand how sawdust can interfere with the navigation of any river. Slabs and edgings and things of that kind may interfere with the navigation but not sawdust. I have read Mr. Fleming's report in regard to the Ottawa River, and I am satisfied that it is correct. I have had 45 years' experience in this matter, and I say that sawdust has never interfered in any degree with the navigation of a river, and it is my opinion that it has never interfered with the fish. All the kinds of fish that were in the rivers with which I am acquainted, as far back as tradition can point out, are there now. It is an impression which has gone abroad, and which is very reasonable, that the fish take the sawdust into their gills in breathing, and that it kills the fish. I have never heard of dead fish in the rivers to which I refer or of fish being driven out of rivers which they previously frequented in consequence of sawdust. We must look at the great interest of lumbering and we must consider that, even if the fish in these rivers were less in quantity, they are not fish for commercial purposes, while the lumbering business is one of the greatest industries we have in Canada. Even if the sawdust did interfere with the sport of certain gentlemen, even if it interfered, as one hon. gentleman has stated, with salmon, trout and smelts, still we must consider the great lumbering interests. It is beyond my comprehension how sawdust can interfere with the navigation of any river, though slabs will. Some of the sawdust may gather into eddies or in deep water, but it never stops in the channel of the stream and never interferes with vessels going out or coming in. I can hardly think the Government would make any preference in the enforcement of this law. As to the river which flows through the county which I represent, the State of Maine has given great attention to the fishery question and the border river between New Brunswick and the State of Maine has never been interfered with either by Maine or by Canada in regard to sawdust, though the State of Maine has been careful to keep bark and edgings and slabs out of the river, because they will sink. This is a matter of serious consideration. It is impossible to so arrange the mills on the Ottawa River that they will keep the sawdust out. They would have to be taken down and reconstructed. In regard to steam mills, sawdust makes a good fuel, but in regard to water mills it is impossible to utilise the sawdust unless the mills are reconstructed entirely.

Mr. LAURIER. It appears difficult to resist the conclusion that an invidious distinction is made, I will not say between friend and foe, but between river and river in the application of this law, and, in view of the very harsh treatment applied to the mill owners on the LaHave River and the very lenient consideration which has been given to the mill owners on the Ottawa River, one is compelled to ask what is the reason for this difference in treatment? What is the reason that the law is applied with the greatest severity on the one hand, and with the greatest leniency on the other? Now, strong evidence has been presented to show that on the LaHave River sawdust, perhaps because the current is strong, does not at all affect navigation. On the Ottawa River, on the contrary, we have had complaints for years about the interference of navigation by sawdust thrown into the river from times almost immemorial. I do not want to be more severe than I can help, but certainly it is impossible to resist the conclusion that if there is not unjust discrimination made between the two cases, then the law is harsh in itself, and should be modified in some manner. The Minister of Justice stated a

moment ago, that perhaps it would be better that the Minister of Marine should be relieved from the power which he now has, of granting permits to avoid the law. Perhaps it would be better, because I have no doubt that this must be a constant source of trouble to him on account of the numerous applications made to him by different parties to be relieved from the enforcement of the law. For my part, I do not think that it is very difficult to carry out the law as it is to-day. In the West, all the sawmills are supplied with furnaces to burn up the refuse of the mill. I have asked lumbermen why this could not be done on the Ottawa River, and I understand that it could only be done by constructing the mills altogether differently, and that would involve a very serious expense and trouble. If the power of making the distinction which the Minister now possesses were removed, or if the law were to be amended so as to provide that in future all mills should be compelled to dispose of their refuse, then there would be uniform legislation, and this source of irritation would be removed. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said that a one-horse sawmill should not be obliged to dispose of its sawdust; but we must remember that this applies not to small streams only, but to navigable rivers on which you will find large mills, and it would not be hard to compel them to dispose of their refuse in some other way than by throwing it into the river.

Mr. McNEILL. I am afraid that if the proposition of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were to be adopted, and if the provisions of the law were only to be applied to mills hereafter built on navigable rivers, in a few years we would not have any fish to protect, because I think the mills at present in operation would put an end to the fish if they are allowed to be poisoned by sawdust. For it is well known that sawdust is a poison to fish. I do hope that this House will endeavor in every possible way to strengthen the hands of the Minister of Marine in his attempt to protect the fishing interests of this country. The fishing industry is a very great industry, and there is no doubt whatever that it has suffered very much already from the cause we are now discussing. My hon. friend who spoke a moment ago seems to suppose that sawdust does not interfere with navigation, and I must say I am rather surprised at his statement. When sawdust has fallen into the water, no doubt a large part of it will float at first, but in a very short time it becomes waterlogged, and then it becomes as effectual in interfering with navigation as sand itself. No doubt where the stream runs strongly it will keep a channel for itself to a certain extent, and so it would do in the very centre of the stream in the case of sand. But you will find that an accumulation of sawdust takes place on the banks of the stream, and that by increase that accumulation draws closer and closer to the centre of the stream, until at last the navigation of the river is closed altogether. Sawdust which has been thrown into the rivers in my own constituency, I know has caused a great deal of damage; it has been a source of the greatest injury to the fishing industry there. It is not only confined to rivers, but it extends as far as the lakes, because a certain quantity of it is carried down the rivers into the lakes and interferes with the fishing industry there. My hon. friend who spoke a moment ago says that there are as many fish in his part of the country as ever; if that be the case he is very much to be congratulated, but I am sorry to say that is not the fact throughout the Dominion.

Mr. IVES. I think there should be some distinction made between navigable and non-navigable streams, and possibly when you come to deal with non-navigable streams, a distinction should be made between those that are largely used by lumbermen and those which are not to any great extent used by lumbermen. The comparative importance of the lumber interest and the fishing industry should be considered by the Government in any action they may take in reference to any particular stream or river. If, for instance, the river is unimportant as a breeding ground for fish, if the total value of fish taken in a particular stream amounts to little or nothing; and if, on the other hand, very large lumbering interests have centred upon that river, it would be madness, it would be suicidal to the interests of the country, for the Government to apply a cast-iron rule to such streams as that. Take, for example, the St. Francis River and its tributaries, in the Eastern Townships. That river is of little or no value as a ground for breeding fish. I do not suppose, that if the market value of all the fish taken in the St. Francis River and its tributaries were added up, it would amount to $500 a year. On the other hand, from Brompton Falls, near Sherbrooke, I am not aware what the extent of the lumber interest may be below that point, but I know at Pierreville there is a large manufacturing establishment on the river; but from Brompton Falls upwards on the St. Francis River and its tributaries, I am perfectly safe in saying there are a hundred millions of lumber manufactured every year. Now, that hundred millions of lumber involves an average of, we will say, $6 a thousand in wages to the men who cut the logs in the winter, to the men who drive them to the mill in the spring, and to the men who manufacture the sawn lumber in the summer. That means a large amount of money paid out as wages in the course of every year. When you compare the importance of that industry with the insignificant value of all the fish that are taken, or could be taken, out of that river, it becomes perfectly manifest that it would be absurd for the Government to enforce a law prohibiting the putting of sawdust into that stream or its tributaries. I am quite prepared to admit that in the case of navigable waters other interests come in, which must be considered in their relative importance compared with the lumbering interests. I think the matter should be regulated in respect to the importance of the interests affected, and no cast-iron rule can be applied to any stream whether navigable or non-navigable.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with a good deal of what has been said by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ives). I think some confusion exists as to the matter, because it has been apparently considered that a proceeding which is based on the one statute is to be dependent in part on the provisions of another statute. The truth is, the proposed legislation which has been discussed, and which would relieve the hon. the Minister from the invidious distinction with which he is at present invested by making the rule cast iron,

is legislation which, as I understand it, would apply only to one set of difficulties, namely, to the difficulties arising from navigation. But the Fishery Act is another statute, with another set of prohibitions, and it also reserves its own exemption power to the Minister; and, therefore, the proceedings in this case, as I understood them, having been taken only under the Act with respect to navigable rivers, it is beside the question to attempt to discuss whether these proceedings are justifiable under the Fishery Act, or upon the ground, for instance, of injury to the fisheries. I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that so long as it is attempted to justify the enforcement of these prohibitions by reference to the fishing interests the proposed legislation as to navigation will be of no consequence, because the Act, which it is proposed to amend, does not authorise any prohibition whatever in consequence of the fishing interests. It deals solely with the interests of navigation; it is the other statute that deals with the prohibition as to the fishing interests, and that statute must be dealt with in order to alter, if it is thought desirable to alter, its provisions as to exemption. There was a great deal of good sense in what the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ives) said in respect to the relative importance of the conflicting interests. I happen to know Mr. Davison, who is an old friend of mine, and early in this Session I was put in possession of the papers in this case, and I expected I would have had an opportunity of dealing with it when the Bill of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was brought up. Since that time my recollection of the facts has somewhat faded away, and I am not able to speak as clearly as I had hoped to speak, on this unexpected occasion. So far as I can remember, whether the diminution in the quantity of fish was due to the sawdust or no, it seems to me to be ridiculous to compare for an instant the existing condition of the fishing interests on the LaHave and the existing condition of the lumbering interests on that river; for the lumbering interests as regards the mill owners, the employés, and the public are of such importance that the action of the law on the ground of the relatively insignificant fishing interests should not prevail. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Ives) that, as regards navigable rivers, the interests of navigation are of much higher importance and require much more careful consideration. I read the evidence on this subject also. There was no doubt some evidence that sawdust had accumulated in some parts of the river. There was no doubt evidence that the channel had been to some extent narrowed, I should judge; but I did not find, taking the whole evidence, that the navigation of the River LaHave such as it is, and such as I should judge it is likely to be, is being at this time substantially impeded, for the uses to which it is put, by the condition of affairs which had been produced by the sawdust; nor did I find from the evidence that there had been, of late years at all events, any great impairment of the condition. It is perfectly obvious that the effect of sawdust will depend very much on the character of the stream. As the hon. Minister of Justice has said, if we deal with rapidly running rivers, having a great descent and without sinuosities, no doubt the sawdust will get away. If, however, the river is somewhat sluggish, and particularly when it is a tidal river with deep bays and eddies, there are abundant points on which the sawdust will be deposited, for I cannot agree with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), that the sawdust keeps floating all the time; but there may be considerable deposits of sawdust in these bays and deep spots, and yet the average depth of the river may be maintained. There is, of course, no object, for purposes of navigation, in having deep holes in a river. The depth of the channel of a river is its depth at its shallowest point. So if the sawdust simply fills up the holes and leave the navigable channel free, of course no damage is done to navigation. The general impression I drew from the evidence was this, and I state it after the speeches delivered by the two Ministers, that there was no great public interest imperilled by the continuance at the present time of the state of things which has been continuing for some time, while it would appear that very serious inconvenience would result, even if the destruction of the entire lumbering business would not result, from a severe course being taken in this regard. All I ask now is, that as we have not had an opportunity of fully discussing this question, which we had reason to expect would be given to us by the Government Bill on the paper standing in the name of the Minister of Marine, which, we understand, will not now be proceeded with, there shall be given a very careful reconsideration of the condition of affairs with respect to these rivers on which the hon. the Minister is at present enforcing the prohibition; and that unless it be made upon that reconsideration absolutely plain that such an important interest as the navigation interest is about to be seriously interfered with by the continuation of the system, a stay of these vigorous proceedings should take place in the instance which has given rise to this discussion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. While the hon. gentleman is quite correct as to the effect of the operation of the Bill to which he refers, that is Bill (No. 47) respecting the protection of navigable waters, the next Bill (No. 85) to amend the Fisheries Act, chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes, takes away the discretion.

Mr. KIRK. This is a question which affects a great many rivers in the Province of Nova Scotia, and it is not confined to the River LaHave in the County of Lunenburg. The regulations of the Government cause very much annoyance to different interests in the country. The arguments advanced in favor of keeping sawdust out of the rivers are not altogether convincing. I do not believe there is much force in the argument that sawdust kills fish. I have lived alongside of a stream ever since I was a boy, and on that stream sawmills had been running long before I was born, and yet I have never seen fish floating dead on the surface of the water killed by sawdust getting into their gills. We have a report by Rogers, late fishery inspector for Nova Scotia, who held the position of inspector for twenty years, and who devoted much attention to this subject. He does not hold to the opinion that sawdust kills fish, and in a special report which he called a sawdust report, which report the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refused to publish I am told, because Mr. Rogers' view did not agree with the Minister's view of the question, but which report Mr. Rogers found

means of publishing and placing in the hands of the people—in that report he claims that sawdust does not kill fish, and he supports his opinion by the opinion of authorities in other countries. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has stated with respect to the killing of fish in LaHave River, that the lumber interest was of greater importance than the fishing interest. I believe he is correct in that regard, but the hon. Minister of Justice, in answer to him, said that it was the lumbering industry which destroyed the fishing industry, and that the former industry is of greater importance to the people now than the fisheries. It must be remembered that the LaHave is not the only river in which the fish has fallen off; for if you examine the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, you will find that the quantity of fish has fallen off in every river in the Province of Nova Scotia. I wish I could agree with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) that fish are as plentiful in Nova Scotia to-day as they were twenty years ago. I know to the contrary, I know that in not a single stream in the Province of Nova Scotia are fish as plentiful as they were years ago, and that applies to streams in which there never was any sawdust at all. We must look for some other reason for the decline of fishing, therefore, than to attribute the cause to the sawdust. There has been a falling off in rivers in which there never was any sawdust, as well as in rivers along which sawmills are in operation. In reference to the injury done to navigation, I may say, that I believe there are certain narrow rivers and harbors in which the sawdust may interfere with navigation, and for that reason, it would perhaps be the duty of the Government to interfere. I cannot believe that sawdust is killing fish. We know that it does not lie where the current is running rapidly, and so far as the eastern section of the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned our streams are all rapid, and the sawdust does not lie in them, unless it is carried down, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, and thrown into pools and flats. But fish do not spawn in pools or in still water. They spawn in streams where the current is rapid and on the shoals, and, therefore, the sawdust cannot injure the fish in the spawning grounds. So far as Nova Scotia is concerned, I cannot see that the sawdust injures the fish, but I do believe, that to enforce the regulation of the Government and to require that the mill owners should keep the dust out of the rivers will be a greater injury to the people of Nova Scotia, because of its hampering and crippling the lumber industry, than will be any injury that can be done to the fishing industry by the sawdust.

Mr. BURNS. The hon. gentleman has a very mistaken idea as to the particular places in rivers in which fish spawn. As a rule, and I speak from observation, the fish spawn in places where the water is not very rapid, and where sawdust is apt to be deposited. From observation of the rivers in my own county, which is, perhaps, one of the most important fishing counties in Canada, I have noticed that where sawdust has been deposited it has been so deposited with serious injury to the fishing in these rivers. Of late years the mill owners have taken precaution to prevent the sawdust falling into the rivers, but in former years, when the same consideration was not given to the matter, or the fisheries regarded in the same important light as now, and especially in the days of the old-fashioned mills, sawdust and slabs and edgings were all put into the river, with the result as I have stated, that these rivers were almost entirely depleted of fish. Of late years, the steam saw mills burn all the sawdust, and the owners of water mills cart the sawdust out into piles and there let it remain, or they mix it up with the edgings and slabs and burn it during the winter season. It must be patent to those who give the subject consideration, that very great detriment indeed accrues to the fisheries by the deposits of sawdust in the rivers, and I think the Department should be encouraged in every way to prevent such a practice continuing. There are no doubt cases in which the enforcement of the law on this matter would be an extreme hardship and would cause very serious loss to the mill owners, and these are cases which deserve the serious consideration of the Government. But, as a general principle, the Government and the Department should be encouraged and sustained as fully as possible in their desire to prevent the destruction of our fisheries, and the obstacles which arise to navigation by the deposit of sawdust. I rose for the purpose of taking exception to the statement of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk). I have observed very particularly, indeed, for some years, the localities in which fish spawn, and I assert that fish do not spawn where the water is rapid enough to take away the sawdust. It is true that they do not spawn in entirely still water, but they do spawn in water which is not rapid enough to prevent the sawdust from dropping to the bottom and remaining there.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). There seems to be a great deal of difference of opinion amongst these gentlemen who understand something about the propagation of fish as to whether the deposit of sawdust in streams prejudicially affects the fish or whether it does not. There is also a great deal of difference of opinion in regard to the Ottawa River, as to whether the deposit of sawdust in that river interferes with the navigation or not, as is evidenced by the conflicting reports we have on that question. Now, as I understand the law, it does not affect only these mills which are situated upon these navigable streams, for it provides "that no sawdust shall be allowed to be placed in the water of any stream, any portion of which is navigable, or into any stream that falls into a navigable river," so that, practically, all saw mills that are situated upon streams in any part of this country which fall into navigable rivers, or if any portion of the rivers upon which they are situated are navigable, they are prohibited from putting sawdust into the stream. I take it that this prohibits all mill owners, except those exempted by an Order in Council, from allowing sawdust to run into the waters of the rivers that may be adjoining their mills, or of any stream, no matter what its character may be, unless it is an inland lake which has no outlet. I do not agree with these gentlemen who contend that the Government ought to be at liberty to exempt any particular locality from the provisions of this law. If the law for the prevention of putting mill rubbish and sawdust into the streams is one that ought to be on the Statute-book, then I say that it ought to apply

in all cases, and that the Government should not have it in their power to exempt any particular locality from the operations of the law. But, at the same time, Sir, I think that the Government, before amending the law in regard to a great industry like the lumber industry, ought to obtain the fullest possible information respecting the interests that are affected by the throwing of sawdust or rubbish into the streams. I think that between now and the next Session the Government ought to use every means in their power to determine, both as regards fishing and navigation. But I am strongly of opinion that the Government ought not to reserve to themselves the right to say what particular locality shall be exempted from the law.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is just one thing I wish to say. The hon. member for Guysborough makes one statement with regard to the propagation of fish, and my hon. friend from Gloucester makes another.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken, and if he is going to discriminate between two opinions, another discussion will probably arise, and I see that the House is anxious to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think your Honor is exceedingly strict in this case. I do not want to resort to any side means of getting my ideas before the House, so I will yield.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think we ought to make some allowance for a great party in this House, and permit at least more than one speech from that party. With regard to a remark of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), that fish do not spawn in waters which flow with sufficient rapidity to carry away sawdust, I think the hon. gentleman is not well acquainted with the habits of the trout and the salmon, which always spawn in rapidly-flowing waters.

Mr. DAWSON. I have had a good deal of experience with regard to both fishing and lumbering, and there can be no doubt that sawdust does kill fishing, whether it kills the fish or not. There are many streams running into Lake Huron in which trout were once very abundant, and where you could catch them with a fly as rapidly as you chose; but the moment a sawmill makes its appearance on a river, the trout disappear. The sawdust frightens them away, disgusts them, they do not like it. There is no necessity for throwing the sawdust into the water at all; it is very easy to provide means for destroying it by burning or otherwise. I fancy there are some fish like the pike, which burrow in mud a great deal, which do not mind sawdust very much; but the finer kinds of fish, like the trout and the salmon, are certainly driven away by it.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To pay Alphonse Desjardins for forty copies "Débats Parlementaires de Québec," for 1888 and 1889, at $8..... $640

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We ought to have some explanation of this. When the Order in Council was passed in 1888, referring the purchase of books to the Library Committee, and that Committee determined what exchanges we should purchase, it was agreed these Parliamentary Reports should not be purchased; and it was stated by Mr. DeCelles that the parliamentary reports of the Province of Quebec had been discontinued, that there were none published for the year 1889, and that, under any circumstances, they would not be purchased. I have two objections to this item. In the first place, I do not believe that forty copies of the Parliamentary Reports of the Province of Quebec in French, are required for this library at all. They are not a proper work to be bought for exchanges. And, in the second place, $8 is largely in excess of the price. We only pay $6 for our *Hansard* for the year.

Mr. DESJARDINS. What does it cost to the country?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot tell what it costs. I know what is charged per volume. We are charged $6 for the whole *Hansard* for the Session, whether one, two or three volumes; and we are asked to pay $8 a volume for the Parliamentary Reports of Quebec—a price, I am told, in excess of what they can be purchased for; and the number is altogether disproportionate to what we require. Why has the Order in Council been disregarded?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The gentleman who has published the *Débats Parlementaires de Québec* has been very enterprising and has done praiseworthy work. In the years 1885, 1886 and 1887 this House voted to purchase forty volumes each year, without any objection being made. Last year by inadvertence a vote was not taken, I being absent, but the books were sent as usual. The price of the book is exactly what it can be published for. The hon. gentleman says, forty copies of this book published in French are not of use to this Parliament, but twenty-five copies are given to the library and are used as exchanges. They are sent to other legislative bodies as usual, with the official publications. The other volumes are distributed among the different Departments. If the Minister in any Department does not care to have them, he can leave the volume in the library to be given to some of the officers in the House who might need them. I can tell the hon. gentleman this is no speculation. My hon. friend says the Order in Council should apply to that. It should not apply. The Order in Council was not passed in 1888, but in 1889, and was not intended to apply to such books, and the Library Committee and the Librarian have not said these reports should be discontinued. They must be in the library, but if the House thinks proper we might next year limit the number to twenty-five. I will not object to that, but forty copies is the usual number. It is not a great generosity on the part of the Government if forty copies are taken. I am only sorry that the other Legislatures do not publish reports of their debates. The chairman of the *Hansard* Committee asks how much our own publication costs. I could not exactly state the figure, but it does not compare favorably with the price we pay for the publication of the reports of the Quebec debates. It would be desirable to have from every Legislature, for the future history of this country, an official report of their debates, and I do not think $320 is a large sum of

money for this Parliament to vote every year to secure that publication.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The reason the objection is taken this year is that, under the Order in Council passed by the Government and forwarded to the Library Committee, we took the matter into consideration and left it to a sub-committee. That sub-committee did not deem it necessary to purchase forty copies of this work. They reported against it, and I am told the Legislature of Quebec have abolished the official report altogether. Why should we pay for the official reports of the Quebec debates, and not pay for the same reports of the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island and the other Provinces.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They have none.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They have all official reports. We should not be asked to pass this vote when the library reported against taking the work, and when that official report has been abolished by the Quebec Legislature.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Some copies of it have been bought by the Quebec Legislature at the same price we pay, but the Quebec Legislature has not given a fixed amount, as they used to do under the previous Government, for the publication of those debates.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. the Secretary of State must admit, that it is utterly ridiculous to buy forty copies of these debates for the use of our library. Five copies would answer every purpose. If you want the reports of the Province of New Brunswick, you cannot even get one copy. You cannot imagine five members of Parliament wanting at the same time to look over those debates. You cannot imagine five members of Parliament seeking at the same time to look through those books.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We do not want five copies here, but we want those copies to exchange with other Legislatures.

Mr. ELLIS. It is not for us here to make that exchange. This is not our publication, but a publication of the Quebec Legislature.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If it is true that the Legislature of Quebec has decided to discontinue the publication of these reports, I do not see why we should pass this vote for next year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They have not decided to discontinue the report, but they will only buy a few copies, as we do.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). As far as the Quebec Government are concerned, these reports are abolished. Of course the publisher may go on printing these reports, but it is certain he will not unless he receives what he was getting from the Legislature. Last year he received either $4,000 or $6,000. If the Quebec Government only take a dozen copies from him, he cannot go on, and I think the hon. gentleman, if he refers to the discussions in the Quebec Legislature this year, will see that it has been agreed to be perfectly impossible for the publisher to go on with that work unless the ordinary amount was voted. That has not been voted. It is quite possible that a few copies will be bought if the work is published, but that will be in the same way as any private publications are bought and is not intended to secure the publication of the report, as the previous vote was intended.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is last year's report that we are paying for and not this year's report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the Government intend to carry out their own Order in Council, they should leave it to the Library Committee to purchase what is necessary for the purpose of exchange.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with my hon. friend that in the future we should not be put to the trouble of purchasing these books but that it should be left to the Library Committee.

Towards aiding in publication of seventh volume of "Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes". $1,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the main Estimates of this year, page 73, I find a vote of $1,000 for aiding in the publication of this work, and I find the same vote of $1,000 in the three years 1888-89, 1889-90, and now there is this other one for 1890-91.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two volumes in one year, and this is the last.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we have voted $3,000 altogether for this work, and I should like to know why we should vote it. It is not a book of such great importance that we should be called upon to vote such a large sum of money for it.

Mr. AMYOT. This is not an annual publication.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is an annual vote.

Mr. AMYOT. This is the last volume of a most important series of works in reference to the history of all the French Canadian families, and it has an intimate connection with the early history of the country. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) should try to deprive us of almost the only chance we have of tracing the history of French Canadian families. If this referred to the history of the families in Prince Edward Island, the hon. gentleman would not discourage the publication.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the approaching extermination of the French race by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I think it is only right that we should have this record of the history of the French families.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will serve instead of a large series of tombstones.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is another book containing some French Canadian history for which we have voted a considerable sum of money.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What is it ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is a book on Military Affairs for which we have paid $500, and I think it gives some very valuable history. I understand that we have paid the $500, not for what the book contains, but for the preface. This book contains the life history of a very eminent French gentleman who sits in this House. I believe the preface was put in after the book was issued. When the book was issued it was found that it did not sell, and this preface was put in afterwards, and we paid $500 for it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What is the title ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is "Military Law." The following is the preface :—

"To the Honorable Sir Adolphe P. Caron."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I should like to ask, which is the book and which is the item.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is in connection with the genealogy of the French families. I do not know what your genealogy is. I do not know why the Secretary of State should object to this.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I only wished the hon. gentleman to state what connection this book has with the item in the Estimates.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This book is dedicated—

"To the Honorable Sir Adolphe P. Caron, K.C.M.G., Minister of Militia and Defence, this volume is (by special permission) respectfully dedicated as a small token of appreciation for the energy, zeal and ability displayed in the performance of the responsible duties of his high position during the most critical and eventful period that has ever occurred in the history of the Dominion of Canada, by his very obedient servant, The Author."

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the author ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. His name is Macpherson.

An hon. MEMBER. Then he is not a Frenchman ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was about to show how important this book is, for which we paid $500. I find that one of the questions in the book is :

"How is a private soldier in a state of drunkenness to be confined ?

The answer is :

"He is to be confined alone, and in the prisoners' room or in a guardroom cell until sober, and not in the guardroom itself, where he may often be provoked to an act of violence and insubordination. He is to be deprived of his boots, except when the weather is too cold, and is to be visited at least every two hours by a non-commissioned officer of the guard and an escort in order that his condition may be ascertained.

"Q. What time should elapse before he is brought before an officer for investigation ?—A. Twenty-four hours should usually elapse before the investigation, so as to ensure his being perfectly sober"

Now, I think when we have paid $500 for this book and this preface, I hope the hon. member for Queen's will withdraw his opposition to having the history of the French families brought down in this genealogy. It would be very unfortunate if we could not afford to pay $1,000 for a history of all the French families, when we have paid $500 for a brief history of an era in the life of the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend, I believe, has received that book without having to pay anything for it. I am surprised that the only feature about that book which struck him, is the identical one which he has been reading to the House —that is, to provide for those who have to be put into the cell, and to divest of their boots those who are unable to do so themselves. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman, who does take some interest in militia matters, knew more about them, he might know that these are the Queen's Regulations which have been transferred into a book which is recognised as being a very valuable contribution to our literature on militia matters in this country. I repeat again that the hon. gentleman has just selected, possibly, that passage in the book that might apply to him personally if he were in the service.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not know that it would apply to the Minister of Militia at all ; and if it is in the Queen's Regulations I do not know why we should pay $500 to have it in this book also.

Additional for plant for Government Printing Bureau $8,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What additional plant is required for this Printing Bureau ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose those who are acquainted with the business of printing will understand that a large printing establishment costing about $250,000 will require, during the year, some additional plant. I could not say exactly what will be required in detail, but I know that type and other plant will be needed.

Classification of old records..... $1,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this for ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The present clerk of the Privy Council, Mr. McGee, has been employed for some time in classifying the records of the old Province of Canada. The records are exceedingly valuable and interesting, as the hon. gentleman will see if he will look into the Privy Council Office. They have been stored away for years and have almost become mouldy. Mr. McGee, who is an enthusiast in that kind of thing, has devoted himself to it, and in fact had to have some assistance for the purpose of classifying them as a series of historical records.

To pay cost of appeal to Privy Council in case of Attorney General of British Columbia *vs.* Attorney General of Canada, in the matter of the title to precious metals in the railway belt. $5,400

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the particulars with regard to this appeal ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will recollect that, although the lands in the railway belt in British Columbia were transferred to Canada, the Provincial Government contended that they should administer the mines in that belt. A case was then submitted to the Supreme Court, I think, and a decision was given in favor of British Columbia. It was subsequently appealed to the Privy Council in England, and, as the hon. gentleman may recollect, the precious metals were given to the Province. This is to pay the expense of that suit.

Amount required to pay Customs share (one-half) of cost of repairs and maintenance of Government steam yacht *Cruiser* during the season of 1889..... $2,631 45

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the service of the *Cruiser*. I quite agree with the policy of the Government in placing a vessel there, and I think it was, perhaps, a favorable opportunity of obtaining a vessel which was taken advantage of when the *Cruiser* was purchased, but I think experience has shown that she is not qualified at all for the service she ought to render. I think it would be advisable for the Government to find some waters in which she can be more serviceable than she ever can be in the Georgian Bay. But apart from that altogether, I would like to take

this opportunity of impressing upon the Government the great advantage it would be to the public service to have on Lake Huron, and especially in the waters of the Georgian Bay, a vessel of capacity, size and power such as is really required for the service that might be rendered there in the interest of the public. Now, the *Cruiser* cannot follow a fishing boat in rough water ; she cannot aid the Customs work except under favorable conditions ; she cannot go out into the open water in anything like a gale of wind. What the Government ought to have in these waters is a vessel of sufficient size and power to go out in any weather, under any conditions, and she would be of great service to the marine in rendering assistance to vessels in distress. There is no vessel there now capable of rendering such service. She could be employed also in laying down the buoys and beacons which will be necessary after the new survey is completed, because the present system is altogether inadequate. Buoys, such as could be employed on that coast, cannot be laid down unless by a vessel peculiarly fitted for the purpose. Larger buoys and those that are proper for the purpose cannot be laid down unless by a vessel of power enough and capacity enough to carry machinery proper for doing it. I would like the Minister of Marine to take this subject into consideration, and see whether he cannot find means of putting upon these lakes, at the earliest possible period a vessel such as would answer the various services that would be required. I will not take up the time of the House now in discussing the various services which such a vessel might render ; they will easily suggest themselves to any one who is conversant with those waters. I hope the matter will be taken into account, and it can be done now under favorable circumstances, because in Owen Sound there are men and material and all the plant requisite for building a vessel such as is required.

To pay John Dyke, Government Agent at Liverpool, England, for services rendered and expenses in procuring information for use of the Customs Department.....$500

To pay Mr. Wm. Doyle, late Preventive Officer in H. M.'s service at Dalhousie, N.B., a gratuity on his retirement from the service, as per Order in Council of 9th September, 1889. .....$100

To pay Mr. R. Robichau, Sub-Collector in H. M.'s Customs, at Meteghan, N.S., a gratuity equal to 18 months' salary on his retirement from the service.....$150

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is not Mr. Dyke in the employment of the Government as immigration agent at Liverpool ?

Mr. BOWELL. He is immigration agent stationed at Liverpool. This item of $500 is for services rendered the Customs Department during the last four or five years. Very often when intricate questions as to values arise and it is necessary to obtain information, we employ Mr. Dyke to do the work. We send him to distant parts of England and sometimes to Scotland, and after his investigation he reports to the Customs Department. This is a very small remuneration for the services he has rendered during the last four or five years, as those services have been of very great value to the Department and have added largely to the revenue. They have been the means of preventing undervaluations and other attempts to enter articles below the actual market value. I obtained the permission of the late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Pope) before I employed Mr. Dyke, and at that time the Minister said he was the best man I could secure for the service. I can assure the Committee that Mr. Dyke has done his work well, and that this is the very small remuneration for the services he has rendered.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We notice Mr. Dyke's name frequently in the Auditor General's Report. He is paid a liberal salary and receives $4 a day for living allowance, and draws altogether over $4,000 a year. Yet when some work is performed by him for the Minister of Customs, it is proposed to pay him a gratuity of $500. It is a vicious principle. Mr. Dyke has been well paid for all the services he has performed, and it is not just that this vote should be asked from the Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this case of Doyle in accordance with the regular custom of the Department ?

Mr. BOWELL. This is an old servant of the Customs Department, who has been employed since Confederation, at a salary of $100 a year. His office has been abolished, but he is not entitled to superannuation. We, therefore, propose to give him a gratuity of $100. Mr. Robichau has been sub-collector for twenty-seven years at Meteghan, in Digby County, and his age is eighty-four years. He could not be superannuated. The port is increasing in importance and greater revenue is being received every year, and under the circumstances we propose to give him this gratuity. I may say here in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), with respect to the *Cruiser* that his remarks are too well founded, and the question is now under the consideration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, whether she will be put in service this year.

Mr. WALDIE. I consider the vessel is entirely useless. My business frequently leads me to Georgian Bay, and I entirely endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), as to the uselessness of this vessel, and the sooner she is withdrawn the better it will be for the public.

To pay Patrick Cullen, messenger and caretaker, Montreal Inland Revenue Office, an additional sum of $200 for services during current year..... $200

Mr. CHARLTON. Why is this increase proposed ?

Mr. BOWELL. He is messenger at the Inland Revenue building in Montreal, and the Minister proposes to give him $200 for taking care of the building.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why is his salary increased ?

Mr. BOWELL. The explanation given to me is that this amount is given for extra services rendered by this messenger for taking care of the building, thus avoiding the necessity of employing another man.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Minister has not given full explanation with respect to the extra services. We should have a detailed statement as to what this man is doing, and for what reason he is to receive an extra salary.

Mr. BOWELL. I have already stated several times that it is on account of extra services performed as caretaker.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We should have reasons given why the increase is asked for extra services. We are not told what his salary was before. We are voting away a certain amount here without any information. We are entitled to that information, and the Minister should give it to us before we pass this vote.

Culling Timber—Further amount required $11,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me this is a very unreasonable demand, and it ought to be fully explained.

Mr. FOSTER. This has been already explained in the House. Last year there was a very large reduction made in the item for culling timber, consequent upon certain proposed changes that the Minister had intended to carry out. When the Estimates were brought down there were $10,000 less than there should have been, on account of a clerical error. But as it was late in the Session that the error was discovered, it was not thought best to go into Committee of the Whole again, and bring down the extra sum. There is a very large saving, as the hon. gentleman knows, in the whole expenditure of that Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can the Minister inform us what the receipts for culling timber are, and what is the annual deficiency in this branch of the service?

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditure the year before last, was $48,000, and the receipts $28,861. The expenditure now is about $30,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the fees as great as before?

Mr. FOSTER. The fees, I think, will be fully as great and the deficiency will be reduced about $18,000.

To pay holders of Dominion licenses (Liquor License Act, 1883), the cost of prosecution and fines incurred for violation of the Provincial Act..... $3,547 16

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the total cost of this legislation to us? I think we ought to have some information as to how this money came to be paid and to whom it was paid.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is strange that the Minister of Finance should ask us to vote some thousands of dollars for fines inflicted on parties for a violation of the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman has not the detailed information, the item should stand.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.) Perhaps you might send for the leader of the Equal Rights party, and he will probably be able to give the Government some information about this.

Mr. FOSTER. We will allow the item to stand.

Amount required to pay law costs, commission and sale of Ordnance lands..... $3,297 40

Mr. DEWDNEY. A large portion of this is required to defray the expenses of the suit which is entered by Mr. Charles Magee of Ottawa, as representative of the Sparks estate, claiming a parcel of land on either side of the canal. The claim is a very old one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How old is it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About thirty or forty years, I think. The nature of the claim, as far as I recollect, is that when the land was transferred by the Sparks estate, for the purposes of the canal, it is contended by the Sparks estate, I believe, that the portion within 200 feet that was not required for canal purposes would revert to the estate.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has the Crown been in possession of the ground for forty years?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This vote includes law costs, commission and sale of land; I would like to know what portion of it is devoted for each purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I think I know something about the claim. The claim arose out of the stipulation of the original cession, which was partly statutory, of this land along the canal by which it was alleged to be on the condition that there should be no buildings erected on it, and that it should be for the use of the canal only, and there is an allegation that there has been a forfeiture of the allegation by the erection of buildings. I think those buildings were erected by squatters. It would be important to know how much of this is for law costs, and how much for commission on sale of lands, and who is the seller of the lands and what is the rate of commission?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is estimated by the Department of Justice that $1,500 will be required to pay the costs of this suit, which is still in progress. The remainder will be required to pay expenses in connection with the sale of the Ordnance land. A sale of the Logan farm was made in Montreal last year, and $1,000 was required to pay for the survey. Then, there is required $700 to pay the commission of the auctioneer, and for advertising and printing.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there not a question as to the deposit on the Logan farm, which the auctioneer retained.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, there is $7,000 or $8,000 which we were unable to recover from the auctioneer after the sale. As soon as I found that there was any difficulty, I placed the matter in the hands of the Department of Justice, who pressed it, and we now hold security which I think is satisfactory.

Mr. BLAKE. What are we giving commission for if the auctioneer retains the $7,000 or $8,000?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is obliged to return the proceeds, and we pay the commission out of the proceeds. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that it is a portion of the Sparks estate that is in dispute, but he is not correct in stating that it was because of the squatters' hut that the condition was supposed to have been broken.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the claim, however, extends to a portion that surrounds the bywash as well as to the other portion.

Mr. CHARLTON. What was the acreage of the Logan farm which was sold, and the price received?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There were 80 or 90 lots; I do not know the acreage. The portion that was sold realised $55,240. There still remain unsold 25 or 30 lots. There was some difficulty about a squatter, who has now removed.

Mr. CHARLTON. It seems to me that $1,000 for surveying 55 lots or so is a very excessive charge.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I said there were about 80 or 90 lots. I do not think the charge is excessive. I went over the ground and examined it before the survey was made when the blocks were laid out and staked. I thought it necessary that the lots should also be surveyed and staked before the sale took place, and I ordered that to be done.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Further amount required..... $40,000

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What is that for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The appropriation of last year for the repairs of the road was $205,000. A vote of $250,000 was recommended by the Department, but it was cut down by the economical Minister of Finance and it has been found that in order to complete the repairs and to provide for the working expenses for this year up to the 30th of June, $40,000 will be required.

Mr. MITCHELL. You call the Minister of Finance of last year economical?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Looking at the amount of the Estimates I would not call him economical.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. Minister inform us how much the Prince Edward Island Railway lacks of paying expenses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had the information here the other day. I cannot now give it from memory.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All I can say is that it costs very much less per mile than the Intercolonial. That is not giving it a very good certificate, perhaps, but I remember making up the estimate last year, and showing that its running expenses were very much less per mile than those of any other Government railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it is not run more economically than the Intercolonial Railway, perhaps it is run more with a view to politics. Of course there is no politics on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does any portion of the Government railway system pay expenses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Could not the Government succeed in getting rid of these assets, and so avoid this drain every year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; if the hon. gentleman will be a purchaser.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think a purchaser could be found.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend the Secretary of State tried to get a purchaser some years ago; but the arrangement was not carried out, and I am afraid if it had been, it would not have reduced rates.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) must remember that the policy of the Government according to a statement made by a very important member of the Government before the last election, so far from parting with these Government railways in the Maritime Provinces, was to increase them by the purchase of the properties of private corporations, in order as Sir Charles Tupper said in a telegram which I read to the House, that they might both be run with greater economy and with greater advantage to the public service. It is true, that policy has not yet been effected; but we have no doubt whatever that although Sir Charles is no longer there, his spirit still prevails, and that within a reasonable time, before the next election, the telegram will again materialise.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has made a reference to a telegram which Sir Charles Tupper sent to me during the last election campaign. I regret that an opportunity has not been afforded me earlier in the Session, although I have watched with great assiduity for several weeks for it, of calling the attention of the House and the country to the matter to which the hon. member for West Durham has referred. Now, although this may be not the proper time, I am strongly tempted to refer to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not spare him.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I had hoped and waited for several weeks, when the Intercolonial estimates were before the House, to have the opportunity of making the statement which I desire to make with reference to this matter before the end of the Session. The last time the Estimates for the Intercolonial Railway were under consideration, they were run through in a few minutes, while, by a mere accident, I was in the Library, and now, I would like very much to be allowed fifteen or twenty minutes in which to put before the House my views.

Mr. MITCHELL. Take an hour.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). To come to the subject, I regret to say that I have not the facts and figures on hand which I had prepared for the opportunity when it came, but the outlines of my scheme are in my mind, and I will take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Government and the House and, through the *Hansard*, of the country, to the importance of the scheme to which the hon. member for West Durham just now referred. In the Session of 1887 the hon. member for West Durham read in this House a telegram from Sir Charles Tupper, in which he sent word to me that he proposed to put before his colleagues a scheme for the consolidation of the branch railways of the Intercolonial with the trunk line. I desire to say that in my canvass in Albert County, I pressed the scheme with all the vigor I could. I put it before the electors as a scheme which I would do all in my power to further, if elected, and as a scheme which I believed to be in the interest of Albert County, of New Brunswick, of the Maritime Provinces, and of the Dominion of Canada. I will take occasion here and now to briefly outline my reasons for putting that scheme before my own people, and for commending it to this Parliament. There are in this country some 13,000 miles of railway. There are, speaking in the rough but with approximate accuracy, rather more than 5,000 miles of railway operated by one great

corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway; there are almost 4,000 miles of railway operated by another corporation, known as the Grand Trunk. There are some 2,000 miles of railway in that section of the Lower Provinces for which the Intercolonial is the great common carrier, a part of which is owned and operated by the Government, and a part by a large number of petty companies, the latter part being local branches of the Intercolonial. The point I would like to put before this House and the country—and I regret I have not the material at hand, the authorities and the exact facts, to make my statement more complete—is this: That if the Intercolonial undertakes the duty of being the common carrier for the Lower Provinces, it should discharge that duty fully and entirely, in the same way in which the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have undertaken to discharge the same duty for the Upper Provinces. The most notable fact which has come before any member of the Railway Committee in those four years, during which I have had the privilege of a seat in the Committee, is this: That all through these western Provinces these two great railway corporations, by the leasing of these branch roads, by getting these branch roads, which were crippled with debts and paying high rates of interest, under their control and assuming their obligations, were enabled to refund their debts, were enabled to borrow money and to convert their bonds into bonds bearing a lower rate of interest, and thus have been enabled to give stability and efficiency to the service, and have aided the establishment and development of mills and other industries in those sections to an extent beyond what could have been expected under the former system. I ask, not as a matter of favor, not as an electioneering dodge to please the people of Albert County, not to corrupt the Lower Provinces, but I ask on the ground of policy, which the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have found to be good policy, that the Intercolonial Railway should rise to a sense of its duty and give our people the same stability and certainty of service, give to those men who open quarries and establish and develop industries in the outlying districts those facilities and rates on the branch roads which the corresponding class of people have in the west. Hon. gentlemen may say that these branch roads are at present barely paying running expenses, and that I am asking the Government to buy them in at high figures. I do not ask anything of the kind; I am asking for no scheme which would oblige the Government to purchase these roads at figures beyond their value. The Government are in a position to determine the commercial value of these roads. The Government are in a position to ascertain their working powers, their running expenses, and whether there is not any margin for profit; and all I ask is that, in cases where the branch roads are willing to sell, the Government should buy those roads at their commercial value and make them a part of the Intercolonial system. Look at the position of the branches of the Intercolonial, and see what an incomplete policy the Government have pursued in this matter. Commencing at the boundary river between Quebec and New Brunswick, the Restigouche, and going down to the terminus of the Intercolonial, you will find sixteen or seventeen branch railways which are feeders of the Intercolonial, but are owned and operated by private companies. Some of them are very short and small, earning not more than working expenses; two or three of them are not earning working expenses, and two or three others are making a reasonable profit and paying reasonable dividends. You cannot expect that these railway lines, which are under fifteen or sixteen boards of management, should be run on as good a system, should be as efficient and yield as good returns as if they were all under one management. The Government have already, in dealing with this Intercolonial system, taken a step in this direction in purchasing the Rivière du Loup section of the Grand Trunk Railway, thus extending the Intercolonial to Lévis opposite Quebec, and besides the Government has built, in the way of extensions or branches, an additional 700 miles of railway, so that in round numbers the Intercolonial system, when the Island Railway and the Cape Breton Railway are run in connection with it, will embrace some 1,400 miles, the Government of Canada will be operating 1,400 miles of railway. It is just as proper and right that these branches I refer to should be taken in at a reasonable figure as that the 700 miles of branches already purchased should have been taken in. I do not complain of the fact that the Government should own a branch in one county and not in another, but I claim that where the Government can, without being plundered, without playing into the hands of any company, without paying heavy prices, buy a road, and where the people are willing to sell, they should purchase such a road and operate it, and thus combine the fifteen or sixteen managements which now exist into one. The advantages of this would be obvious. On many of these branches the Government would be possessed of engines of a lighter character for which they are substituting every year heavier engines, but the lighter engines could be used on these branches. They have cars which are not exactly fitted for the spick-and-span style of the main line, but which are used on the branch lines. They can use these and lower the rate on these branch lines and develop a travel which they do not get now. If they were to buy these branches and cut down the rates on them, they could recoup themselves by the amount of the limestone or the freestone or the plaster which they would carry down on the main line to the sea-board. They might lose something in the local freight rates, but they would gradually develop the carriage of these heavy articles and so would recoup themselves on the paying part of the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway. I make these statements in brief as the grounds on which we ask for this action in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. We ask that the Intercolonial Railway should do what the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have done for the sections of country through which they move. If the Intercolonial Railway cannot see its way to do that, we ask the Government to step down and out and to give place to a commercial company which can do this justice to a people who are not satisfied with the present state of things. If the Government would give their attention to these branch roads and would pay less attention to the through

trade and to the development of the flour trade from the west, and the coal trade from the east, I believe they could very soon wipe off the deficit. I was never more in earnest than when I pressed for this. In the County of Albert, this question is to-day of much greater consequence than it was at the time of my election. At that time the two roads in that county were encumbered with bonds, but now they have been relieved from that encumbrance. This Administration will have to undertake this duty in the future if they do not now, and any Administration which undertakes to operate and control the Intercolonial Railway systems, will have to follow the example which has been given by the railways west of the St. John River, which have been consolidated, and we ask that the same system should be pursued with regard to the railways east of the St. John River, that those railways—except, perhaps, Mr. Gibson's road, from Fredericton to the Miramichi—shall be bound together in the same way, that one management shall be substituted for many, that one company or one Government shall be substituted for many companies, and we are convinced that the results will be that the net earnings of the whole will be more favorable than they have hitherto been.

Mr. BLAKE. Proposals of this kind have accomplished certain ends on former occasions. There was a former occasion when this subject was brought forward, not on the suggestion of a simple candidate for a county, no matter how important he might be, but on the formal representation of the most important man in the Ministry next to the Prime Minister. It was on the 11th of February, 1887, that Sir Charles Tupper telegraphed to the present hon. member, then the candidate actively canvassing for Albert (Mr. Weldon), as follows :—

"I intend to submit to my colleagues a proposal to consolidate the branch railways with main line, by which greater economy in administration will be effected, and much greater utility to the country secured."

Think of it ! The Minister who had been in charge of the Department of Railways for a long time, and who was then, I think, Minister of Finance, and who therefore had a long experience in the two Departments which most specially fitted him to deal with a matter of this kind—his experience in the Department of Railways having given him a knowledge of the requirements of the railways of the country, and his knowledge of the Finance Department having instructed him in regard to the attention to be paid to the finances of the country—that Minister, with all that experience, and with all that influence, had come—it is true at a late period, it is true at a critical period, it is true at a period which perhaps did not fit him for calm consideration of all the fiscal and economical questions which were involved, at a period when his judgment might perhaps, to a certain extent, be obscured by other and political considerations had come—to this conclusion, that the consolidation of the branch railways with the main line of the Intercolonial would at once effect greater economy in the administration of the whole and much greater utility to the country ; and he had also come to the conclusion that it was his duty to submit to his colleagues a proposition to accomplish that result. He obtained from the people that measure of power which he desired the Administration to secure—

whether by these or similar devices it is not material now to consider—but he came to this Parliament backed by my hon. friends opposite, many of whom, no doubt, received telegrams, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) amongst them. I cannot doubt that Sir Charles Tupper submitted that proposal to the Government. I cannot doubt that the member for Albert pressed upon him to press upon them that the proposal should be carried out. I cannot doubt that Sir Charles Tupper did all he could—and who could do more ?—to bring about the redemption of the promise which had so successfully redeemed the County of Albert.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). He had not time enough.

Mr. BLAKE. He had not time enough ! He left his office and the country, and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) tells us that for four years he has been laboring in that field which Sir Charles Tupper deserted.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Three years.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, for three years. I recommend the hon. member for Albert, who now for the first time brings this matter before Parliament, to continue laboring, with the assurance that it will not be until the time, or about the time shortly preceding the general election, that he may expect to reap a harvest as the result of his labors. I do not suppose that he will be now contented ; I hardly expect that the electors of Albert will next time be contented with another telegram, but this time he may possibly hope to get an Order in Council providing for a future consolidation of these railways to be effected if the next elections go right.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is an older politician than I am, and has much more experience, and he speaks with that sarcasm—I will not say he speaks so sneeringly, but he speaks in that manner which appears to lack the candor and to lack the sweet reasonableness which I think is more becoming a public man, in regard to my statements. I believe frankly in the wisdom of the policy I have advocated. I believe that this Government, if it continues to operate the Intercolonial Railway, must adopt that policy, and that it must do so soon. I shall take occasion early in the next Session, if I have an opportunity of getting the ear of the House, to make a much more careful and reasoned statement than I have been able to make to-night, because, though I had made certain notes on this subject, they were put away in my desk some two weeks ago. But I will make this statement, that I never was more in earnest in my life than I am to-night in pressing this matter upon the Government. I believe it is a measure of justice to the Lower Provinces, and I am speaking particularly of those counties which lie away from the line of the Intercolonial Railway. We see all along the Intercolonial Railway towns and cities rapidly springing up, but we do not see a corresponding growth in the counties that lie a little away. The reason is that the branch railways are not discharging their duty as we hoped. In our own county the question has been for many years one of acute interest, and if the Intercolonial Railway will not do its duty in the matter, then we will do our best to bring pressure to bear upon the Government to abandon their control, and give or sell the Intercolonial

Railway to a company who will run it on business principles. In the judgment of some of us who have given a good deal of study and attention to Intercolonial Railway statistics, there is no need of a deficit, and we believe that all the while a deficit is due to ignoring the local trade, to an over-straining for what may be called, in the large sense of the word, the political aims of the road—not in a bad sense of the word, but in the large sense of the word, that is, to bind the Eastern Provinces to the far West, and develop the country between the two sections. We sympathise with those aims, but we do not want the whole pressure of that service to fall upon our own section of the country. We know very well that when the Intercolonial Railway was built it was partly in order to get the help of an Imperial subsidy in guaranteeing the money for the road, and partly to comply with Imperial interests, and partly, no doubt, to please the people in Quebec and northern New Brunswick, that the natural and commercial route was not taken, a route which, after getting away from Halifax, would cut through the Isthmus of Chignecto and make a bee line to the upper waters of the St. John. We did not take that route and in consequence we have operated the road at a great loss. That road was built, and that route was taken, mainly from considerations of defence, and you must bear your own share of its maintenance, gentlemen of the Middle Provinces and of the West. It was not our asking, it was not our doing, it was largely Imperial interests which drew that railway away round the Bay of Chaleurs. The Intercolonial Railway is a losing enterprise at present, as I am pointing out, and, having given this matter a great deal of attention, and taken the best opportunities to talk with railway men, I think it my duty to point out that the real remedy seems to me to lie in the development of this branch traffic. I know that, in the county which I represent, the people are unwilling to open quarries from the danger of these railways being closed in the winter and spring, in which case the lumbermen and quarrymen could not fill their contracts. That disaster could not happen if the Government were operating the roads. Therefore, capitalists are unwilling to invest their money in the development of the resources of Albert county, of which I speak by way of example.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) My hon. friend from Albert speaks of the railway being relieved of its bonds. On the first railway there was a pretty heavy mortgage, I think, some $600,000 of bonds, that were sold in England. If I could lay my hand upon the prospectus that was used we would find that some remarkable statements were made at that time. The bonds were sold in England and five years' interest paid, and afterwards no interest was paid. I think after the hon. member became a member of Parliament a grant of $15,000 was given to that railway as a loan, and a mortgage was taken upon it and remains on the records of Albert county to-day as a specimen of Government assistance to railways. My hon. friend says that the railway is relieved of its bonds. It is relieved of its bonds in this way, that the unfortunate English bondholders were obliged to buy the road in. I find in the Public Accounts that we are credited with having rendered assistance to that road to the extent of something like $14,800. With regard to the other road it is just in the same position, that is, it is in the hands of a receiver. I am sorry to say that the mode in which these bonds have been sold does not do credit to our railway companies on the other side of the water. I may say that the parish of Elgin, in the county of my hon. friend, voted very unanimously towards assisting that railway, and after they voted the money they did not want to pay the interest, and it required the persuasion of the Supreme Court to compel them to do so. It has been rumored that my hon. friend has held out hopes to them that they will get rid of that $15,000. That may be so, and that may be one of the objects which has inspired my hon. friend to open up this great scheme, which he put forward for the purpose of embracing all these railroads which, I am sorry to say, judging from the returns we had the other day of the Caraquet Railway, leave us on the wrong side of the balance sheet.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I wish to correct my hon. friend. The loan of $15,000 to the Albert Railway was given some time before I became a member of this House. The money was almost all spent before I was elected. I made no promise and I held out no hope of getting a similar loan of $15,000, or of any amount to relieve the Elgin ratepayers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have strayed away a good deal from the question before the Chair. I certainly do not at all object to my hon. friend behind me taking this opportunity to bring up the scheme which he has mentioned, and which, as I understand, involves the acquisition by the Government and attaching to the Intercolonial Railway various branches of railway which are now connected with it, but are not a portion of it. I am not able, of course, to judge at once of the feasibility of the scheme. Of course, if all these branches were worked together with the main line as one line, there would be considerable economy as a matter of course. Whether it would increase the revenues and diminish the expense materially, so as to show a better balance sheet on the right side, I am not able to say. I must say that I have a great deal of doubt about it. However, this is a matter that ought to be fully considered, and the proposition made by my hon. friend is worthy of all consideration. He says, he thinks, that if the Intercolonial Railway, with its extensions and branches, were transferred to a railway company, it could be run on commercial principles, that it would be of great benefit to the country through which it passes, and it would also relieve the Government of the incubus of managing a great railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What would the Government have to pay in order to induce a company to take it ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I am unable to say ; but I think that if Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should, in some way that we could consider as expressing the voice of the two Provinces, declare they would be willing that such an arrangement should be made, I do not think the Dominion Parliament would object. I consider the building of the Intercolonial Railway was one of the conditions of the Union, it was the bond, the link uniting the three Provinces together, Old Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick ; and I

have stated before in my place that, in my own individual opinion, it would be contrary to the spirit of the Union if this link between the Provinces were handed over to a commercial company, a railway company, liable to all the exigencies of a private enterprise, and one which might utterly fail to perform its duty in maintaining the link between the three Provinces. But if Nova Scotia and New Brunswick by the votes of their Legislatures, or in any other way which the Parliament of Canada could accept as a genuine expression of the opinion of the two Provinces, said it would be willing that the change should be made, I am quite sure the Parliament of Canada would accept it. But I am afraid it would be very much like the case of the Prince Edward Island Railway. When, also for the purpose of securing a union of that Province to the Dominion, the Government undertook to compete the Island Railway and place it in good running order, and it was proposed to make a present of the road to the Island, the offer was gracefully declined. I am afraid Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would take the same position in regard to the Intercolonial. Let me go back to the question before the Chair, and express the hope that without much further discussion this grant of $40,000 additional to finish repairs up to 30th June, will be granted.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been a good deal said about the Intercolonial Railway and what should be done with it, and a good many of those who claim to speak on behalf of the interests of the country have endeavored to put forward this scheme, which they think would perhaps serve the interests of the road. I have listened to what the First Minister has said, and correctly said, as to the object for which the Intercolonial was built. It was not built as a commercial undertaking; it was built as a means of communication between the Maritime Provinces and the old Province of Canada. I can well remember when the constitution was framed for submission to the British Parliament that the present First Minister desired not to put this railway into the contract, and he urged that the construction of a railway should not form part of the constitution. But gentlemen who represented the Maritime Provinces on that occasion insisted that a clause should be inserted in the British North America Act, providing that the railway should be built and maintained by the Dominion of Canada as a means of communication, for all time, between the two extremes of the Dominion as it existed at that day. Without that road we would not have come into Confederation. Without that railway our constitution would have been a paper constitution, for there would have been no communication without going through a foreign country. We insisted on our point, and we gained it. The proposal submitted by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) of taking in all the bankrupt roads in the Maritime Provinces and adding them as an incubus to the Intercolonial could not, if carried out, fail to make the condition of that road ten times worse than it is to-day. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) can give us an account of some of those roads. I will not refer to some others, because my reference might be considered of a personal nature in view of our discussion the other night, but I may refer to them when the matter comes up on a motion to be submitted by the hon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

member for North York (Mr. Mulock). A great many of those roads are of the same complexion. I desire to say in regard to the Intercolonial that that road should run and sustain itself, and it would sustain itself if properly managed. If the political barnacles which are attached to it, and which have used the road to carry constituencies, were wiped off, if the road was economically managed, if unnecessary employés were struck off the pay-roll, and if the railway was managed on business principles, I am satisfied it could be made to pay, and I trust the First Minister, who is now Minister of Railways, will give a little more attention to it, with a view to endeavoring to make it pay. The First Minister spoke of what this Parliament might possibly do if the Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would agree to have the Intercolonial Railway sold, and run by a private corporation for personal and private interests. I trust the time will never arrive when the Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will consent to any such arrangement. It would be a violation of the engagement under which we came into Confederation, and I am satisfied they will never consent to any such arrangement. The hon. Secretary of State will recollect that two or three years ago one of his friends made a proposition of this kind, and the moment the matter was brought before this House and exposed the bubble burst, and the hon. gentleman himself on that occasion stated that the object for which the railway was constructed was for the purpose of enabling the Maritime Provinces to unite with Canada and secure not only a paper union but a commercial and practical union by giving us means of communication from Halifax to the centres of trade and commerce in old Canada. I would deprecate the idea of placing that road in private hands. It would be a breach of the agreement made in 1866-67, and it would create a feeling of want of confidence in the stability of the Union if we departed from the arrangement by which this road forms a part of the constitution of this country, and by which it must be maintained by the Dominion for all time. Let me say a word or two about branch roads. I am willing to do anything reasonable to promote the prosperity of the Maritime Provinces, as well as of the Dominion of Canada at large. But it will not be in the interest of either Canada or of the Provinces that this Government should deliberately undertake to buy up these branch roads which are earning almost nothing, such a road as was spoken of the other day, a road which earned $14,000, while the cost of running was $27,000. We do not want such roads tacked on the Intercolonial. Was that the reason why Sir Charles Tupper telegraphed not to close anything until a certain gentleman came out here, and was it the inducement that made those gentlemen who hold bonds in the roads offer to transfer them to the Government for the issuing rate of the bonds? I am afraid there is a scheme abroad for the next general election in regard to this matter. I think I can see looming up something of the same kind as produced the letter or telegram sent to the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) by Sir Charles Tupper. I think I can see a magnificent scheme by which all the bankrupt roads in the Maritime Provinces and in other Provinces may be induced, if they succeeded in return-

ing the Administration of the day, to unite into a grand consolidated scheme such as has been submitted to this House, the object being to buy up the constituencies. I deprecate anything of this kind, and I will stand up in my place and oppose it in every possible way. For the last two Sessions I have brought under the notice of the Minister of Railways, not the Premier but his predecessors, the fact that in my county the Government have a branch road, fifteen or sixteen miles in length, called the Derby branch. There is a road which runs down from Fredericton to Blackville, and then on to Chatham. There was a hiatus of about nine miles, for which road the Government gave a subsidy of $3,200 a mile. They gave the contract to a very good friend of mine, Mr. Snowball, a gentleman from whom I received a good deal of support at the last general election. He took the contract for the construction of that road and he built, along with Mr. Gibson, the road from Fredericton to Newcastle, and this hiatus between the Derby branch and Blackville. He took the contract, received a subsidy, built the road, and got his money, and now going on three years that road has been unused, and not a locomotive has been run over it or the least traffic done. It is a disgrace that the Government of the country should have placed themselves in a position to allow that state of things to exist. It is a scandal in the county from which I come that the public money should be appropriated for the construction of a railroad to connect two important links and that after the road is constructed, the Government have so conducted the matter, that there has not been a locomotive run over it for three years. I called the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this matter last year and the year before. I now call his attention to it again, and I say that it is the duty of the Government to take some steps, either by purchasing or leasing this nine miles of road, or by compelling those people who have received Government money to run the road, to see that this road is operated, and that the $28,000 of public money which has been spent on these nine miles should not be spent in vain. I hope the right hon. gentleman will see to that matter at once.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to say a word in connection with the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Mitchell) and I shall recall to his memory something that happened two years ago. This is the second or third time in this Parliament that my hon. friend has connected my name with a scheme to purchase the Intercolonial Railway. When he did this two years ago, it is true that it was in the small hours of the morning, when perhaps less importance might be attached to some statements made in this House, than if they were uttered in the early part of the sitting. I then told the hon. gentleman that his statement was not correct. He had then stated that at a conference or at a meeting held at the office of the High Commissioner at London, a scheme had been propounded and discussed for the sale of the Intercolonial Railway. I told him that his statement was wrong, and that he had even mistaken his own recollection of a private and confidential conversation that he had at the Windsor Hotel in Montreal, with regard to the railway, and the discussion which he imagined had taken place at the office of the High Commissioner in London. I told him that there was nothing correct in his statement, so far as I was concerned, or so far as the High Commissioner was concerned, or so far as the Minister of Customs was concerned, whose name, I think, he mixed up with my name, and the name of the High Commissioner. I told him that there had not been the slightest mention made about the Intercolonial Railway at the meeting which had taken place at the office of the High Commissioner in London, and that the discussion was about some matters connected with duties to be imposed on steel rails, and the establishment in Canada of a large iron manufacture by French engineers and capitalists. I take this opportunity also to tell the hon. gentleman that, perhaps, he is mistaken when he states, on his authority as one of those who were a party to the negotiations for the Confederation of the Dominion, that the absolute condition was then, and should always remain, that the Intercolonial Railway should be worked by the Government whether at a loss or not, for all time to come. I do not think any one will support the hon. gentleman in that pretension. It was a condition of the Union that there should be a railway connecting the Maritime Provinces with the old Province of Canada to afford facilities for commercial communication, and that this railway should be built by the Dominion Government. I do not think there has been, and I do not think there should be a condition involving the necessity when that communication has been established, and when it is an accomplished fact, for the Government to maintain, no matter at what cost, that line of railway. We have now the Short Line, built at a heavy cost, connecting these Provinces with the Lower Provinces. We might be called upon to subsidise another railway, besides the Intercolonial and the Short Line, to connect the Maritime Provinces with Old Canada, but I do not think my hon. friend is right in saying that it is an absolute condition for the maintenance of Confederation, that the Intercolonial Railway should be maintained as a Government railway when commercial communication between the Maritime Provinces and Western Canada is established in a manner that cannot for the future be disturbed. I say that one of the conditions of Confederation was, that there should be a communication between the Maritime Provinces and Canada, but now this communication having been established, I do not think it is an absolute necessity that the Government should work the Intercolonial Railway as a Government property. I do not express that opinion in so far as I am a member of the Government. I have no right to do it and I do not want to do it, but I do not want it to be said in this Parliament, that it is an absolute necessity for the Government to maintain the Intercolonial Railway at a cost which might be, in the future, ruinous to the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Secretary of State has made one of the most mixed up statements I have ever heard in my life. You cannot make head or tail of it. He mixed up something I said about the Minister of Customs, and some steel rails, and an interview with the High Commissioner in London. There is some truth in that, I have no doubt. I made the statement in this

House, and he said the discussion was only about steel rails. My information was that the discussion between the Secretary of State and the gentlemen who were promoting this scheme for the purchase of the Intercolonial Railway, was of something much more extensive in its character. My hon. friend has had a good deal to do with the transfer of railways. When he was Minister at Quebec, we know that the transfer of a very important railway called the "North Shore Railway" was made, and it was a transfer which inured to the benefit of certain individuals and not to the benefit of the Province at large. Two years ago, when I brought up this question, I had the proof of what I stated in the book before me. I had the circular and prospectus which was issued by the friends of the Secretary of State, one of whom is out of the country, and the other, unfortunately, is dead. I have not the book at hand now, and I do not know that I can produce it, as I did on that occasion; but I then read the statement in which the scheme for the purchase of the Intercolonial Railway was made, and my hon. friend knows that for months they had gentlemen stationed at different points along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, to ascertain the earnings of the Government road, the traffic on the road, and the probability of a financial return coming from it. He knows that they had made a proposition to the Government, and if it had not been for my discovery of it, the matter would not have been ventilated in this House. I told my hon. friend that he was encouraging and favoring that scheme.

Mr. WALDIE. It might be a good thing.

Mr. MITCHELL. It might be a good thing if the running of the road brings the country into debt; and, perhaps, it might be a good thing for individuals.

Mr. WALDIE. It might be well to sell the road.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; if you had a share in it you would like to sell it. When my hon. friend the Secretary of State states that there is no obligation on the part of the Government of Canada to maintain that road, I say there is an obligation. The Maritime Provinces were induced to come into the Confederation by the understanding that a railway was to be built and maintained between the Provinces. Do you mean to say that the mere construction of the road is a compliance in spirit as well as in letter with such an arrangement, which had the force of a treaty, between these Provinces? No, Sir; the Government of Canada bound themselves to build the road and practically to maintain it. My hon. friend asks: Have the Government to maintain that road by sacrifices through all time? Let them economise in the management and working of that road, and they will not require to make sacrifices. The road could be run without costing this country much money, if any. But I do not care what it costs, the Government are bound by their agreement under the British North America Act to maintain that road, and any attempt to pass it out of the hands of the Government, so that it may be run for commercial advantages, irrespective of the facilities which it might afford to the Maritime Provinces, is something that cannot be thought of for a moment. The hon. gentleman says that since that road has been built another means of communication has been opened up between the centres of trade and commerce in old Canada and the Maritime Provinces. How has that been done? By running the line through a foreign country, depending on the bonding system of that country, which may be repealed at any time. Does the hon. gentleman contend that that is a compliance with the terms of the treaty under which the British North America Act was passed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend did not oppose the building of the Short Line.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not oppose it, and I do not oppose it now. They can have the Short Line if they like, but if my hon. friend supposes that I shall accept the Short Line as a compensation for the Intercolonial, he is very much mistaken. While I am willing to give the people of St. John and Halifax the facilities of a shorter route—there is no dog-in-the-manger about me—we have the Intercolonial, and this Parliament cannot take it away; I defy this Parliament to take it from us. When that railway was built, it was not as a commercial transaction. It was built in compliance with the treaty, and it was built as a military road to carry, for all time, with safety and facility, British troops and British materials, in case any difficulty arose with our friends on the other side of the border. There is no other way by which British troops or military stores can be transported across this continent; and my hon. friend is mistaken if he imagines that a road running through a foreign country, will give the facilities and protection which the British Government demanded when they gave the securities they did. I do not wish to discuss this question, which is not a live issue; but I wish to inform my hon. friends that when they want to make it a live issue, when they want to allow this road to be stolen, for that is what it will amount to, they will be very much mistaken, if they expect to do it quietly.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I congratulate the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) on adopting the views that we on this side of the House have always advocated since he has had a seat in this House. On more than one occasion, I have called the attention of the House to the extravagant expenditure and mismanagement of the Intercolonial Railway. I have no doubt my hon. friend had then as much knowledge of those things as he possesses to-night; but I do not remember him ever supporting me in the position I took. But the hon. gentleman has stated, and stated truly enough, that if the road were properly managed and were separated from political and other influences, which tend to increase its expenses and not its receipts, it would be a paying road. But the hon. gentleman has no doubt taken that line to-night in order to impress on the House the desirability of the country acquiring a piece of road, in which I do not say he is personally interested, but in which he was politically interested at an early and very important time in his political history. The House has been informed to-night, as it has been on previous occasions, that but for the telegram which the hon. gentleman received from the hon. Minister of Railways during the time he was running for Albert County, we should not probably have his presence in the House to-night. The House is perhaps aware

that the influence the hon. gentleman exercised in his locality and through the various parts of the Province of New Brunswick increased the usefulness of the telegram which he received from such a prominent member of the Administration as Sir Charles Tupper. That telegram, indicating the policy of the Government as tending to absorb those unprofitable branches, and to relieve the different counties of the assessments placed upon them and the stockholders from the unfortunate position they occupied, had a most salutary effect in securing their support; and the hon. gentleman, after having sat here for some years, has at last spoken out. I do not blame him if he was misled, but I think he was a willing victim, and does not perhaps deserve very much sympathy from those of us who have understood the question from its very inception. But, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways, and others who have referred to the Intercolonial Railway, point out that it has involved a very heavy expenditure on the country. That, unfortunately, is quite true, and I have no doubt that it has largely occurred, as the hon. member for Albert stated to-night, through the incompetency of the people who have been placed in charge of it, and through the general mismanagement of the road. The question of the assumption of the Intercolonial Railway by the Provinces need not, I think, go much further than this discussion to-night. The people of the Maritime Provinces have no more idea of assuming the responsibility connected with the running of the Intercolonial Railway than the people of Ontario have of assuming the responsibility and debt connected with the canal system of the country. We know that about $50,000,000 have been expended on the canals of the West, the same amount has been expended on the Intercolonial Railway; and the hon. First Minister, in an interview, lately indicated the intention of the Government to expend $14,000,0000 or $15,000,000 more to increase the depth of the western canals. I do not intend to express an opinion on that subject more than this, that when hon. gentlemen from the West are continually pointing to the Intercolonial Railway as a burden on the taxpayers of this country, they will do well to look to the canal system, in which the working expenses exceed the receipts by $500,000 a year. With regard to the Intercolonial Railway, I may say this, that the chances of their ever becoming a very profitable inves tment has been very much interfered with by the policy which the Government have pursued in building the Short Line. I pointed out on another occasion that the Government could have adopted no course better calculated to destroy the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway than by giving the large subsidies which they have granted to the so-called Short Line. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the subsidy to the Short Line amounted somewhere in the neighborhood of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000; and when the road was completed it only shortened the line to Halifax by 90 miles. If the Intercolonial Railway had been properly managed from the commencement, and if the speed had been obtained which could be obtained on a road equipped as that is, and if the Government had heeded the warnings raised on this side on more than one occasion that the public were not satisfied with the rate of speed over that road, and had made the time between Halifax and Montreal in about twenty-nine hours instead of forty hours, which has been the time made ever since the road has been under the management of the present Administration, the country would not have been so willing to incur such a heavy expense as was incurred in building the Short Line. When that Short Line was undertaken, we were told that it was going to affect a much greater saving so far as Halifax is concerned, and as I stated before, that saving amounted to about 90 miles. Under these circumstances I am sorry to have to apprehend that the probable future of the Intercolonial Railway is not very promising. We cannot imagine that with the competition now going on from the Short Line, both for freight from St. John and passenger traffic all through during the season, the receipts of the Intercolonial will amount to as much as they have amounted to in the past; and if it should unfortunately happen that such should be the case, and that this country should be burdened with a heavier deficit on the working of the Intercolonial than has hitherto been the case, we must put it down to the policy which the Government have pursued with reference to the Short Line, which is a policy rather in the interest of some people, very nearly connected with the Government, than in the general interests of the country; and the Government may well understand from the commencement, that the people of the Maritime Provinces never had, or never will have, the idea of assuming the responsibility of working the Intercolonial Railway. That belongs to the country, and be the deficiency large or small, it will have to be worked and controlled by the Government. I hope, that after the warning and the rebuke they have at last received from their own side, they will now take some heed, and will look into the practical working of the Intercolonial. The expenses can be very largely reduced. They will require to be reduced, looking at the competition which already exists with the Short Line. I again state, most emphatically, that the Government might as well disabuse their minds of the idea, if they entertain it—and the hon. the Secretary of State has given us to understand to-night that it is his opinion—that the Maritime Provinces are going to take upon themselves that burden, and at once recognise the fact, whether the amount be large or small, it will have to be borne by the Dominion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Northumberland. He said I was wrong in stating that the articles of Confederation did not imply the absolute necessity for the Government of maintaining, at all times, as a Government property, the railway connecting the upper Provinces with Halifax. I might quote for my hon. friend, although he knows it, being one of the fathers of Confederation, Article 45 of the Act of Confederation, which says:—

"It shall be the duty of the Government to give effect to that agreement and to provide for the commencement, within six months after the union, of the railway connecting the River St. Lawrence with the city of Halifax and Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof without intermission."

My hon. friend has thought proper to say that I had made a very mixed statement as to what had taken place in the office of the High Commissioner in London. I must apologise for my shortcomings in this respect. I stated that, when the hon. gen-

tleman said I was connected with any project concocted in the office of the High Commissioner in London concerning the sale of the railway, he had made an incorrect statement; he pretended to divulge a scheme which he had taken from a confidential communication of a friend of his—he may have been a friend of mine—but he misunderstood the facts or mis-stated them to the House. In the second place, the hon. gentleman has taken the opportunity of saying that the sale of the North Shore Railway by the Government of Quebec, which was made when I was the First Minister there, was a transaction for the benefit and profit of certain individuals. I need not tell my hon. friend that I repudiate and deny the charge, and challenge him to prove what he says. If the hon. gentleman would read a report which has been published under the authority of the present Premier of Quebec, the Hon. Mr. Mercier, he would find in the evidence taken by the commission, which was appointed to investigate the sale of the North Shore Railway, the statement made by Mr. Duncan McIntyre that the sale of that road was the best financial transaction which could have been made at the time for the Province, and one of which the Government and people of Quebec had not cause to repent.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. the Secretary of State says that my allegation is not correct that the Government were bound to build the Intercolonial and to maintain it, and he read the section of the British North America Act to prove his assertions. Why, the very section he read shows that, in order to give effect and permanence to the arrangement or treaty which was made at that time, the Government were bound, within six months, to begin the construction of the road. They did not do so, and in that violated the treaty. But, in order to give effect to the arrangement, what was necessary? Did the arrangement mean that the Government were to begin the road and then drop it? No; they were to build the railway, and, to give effect to the treaty, they were also bound to run it. The fair inference, the fair logical construction of the agreement, is that the Government are bound to run the road, and it would be a breach of contract if they did not. My hon. friend states another thing. He says I have used confidential communications which I obtained from a friend of his, and perhaps a friend of mine, in the Windsor Hotel, as to what took place in London. There was nothing confidential about it. The gentleman in question furnished me with a confidential published book which they intended to put forward to the world as their prospectus, and I had his permission to use the statement in this House, and I did use it. The third statement he makes is that I was wrong in mentioning his name in connection with the sale of the North Shore Railway when he was Premier of the Province of Quebec. He says that Mr. Duncan McIntyre made a report in his favor under a commission from Mr. Mercier, the present Premier of the Province of Quebec. What does he mean by that? Mr. McIntyre thought it was a good transaction. What has that to do with it? Does not everybody know that $1,000,000 was cleared by Mr. Senecal and his associates, and it is generally believed in the Province of Quebec that some other people were interested in that. The less my hon. friend says about it the better. The people of the Province of Quebec believe that they have lost $1,000,000 by the transaction which was countenanced by the hon. gentleman when he was Premier, through his friend, Mr. Senecal, and his associates, and I believe it. I dare say, if the hon. gentleman wants the proof, that we can get it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I desire to say that what my hon. friend has just stated is utterly and essentially unfounded and untrue. I desire to be parliamentary in what I say. It is untrue in this manner: The transaction has been declared by men who are not my friends politically, to have been a good financial arrangement for the Province of Quebec, and, when my friend says that the sale of the North Shore Railway, which was a transaction between the North Shore Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway—that is, between two private companies—was made to the detriment of this country, to the extent of $1,000,000, he should know, as he does know, that I was not at all favorable to such a bargain. My hon. friend should know, and he does know, though he does not say so, that I had personally been in favor of a transaction which would make the North Shore Railway the joint property of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, a transaction which would have secured to Quebec the free access of the trains and traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway and would not have entailed the disbursement of a dollar from this Dominion or from anybody else. The hon. gentleman knows that, and he should not repeat what may have been written in his paper, but which is essentially contrary to the truth.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend is attempting to put words in my mouth which I never uttered. He states that I spoke of a sale of the North Shore Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I never mentioned the Canadian Pacific Railway in this transaction. I say, that the sale of the North Shore Railway to Mr. Senecal and his associates by the Government of which my hon. friend was the head, was made for $1,000,000 less than Mr. Senecal sold it for a very short time afterwards, and I say that the interests of the Province of Quebec were sacrificed to that extent. The transaction in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway is another thing, and I do not charge my hon. friend with that; but I repeat that the general impression is, that the transaction between the Government of Quebec, when he was the leader of it, resulted in Mr. Senecal and his associates receiving $1,000,000 more than they paid for it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; I do.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. To whom did the North Shore Railway Company sell, if not to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. MITCHELL. The Government of which my hon. friend was a member did not sell to the Canadian Pacific Railway. They sold to Mr. Senecal and his associates, and the latter sold to the Grand Trunk, and it was taken over under arrangement by Government for the Canadian Pacific

Railway Company. That is where the $1,000,000 came in, and I should like my hon. friend to tell us how the profit was divided.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not intend to satisfy the curiosity of the hon. gentleman on that point.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is just as well you do not.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The sale of the North Shore Railway has been characterised as the best financial and political operation——

Mr. MITCHELL. For some individuals, no doubt.

Mr. CHAPLEAU,—as the best financial and political operation for the interests of the Province of Quebec; and, when my hon. friend says he did not know that the North Shore Railway was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway, he must be again mistaken, as he has been in all his statements.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) has expressed my views so well in regard to the Intercolonial Railway that I shall not prolong the debate by repeating them. I rise simply to repeat a question which has been put before during this Session, but which is of growing importance in view of the early return to their homes of members from north eastern Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, whether the Minister of Railways has made any arrangement for a connection at Truro with the Pictou branch. The Intercolonial express arrives at Truro at noon, and the Halifax express leaves for Pictou at ten o'clock in the morning. The result is that we have to remain at Truro twenty-two hours. I want to know if the hon. gentleman can remedy that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it can be remedied.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) asked permission of the House, and received that permission to go beyond the item which was under discussion. I think, however, the discussion has now gone far enough, and I will ask members of the Committee now to confine themselves to the item.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I suppose we are obliged to bow to the decision of the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It appears to be the wish of the Committee that the hon. gentleman should proceed.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not wish to trespass upon the time of the House to any extent, but I would like to make a remark or two. I would not speak at all, were it not that I feel that some of the observations which were made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in the course of this debate, were calculated to leave a wrong impression upon the minds of the members of the House, and I think they should not be passed unnoticed. In the first place, I would say that I think the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) presented a fair argument to this House, and one which has not been answered, and which no attempt has been made to answer. The hon. gentleman laid down a principle which every of this House will recognise as a correct commercial principle, namely, that trunk lines can operate branch lines connected with them more cheaply and with better advantage to themselves, and to the sections of country which are served by these branch lines, than they can be operated by separate companies under entirely different managements. That was the principle which the hon. gentleman laid down, and he illustrated it by cases of great railway corporations in the West, and showed that they, on commercial principles, were acquiring branch lines that were connected with them; and he only asks that this same principle should be adopted in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, as I say, no attempt has been made to answer that argument. Hon. gentlemen on the other side, on the contrary, have attempted to insinuate that the present Government and the members from the Maritime Provinces, in their railway policy, had been influenced solely by political considerations. That I most emphatically deny, and I charge hon. gentlemen opposite to prove those assertions. I think, that especially from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who, I am sorry to see, has left the House, that charge came with very bad grace. We all know that one of the branches of the Intercolonial Railway was built in the county which he represents, and at his urgent request, and we also know that he was then in Opposition. That hon. gentleman surely ought to be willing that the policy pursued in his county should be extended to other counties in the Maritime Provinces as well. The remarks which the leader of the Government made when speaking upon the question, were to the effect that doubts existed in his mind, as to whether the acquisition of those branch lines would improve the position of the Intercolonial Railway. I understood that position to be assented to by the hon. member for West Durham. Whether they are correct in those assumptions, I am not prepared to say. I am willing to admit, that a Government road cannot be managed as cheaply, or as economically, or on as sound business principles, as a road managed by a private corporation. But, if we do admit that the Intercolonial Railway is prevented from acquiring branch lines in the Maritime Provinces, and thus conferring a general benefit upon the people and upon the trade of those Provinces, because it is a Government railway, it does become a very serious question for the people to consider whether the management and control of that road should not be transferred to a private company. The argument which the hon. gentleman from Northumberland used in opposition to this view of the case, that we were bound by the Act of Confederation to maintain this as a Government road, has already been answered by the Secretary of State. I think this point, too, should be borne in mind in considering that branch of the subject. Every one knows that at the time of Confederation the Intercolonial Railway, connecting the Upper and Lower Provinces, could not be a paying investment, that no private corporation would undertake to build and operate that road, or would undertake to operate it after it was built; that it was operated during the first few years after its construction at a great loss; the loss, if I remember correctly, without looking at the figures, was in the neighborhood of half or three-quarters of a million dollars. But since then things have entirely changed, and I

believe that that road in the hands of a private corporation could be profitably operated to-day, and that the principle which the hon. member for Albert has advocated would make it a still more profitable investment for a private company than it would be under present circumstances. That hon. gentleman also referred to the necessity of maintaining it as a military road. I quite admit that in the case of the transfer of this road to a company, it would be necessary for the Government to take such measures as would secure the maintenance and the continued operation of that road, and would also provide for its use in case of necessity as a military road. The other remarks which I thought were calculated to leave a very erroneous impression upon the minds of the House, were remarks which fell from the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Weldon). He endorsed the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland, that these branch lines in the Maritime Provinces were losing concerns—I think that was the term used. Now, it is a fact, I believe, that in the past the operation of very many of these roads has been unprofitable, but that has resulted from the fact that they were badly managed. It has been, unfortunately, the case with very many of the railroads in the Maritime Provinces, that they have fallen into the hands and under the control of mere speculators, that they have not been managed on business principles. I am not prepared to say that when these roads were originally constructed they could have been profitably managed, but I believe the condition of things has changed to-day, and from my knowledge of the cost of management and of the traffic on the branch lines in the Province of New Brunswick, with perhaps one or two unimportant exceptions, the great majority of them would not only pay expenses but leave a fair margin of profit, if managed on fair business principles. I think, therefore, that the proposition which the hon. member for Albert has presented to the House is one which is well worthy of consideration.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I can quite understand that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) would naturally support the view adopted by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), because the hon. member for Westmoreland, as the House is well aware, occupies the position of being a large owner in one of these branch lines, and doubtless the policy which he is advocating to-night may place him in the position of approaching the Government with a view of absorbing that branch also. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but it is well known that this House has been called upon last year for $60,000 and this year for $110,000, to build a railway to Cape Tormentine in the interest of the hon. gentleman's road, for which no public advantage to the Maritime Provinces will accrue. It was stated by the hon. members from Prince Edward Island, and it is well known to every hon. member from that part of the country, that, except the interest of his own road, it will serve no public interest at all. The trade and traffic from Prince Edward Island, as far as Halifax is concerned, will naturally come to Pictou; and the trade and traffic, so far as New Brunswick and the West is concerned, will naturally go to Shediac; but the hon. gentleman, with the influence which he possessed with the Government last year, as I say, induced them to appropriate $60,000 and $110,000 this year to add to the value of this road and to the expenditure of money not in the public interest, but in the interest of the small branch in which the hon. gentleman is a large owner. Therefore, I say it is natural the hon. gentleman should sympathise with the views of the hon. gentleman for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood).

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman has pursued a course that is characteristic of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). Instead of addressing himself to the question before the Committee, or attempting to address himself to the arguments which have been addressed to the Committee on the subject under consideration, he has attempted to insinuate political motives.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are they true?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). No; they are not true; I will answer that before I sit down. The hon. gentleman has taken occasion to refer to the road with which I am connected. I challenge him or any other hon. member to show it has not been managed on strictly business principles from the start. I challenge him to show that the road has not been of advantage to the section of country through which it passes, and I can state too, from the knowledge I have of the operating of that road, that it not only pays its expenses and its maintenance in good order, but it also gives a fair return for the money invested in it. With respect to the application for the construction of a wharf at Cape Tormentine, I can assure the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken in supposing that the expenditure was due to any political influence I may have had with the Government of the day. I will remind the hon. gentleman that in 1883 the question of communication with Prince Edward Island was brought up in this House, not by me, but by hon. members representing the Island; that, in compliance with the request of those hon. gentlemen, a Committee of this House was appointed to enquire into the whole question of communication with Prince Edward Island, and the hon. gentleman, if he will turn to the reports for 1883, will find the report of that Committee in relation to that subject; and it was in pursuance of the recommendations in the report of that Committee that the Government of that day made this appropriation for the construction of a wharf at Cape Tormentine, and that they expended a considerable sum in the extension and repair of the wharf on the opposite side of the straits, at Cape Traverse, and also granted a subsidy towards the construction of the road from Sackville to Cape Tormentine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman inform us whether he is a large proprietor in the road which derives benefit from this expenditure, because my recollection is that the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the Committee, and who has so much resented the remarks of the hon. gentleman for Halifax (Mr. Jones), is a man largely personally concerned in the road which derives benefit from that expenditure? He is here in his place in Parliament, and using his influence as a member of Parliament to aid and

assist in obtaining a subsidy for a road of which he is a large proprietor.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I have no hesitation in informing the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I have a large share in the road to which he refers. That road only received the same subsidy from this Parliament which other branch lines received in New Brunswick and all other Provinces of the Dominion. I have never used any undue influence with the Government in any way to obtain that subsidy, and I do not know what the hon. gentleman intends to insinuate by the remarks he has made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I insinuate nothing.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not know what is the object of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will tell you in a moment.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I shall be glad to know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My opinion is that an hon. gentleman who is largely interested in a road, for which road the Government, of which he is a supporter, has given a large subsidy, is, of all men in the world, least qualified to raise any objection to such a statement as was made by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Jones); and he is, in my opinion, unfit to exercise an independent vote on any such question or to offer independent advice on any such question, or to give independent votes or advice on any questions coming before this Parliament.

Mr. KENNY. It is exceedingly to be regretted that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not apply the doctrine which he has just laid down when he noticed that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has not hesitated to urge the granting of a subsidy to a line of steamers of which he is the agent at the port of Halifax. The senior member for Halifax, ever since I have had the honor of having a seat in this House, has not hesitated to demand from the Government a subsidy for the line of steamers of which he is agent in the city of Halifax.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Untrue.

Mr. KENNY. I appeal to the House if the hon. gentleman this session—and the record on *Hansard* will show it distinctly—has not advocated that a subsidy should be given to the Dominion Line of steamers. The hon. gentleman is agent in Halifax for the Dominion Line of steamers. As regards the railway through Westmoreland, to which the senior member for Halifax has referred in a manner which has shocked the propriety and sense of decorum of this House, I have some knowledge of that road.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are you a shareholder?

Mr. KENNY. I think that railway will be an exceedingly useful one, and great merit is due to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) for the interest he has taken in securing so important a public work for the county which he so well represents. To show the confidence which the people of Westmoreland have in that road, I may say that every bond of the company (I think I am correct in saying every bond) was taken by the people of Westmoreland. The question of the acquisition of railways by the Intercolonial, that is to say, the railways that are in connection with it, has been under discussion in this debate. I will take advantage of this opportunity to say to the hon. Minister of Railways that when the question of railway acquisition comes forcibly under his consideration I hope he will remember that in the Province of Nova Scotia we have a system of railways extending from Halifax to Yarmouth, known as the Windsor and Annapolis and Western Counties, and which it would be in the interests of the Province that they should be acquired by the Dominion. It is very fashionable in this House to charge the administration of the Intercolonial with great extravagance; and I heard some such remark dropped by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), when he referred to the associations of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) early in his political history with railway matters. Has the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) forgotten that in 1878, when he appealed to his constituents, one of his great claims was that he had succeeded in securing an expenditure of $720,000 in Halifax for Intercolonial Railway purposes? I find no fault with that expenditure; I think it was proper and legitimate; but I do say that it is exceedingly unbecoming in that hon. gentleman to stand here and attribute motives to, and make insinuations against, hon. gentlemen who take interest in railway expenditures in their own counties. One trouble with the Intercolonial and one cause of its deficit is the fact that the Intercolonial has no close connection with the traffic west of Chaudière. If the Intercolonial had closer, more intimate and better connections with the great trunk lines of Canada which are located at points where the trade originates, I believe, it would advance the interest of the Intercolonial to have such connection. There is a project, it is a matter of public notoriety, and I may be permitted to refer to it here, for the extension of the Temiscouata Railway from Edmundston to Moncton, and for the extension of the Grand Trunk system to the Maritime Provinces, which would be secured in this manner, and it would, I believe, divert to the Intercolonial and to the Maritime Provinces a large amount of freight which now passes over the American connections of the Grand Trunk and finds its outlet either in Portland or Boston. I believe, therefore, that it would be in the public interest, in the interests of our interprovincial trade, and in the interests of our export and import trade, if the Grand Trunk Railway system could be extended to the Maritime Provinces. And from what I have heard, I believe that can best be accomplished by the extension of the road from Edmundston to Moncton.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny) is certainly very ungrateful. The House will remember that on a quite recent occasion, that hon. gentleman brought to the notice of this House the very unsatisfactory manner in which the English mail service was carried out. He read a most pathetic account of the sufferings of the people who were on board of several of the steamers, and of the long passages which the steamers were making, and when I came to the rescue of my hon. friend, and complained that the Government had

not completed arrangements for giving us a faster and better mail service across the Atlantic, the hon. gentleman now tells me that I did this because my firm was agent for the Dominion Line.

Mr. KENNY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) ought to have reproved the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) for having referred to it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman cannot escape on any such line as that. The insinuation was, that I was using my public position here, as he has used his on many occasions—that I was using my public position in the interest of a company in which I was interested. He was endeavoring to place me in the same position that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has been placed in to-night, of having used his position here to obtain large monetary considerations for the benefit of a railroad in which he has been compelled to admit he was largely concerned. I may say to my hon. colleague — and no one knows better than he does—that, so far as my interest in the Dominion Line is concerned, I have not one farthing directly or indirectly connected with it, and not only that, but the Dominion Line have no contract and never had a contract with the Government. The contract for carrying the mails is with the Allan Line; and the Dominion Line are working under the Allan Line, and by an arrangement with them. The hon. gentleman knows very well that that is the arrangement, and he knows that there never has been any contract between the Dominion Line and the Government. It will be seen therefore how far my hon. colleague had to travel to bring any charge of indiscretion against me. He says I shocked the moral sensibilities of that side of the House. God preserve us! I have not heard language on this side of the House that would shock the moral sensibilities of many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, my hon. colleague included. After all the exhibitions we have had of corruption and undue influence by hon. members on that side of the House, which have been made the subject of parliamentary enquiry, during this last couple of weeks—why, Sir, if the hon. gentleman's political digestion can stand that, he can stand anything that will come from this side of the House. But, Sir, I only mean to say that, when the hon. gentleman seeks to put me in the position which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) occupies, I think the House will readily recognise the fact that there is no comparison at all. I am not interested, as my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright) has repeatedly shown the hon. gentleman is interested, coming here year after year, and obtaining a large subsidy to benefit his own property, to add value to his property, and not in any way to improve or to extend the communication between Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada. The hon. gentleman hardly occupies the position which is so frequently used by courtesy, at least, of an independent member of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that there is no comparison between himself and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), and I congratulate the hon. member for Westmoreland on that fact. I seldom have heard during my parliamentary experience a more unwarrantable, a more unjustifiable and uncalled for attack, than has been made on my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) by the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Jones), and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in a very calm and parliamentary mood, expressed his views as to the best mode of managing the Intercolonial Railway. Nobody could object to that. Everybody listened to the hon. gentleman, as he is always listened to, with pleasure and instruction. He gave his views calmly, and although I did not agree with him altogether, I listened with that respect which every hon. member has a right to receive when he talks common sense, and addresses himself to this House or to a Committee of the House, in parliamentary language. Then my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) arose, and in calm, deliberate, parliamentary tones, he sustained the views that had been taken by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). Nobody could object to that. The hon. member for Westmoreland argued his point, and whether his arguments were right or wrong he expressed himself in parliamentary language. His statements have got to be taken for what they are worth, and his statements in this House are always considered to be well worth listening to. He is a man of high standing and of high character, respected, I believe, in the Province from which he comes, and respected by all who know him. But instead of answering these arguments, instead of discussing the statements he made, instead of pointing out wherein he was wrong—if the hon. gentleman thought he was wrong—the hon. member, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), rises in his place and says: You have no right to talk here; you own a railroad, and by your influence you have got grants made, to your own advantage. That is the statement which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) made, utterly ignoring the arguments of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and not even discussing them in any way, but he makes a violent personal attack on the hon. member for Westmoreland. That conduct is unparliamentary; it is more than unparliamentary, and it deserves stronger language than I can use within the walls of Parliament.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Go on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I will not commit the fault the hon. gentleman has committed in this instance. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the fact? As has been pointed out, this communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland *viâ* Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, was pressed upon this House a long time ago by a Committee of the House. It was pointed out to be the safest, the shortest and the best means of carrying on winter communication between the Island and the mainland. It was urged upon this House by the Committee. It was urged upon this House by the members from Prince Edward Island that, in justice to that Province, there should be a railway running to Cape Traverse from the main Prince Edward Island line, and that there should be a steamer plying across that short distance to Cape Tormentine. The fact that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) was enterprising enough to put money into railways—and God knows they

are not profitable enterprises in this country—is made a matter of reproach to him. The hon. gentleman says that he, by his influence, got certain grants made. It was got by the influence of its being the right route, the most convenient and the safest mode of communication.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ask the members for Prince Edward Island ; ask those members who pressed it on this House who were here at the time, and they will tell you that this project was carried out without reference to politics, that they were all pressing on the Government and on Parliament, as a matter of justice to Prince Edward Island, that it should have that communication ; and now my hon. friend behind me is insulted by being told that because the Parliament had listened to a report of a committee, and to the expression of opinion to the members from Prince Edward Island, he, forsooth, had corruptly and improperly exercised influence in carrying out this project. Leave it to the electors of Prince Edward Island, whether they think that is an improper expenditure of money, whether they think that is not a mere matter of justice to Prince Edward Island ; leave it to them, and you will find how completely and utterly they will condemn the censure, the language and the reproaches of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) followed in the same strain. I regret that he did so. I do not regard what the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) says, because his uniform system of detraction and abuse of every man to whom he is opposed renders his censure just as harmless as his praise would be contemptible. But the hon. member for South Oxford stands on a higher plane, from his ability if from nothing else, and I regret extremely that he should follow in the degraded track and style of the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is often very difficult to know whether we are to take the hon. gentleman seriously or not. Generally speaking, I have found that when he assumes this attitude of indignant virtue, which does not sit so well upon him as some of the other *roles* he is fond of playing, it is because the hon. gentleman is conscious that the facts laid before the House at any particular time are not easy to explain, and thereupon he at once devotes himself to an attack on any one who brings these ugly facts to light. I take issue with the hon. gentleman as to whether the language used by myself or my hon. friend was unwarranted or not. I tell the hon. gentleman that in all his long experience he has done nothing, in my opinion, so calculated to demoralise this House, and individual members of this House, so calculated to undermine the right regard which members of Parliament ought to hold for the place they occupy, as by the introduction of this most pernicious system of granting railway subsidies indiscriminately to railroads in which large numbers of members of Parliament are personally interested. From the first that system was a corrupt, mischievous and pernicious one, calculated in the highest possible degree to undermine the independence of members of Parliament ; and when I put the question to the hon. member for Westmoreland, as to whether he was or was not largely interested in a road to which the Government of which he is a supporter and of which the hon. gentleman is the chief, had granted large subsidies, I did that, not with a special design to annoy the hon. member for Westmoreland, but because on this and on all other occasions I mean to call the attention of the House and the country to the position in which members of Parliament are placed when large sums of money from the public chest are given to roads of which they are large proprietors ; and I repeat to the right hon. First Minister that no system can be devised more contrary to all principles of sound government than to allow members of Parliament, under cover of the law, to become in this way pensioners of the Government. We have had many notable instances of this in this House. I do not design to protract this discussion, and I will not enumerate those instances, but if the hon. gentlemen wants them, I can give him plenty of examples which have been highly scandalous to the honor and credit of members of Parliament, and to the Parliament of Canada, which has permitted these things to exist.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have this to say to the hon. First Minister, who has shown considerable warmth in this discussion, and it is generally well understood that when the hon. gentleman exhibits that warmth he feels that he and his Government have been struck pretty hard, and have been exposed in transactions which they cannot defend on public grounds. The right hon. gentleman is the last man in this country from whom any one should receive instruction. The hon. gentleman's age should entitle him to different treatment, I admit ; but when he looks back on his political life and to what he has been connected with—the hon. gentleman may smile—no doubt he would like to forget those transactions—and then ventures to lecture an hon. member of this House, it is, to use the old saying, a case of Satan rebuking sin. The hon. gentleman knew nothing of what he was talking about, and he showed it in his explanations. He said this was a winter route, which is just one of the things it is not. It cannot be used in the winter time at all. It was only intended to accommodate the people of Prince Edward Island during the summer months. When the hon. gentleman undertakes to speak on a subject, he should be better qualified, from experience and from information, than he has shown himself to be to-night. As to anything the hon. gentleman says about myself, I treat it with the contempt it deserves.

To pay widow of late W. B. Forbes, superintendent, arrears of travelling expenses from 1st July, 1873, to 1st October, 1879..... $1,250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an item which requires some explanation. In the first place, the amount is considerable, and in the next place the practice of paying arrears running over a period of six years is in itself a very questionable proceeding, unless there is some strong ground for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It stands thus, and I think the hon. gentleman will see that the widow has a fair claim to this money. On the 8th of February, 1870, an Order in Council was passed allowing the late superintendent $200 per annum for travelling expenses, in addition to his regular

salary. This allowance was paid to the end of 1873, when the payment was dropped. In that year his salary was raised, but the Order in Council sanctioning the increase in his salary did not refer to travelling expenses, and was not intended to affect the allowance, the non-payment of which rendered the increase altogether nugatory. Nearly all the canal superintendents received this allowance. In 1879 it was resumed, and this vote is to cover the time during which the allowance was not paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that no claim was preferred during the long period from 1879 to 1890? Here is a claim which has elapsed for eleven years. It is very clear that this gentleman was singularly negligent in pressing this claim, or the Government have been negligent in granting it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The allowance was the same in 1879, and it was paid from 1879 to Mr. Forbes until he died.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did he make any claim before?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I cannot say. It was stopped in 1873, for what reason I do not know. There would be no claim, I take it, until January of that year. Why it was not made I cannot tell; but this claim was presented by the family of Mr. Forbes, and it is quite clear that by some error or by some refusal of the claim it was not paid; but in my opinion it was an honest claim.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should have some explanation as to why the claim was not preferred before.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The man died a year ago, and we do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In ordinary business, if such a claim were not preferred during ten years, the presumption would be that there was good reason for not preferring it; and if it was preferred and refused by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, we ought to know the reason.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was stopped in 1873—why, I do not know. The hon. gentleman may remember, as he was in the Government at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1879 the claim was pressed by Mr. Forbes, who was, for all I know a political opponent of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. I do not know anything about it, but at any rate we did not get it and did not press it. At all events, in 1879, he claimed and got his allowance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If he thought he had a right, then he must have applied before.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He may have done so, but I do not know. I will make enquiries.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to me that when Mr. Forbes made his claim in 1879, if he thought he was entitled to be paid the same amount for the six years preceding, he would have asked for those arrears; and not having asked for them, it must be taken for granted that he did not consider he was entitled to them. What was the increase of salary given this man at the time the payment of the extras was discontinued? I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that up to 1873 Forbes received a certain salary with an allowance for travelling expenses, and that in 1873 his salary was increased and the travelling expenses discontinued, the increase being intended to take the place of the extras which had been previously allowed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the increase was made to put him on a par with other officers holding similar positions, without reference to any allowance for travelling expenses.

Mr. MULOCK. The circumstances under which that increase was made should be made known to the Committee, and all the papers in connection with it should be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will make enquiries about them.

To additional pay to persons permanently employed in the public service, and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for, or in connection with, passing vessels through the canals between Lake Erie and Montreal, from midnight on Saturdays to 6 a.m. Sundays, and from 9 p.m. Sundays to midnight..... $10,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The men are employed on the canals for six days in the week. In order to prevent stagnation of trade and the diversion of trade on the Welland Canal to the Erie Canal, it was provided that the canal should be opened from midnight on Saturday till six in the morning, so as to allow the crew and any passengers on a vessel to go on shore to church if they liked, and the canal was closed from six o'clock on Sunday morning until nine o'clock on Sunday night. This was a new engagement and we had to get other men to do the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the first time that arrangement was put in force?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was paid out of the general vote for contingencies, and it was thought better to have it passed by Parliament in this shape.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I believe representations have been made to the Government urging them not to allow Sunday traffic on that canal, and it is a question whether we should appropriate this large sum of $10,000 for the purpose of enabling men to work on the Sabbath day. The laboring men there should have an opportunity to devote the Sabbath to their religious duties instead of our encouraging a larger amount of traffic on that day. I believe the Government did endeavor, after receiving representations, to prevent vessels from doing business through the canal on Sundays except in case of urgency, but now they propose to vote $10,000 to encourage that Sunday business. Is it not in the interests of morality, of keeping the Sabbath day holy, and of decorum, to allow the men to refrain from doing unnecessary work on the Sunday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend will see that the question whether the canals should be closed altogether on the Sunday is one thing, and the payment of any men who are employed when the canals are open is another thing. If the

hon. gentleman thinks that the canals should be closed on Sunday and the whole traffic paralysed along the line of our lakes and rivers, that should be brought up and discussed as a separate question. At present, the instructions of the Government are that the canals shall be closed from 6 o'clock in the morning till 9 o'clock at night. The whole of the Sunday which includes the hours for divine service is kept for the crews of those vessels. This matter was discussed in the House very thoroughly on more than one occasion, but I am quite satisfied that, if you do not desire to render our whole canal system infinitely less able than it is now, and less able to compete with the railway and canal system of the United States, you must not interrupt the flow of the waters through the canals or the lakes. The crews are on board the vessels on Sunday when they are crossing Lake Superior, Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and yet, because there is a little cut through the land at the Welland Canal, they are to be stopped. I think, if we discussed this matter on its merits, I should have the support of my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson), but at present I would suggest that he should let the item pass.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think there was some remonstrance sent from St. Catharines against the opening of the canal on Sunday. Are those people satisfied now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not heard anything on the subject for nine months.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not like the argument of the First Minister that because the Americans break the Sabbath we should do so also in order to compete with them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Suppose we had Jews for workingmen we might avoid the difficulty.

Post Office Department..... $26,461 20

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is here a sum of $200 to enable the Postmaster General to increase Mr. Sydenham Howe's salary to $600 a year. What is the position occupied by this gentleman? I think he was auditor or something of that kind in the post office at Halifax at a pretty good salary, and he cannot be supposed to occupy the position of a junior clerk.

Mr. HAGGART. He was formerly a civil service clerk at $600. He was superannuated, I think, at $200, and this is to enable us to employ him at the rate he was previously receiving.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My impression was that he occupied a much more responsible position. I thought he occupied the position of deputy receiver general or something of that kind at Halifax, and got a considerable pension when his office was closed. He is a son of the late Joseph Howe, is he not?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Referring to the Auditor General's Report, I see that his superannuation allowance was $1,215, so that he must have been occupying, as I thought, an important position. He could not possibly have that superannuation allowance unless he had occupied a post with a salary of about $2,400. I daresay Mr. Howe is a good officer, but I can hardly understand how he can be placed in the position of a clerk at $400 or $600 a year in the Post Office Inspector's office.

Mr. HAGGART. I think this is to make up the amount to the salary he was receiving before he was superannuated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I presume, but what office does he fill, because he can hardly receive this amount for a simple clerkship?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the first time I have heard the gentleman's name, and I have not the list here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is of some importance in reference to the employment of superannuated officers, and I should be glad to have the information.

Mr. HAGGART. I will bring it down tomorrow.

Amount required to pay Canadian Pacific Railway Company for mail service between Vancouver and Victoria..... $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does that mean?

Mr. HAGGART. There are two amounts that had lapsed. The contractors had not sent in their account for the last year, but they have done the work.

Amount required to pay Canadian Pacific Railway Company for mail service on main line.... $20,261 20

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter which interests a large portion of the constituency which I represent. I mentioned the matter to him the other day, and I suppose he has looked into it—I refer to carrying the mails on the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. The people along the Manitoba and North-Western Railway from Portage la Prairie for some 225 miles, are actually delayed two days in getting their mail under the present arrangement. The mail service is contracted for over the Manitoba and North-Western from Portage la Prairie to different points along that line. At present, under the existing arrangement, the Manitoba and North-Western are running triweekly trains to Winnipeg, a train leaving Winnipeg at 11.15, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which carries the mail to Portage la Prairie to be distributed at that point, leaves Winnipeg at 1.20; the result is that the Manitoba and North-Western only running three trains a week, the people along that line of railway have to wait two or three days. For instance, Saturday's mail is not dispatched until the following Tuesday. I hope the Minister will make some arrangements with the railway for carrying the mails from Winnipeg for the Manitoba and North-Western people instead of from Portage la Prairie. At present the people as far west as Calgary receive the mail as early as they do on the Manitoba and North-Western, a few miles from Portage la Prairie. These circumstances have only to be mentioned to the House to convince hon. members that an injustice is being done to these people. I know the change in running arrangement was made recently, but I do not think this House would refuse spending a sum of money which is sufficient to compensate the Manitoba and North-Western people for carrying their mails from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the subject which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, I have been in communication with the railroad company. As he states, the Manitoba and North-Western run a train at present into Winnipeg which starts an hour before the Canadian Pacific Railway train leaves for Portage la Prairie, and as a consequence if the mails went by the Canadian Pacific Railway and thence by the Manitoba and North-Western they would be delayed 23 hours. But you must remember that the cost of paying an extra train from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie amounts to $1,800 a year, or a great deal more than we derive altogether in postage all along the line of the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. However, the Post Office Department are making arrangements by which the postal matter will be carried on the train mentioned.

Further amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c.. ..... $30,000

Mr. DEWDNEY. When the item was up in the main Estimates for this work it was late at night and the item passed without any comment. The amount asked for in the main Estimates is $95,000. At that time I found upon enquiry that we should really require $125,000 to meet our engagements and carry out the surveys proposed until the end of the next financial year. The operations of the surveyors depend a great deal upon the seasons and the time at which they are able to set out in the spring and the time at which they are obliged to cease in the autumn. Last year our surveyors were out very late, which added considerably to the expense. I have asked for this money in order that we might have an amount over the estimates voted last year to meet our expenditure to the 30th June. Next year we propose to carry out and continue our system of making surveys and sub-division surveys in the railway belt in British Columbia, which we estimate will cost $16,000. In Manitoba and the North-West township outlines will take $35,000, and sub-division contracts and examination and correction of surveys will take $10,200. Then I propose to send up to the James' Bay region, and to run a line from the Lake Temiscamingue to James' Bay. It is uncertain where that will strike. It is found necessary on account of the negotiations now going on with reference to the boundaries between Ontario and Quebec, and at the same time it is necessary to get some information in regard to James' Bay, the head office estimates that about $21,000 will be required; printers, $3,900; miscellaneous expenses, $5,400.

Mr. WATSON. In what part of Manitoba are these surveys carried on?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I propose to send two parties into the Lake Dauphin district, where settlement is going on. I think we have only two or three townships which have been sub-divided, and I want to send two parties there immediately in order to avoid conflicts.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to hear the Minister state that he is going to send surveyors to the Lake Dauphin district, because there is a great demand for land at the present time, and people are coming in there every day. Unless the surveyors go there very soon people will squat on lands and there will be trouble.

Mr. WATSON.

Amount required to cover unprovided items for 1888-89, as per Auditor General's Report, page D—64 ..... $555,609 86

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what special sub-divisions of the service did the hon. gentleman's estimates fall short? I observe that the total estimate has not been exceeded, but it is evident that $104,000 have been over-expended in certain particular branches.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have a statement prepared, which I forgot to bring with me. I think it is in reference to an over-expenditure on the Indian consolidated fund, which has been going on during the last ten or twelve years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that the $104,000 unprovided did not occur during last year, but is the accumulation of a number of years?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The accumulation for a number of years.

Mr. MULOCK. If this is the case, it represents an improper state of affairs, for it means that large sums have been spent without parliamentary authority.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I thought the statement I made at the time was correct, but I find I was mistaken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister bring down the details?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

The estate of the late Major R. S. King, Welland Field Battery:—Rent of building to store guns, &c., of the Battery, from 1862 to 1883, 22 years, at $100 per annum.	2,200 00
Transport of ammunition, stores and arms of the Battery (O. C., 6th January, 1890.)	102 53

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what circumstances is this vote asked? How does the Militia Department come to have allowed rent to accumulate for 22 years and then bring down a vote for the amount in a lump at this time?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The memorandum which I have to communicate to the House is as follows:—From 1862 to 1883 Major King provided a suitable building for a battery at Port Robinson. The Government and the county council voted some moneys in 1872 for the erection of the necessary shed and store room, but nothing further was done. Major King, besides this, paid rent to a farmer of Thorold for storage of powder, fuses, &c., as he had no magazine at his disposal. The claim is $100 per annum from 1862 to 1883, inclusive, making about $2,200. The Deputy Adjutant General says the claim is a just one. The memorandum goes on further to give an examination of items 8, 9 and 11 of the account rendered. In 1864, Major King received from the Government two cases of arms, and the freight was unpaid, amount, $2.36. In 1886, he received four nine-pounder guns, complete; the teaming from Thorold station to Port Robinson cost $60. The same year he received a carload of ammunition; the freight and teaming, which was unpaid, amounted to $53 and $4; total $71.36. The Deputy Adjutant General considers these items as being correct. Items 10, 12 and 15; In 1886, he received four cases of arms, freight un-

paid, $1.70. Same year he received three barrels of ammunition, freight unpaid, $2.25. In 1872, he spent $6.10 repairing harness for the battery of which he was in command. In 1876, he received four gun carriages, the teaming of which cost $6, and the same year he had to pay the teaming for four nine-pounder guns, with carriages and a large quantity of ammunition from Port Robinson to Thorold, which cost $15. The Deputy Adjutant General says: I have seen the shipping bill and receipts which are evidently *bonâ fide*. Then, there were 37 days' pension, at $400 per annum, from the 1st July, 1885, to the 7th August, 1885, the day of the death of Major King. He lost his leg during the Fenian troubles, and he was receiving a pension from the Government, and this amount was due when he died.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know under what possible circumstances a rent amounting to $100 could have been allowed to accumulate for 22 years; Did Major King never make any application from 1862 to 1883 for the rent of these buildings? Was no agreement entered into with him?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There was no agreement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a most unusual thing that rent should be allowed to accumulate for nearly a quarter of a century, and for seven years after the building seems to have been used. It is a very dubious sort of claim.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is ridiculous.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not so absurd or ridiculous as the hon. gentleman seems to say it is. The case arose in this way: The Government and the city council provided for the building of a shed. Major King was in command of the Welland Battery, and pending the time that this shed was being built the guns were stored away in a shed which the Major provided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did he make any claim?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He made no claim because at that period it was supposed that the Government was going to provide for the storage of the Government guns. Major King met with some losses, the circumstances of which I cannot be quite sure of, and when he died the amount for the rent of the shed during that period of years was sent to the Department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did he put in a claim during his lifetime?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The claim, I believe, was sent in the Department before he died. I was wrong in stating the other day that I thought the claim had been put in before I took charge of the Department. I find from the statement placed in my hands it was in 1882 that the claim was made.

Mr. MITCHELL. What claim?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He put in a claim for $100 per annum for the period of time the shed had been used.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has it taken you 18 years to find out the facts of this case, Mr. Minister?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It did not take me 18 years, for I was not there.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought you said the claim was put in 1872?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I read the statement to the hon. gentleman which was placed in my hands.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that all you know about it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think that is quite sufficient.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it is sufficient, and we ought to have more information.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think the hon. gentleman could ask for any more information.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think he can.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have stated that from 1862 to 1883, Major King provided suitable buildings for the battery at Port Robinson.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you know anything about it except what you read from that paper?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No. How could I know anything more about it than from the reports of my officers? I have not been there to examine whether the shed is up or not, or whether the guns were stored there, and I have to accept the reports of the Adjutant General and the officers of my Department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think those reports ought to be laid on the Table.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am prepared to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Wait a moment, I am doing the talking now, if you please. I think the reports ought to be laid on the Table to enable us to get some information. A claim that has not been settled for 22 years we ought to enquire about it. Is this the Major King who ran against W. J. Thompson, in 1872?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps your neighbor beside you knows; he is an Ontario man. Is he the man who lost his leg?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes. It is the same man in whose favor you made a speech up there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made a remark that this claim was absurd, and it seems to have appeared to the Minister of Militia as being a very ridiculous statement. I have listened to what the Minister of Militia has read and I cannot come to any other conclusion. If Major King, 22 years ago, paid money for the old Provinces of Canada, or the old Province of Ontario, and did not send in his bill to the old Province, or to the old Parliament of Canada, I fail to see on what possible ground the present Dominion of Canada can be asked to liquidate that bill. I, for one, most strenuously object to pay these old claims which have been lost sight of for twenty or thirty years. It is ridiculous and absurd that this Parliament should be asked to pay some old claims which were in abeyance, which were not pressed, and which do not appear to have been rendered to the Provinces of Canada before they came into Confederation. On what ground, legal or moral, should we pay this claim? We are not responsible for it, and we must have strong grounds, at this day, be-

fore we should consent to paying a claim which has been standing for twenty-two years without being pressed. If I understand the hon. gentleman, some claim was rendered in 1872, but it was not recognised by the Department, and if he wants to override the decision of the Department at that time, I think he has to give stronger reasons than the mere opinion of the Deputy Adjutant General that the claim seems to be good. I want to know the grounds on which he arrives at that conclusion. I, for one, most strenuously and determinedly object to pay a claim which existed before this Confederation came into existence, and which was ignored and rejected by the Department until it comes up again in the year 1890, without any reasons being given why it should be paid. I say Parliament has no right to grant such a claim, and there is not a constituency in the Dominion but will laugh at us if we grant it without some legal or moral grounds being given why we should do so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will remember that this matter came up on Friday night late, when I was asked to produce the reports, and I said I would. It was impossible for me to have the reports prepared for to-night, but I had a synopsis prepared. The hon. gentleman's argument is perfectly correct, that a claim which originated previous to Confederation might possibly require a great deal of explanation before Parliament should be asked to entertain it; but the hon. gentleman must remember that the fact of its having originated previous to Confederation does not change the question in so far as the liability of Canada is concerned.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes; it does.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman permits me to continue my argument, he may get up afterwards, and if he succeeds in convincing me, I shall be quite ready to admit it. What I was going to say was that after Confederation the whole militia force, the different buildings belonging to the different Provinces, and everything connected with the militia force, were handed over to the Government of Canada. No doubt the use of this shed avoided the necessity for the Government to expend money for the erection of a building for the purpose of securing and protecting the property of the Government in the shape of guns and ammunition. The hon. gentleman knows that when we have to store our powder, and other stores which are required in artillery practice, they must be stored in a place where they will be perfectly secure. The hon. gentleman sees from the receipts, which the Deputy Adjutant General says are correct, that this amount of money has been paid to this farmer.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) How much?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I tell the hon. gentleman that I will produce all the statements which I have in the Department; I have nothing to hide.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did he pay after he was dead?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is so clever that he should be able to answer that question himself; no one but himself could answer such a question, and I leave him to answer it. I have given all the information I have. I have stated that I am prepared to lay on the Table the reports made to this Department, and the item was put in the Estimates because it was one that ought to be paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have asked the hon. Minister a very civil question, and he has answered me in a manner which outside of the House I would call impertinent. In the House I cannot say that; but I have to say that when a Minister brings in a claim so extraordinary as one for 22 years' rent for a building, the owner of which has been dead for years, I think he should have a more civil manner of answering the question I asked. I have been told that this man has been dead since 1883, and yet the hon. Minister asks us to pay rent which this man is said to have paid some farmer seven years after he was dead. The whole matter is so fishy, and the hon. gentleman is so unable to give a satisfactory explanation of it, that I think he ought at least, if he cannot give information, to keep a civil tongue in his head when proper questions are asked.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman has not stated the amount paid by Mr. King to the farmer. The hon. gentleman must see that he is opening a door through which an enormous number of claims will come in. The Dominion of Canada, if it is going to assume the liabilities of the old Provinces of Canada, will have to assume debarred claims of the Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There is no limit to these claims; if you go back twenty-two years, you may go back fifty years. I, for one, will never consent to vote this money unless I have some further information and some more convincing reasons for doing so; I think it would be an injustice. Why, you will have them pouring in upon you from all sides. We must not be asked to vote money without having the evidence before us, as well as the conclusion of the Adjutant General. If the claim is a just one, I would not stand in the way, except as regards the part before Confederation, and as regards that, whether the claim be good or not, we ought not to pay it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the objection taken by the member for Queen's is perfectly correct. In 1866, when in London the conference was fixing the terms of Confederation, each of the Maritime Provinces produced a statement of its assets and its liabilities, and the old Province of Canada in general terms produced the gross amount. We gave details, but the Province of old Canada, from that day to this, has never shown her assets in detail, or given the details to show how the balance given was arrived at. Here is a case in which the very question arises whether these old debts of old Canada are to be paid by the Maritime Provinces. I object to the principle of paying these bills in this way, and I object to this claim on another principle. I do not think we should accept it on the simple statement of one of the officers of the Militia Department, which we know is not a very economically managed Department. The Adjutant General makes a report, and that is all the information the Minister can give us, and when asked for details is rather inclined to give a sharp reply but no information. We have suffered enough by old Canada; we were misled and deceived in relation to its assets and liabilities. We gave the particulars of our assets and liabilities, but never got theirs. I am speaking in the presence of at least one gentleman who was

at the conference, and who knows what I state to be true.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who are the representatives of this estate?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The papers I am going to bring down will show that. The claim was sent in in the name of the estate, and I cannot tell now who are the representatives.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who made the application for the claim?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was made by the estate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who made it, the dead man?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The dead man, speaking through a living man, but through whom I do not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It appears to me that you do not know anything about it.

Mr. FOSTER. We will let this item stand.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to another claim that was submitted to him some time ago. I refer to the claim of the captain of the 24th Battalion of Kent. He rented a building to store the arms and equipment of his company, for which he agreed to pay the sum of $40 a year. He made a claim on the Department which I think ought to be admitted. I think the Minister ought to pay some attention to this claim, more especially when he is considering claims twenty-four years old. Has the hon. gentleman come to any decision about this claim, for storing these arms and clothing during the past two years?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The matter was brought up last Session, and I explained to the hon. gentleman that the captain received the grant of money which is allowed by Parliament for the storing of these arms and clothing, and we could not very well pay him the second time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Parliament is supposed to provide a place to keep these arms and clothing, and the allowance to the captain is simply for taking care of them and not for furnishing a place to keep them in. The Militia Department is certainly expected to provide some suitable place in which to store these arms. It would be impossible to suppose that a captain could provide a place to keep them on the small allowance of $40. Other officers receive $40 in places where they have a good drill shed and armory, and where there is none the Government should provide one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This case gives me a great deal of hope. I brought up some years ago the claims of volunteers, some of whom lived in Hanover and some in Durham, who contracted a fever while they were at drill. Up to this time, the Minister of Militia has not paid the expenses they incurred during their illness, but now I have great hopes that he will take up their case, though it is about 8 or 10 years old, and will see that they are paid. There is no doubt about the justice of their claims, and I think the only reason why payment has been refused is that I have not supported the Minister of Militia. I think I have given him a generous support to-night. I have looked into his pedigree, and I will look into it a little more if he does not do justice to these volunteers.

Mr. MULOCK. If we are asked to pay this claim because it is a *bonâ fide* debt, I think the Minister should lay on the Table the correspondence on which the report is based as well as the report. The hon. gentleman might also inform the House what number of batteries were sheltered during these 22 years, so that we may have some idea whether $100 a year is adequate or inadequate for this service. In the country $100 a year will obtain considerable shed accommodation. I have a little suspicion that this claim is pressed on account of the public services rendered by the late Major King, and I would sympathise to some extent with that, knowing the value of the services which he rendered. In regard to the attitude of some hon. gentlemen, that, because part of this claim originated before Confederation, it should not be recognised now, there may be a great deal of force in that argument, but we would be in a very peculiar position if we were to repudiate a just claim against a Province which ceased to preserve its identity at Confederation when it became part of the Dominion. No particular Province would pay an amount of this kind, and it must be either repudiated altogether or paid by the Dominion.

Mr. MITCHELL. It will be recollected by some hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that there was an official notice given to the Dominion Government by the Government of Ontario—I am speaking under correction—that they would not pay any of these old claims unless they were first submitted to and approved by the Ontario Government.

To pay the depositors in the Savings Bank the amount appropriated by the assistant postmaster at Kingston $3,253 47

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object to the Government making good the defalcations of this officer, but I would call attention to the extraordinary state of thing which has prevailed for many years in this post office at Kingston. I called the attention of the late Postmaster General to the very extraordinary circumstances connected with the robberies committed by the assistant postmaster at Kingston, Mr. William Shannon, and to the fact that, though this man was caught red-handed by the Government inspector, he was given twenty-four hours in order to allow him to depart from Kingston. No punishment was inflicted upon him, though it was proved that he had committed several robberies, and I believe forgeries. At any rate, it was proved that he had opened letters and had taken money from them, and innocent junior officers had been suspected of having committed those offences. That should have called the attention of the Government to the state of affairs in Kingston, and yet the very next year the man who was selected to replace Shannon is found to have committed a great number of frauds reaching back for a series of years, involving robberies and forgeries, and, when he is brought up for trial, he receives a sentence of only two years in the penitentiary. He fared a little worse than his predecessor in office, who got off scot free with the knowledge and connivance of the Government officials. It seems to me that the conduct of the Government in dealing with Mr. William Shannon and in allowing such a small punishment to be inflicted

upon Mr. Burns who succeeded him, and for whose malfeasance, I presume, this vote is asked, requires some explanation. If I am rightly informed, several officers of the Postmaster General's Department, many of them young men under 21 years of age, have been convicted and sentenced to 5 years or 7 years, or perhaps 14 years in the penitentiary, I will not be certain about the time; but, at all events, they have been sentenced to long terms for offences which appear to me to have been infinitely less serious offences than those committed by Mr. Burns. The case of Mr. Shannon has already been discussed in this House, and in that case no punishment whatever was inflicted on the offender. I considered that that reflected gravely on the whole administration of justice and on the administration of the Postmaster General of the day. In the case of Mr. Burns, I am not prepared to say that the Postmaster General or the Post Office authorities neglected their duties. I do say that the attention of the House ought to be called to the fact, that so very trifling a sentence as two years was inflicted on a high official proved guilty of having committed such offences as I have described, while junior officers found guilty of opening individual letters, were sentenced to terms of punishment three and four times as great. I can conceive of nothing which is more calculated to debauch the service than to see such a difference in the punishments awarded for offences of an inferior degree of criminality to those which are awarded for offences of the very highest kind. I think the attention of the House ought to be called to the circumstances connected with the defalcation for which we are asked to provide. I do not know whether the Postmaster General knows the facts of his own knowledge.

Mr. HAGGART. I know the whole facts as reported to me. With reference to the punishments inflicted on the parties who have been found guilty of any crime, as this man Burns was, of robbing the post office, the Government of the Dominion have nothing whatever to do. All we did was to lay a charge, and he was prosecuted by the County Attorney in Kingston, an official of the Ontario Government, who sees that the law is administered in the Province, and he was tried before the Police Magistrate appointed by the Ontario Government, who awarded the punishment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was the County Judge.

Mr. HAGGART. The Dominion Government are in no way responsible for the punishment. All the Post Office Department did, when the facts came to their knowledge, was to communicate them at once to the officers of the Ontario Government and see that the offenders were arrested and tried for their crime. As to the distinction between the punishment, one case was before the Police Magistrate in Ottawa, I think, where two young men convicted of robbing the mails were sentenced to five years, whereas in Kingston the Police Magistrate sentenced the offender to two years. There was no effort made by the Postmaster General to have the sentences lessened or increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not allege the Postmaster General in this case was responsible; the hon. gentleman's predecessor was, in my opinion, gravely derelict in duty in allowing the man Shannon to escape, or in not punishing the officers who permitted him to escape. But this case stands on a different footing. I believe the Postmaster General is in error in thinking that it was the Police Magistrate who sentenced him; my recollection is that it was the County Judge. If I am correctly informed this man committed a great number of offences; I fancy he must have committed forgeries by the score. What I am informed he did was deliberately to falsify the accounts of illiterate depositors having deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank, that he did this for a series of years, that he picked out the illiterate depositors and availed himself of his position to make false entries in the books and false reports—the Postmaster General can correct me if I am overstating the case—in other words, he committed a whole series of offences of the gravest possible character. Now, it is quite possible that he was tried for only one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was tried and convicted on several indictments. There are several convictions yet against him, but he was sentenced on only one conviction, and he is liable still to be sentenced on the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to add to the man's punishment, but it does appear to me there is something seriously amiss—whether it comes under the purview of the Minister of Justice or not, except in the way of exercising the pardoning power—it appears to me there is something seriously amiss when we find a man of mature years—this was a man of 40—occupying a high position in the Kingston post office, and who was proved to have carried on the worst possible crimes in appropriating the money of these poor people for many years; and that this man should have been sentenced to but two years, while very young men who had given way to temptation, and were pilfering, money from letters, were sentenced for periods nearly three times as great. It appears to me that is contrary to all justice and morality, and is calculated to do great damage to the public at large. Whether the fault lies with the Police Magistrate here, or the Police Magistrate in Kingston, or with the Ontario Government, or in any other quarter, I am not prepared to say; but I am prepared to say that it is a scandal, in my judgment, that the greater criminal should escape with so very much lighter sentence than the younger and lesser criminals. I think it is a thing that the Minister of Justice might well take cognisance of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course we are not in a position to say anything with respect to a judgment passed by the Police Magistrate or the Superior Court judge on a conviction rendered before them. But I would like to know why it was that the other convictions were obtained and no sentence pronounced?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have no charge of the case at all. If in these cases there is a crime committed, and a case goes to trial, we generally ask some counsel to attend on behalf of the Department and assist the County Crown Attorney, unless the accused pleads guilty. I think myself it would be better that the severer sentence should be pronounced at once, instead of waiting for judgment on the other convictions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although I am as well disposed as any man to respect the

decisions of judges, we must remember that we in the House of Commons are entitled to review even the proceedings of judges in certain respects; and with all respect to the legal profession, I must maintain my right. My attention has been called at various times to the extraordinary difference in sentences inflicted by different judges. I find that one judge will sentence for three years where another will sentence for 14 years, and the punishment depends on the temper and views of the particular judge very often much more than on the guilt of the prisoner. Of course, I am not prepared to speak of all cases, but I think the Minister will find in this case I am quite correct, and that the criminals who might well have been let off with lesser sentences have received far heavier sentences than were inflicted in this particular case. I am not going to interfere with the prerogative of the Crown; I am not going to say that it is necessary to reduce the sentences that have been inflicted on these people, but I think there is a very great anomaly and injury inflicted when cases like these come up. These three persons are now serving terms in Kingston Penitentiary together, and I must say it appears to me that the case of the man Burns is vastly more aggravated than the cases of those young men to whom the Postmaster General alluded, and who, I believe, only committed one or two offences running over a very short period, whereas this offence runs over many years. They got five years, and Burns got two years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the hon. member distinctly heard my remarks. I was not at all finding fault with what the hon. gentleman said by way of criticism of the sentences in these cases. On the contrary, I said it would have been better in the grosser cases of that kind that a severer sentence should have been pronounced on the first conviction, or else that several consecutive sentences should have been pronounced, and if there were any mitigating circumstances they should have been left to the executive, because of the public impression produced when a severe sentence is pronounced in a very aggravated case like this. The cases of the young men are those of postal clerks detected in robbery. They were only convicted on one offence; but, generally speaking, it is found that they have been carrying on the practice for a long time and only have been detected in a comparatively trifling case. The law fixes in such case a minimum of 5 years imprisonment, and that is why the sentence was 5 years in their case; and I have been unable of late years to recommend a mitigation in any case where postal clerks have been guilty of robbery, because the offence has become very prevalent, notwithstanding the severity of sentences. In regard to the disparity of sentences in general: that strikes the public mind everywhere, but in this country no more than in others. We have a very great number of these cases to review in my Department. I think on an average about 1,500 applications per year are made for executive clemency, and in such applications any disparity of the sentences has always been observed, and in many cases when long sentences appear to have been inflicted for trifling offences an impression has been made on the public mind that some sentences are too severe. It has generally been found that these are by no means the first offences against the law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to guard myself against a misapprehension that I am opposed to the view that a member of Parliament has a right to discuss in this House any sentence passed by any judge in the land. I must distinctly disavow any such intention. I believe that every member has a right to call for the evidence and to discuss before Parliament any sentence which may have been pronounced, but I was only guarding myself against expressing an opinion on a collateral matter when I had not the evidence before me.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to bring before the Postmaster General an occurrence of two years ago. A letter was sent by the Bank of Commerce to a lady, containing a large sum of money, and the money was extracted from the letter. After a delay of six or eight months, restitution was made by the Postmaster at Palmerston, but a balance of from $20 to $30 was kept back. I should like to hear an explanation from the Postmaster General.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know any of the circumstances of the case. The Government in no case refunds money lost in the mails, but if it is through the fault of an officer, such officer is made to recoup the amount, but if the money has been feloniously abstracted, the party will be arrested. I do not understand why any portion of the money should have been kept back.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the rule in regard to taking security from postmasters who receive public moneys?

Mr. HAGGART. A very small amount is taken as security; in Burns' case it was only $400.

Mr. MULOCK. No doubt the Postmaster General is simply following the example of his predecessors, but he will be open to criticism if he does not obtain greater security.

Harbors and Rivers—General repairs and improvements $7,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will any of this amount be expended in removing the bar at the river Thames?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to finish the work of the year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is a very important matter and it is important inasmuch as the contract was commenced last year and only half completed. It only requires about $4,000 more to complete the work. Vessels are now moving in that river and it is impossible to get them in or out without shifting the cargo. Might I ask if it is the intention of the Minister to go on with the work, as he stated he intended, to a deputation a short time ago? I suppose we may expect a sum in the supplementary Estimates providing for that work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say yes or no. The Estimates will be down in a very short time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You promised the deputation that you would go on with the work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated to the deputation that I would examine the matter and then lay the whole thing before my colleagues. If my colleagues are not willing to go on with the work, then, I cannot help it.

Compensation to M. M. Peloquin and Phaneuf for the loss of their barge at Nicolet, &c..... $400

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that if the Government give the idea that they are responsible for the loss of property where navigation is obstructed, they are establishing a dangerous precedent. It is difficult to say what claims may arise from it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work was under construction and there was a buoy put to indicate the obstruction, but it appears the water rose above the buoy, and, as it was a dark night when this barge came along, she was wrecked. This was the only means of living for these poor men. Their claim was for $1,200 and the matter was referred to the Minister of Justice, who said that in a strictly legal sense they could not recover, but as it was a question of equity, the House might grant a sum if it were laid before Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Who drove in the piles there that caused the obstruction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was the contractor, but he had taken the necessary precaution.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not object to the amount, but it appears to me you are establishing a very dangerous principle.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you not require a contractor to give security that he will not construct his work in such a way as would endanger property or life?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That has never been done. It is the first time an accident of this kind has occurred.

Mr. MULOCK. You have been fortunate so far, but this suggests the propriety for doing something to make the contractor cautious. To-day, you have got your experience at a very small cost, but to-morrow it may be some large vessel which would be lost, and the owner may urge his claim here and may argue that the Government accepted the responsibility.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of that.

Amount required to supplement that voted by the British Association for the advancement of science for the purpose of making an investigation into the physical character, languages, and industrial and social condition of the North-West tribes of the Dominion of Canada, and especially the tribes and bands of British Columbia..... $500

Mr. FOSTER. This is one of the little things in which we encourage research into past records. We gave $750 last year to this society in furtherance of this object. This year they made a demand for $1,000, and we came to the conclusion to give them $500 for the researches they are to carry on this year, and then to stop the grant.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I am glad to hear the latter part of the statement.

To purchase and supply seed grain for settlers in the North-West Territories..... $31,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was the amount we carried the other evening?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was a small item of $250 which we expended two years ago; but the debate took place on this item. I promised to bring down a return, and in looking over the papers to-day I found that I had more information than I thought I had. It is being copied, and I will lay it on the Table when it is finished.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know nothing that will do more harm to the country than the knowledge of this fact, that we have been obliged to spend $31,000 to purchase seed grain for the North-West. The general impression is that that country is our granary, from which we are going to get our food supply; that it is very fertile; that while there is failure of crops in Dakota, there is none in our Territories. That is accepted as true in the Province I come from. I must say that on seeing the Government taking $31,000 to purchase seed grain for the North-West, my faith in the country has been very much shaken.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.12 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 30th April, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) to amend the Militia Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to repeal section 37 of the Militia Act, which is as follows:—

"There shall be appointed an officer who holds the rank of colonel, or superior thereto, in Her Majesty's regular army, who shall be charged under the orders of Her Majesty with the military command and discipline of the militia, and who, while he holds such appointment, shall have the rank of Major-General in the militia, and shall be paid at the rate of $4,000 per annum in full of all pay and allowances."

The Bill which I ask permission to introduce proposes that this section shall be amended by making eligible to the position of officer commanding Her Majesty's forces in Canada, any person holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel in the active militia in Canada, or superior rank, as well as those made eligible under the clause in question. I find that this section did not originate in 1886; but, tracing it back, it appears that it is substantially a continuation of the principle embodied in the Militia Act passed in the first Session after Confederation. I have not before me the Act to which I now refer, but it provided that the officer commanding the forces in Canada must be a person who has been educated to the military profession, and holds the rank at least of a field officer in Her Majesty's regular army. That is the idea we find embodied in the Militia Act of 1867. That was about twenty-three years ago. At that time there may have been very good reasons for that provision in the Act, and I am not finding fault with what has taken place; but I desire to suggest to the House whether the time has not arrived when we can emancipate Canadian officers to the extent of placing them on an equal footing with their fellow comrades in arms in the regular army. During these twenty-three years very considerable

changes have taken place in the management of our force, and I trust they have been favorable to its development and efficiency. While at the time of Confederation we expended about $750,000 a year on the force, the expenditure has been increased until to-day it amounts to $1,250,000; so it may be said that since Confederation we have expended in promoting the efficiency of the force about $20,000,000. A portion of that money may have been expended in pure maintenance, whereby perhaps no very great improvement has been effected in the service, but a large portion has been expended in establishing permanent corps and schools for military education. For example, we have the military college at Kingston, maintained at an expenditure of about $60,000 a year; we have various permanent corps, such as the cavalry schools in Quebec, Batteries "A," "B" and "C," mounted infantry, and we have other schools of a permanent character which I trust have made their impression on the military men of the country; and we have, therefore, to-day a class of men in connection with the active militia of Canada infinitely better qualified to perform the duties attaching to the office in question than there were at the time of the passage of the Act, the spirit of which I desire to have changed. There are many reasons, apart from these I have referred to, which would justify this House in at least making Canadian officers eligible for the position. It is not an encouraging thing to the men of our force, who choose to make sacrifices, personal and pecuniary, for the good of the country, that they should find upon the Statute-books a law declaring that under no circumstances can they attain to the highest position in the force. I am not contending for nativism alone, I am contending for the freedom for the people of Canada to be allowed a fair field and no favor, no discrimination, and no disqualification. If I sought for a precedent or justification for this, I might, perhaps, evoke the principle of the National Policy and ask to have it applied in a spirit so as to give protection to native ability. However, Sir, on this question I am in favor of free trade, and I am only asking to have the Canadian officers put upon the same plane, no higher and no lower, than those of the regular army. I believe—and I express this opinion with very great deference to those who may, perhaps, know better—that for very many reasons, the office in question can be much better filled were the incumbent one who has grown up with our system, who is familiar with the spirit of the country, and who knows the requirements of our people, than by a person from the British Army, which we all respect, but who, perhaps, is unfamiliar with the spirit of the Canadian people. I say, that for this and for other reasons, I conceive that the public service might be promoted by declaring that the highest military gift in the hands of the Governor General might be placed within the reach of those who choose to take an interest in holding together and building up the system of citizen soldiery that we are endeavoring to establish in this country. As a rule, the commander in question will have nothing to do with carrying on military operations in the full sense of the word. He may have to do with the suppression of an internal disturbance, and acting as a sort of police officer with the aid of the force, but I trust it will be long before he will be called on to discharge more serious duties. I, therefore, would urge upon the Government the propriety of their yielding—perhaps not this Session, but at an early date—to the principle involved in this Bill. They may not see fit to take charge of this Bill, and put it upon the Government Orders; but, if they do, I will cheerfully assent. If they prefer that it shall stand over until another Session, so that there may be full opportunity both within and without the House, to have the principle considered, well and good; but, at all events, I take the liberty now of asking the House to allow me to present this Bill, trusting that it will receive a favorable reception, and ultimately become law.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The question which the hon. gentleman has just submitted to the House, by the Bill which he wishes to introduce, is one of very great importance, and I am quite sure, as I understood from his speech, that he did not expect that such an important question could be dealt with at this late period of the Session. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is a question which must receive the attention of the Government between this period and the meeting of Parliament again, next Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am delighted to hear the assent which is given by the Minister of Militia to the proposition of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock). I think it is one of the stains upon the Statute-book of this country, that while our militiamen devote their time and money to an organisation for the defence of the country, it should be required such a slur should be placed upon them as to maintain a law which provides that not one of them is fit for the position of commander of our forces. When I look on my left hand, and on my right hand, and in front of me, I see gallant colonels abounding in this House. In the Chair of this House, presiding over its deliberations, I find a gentleman who occupies the distinguished position of one in command of Her Majesty's regiments. While approving of the Bill, and trusting that the hon. Minister will take the matter in charge next Session, I hope that he will take good care that that part of the law which prevents any man having a seat in this House, who enjoys the emoluments of office, except in certain cases, will not apply to any one who may be chosen to occupy the position of commander of our forces. I see delight beaming in the face of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) at this suggestion, for he may be a candidate for the office. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will be a candidate for the office, and I am quite certain that Colonel Amyot will be a candidate for the position of Commander-in-Chief; but, at all events, I would much rather see one of ourselves in command, than that we should have to go abroad to import a man for the position, and that a law should be on our Statute-books providing that none of our militia officers are fit for the office. It is time that we should depend more on ourselves in this country and go less abroad for assistance and advice.

Mr. BLAKE. Although the Bill is not disposed of, it is not, perhaps, wholly remote to enquire, when the report of the Committee in reference to the present Commander of the Forces, will be printed, so that we can deal with that question?

Mr. DAVIN. Speaking for the North-West, I consider that the principle contained in the Bill of

my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), will meet with acceptance. I have not seen the Bill, but as I understand it, it will not be exclusive of British officers. It will merely be, as my friend from York (Mr. Mulock) says, a fair field for all, and no favor. We have certainly come to a period of development in Canada, military and otherwise, when any position short of that of Governor General, should be opened to all Canadians.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will come to that soon.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I do not know anything about that. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the spirit of my hon. friend's remark, and I congratulate the Minister of Militia on practically——

Mr. MITCHELL. Accepting the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know whether he has accepted it or not, but I congratulate him on the spirit in which he has received the proposition.

Mr. LISTER. Germane to this, is the question as to the printing of the report of the committee, in reference to the conduct of General Middleton in the North-West. That investigation closed some days ago, and the report of the committee was presented to this House by the chairman. Instructions were given that the proceedings and the report should be printed at once for the use of hon. members in this House, so as to aid them in determining such steps as they might consider proper, but I may say to the Government that the report is not yet before the House ; and I say, furthermore, that if this House closes without considering that report as it ought to do, it will be most discreditable to the Government and to the House generally. I desire to press upon the Government the necessity of urging upon the proper Department the propriety of having these proceedings brought down at once, so that the matter may be considered by the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEIZURE OF TOBACCO.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has instructed any person. or persons, to proceed to the North-West to seize all tobacco not in stamped boxes? Whether, as a fact, such tobacco has not all paid the requisite duty? To what points in the North-West such persons have been sent ; if sent they have been?

Mr. BOWELL. A preventive officer of the Inland Revenue Department was instructed to proceed to the North-West, with a view to determine what truth there was in certain reports which reached the Department that spirits were being illicitly manufactured there. As an officer of the Revenue he would doubtless seize any tobacco of foreign manufacture smuggled into the Dominion. Inasmuch as it is only in compliance with Inland Revenue regulations as to stamping and preserving the identity of original packages that the fact of tobacco having paid duty can be satisfactorily established, it is quite possible that some inconvenience may arise to those who, without fraudulent intent, have ignored the requirements of the law. No report having been received from the officer, it is impossible to state what points he has visited or may visit. The main object of his visit, however, is the prevention of illicit distillation reported to be prevalent.

RIVER McKINACK WORKS.

Mr. STE. MARIE asked, 1st. How many days did Mr. Léandre Hould work, in 1889, as foreman of works, River McKinack? 2nd. How many days work were performed by the day laborers at that work? 3rd. How much was paid for the board of men employed thereat? 4th. What has been the total cost of the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the first question of the hon. member, 45 days ; 2nd, 174 days ; 3rd, 35 cents per day : 4th, $513.

TWO-ROWED BARLEY.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, Whether the Government has, through Professor Saunders, made any arrangements with farmers to grow two-rowed barley, with the understanding that the Government will purchase the crop when grown? If arrangements have been made, did the Government furnish the seed or did the farmers pay for it? If so, how many acres are arranged for? Is there any arrangement as to price? If so, what price is to be paid? Will the Government purchase two-rowed barley from any other parties who bought their seed from the Government?

Mr. CARLING. The director of the experimental farms made arrangements with George E. Lewis, of Winona, to grow four acres of Carter's "Prize Prolific" barley ; with C. P. Carpenter, of Winona, three acres ; with John Weir, of West Flamboro', five acres : or twelve acres in all. The agreement with each of these farmers was to supply them with sufficient seed, without charge, and to take the crop, delivered at nearest railway station, at 75 cents per bushel of 48 pounds, they to have the privilege of retaining one-fourth of the crop, if they so desire, for their own use. These farmers have agreed to thoroughly prepare their land for this crop, and to carefully handle and thresh the grain, so as to keep the seed pure and clean. This arrangement has been made with the object of ensuring a sufficient supply for the distribution next year through the mail, in 3-lb. bags, to farmers in different parts of the Dominion. The district referred to was chosen for this purpose for the reason that some of the finest samples grown by farmers from last year's distribution were produced in that locality, and because it is well known that the climate there is favorable for the growth of good barley. It is not proposed to make any further arrangements of this sort, as it is believed that the crop from twelve acres, supplemented by the barley which will be grown on the experimental farms, will afford an ample supply for the purpose named.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister when it is the Government's intention to bring down the subsidies for railroads. One of the railroads talked of as likely to get a subsidy is one of great interest to my constituents, running from Edmundston to Moncton. I am constantly receiving letters of enquiry about it, and I would like to know whether it is likely to receive a subsidy or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot answer that question. When the Estimates are brought down, they will speak for themselves. We will bring them down early next week.

SUPPLY—JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I wish to place in your hands a motion of which I gave notice a few days ago, with a few slight variations in the verbiage, with reference to submitting the Jesuits' Estates Act to the Supreme Court of Canada. It may be claimed that this question ought to be allowed to rest; and perhaps, if I had consulted my own wishes and feelings in the matter, I should not have moved on this occasion. However, it will be remembered that last Session I attempted to make this motion. It is not necessary to refer to the circumstances connected with that attempt; but I was assailed during the summer by the organ of the Government with the charge of insincerity, that paper making the assertion that I had not designed to make the motion. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) also appeared in the press with a characteristic letter, stating that I could have made the motion long before, and did not intend to make it. I think it is proper the motion should be made, because I believe the Government, in the course they have taken in referring this matter to the law officers of the Crown, and in the manner the reference was made, did not take a step calculated to allay the public excitement which exists, but gave reason for an intensification of the feeling of dissatisfaction. The reference made to Sir Richard Webster and Sir Edward Clark was upon the statement of the case, which may fairly and properly be termed an *ex parte* statement; and the opinion of the law officers was not, so far as I am able to see, given upon a full possession of the facts. I do not find in this return the Bill itself. I do find the memorandum of the Minister of Justice discusses the provisions and terms of the Bill, but the Bill itself, so far as I am able to see, was not in the hands of the law officers of the Crown. The schedule of the papers submitted shows that the principal matter is a memorandum of the hon. the Minister of Justice, certain petitions from the Evangelical Alliance and from other sources, and the answer of His Excellency the Governor General to the delegation which waited upon him at Quebec. We have an opinion given by the law officers of the Crown, but that opinion is expressly based, by the terms of their finding, upon the memorandum of the hon. Minister of Justice. It does not seem that any other evidence was furnished or any other authority consulted in the matter. The case rests, then, merely upon this memorandum and upon the petitions forwarded to the Imperial authorities, these petitions having reference, not to the question of constitutionality, except incidentally, but to the question of the propriety of disallowance. There is no reference to any of the old English statutes, except in a general sense, save in one of these petitions from certain citizens of Quebec, which does refer to the 1st Elizabeth, chapter 1. This reference cannot be termed a judicial investigation. No evidence was furnished, there was no trial, there was no argument, and no counsel was heard. It was, in fact, at least so it seems to me, as a layman, simply an opinion given by two law officers, not sitting in their capacity as a court, but as individuals, based upon the statement of the defendant's attorney, and on that alone. This, I do not think, Sir, can be considered a fair and proper reference by the Government. We have in our Statute-books a provision for cases of this kind. We have in the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, Revised Statutes 135, section 7, this provision:

"The Governor General in Council may refer to the Supreme Court for hearing or consideration any matter which he thinks fit to refer to the court, and the court shall thereupon hear or consider the same and certify their opinion thereon to the Governor in Council, provided that any judge or judges of the court who differ from the opinion of the majority may, in like manner, certify as to their opinion or opinions to the Governor in Council."

Here is the proper constitutional method of arriving at a decision upon such cases, the mode is provided by our own laws, and to ignore the Supreme Court in this matter by having recourse to the law officers of the Crown was most derogatory to the dignity of the Supreme Court. The step taken by the Governor General, for whose action the Ministers are responsible, was, I submit, an improper one, taken in disregard of the functions of the court.

The memorandum of the Minister of Justice proceeds, in the first place, to meet the objections raised; and the first objection is that the statute endows from the public funds of the Province a religious organisation and creates inequalities among religious denominations. This objection is met—ably met, of course—in the memorandum of the hon. Minister. The second objection is that the statute recognises the right of the Pope to claim that his consent was necessary to empower the Provincial Legislature to dispose of part of the public domain. The third objection is that the statute diverts assets from the educational purposes to which by law they had been devoted. And the fourth objection is that the sanction of the Province of Ontario, which was necessary to the disposition made by the statute of the estates in question, was not obtained. In the statement made in the memorandum meeting these objections and attempting to set them aside, is one with reference to the claim that the Provinces may make a union of Church and State. It is asserted that they may, and that they may endow religious bodies, and may do so unequally. The memorandum next proceeds to assert that it is impossible to test the validity of such legislation. The memorandum then proceeds to state that the Act merely restores to a society a portion of the property of which it was deprived without compensation. The next point is that the Pope only acted as umpire for two claimants, to conduct the negotiations for both, and strives to explain away the character of the interference of a foreign power. Again, it attempts to explain and set aside the force of that phrase used in the Bill: "Binding only so far as ratified by the Pope," by saying that the recognition of the right of the Pope to decide in a matter of public domain, does not form any necesary part of the statute; and the hon. Minister, in conclusion, says that the Government have been asked to test the validity of the Act in the courts and especially before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but

declined to recommend an appropriation for such a purpose as they did not feel called upon to enter into litigation ; that they considered the authority to pass the Act was clear, and that, furthermore, in contesting the Act they would be defying the opinion of the House. This is tantamount to taking the position that if this House agrees upon the character of an Act, or if the responsible officers of His Excellency agree as to the character of an Act, then there is no necessity for any reference. If the House, forsooth, are satisfied, and if the Ministers are satisfied that there is no cause for reference, then no reference should be made. I venture to say there are not in this House twenty gentlemen who have that reputation as jurists which would enable them to give an opinion on a constitutional measure that the country would unhesitatingly accept. There are not twenty men in this House who would be considered eligible to seats upon the bench of the Supreme Court, and in the Ministry themselves there are very few. I see the Minister of Customs, I see the Minister of Public Works, I see the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Militia. I do not see the Minister of Inland Revenue in his place, and I must say I do not suppose any one would claim that any one of these gentlemen is a jurist of a character so high as to render it proper to trust to him the decision of a nice constitutional question. There are probably not more than one-third of the Ministers of the Crown in whose opinion on a matter of this kind the country would have any confidence whatever ; and yet the conclusion arrived at in this memorandum is that, as the House has pronounced upon this question of constitutionality, and as the Ministers are satisfied, there is no necessity, forsooth, for any reference. The memorandum further says that the Government do not hold the view that the Jesuits should have been denied corporate rights. Well, that is a question upon which there is great difference of opinion. That is one of the questions involved in this case. It is a question which ought to be settled by the highest judicial tribunals of the country, and is not one, in my opinion, in which the Government are warranted in saying that their opinion should govern. In fact, the memorandum can scarcely be considered as other than a special plea. It is the plea of the Government in this matter justifying their course. It is made with consummate ability, but it is not by any means all of the statements and arguments that ought to have been before the court upon which devolved the duty of deciding in this matter. The opinion of the law officers is, in fact, an *ex parte* decision, made upon the statement of the counsel for the defendant, without due precautions having been taken to place in the hands of these law officers all the circumstances and facts bearing upon the case. The deliverance of the law officers of the Crown was exactly what might have been expected from the character of the memorandum. I have read the memorandum over very carefully, and I fail to see how any different opinion could be arrived at from the premises as laid down by the Minister of Justice. The reply was, that in their opinion the Act was constitutional, that it was *intra vires* of the Legislature of Quebec, that His Excellency was not warranted to interfere in the matter, and that the Act should be allowed to become law.

The obvious deductions to be drawn from this memorandum and return are, that this reference was made without the Ministry having desired to make it. Although they are responsible for the reference, although it is quite constitutional and legal that it should be attributed to the advisers of the Crown, yet my inference is, that His Excellency the Governor General was not satisfied in regard to the matter in view of the agitation which had arisen, and that, knowing it was such a delicate matter, he desired to be fortified in his view and in the view taken by the Ministers, and I believe it was at his request that the reference was made to the law officers. It is needless to say that this memorandum is on all fours with the speech made by the hon. Minister of Justice in the House, with the speech of the Governor General to the delegation which waited upon him in Quebec, and with the answer of the hon. Minister of Justice to Mr. Graham. The law officers of the Crown were evidently averse to interference with this matter. They did not want to meddle with it. They took the position that it was a subject which the Dominion authorities should deal with themselves, and, acting upon the positions which had been taken, upon the statements which had been made, and upon the memorandum of the hon. Minister of Justice, they arrived at the decision to which I have already referred. So far as the petitions presented to those hon. gentlemen were concerned, the question of constitutionality was not referred to except incidentally. The demand for disallowance and the demand for reference were both denied. It is well known that a great deal of excitement existed in the country on this subject, not only when the House took action in the matter, but during the spring and summer before His Excellency answered the deputation which waited upon him in August. It was the opinion of many people that this Bill infringed upon the Queen's prerogative, and in an unconstitutional manner. In the minds of thousands of people, the Bill was considered to be undoubtedly unconstitutional, and the general belief was that the proper tribunal to which it should have been referred was the Supreme Court of this country ; that it should not have been referred and acted upon in a clandestine manner, if I may be allowed to say so, by the law officers of the Crown, but that everything appertaining to it should have been open and public, and that those who had objections to urge should have had opportunities to urge those objections before the court adjudicating upon the question.

I am unable to see why the Government should have been averse to this reference. I would have supposed that they would have been anxious to fortify their position by a reference to the highest tribunal in Canada, and it appears to me that there is something singular in the hesitation of the Government to submit this case to the Supreme Court of Canada. As to the action of the members of the Government in refusing disallowance, they certainly were not debarred by any considerations as to their want of power in the premises. They had repeatedly disallowed the Acts of Provincial Legislatures. They had taken the position, which was undoubtedly a constitutional position, that they had the right to disallow Provincial measures. It cannot be doubted that that right exists for the Imperial Government under the 56th section of the British North America Act, and for the

Dominion Government under the 90th section of the British North America Act. There can be no question as to the power of the Government to exercise that function of disallowance, though of course they are responsible to the people for its proper exercise. In the debates in this House and in the course of reasoning by which opinions were arrived at in this House, there was some difference of opinion as to the motives on which members acted. Of course, members on the Conservative side had no doubt as to the right of the Government to disallow the Act, because they had repeatedly sustained the Government in the exercise of that power in regard to Provincial Acts ; but unquestionably the case was different in regard to hon. gentlemen on thisside of the House who then sustained the Government. They took the ground that the power of disallowance of Provincial Acts had been used by this Government unjustly, and that it should not be used except where the general interests were involved or in cases of unconstitutionality. At any rate the Government, after having refused to disallow this Act, were not justified in refusing to test its constitutionality before the proper tribunal. I might dilate at length on the reasons which led to the introduction of this power of disallowance into the articles of Confederation, but it is not necessary. The Government, having refused to exercise this power in this instance, took refuge behind the principle of Provincial rights which has been asserted on this side of the House. Having disallowed the Rivers and Streams Bill of Ontario and the Manitoba Railway legislation, and then, having arrived at the consideration of an Act which certain influences pressed them not to disallow, they took refuge behind this principle of Provincial rights, and they now stand where their opponents stood before.

The claim that expense would follow this reference is set at rest by the fact that the expenses were tendered to the Government by Mr. Graham of Montreal. I have in my hand the Toronto *Empire*, in which the answer of the Minister of Justice to Mr. Graham is published. It was dated on the 10th July and published in August. The first thing given in this is a minute of the Privy Council :

"The Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration the petition of Mr. Hugh Graham, of the city of Montreal, requesting Your Ecellency to refer to the Supreme Court of Canada for hearing and consideration, an enquiry as to the constitutionality of the Acts of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, intituled, respectively : 'An Act to incorporate the Society of Jesus' (50 Vic., chap. 38) and 'An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates' (51 Vic., chap. 13).

"The Minister of Justice, to whom the said petition was referred, has submitted a report thereon, dated 10th day of July, 1889, stating that, for the reasons therein set forth, the request of the petitioner is not one that can properly be complied with, and recommends that the petitioner be so informed, and that the certified cheque on the Bank of Montreal, payable to the order of the Deputy Minister of Finance, for the sum of $5,000, deposited by Mr. Graham as an evidence of his willingness to bear the necessary costs of the Government in the matter of such reference, be returned to him.

"The Committee concur in the said report and the recommendations therein contained, and submit the same for Your Excellency's approval, and they advise that the Secretary of State be authorised to communicate the substance thereof to the petitioner."

Then follows the letter of the Minister of Justice, to Mr. Graham, and one of the positions taken in this letter by the Minister of Justice is that Mr. Graham had applied to the wrong party for redress, that he ought to have gone to the Attorney General of his own Province. He says :

"The petitioner has, furthermore, an opportunity of calling on the Attorney General of his Province to take legal proceedings."

Well, Sir, I do not think that gentleman's chance to get redress from the Attorney General of the Province that had passed the Act, was a very great one. It was recommending Mr. Graham to resort to an expedient in which he was foredoomed to failure, in which he, as well as the Minister of Justice knew that the result would be failure. The Minister of Justice further says :

"The provision which confers that power on Your Excellency was undoubtedly intended to enable the Governor General to obtain an opinion from the Supreme Court of Canada in relation to some order which his Government might be called on to make, or in relation to some action which his officers might be called on to adopt. For the guidance of Your Excellency, or of your officers, the provision may be a valuable one, but, used as a means of solving legal problems in which the Governor of Canada has no direct concern, however much they may interest or excite the public mind, as the petitioners seem to propose or used to compel an adjudication on private rights and interests, it would be perverted, the undersigned humbly submits, into an arbitrary and inquisitorial power, anticipating and interfering with the ordinary course of justice."

And again the Minister informs Mr. Graham that :

"The Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates was assented to by the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, on the 12th day of July, 1888, was transmitted to the Secretary of State of Canada on the 6th day of August, 1888, and on the 19th day of January, 1889, the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec was notified that it would be left to its operation."

Why this step, Mr. Speaker ? Parliament was to meet in a few days, yet, on the 19th January, in anticipation of the meeting of Parliament, while the excitement in the country with regard to this matter was rising higher and higher, the Government took the step of announcing to the public that this Bill would be allowed to take its course. In the conclusion of his letter to Mr. Graham, the Minister of Justice says :

"The undersigned would remind Your Excellency that as regards the Act for the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates, a resolution in favor of disallowing the same was presented to the House of Commons of Canada during the last Session of Parliament, and was, after a thorough discussion, negatived by an overwhelming majority. The will of the House of Commons that the Act should be left to its operation in the usual way, as being probably within the powers of the Legislature which passed it, was thereby unequivocally expressed. The attempt to attack the Act in the courts, by the use of Your Excellency's power to seek advice from the Supreme Court of Canada, would not, in the opinion of the undersigned, be consistent with the deference which should be shown to that branch of Parliament, and would not be justifiable on the ground that the doubts which had then been asserted continued to be expressed by some who do not acquiesce in the conclusion then arrived at."

Sir, this position is not a tenable one. We can never have a case where there has been a decided expression of opinion of this House as to its constitutionality, in which that fact would not close the door to a legal decision, if that position is a correct one. Not only was there no reason for submitting the Jesuits' Estates Bill, if the position is correct, but there can be no reason, in the future, for submitting any Bill upon which this House has in an emphatic manner given a decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may, perhaps, not be inappropriate in connection with the discussion of this question, indeed I think it is neces-

sary, to make a brief enquiry as to the basis of the popular belief in the unconstitutionality of this Bill. Was that belief a baseless one? Was there no foundation for that belief, or was there some tangible reason for entertaining that opinion? In the memorandum of the Minister of Justice in reference to this matter, on page 25, I find that he says :

"It is contended by those who sustain this view, that, in consequence of the early English statutes against the Jesuits, it is impossible for a Colonial Legislature to give members of that society corporate rights, or even to recognise their presence in the country. This view is not held by His Excellency's advisers. Considering the large powers of self-government which have been conferred from time to time on the various colonies, Canada included, and especially considering the powers given by the British North America Act of 1867, it is believed by His Excellency's Government that it is clearly within the power of any one of the Legislatures to pass statutes on such a subject, even though they may conflict with the early statutes relating to religion or in any way connected with religion."

Now, in this extract the inference that the Minister of Justice would lead us to draw, in my opinion, is that the statutes referred to were ancient ones, were very early statutes, and the inference I would draw would be that they dated as far back, perhaps, as Richard II or Henry VIII. But the truth is that the statute upon which objection to the incorporation Act is based, is a statute of comparatively recent date, as late as the year 1829. With reference to the power of a Provincial Legislature to override Dominion statutes, as a layman, I can hardly reconcile that position with the 129th section of the British North America Act, which is as follows :—

"Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick at the Union, and all courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all legal commissioners, powers and authorities, and all officers, judicial, administrative and ministerial, existing therein at the Union, shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, respectively, as if the Union had not been made; subject, nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland), to be repealed, abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada, or by the Legislature of the respective Provinces, according to the authority of the Parliament or of that Legislature under this Act."

"Subject to be repealed except as regards Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of Great Britain and Ireland." I cannot reconcile with the terms of that clause the assertion of the Minister of Justice, that the Legislatures of the Provinces can override Imperial enactments by their own legislation.

Now, as I consider it necessary to lay down the premises on which I proceed, I will read some of the sections of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, relating to the question under discussion. I find in the 28th section of that Act, chapter 7, 10 George IV, the following :—

"And, whereas Jesuits, and members of other religious orders, communities or societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, are resident within the United Kingdom; and it it expedient to make provision for the gradual suppression and final prohibition of the same therein——"

It goes on to make provisions—I do not know as it is necessary for me to read them; I will have them incorporated in the *Hansard* if the Minister will permit.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will read everything he wants to have published in the *Hansard*.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will have great pleasure in doing so, but I desired to save the time of the House.—

—"be it therefore enacted that every Jesuit, and every member of any other religious order, community, or society of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, who at the time of the commencement of this Act shall be within the United Kingdom, shall within six calendar months after the commencement of this Act, deliver to the clerk of the peace of the county or place where such persons shall reside, or to his deputy, a notice or statement, in the form and containing the particulars required to be set forth in the schedule to this Act annexed; which notice or statement such clerk of the peace or his deputy shall preserve and register amongst the records of such county or place, without any fee, and shall forthwith transmit a copy of such notice or statement to the Chief Secretary of the Lord Lieutenant, or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, if such persons shall reside in Ireland, or if in Great Britain to one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State; and in case any person shall offend in the premises, he shall forfeit and pay to His Majesty, for every calendar month during which he shall remain in the United Kingdom without having delivered such notice or statement as hereinbefore required, the sum of fifty pounds."

Section 29 says :

"And be it further enacted, that if any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community or society, as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, come into this realm, he shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being thereof lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life."

Section 30 says :

"Provided always, and be it further enacted, that in case any natural-born subject of this realm being at the time of the commencement of said Act or other member of any such religious order, community or society as aforesaid, shall, at the time of the commencement of this Act, be out of the realm, it shall be lawful for such person to return or to come into this realm, and upon such return or coming into the realm he is thereby required within the space of six calendar months after his first returning or coming into the United Kingdom, to deliver such notice or statement to the clerk of the peace of the county or place where he shall reside, or his deputy, for the purpose of being so registered, and transmitted as hereinbefore directed; and in case any such person shall neglect or refuse to do so he shall for such offence forfeit and pay to His Majesty for every calendar month during which he shall remain in the United Kingdom without having delivered such notice or statement, the sum of fifty pounds."

Section 31 says :

"Provided also, and be it further enacted, that, notwithstanding any time hereinbefore contained, it shall be lawful for any one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State being such a Protestant by a license in writing signed by him, to grant permission to any Jesuit, or member of any religious order or society as aforesaid, to come into the United Kingdom and to remain therein for such period as the said Secretary of State shall think proper, not exceeding in any case the space of six calendar months; and it shall also be lawful for any of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State to revoke any license so granted before the expiration mentioned therein if he shall so think fit; if any such person to whom such license shall have been granted shall not depart from the United Kingdom within twenty days of the expiration of the time mentioned in such license, or if such license shall have been revoked, then within twenty days after notice of such revocation shall have been given to him, every person so offending shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor, and being thereof lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced to be banished from the United Kingdom from the term of his natural life."

Section 33 says :

"And be it further enacted, that in case any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community or society aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, within any part of the United Kingdom, admit any person to become a regular ecclesiastic, or brother, or member of any such religious order, community or society, or to be aiding or consenting thereto, or shall administer, or cause to be administered, or be assisting in

the administering, or taking any oath, vow, or engagement purporting or intending to bind the person taking the same to the rules, ordinances or ceremonies of such religious order, community or society; every person offending in the premises, in England or Ireland, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor."

Section 34 says:

"And be it further enacted, that in case any person shall, after the commencement of this Act, within any part of this United Kingdom, be admitted, or become a Jesuit, or brother, or member of any such other religious order, community or society as aforesaid, such person shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of misdemeanor, and being thereof lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life, and in Scotland shall be punished by fine and imprisonment."

These provisions of 10 George IV, chapter 7, give at least a color to the assertion that this society was under the ban of Imperial law; and if it was under the ban of Imperial law, and if under section 129 of the British North America Act a Provincial Legislature is expressly debarred from repealing Imperial laws, then it may be submitted that this society was incapable of incorporation within any part of the British realm; and whether this is so or not, it is at least a contention that requires thorough judicial investigation, and if the Government wish to allay the excitement in regard to this matter, it requires the decision of the highest court of the Dominion. It requires a decision arrived at after a fair and full judicial investigation, not a decision arrived at as was the decision of the law officers of the Crown, on a statement prepared by the Minister of Justice without any other evidence, and that statement prepared evidently with the intention of justifying the act of the Government in its refusal to disallow the Act and its decision not to submit the case to the Supreme Court. It may be asserted that this law is obsolete and is not in operation. But this very law was referred to in 1875 in a debate in the English House of Commons on 10th July of that year, by Mr. Disraeli, then Prime Minister, who expressly declared that the law was not obsolete, but that its provisions were reserving powers in the hands of the Government to be exercised at any time they might care to exercise them. Certainly this matter has a bearing, and a very important bearing on the question of the Jesuits' Estates Bill. Was this Act mentioned in the reference made to the law officers of the Crown? A general reference was made to the ancient English statutes, but there was nothing to govern or guide the law officers in their examination with respect to this law, there was nothing to lead them to consider that the law referred to was less than two or three centuries old. Nothing was said to them about the provisions contained in the Catholic Emancipation Act. It should have been expressly referred to in any case submitted to a tribunal that was to adjudicate on this case.

Then, in the second place, with respect to the provisions of the Bill itself. It has been held that the preamble to this Bill contained allusions to a foreign potentate that were not consonant with the requirements of English law, but were, on the contrary, in direct conflict with its express provisions. But the Minister of Justice tells us that the preamble of a Bill is a matter of no consequence whatever, although during this Session he did attribute importance to the preamble of the Bill which dealt with the dual language in the North-West. I find in the memorandum this reference to the preamble of the Bill, on page 16:

"It will be seen, therefore, that the only portions of the many matters which are set out in the preamble to this statute, which are ratified, and which, therefore, form any material part of the statute, are the arrangements entered into between the Premier and the Very Rev. Father Turgeon. These arrangements are contained in the letter of the First Minister of Quebec, dated 1st May, 1888, the letter of Father Turgeon, dated the 8th of the same month, and the letter of the First Minister, dated the same day, and the legal documents which followed in order to give effect to the settlement. All other matters which are referred to in the preamble to this statute are extraneous and irrelevant."

Let us see what is said in the letter of the Premier of 1st May, and the letter following that of the Premier. On 1st May, 1888, Premier Mercier addressed a letter to the Rev. Father Turgeon, of which the following are some extracts. He wrote:

"Before entering into negotiations with you respecting these estates, the Government desires you to bear in mind:

"1. That you must deposit with a notary the original of the aforesaid letter from the Sacred College, with two solemn declarations made according to law, and identifying the signatures of the Prefect and Secretary of the said College, which are at the end of the said document."

That is to say, he was to satisfy the Government that he was the accredited agent of His Holiness, and of the College of the Propaganda, and he was to enter into negotiations with the Premier of Quebec, as the ambassador of His Holiness the Pope, and the representative of the College. The letter further contains the following language:—

"That you will grant to the Government of the Province of Quebec a full, complete and perpetual concession of all the property which may have belonged in Canada, under whatever title, to the Fathers of the old Society, and that you will renounce to all rights generally whatsoever upon such property and the revenues therefrom in favor of our Province, the whole, as well in the name of the old Order of Jesuits, and of your present corporation, as in the name of the Pope, of the Sacred College of the Propaganda and of the Roman Catholic Church in general;

"That any agreement made between you and the Government of the Province will be binding only in so far as it shall be ratified by the Pope and the Legislature of this Province;

"That the amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in the possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit until the Pope has ratified the said settlement and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country."

The reply of the Rev. Father Turgeon contains the following:—

"Any agreement made between the Government of this Province and the Jesuit Fathers will be binding only is so far as it shall have been ratified by the Pope and the Legislature of this Province.

"The amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in the possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit until the Pope has ratified the said settlement and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country."

Now, the hon. Minister in his memorandum expressly says: that although there is much irrelevant matter in the correspondence which does not pertain to the Bill, yet that these two letters do, and these are the two letters that contain the most objectionable features of the Bill. The Bill provides:

"1. That the aforesaid arrangements (those I have referred to and many others), entered into between the Premier and the Very Reverend Father Turgeon, are hereby ratified, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to carry them out according to their form and tenor.

"2. The Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorised to pay, out of any public money at his disposal, the sum of four hundred thousand dollars, in the manner and under the conditions mentioned in the documents above cited, and to make any deed that he may deem necessary for the full and entire execution of such agreement."

Now Sir, this Act, with these documents that I have read—which the hon. gentleman's memor-

andum says do constitute part of the Bill, if other portions of it do not—these documents first of all open negotiations with His Holiness, then they accept authority from His Holiness, then they submit legislation to His Holiness for ratification, and then they place money at the disposal of His Holiness. If all these things are not a recognition of the Pope in civil matters, then I am unable to draw a just conclusion with regard to the case. I am sorry to occupy the time of the House, but I wish to show upon what grounds I based my opinion, that this Bill is contrary to the provisions of the English statutes. I wish to draw attention first of all, to the old law of *præmunire* passed in the reign of Richard II, in 1392.

Mr. DAVIN. Why not go back a little earlier?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is as far as it is necessary to go back, and the hon. gentleman will find that these provisions are re-enacted in a law passed so late as the tenth year of the reign of Queen Victoria, by which they are specially declared to be continued in force. Therefore, in order to find the law of the land, it will be necessary to go back to the origin of *præmunire*. Blackstone gives the following definition of *præmunire*:

"Introducing a foreign power into the land and creating *imperium in imperio* by paying that obedience to papal process which constitutionally belonged to the King alone."

There were provisions made with regard to this matter in the reign of Edward III, in the reign of Henry IV, and in the reign of Richard II, this law of *præmunire* was placed on the statutes. It will be necessary, I suppose, for me to read these provisions, because I wish them to appear in the record. I want to quote them to show upon what authority the prevailing opinion is in regard to the constitutionality of this Bill is based.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will be glad to dispense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. CHARLTON. Chapter 5 of Richard II. in the 16th year of his reign, provides:

"And also it is said, and a common clamor is made, that the said Bishop of Rome hath ordained and purposed to translate some prelates of the same realm, some out of the realm, and some from one bishopric into another within the same realm, without the King's assent and knowledge, and without the assent of the prelates, which so shall be translated, which prelates be much profitable and necessary to our said Lord the King, and to all his realm; by which translations (if they should be suffered) the statutes of the realm should be defeated and made void and his said Liege Sages of his Council, without his assent, and against his will, carried away and gotten out of the realm, and the substance and treasure of the realm shall be carried away, and so the realm destitute as well of council as of substance, to the final destruction of the same realm; and so the Crown of England, which hath been so free at all times, that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God in all things touching the Regalty of the same Crown, and to none other, should be submitted to the Pope, and the laws and statutes of the realm by him defeated and avoided at his will, in perpetual destruction of the sovereignty of the King our Lord, his Crown, his Regalty, and of all his realm, which God defend.

"And moreover, the Commons aforesaid say, that the said things so attempted be clearly against the King's Crown and his Regalty, used and approved of the time of all his progenitors; when wherefore they all the Liege Commons of the same realm will stand with our said Lord the King, and his said Crown, and his Regalty, in the cases aforesaid, and in all other cases attempted against him, his Crown, and his Regalty in all points, to live and to die."

And the concluding part of this law says:

Mr. CHARLTON.

"Whereupon our said Lord the King, by the assent aforesaid, and at the request of his said Commons, hath ordained and established, that if any purchase or pursue, or cause to be purchased or pursued in the Court of Rome, or elsewhere, by any such translations, processes, and sentences of excommunication, bulls, instruments, or any other things whatsoever which touch the King, against him, his Crown, and his Regalty, or his realm, as is aforesaid, and they which bring within the realm or them receive, or make thereof notification, or any other execution whatsoever within the same realm or without, that they, their notaries, procurators, maintainers, abettors, fautors, and counsellors, shall be put out of the King's protection, and their lands and tenements, goods and chattels, forfeit to our Lord the King; and that they be attached by their bodies, if they may be found, and brought before the King, and his council, there to answer to the cases aforesaid, or that process be made against them by *præmunire facias*, in manner as it is ordained in other Statutes of Provisors, and other which do sue in any other court in derogation of the Regalty of our Lord the King."

Now, Sir, the provisions in this statute were emphasised and enlarged in the reign of Henry VIII, and I will spare the House by not inflicting these extracts upon them, but if any hon. gentlemen wish to consult them, I will give the data by which they can do so: Act for the Restraint of Appeals, 24 Henry VIII (1532), volume 2, page 167, chapter 12, sections 2 and 4. Act concerning Peter pence and dispensations, 25 Henry VIII (1533), volume 2, pages 183 and 4, chapter 21, section 3. In these several statutes, the provisions of the law of Richard II are made more stringent. These Acts were repealed in the reign of Philip and Mary, but as soon as Queen Elizabeth came to the Throne of England, among the very first legislation in her reign was the re-affirming of the provisions of these various statutes, and I shall trouble the House with some extracts from the law under Queen Elizabeth. Chapter 1, of 1 Elizabeth, from the 3rd to the 13th sections, re-enacts the laws that were annulled in the reign of Philip and Mary. This statute contains the following provisions:—

"And to the intent that all usurped and foreign power and authority, spiritual and temporal, may forever be clearly extinguished and never to be used or obeyed within this realm, or any other Your Majesty's dominions or countries; may it please Your Highness that it may be further enacted by the authority aforesaid that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall, at any time after the last day of this session of Parliament, use, enjoy or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm, or within any other Your Majesty's dominions or countries that now be, or hereafter shall be, but from thenceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm, and all other Your Highness' dominions forever."

In 13 Elizabeth, chapter 2, we find the following provisions:—

"Wherein the Parliament holden at Westminster in the fifth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady the Queen's Majesty that now is, by one act and statute then and there made, intituled an Act for the Assurance of the Queen's Majesty's royal power over all states and subjects within our Highness' Dominions, it is among other things very well ordained and provided for the abolishing of the usurped power and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome and of the See of Rome, heretofore unlawfully claimed and usurped within the realm and other the dominions of the Queen's Majesty belonging, that no person or persons shall hold or stand with, to set forth, maintain, defend or extol the same usurped power, or attribute any manner of jurisdiction, authority or pre-eminence to the same, to be had or used within this realm or any of the said dominions, upon pain to incur the danger, penalties and forfeitures ordained and provided by the Statute of Provision and Præmunire, made in the sixteenth year of the reign of King Richard II as by the same Act more at large it doth and may appear: And yet nevertheless divers seditious and very ill-disposed people, without the res-

pect of their duty to Almighty God, or of the faith and allegiance which they ought to bear and have to our said Sovereign Lady the Queen, and without all fear and regard had to the said good law and statute, or the pains therein limited, but minding as it should seem very seditiously and unnaturally, not only to bring this realm and Imperial Crown thereof (being in very deed of itself most free), into the thraldom and subjection of that foreign, usurped and unlawful jurisdiction, pre-eminence and authority claimed by the said See of Rome; but also to estrange and alienate the minds and hearts of sundry of Her Majesty's subjects from their dutiful obedience, and to raise and stir sedition and rebellion within this realm, to the disturbance of the most happy peace thereof; have lately procured and obtained to themselves from the said Bishop of Rome and his said See, divers bulls and writings, the effect whereof hath been and is to absolve and reconcile all those that will be contented to forsake their due obedience to our Most Gracious Sovereign Lady, the Queen's Majesty, and to yield and subject themselves to the said feigned, unlawful and usurped authority; and by color of the said bulls and writings, the said wicked persons very secretly and most seditiously, in such parts of this realm where the people for want of good instruction are most weak, simple and ignorant, and thereby farthest from the good understanding of their duties towards God and the Queen's Majesty, have, by their lewd and subtil practices and persuasions, so far forth wrought, that sundry simple and ignorant persons have been contented to be reconciled to the said usurped authority of the See of Rome, and to take absolution at the hands of the said naughty and subtil practicers, whereby hath grown great disobedience and boldness in many, not only to withdraw and absent themselves from all divine service, now most godly set forth and used within this realm, but also have thought themselves discharged of and from all obedience, duty and allegiance to Her Majesty, whereby most wicked and unnatural rebellion hath ensued, and to the further danger of this realm, is hereafter very like to be renewed if the ungodly and wicked attempts in that behalf be not by severity of laws in time restrained and bridled.

"For remedy and redress whereof, and to prevent the great mischiefs and inconveniences that thereby may ensue, be it enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, with the assent of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same: That if any person or persons, after the 1st day of July next coming, shall use or put in use in any place within this realm, or in any the Queen's dominions, any such bull, writing or instrument, written or printed, of absolution or reconciliation, at any time heretofore obtained and gotten, or at any time hereafter to be obtained or gotten, from the said Bishop of Rome or any of his successors, or from any other person or persons authorised or claiming authority by or from the said Bishop of Rome, his predecessors or successors, or See of Rome; or if any person or persons, after the said first day of July, shall take upon him or them, by color of any such bull, writing, instrument, or authority to absolve or reconcile any person or persons, or to grant or promise to any person or persons within this realm, or any other the Queen's Majesty's dominions, any such absolution or reconciliation, by any speech, preaching, teaching or writing, or any other open deed; or if any person or persons within this realm, or any the Queen's dominions after the said first day of July, shall willingly receive and take any such absolution or reconciliation:

"Or else if any person or persons have obtained or gotten since the last day of the Parliament holden in the first year of the Queen's Majesty's reign, or after the first day of July, shall obtain or get from the said Bishop of Rome, or any his successors, or See of Rome, any manner of bull, writing or instrument, written or printed containing anything, matter or cause whatsoever; or shall publish or by any ways or means put in use any such bull, writing or instrument, that then all and every such act or acts, offence and offences shall be deemed and adjudged by the authority of this Act to be high treason; and the offender and offenders therein, their procurers, abettors and counsellors to the fact and committing the said offence or offences, shall be deemed and adjudged high traitors to the Queen and the realm, and being thereof lawfully indicted and attainted according to the course of the laws of this realm, shall suffer pains of death, and also lose and forfeit all their lands, tenements, hereditaments, goods and chattels, as in case of high treason by the laws of this realm ought to be lost and forfeited. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid that all and every aiders, comforters or maintainers of any the said offender or offenders, after the committing of any the said acts or offences to the intent to set forth, uphold or allow the doing or execution of the said usurped power, jurisdiction or authority, touching or concerning the premises, or any part thereof, shall incur the pains and penalties contained in the Statute of Præmunire made in the sixteenth year of the reign of King Richard II."

I might strengthen this position by many other quotations from the English law with regard to this matter. Suffice it to say that what was the law beyond all question in the days of Queen Elizabeth, in the days of Henry VIII, in the days of Richard II, has been the law ever since then. All these provisions have been expressly given force to by a statute passed in the reign of Queen Victoria; and this is important, as showing that these are *not obsolete or lapsed laws*, but laws still in force, and expressly declared to be in force in all respects, except in regard to the penalties attached to these offences. In 9 and 10 Victoria, chapter 59, we find the following:—

"Also, so much of an Act passed in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, intituled an Act to restore to the Crown an ancient jurisdiction over the estate, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same, and of an Act of the Parliament of Ireland passed in the second year of the same Queen's reign, intituled an Act restoring to the Crown the same ancient jurisdiction of the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same, as makes it punishable to affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain, or defend, as therein is mentioned, the authority, pre-eminence, power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, State or potentate heretofore claimed, used or usurped within this realm or any dominion or country being within or under the power, dominion or obeisance of Her Highness, or to put in use or execute anything for the extolling, advancement, setting forth, maintenance, or defence of any such pretended or usurped jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence and authority, or any part thereof, or to abet, aid, procure, or counsel any person so offending: Provided always, and be it declared, that nothing in this enactment contained shall authorise or render it lawful for any persons to affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain, or defend any such foreign power, pre-eminence, jurisdiction or authority, nor shall the same extend further than to the repeal of the particular penalties and punishments therein referred to, but in all other respects the law shall continue the same as if this enactment had not been made: Provided further, that if any person in holy orders, according to the rites and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland, shall affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain or defend any such foreign power, pre-eminence, jurisdiction or authority, such person shall be incapable of holding any ecclesiastical promotion, and if in possession of any such promotion, may be deprived thereof by due course of law, in the same manner as for any other cause of deprivation."

This, then, gives power and efficacy to, and reaffirms the provisions of the old laws which I have quoted.

Now, Sir, it is held, and I think justly held, that the laws from which I have quoted are directly contrary to the provisions of the Jesuits' Estates Act; that that Act in itself is a recognition of the Pope; that in itself it accepts authority from him in submitting legislation to him for approval, and in appropriating money for his disposal; and that, in recognising his authority in civil matters, it is an infringement and violation in express terms of these statutes which I have quoted. In addition to this, aside from the question of the infringement of the Queen's prerogative by the Jesuits' Estates Act in the manner I have described, the general impression on the part of those opposed to that Act is that it is unconstitutional, inasmuch as it reverses, in part at least, Imperial legislation in regard to the confiscation of the Jesuits' Estates. It is held, moreover, that the Act is unconstitutional, in that it breaks a trust—creates a malfeasance in trust funds which were placed in the

hands of the Quebec Government for a specific purpose. And to summarise the objections on the ground of unconstitutionality, it is held to be unconstitutional; because the Emancipation Act of 1829 placed the Jesuit organisation outside the protection of the Imperial law, which makes it an illegal society; because it recognises a foreign potentate, in contravention of the express terms and provisions of the English law, dating from the year 1392 to 9th and 10th Victoria; because it reverses an Imperial Act of confiscation; because it is a malfeasance of a trust fund. It is not for me to argue at this time whether these objections are sound or unsound. I recapitulate them to show what the state of public sentiment was, and what were the objections raised to the Bill, and to emphasise the objections made in the House of Commons against the course of the Government in not submitting the Bill, under the circumstances, to a proper tribunal, in order to obtain an authoritative decision as to its constitutionality. The reference made, the manner and the circumstances in which it was made, all increase the popular distrust; and the Government, in my opinion, did not discharge its duty in the course it followed. If this was not a case for reference to the Supreme Court, pray what could be such a case? If this was not solemn enough to justify the Government invoking the intervention of the Supreme Court and submitting the case to them for decision, it is difficult to conceive a case whith would warrant such a reference.

In the answer of His Excellency the Governor General, to the delegation which waited upon him at Quebec, the first position he took was this:

"I believe, and am confirmed in my belief by the best authority whom I can consult, that the Act was *intra vires* of the Quebec Legislature. Here my power of interference is limited. The Act does not appear to do more than to seek to restore to a certain society, not in kind, but in money, a portion of the property of which that society was in years gone by deprived without compensation; and it provides to give in compensation therefor, the money of the Province which had become possessed of the property, and was profiting by it."

Now, the voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was that of Esau. While it is the Governor General who ostensibly speaks, there is a marvellous similarity between the language of His Excellency and the speech of the Minister of Justice, the memorandum of the Minister of Justice, and the letter of my hon. friend to Mr. Graham. The similarity is so striking that the Governor General must at least have consulted the Minister of Justice with regard to the terms and phraseology of his reply to the delegation. In the second place, His Excellency says:

"But, as a matter of fact, I do not find any evidence that in this Dominion and in this nineteenth century the Jesuits have been less law-abiding or less loyal than others."

Well, His Excellency perhaps had not searched very diligently for the evidence that bore upon the character of this organisation during the nineteenth century, and was hardly warranted in making that assertion, that there was no evidence procurable that this organisation was less law-abiding, less desirable than others. It may be the case with regard to the organisation in Canada, against which I have nothing to say, but as regards the whole broad question of the status of the society and its antecedents and its history in the nineteenth century, I think His Excellency was singularly at fault. If his statement be true, why was that society expelled from France in 1804? Why was it expelled from Naples in 1810? from Belgium in 1818? from Russia in 1820? from Spain in 1826? from France in 1845? from Bravaria in 1848? from Switzerland in 1848? from the Papal States in 1848? from the Austrian Empire in 1848? from Gallicia in 1848? from Sardinia in 1848? from Sicily in 1848? from the Italian States in 1859? and from Switzerland in 1860? The attitude of these powers towards the order is utterly at variance with the conclusions arrived at by His Excellency. Why should so high an authority as Blackstone speak of the black intrigues of the Jesuits, and of their being the enemies of society? His Excellency was hardly warranted in making use of so sweeping a commendation of this order. Then His Excellancy goes on to say:

"It appears to me that the legal state of that society was settled by the Incorporation Act of 1887, to which little or no objection was taken. I cannot see anything unconstitutional in that respect in the payment of the money in question to a society duly incorporated by law."

Well, it was with regard to the legal status of that society, under the Incorporation Act of 1887, that we want the opinion of a judicial tribunal. That is one of the most important questions connected with the case—as to the legal status of the society under the Incorporation Act, as to whether it has any legal status, as to whether that Act is constitutional or not, coming into conflict as it does with the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, as to whether it has any legal right to a position in the Statute-books of any Province of the British Empire. His Excellency proceeds to say:

"Then it has been said: Why not facilitate a reference to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council? I believe that my advisers have a perfectly good answer, that having no doubt of the correctness of their view they have a good reason for not doing so."

I have to dwell on that feature of the case. I consider it is a very insufficient reason that, because the advisers of Her Majesty in Canada, that because the majority of this House—the majority of whom are not jurists—hold the opinion that this Act is all right, it should not be referred to a court. If the functions of the courts are worth anything, they are not to decide whether the majority of this House must be taken as an absolute authority, but whether that majority is right in its opinion. The action of the House or of the Government in the matter does not make the Act constitutional, or it would not have been necessary to have a reference at all. His Excellency then states:

"I earnestly call upon all the best friends of the Dominion as far as possible, while holding their own opinions, to be tolerant of those of others; and like our great neighbor, to live and let live, that we may in time come to feel that we have the one object of promoting the prosperity and welfare of the Dominion, and the maintenance of loyalty and devotion to the Sovereign."

These sentiments any person can echo—the preservation of the peace, the promoting of the welfare of the people, the adoption of measures to promote the peace and welfare of the people of the country—to these every person in Canada can say "Amen." But the question is, what measures are calculated to produce these results? Is the refusal of the Government to test the constitutionality of the law, when a large section of the people demand it, a step calculated to promote the harmony and welfare of the country? No, Sir. His Excellency referred to our neighbors to the

south. Is this the source from which we may draw examples to justify us in not referring this question to the courts? Have they no tribunal for the settlement of constitutional questions? Is it the case there that when the majority of Congress and the members of the executive have pronounced an Act constitutional, that there is no reference to the Supreme Court? Such is not the case. The constitutional reference of a case can be reached there, but here we are debarred from a constitutional reference by the action of the Government, and the courts of justice are closed to us, and in that the action of the Government is not calculated to promote the well-being and the welfare of the people. Those who wish for a constitutional reference feel that they have been outraged; they feel that the reference should have been made; they feel that the reference has been refused without cause; and for that reason this agitation has been kept alive. If the Government had referred that case to the Supreme Court, whatever the decision of that court might have been, the people would have acquiesced and the excitement that agitated the people would have passed away.

I have detained the House longer than I intended, in consequence of reading these extracts. It is useless to conceal the fact that there is a feeling of uneasiness existing in this country—a feeling which is to be lamented, but a feeling which it is the duty of the Government to take every proper precaution and proper means to remove. There is a feeling that there is an *imperium in imperio* in this country. It is well known that the papal power is not exclusively a spiritual power. It does not strictly adhere to the principle of the statement made by the Messiah that His kingdom was not of this world. This power seeks not only a spiritual kingdom—and in regard to its spiritual functions, no man desires to interfere with it, no man has any business to interfere with it—but it seeks for a kingdom on this earth as well. It seeks, in the opinion of many people, to exercise civil functions, and that feeling creates uneasiness. The aims of the hierarchy are suspected. It is supposed to be the desire of the hierarchy to seek this power, and that supposition creates what may, perhaps, be called prejudice, but what, at all events, is a feeling of uneasiness. The Church attempts to be dominant and to make the State subordinate. This belief, which finds place in the minds of hundreds and thousands and scores of thousands of people in this country is one that should not be disregarded by the Government; they should recognise the existence of this feeling and should seek to avoid inflaming and arousing these passions which are so much to be deprecated. The Province of Quebec, notwithstanding the fact that the inhabitants of that Province are so fine a race, notwithstanding the fact that that Province gives us so many valuable public men, and amongst them so courtly and eloquent a gentleman as the hon. member who leads the Opposition in this House, still has a system including tithes, the Fabrique assessments, the exemptions of the vast property belonging to the church from taxation, the power of the priesthood, and the denominational school system, which do not secure the approbation of people outside of that Province, and there is a desire on the part of the public to localise these features and confine them to the district in which they are now found. The people who entertain the opinions to which I have referred, imagined that in past years they could detect a design to nationalise this system. They look at the incorporation of the dual language in the North-West Bill and the incorporation of the separate school clause in the same Bill, and many of them argue that if separate schools are established in the North-West, that should be done by the Local and not by the Dominion Government. that this Government have no right to assume that separate schools form part of the national system, and that they have no right to establish them in territories or provinces which do not possess provincial autonomy. I think that is a sound principle. At all events, it is evident that ecclesiastical and civil tyranny are mutually productive of each other. There is a feeling of unrest, and it is very easy to arouse a feeling of alarm in the country. With all these circumstances, with the fact that there is an influence in this country that can be managed and made use of, the political influence of which can be handed over to any party with this fact staring us in the face, there is a feeling abroad which the Government should recognise, and it should endeavor to placate that feeling by referring any law of this kind to a high judicial tribunal to decide as to its constitutionality. What did the First Minister say in reference to this question when it was before the House a little over a year ago? He said:

"No Government can be formed in Canada, either by myself, or by the hon. member who moves this resolution (Mr. O'Brien), or by my hon. friend who sits opposite (Mr. Laurier), having in view the disallowance of such a measure."

Here is an explicit declaration that the disallowance of this measure would lead to the destruction of any Government, and that for that reason he did not disallow that measure. The inference the country draws is that the hon. gentleman did not dare to refer that measure to the proper tribunal, and that he recognised that he could not disallow it without incurring political destruction, he felt that he could not refer it without political destruction, except in the clandestine way in which he did refer it. I have no doubt that the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice, and their colleagues would have been glad to refer that measure to the Supreme Court; I have no doubt that it was the natural solution of the difficulty which occurred to their minds, and I have no doubt that it was this influence to which the right hon. gentleman referred which prevented the reference of that Bill. I believe that, while the leader of the Government might have been disposed to refer the Bill, the power which is higher than he, the power which he has recognised in this matter, objected to that reference and protested against it, and, therefore, he did not refer it. That is the inference which I draw. The refusal to refer this Bill to the Supreme Court was, I think, improper and unjust. This is a matter of the greatest importance. If we provide that any matter may be referred to the Supreme Court for hearing and decision, if we provide the machinery for such a reference, and if the Government refuses to avail itself of that machinery, but goes with an *ex parte* statement, and gets a statement from legal gentlemen simply on the application of the defendant's attorney, without any chance being

given for the other side to be heard, I maintain that the Government has not done its duty and that the reference is simply a mockery.

There has been room for a wide difference of opinion as to the position members took in this House upon the question of disallowance. I may have stultified my former record in favor of provincial rights, in the vote I took upon that question. I had no doubt that the measure was one that should be disallowed, I had no doubt of the power of the Government to disallow it, consequently I voted against the Government for not disallowing it. I do not suppose that there was a member on the opposite side of the House supporting the Government who had any doubt of the power of the Government to disallow that Act, who had any doubt of the right of the Government to disallow that Act if it chose do do so. Every one of those hon. gentlemen who stood up and voted for the Government in its refusal to disallow the Act, endorsed the principle of refusal *per se*, not having been governed by any scruples as regards the right of the Government to make the disallowance. On this side, probably, the case was different. It is quite presumable that many members, governed by their scruples in regard to the question of provincial rights and provincial autonomy, voted with the Government who really did not approve of that Bill. But whether this is so or not, whether I was right or wrong in the position I took as a Liberal member of this House, and whether the Liberal members who voted for that motion were right or wrong, there can be no question, at least, in my mind, that after the Government had refused to disallow the Bill they should not have refused a reference of that Bill to the Supreme Court of Canada. The refusal, practically, closes the gates of justice, it causes distrust. We should have had this matter probed to the bottom. There is no reason why it should not have been referred to the Supreme Court there to be tried, after all the circumstances, and all the facts, and all the statutes that pertain to the case, had been laid before that court, and where a decision could have been secured which would have commanded the confidence of the country and would have set the excitement at rest. This has not been done, and I claim that in failing to do this, the Government have failed to discharge the functions that properly devolved upon them, they have trifled with the excitement that exists in the country, they have taken a course calculated to prolong and intensify that excitement, when the proper course would have allayed it at once. Taking this view of the case, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"regard being had to the fact that the competency of the Legislative Assembly of Quebec to pass the Act 51-52 Victoria, chapter 15, intituled: 'An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates,' was called in question, and that belief in the unconstitutionality of the said Act was entertained in many sections; and in view of the feeling of dissatisfaction excited thereby, and generally the disturbed state of the public mind on the subject thereof;

"And further, having regard to the fact that His Excellency obtained the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England, as to the course which His Excellency should pursue regarding the said Act;

"This House is of the opinion that the question of the constitutionality of the said Act should have been submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, in pursuance of the powers conferred by the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, when the question could have been definitely determined by such Court."

MR. CHARLTON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In following the remarks that have just been addressed to the House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I shall be unable to deal with a part of the case, to which he gave a great deal of comment, not out of any discourtesy to him, but because I think in the allusions he made to that part of the case, he was going very far afield, indeed, of the argument which he might fairly present to the House, in pressing the resolution which is now in your hands. I do not propose to follow, to any extent, the observations which the hon. gentleman has made, by way of attack upon the Jesuit society or upon that larger organisation professing the Roman Catholic faith in this country, or with respect to the status and condition of the people who profess that faith in the Province of Quebec. I shall trust to the indulgence of the House to relieve me from any observations on these branches of the question, if, indeed, they are branches of the question at all, with a single exception. The hon. gentleman professed to the House this afternoon a very strong faith in the power and existing force of a great many early enactments on the subject of religion; I would commend to the hon. gentleman an observation of the most eminent writer on criminal law of modern times, when he comes to revise the speech which he has just delivered to this House, when he comes to circulate it, as I have no doubt he intends to do, throughout this country, for the purpose of creating, or continuing, an agitation in this country on this subject—I would commend to him an observation which is made by Sir Fitzjames Stephen, in his History of the Criminal Law, second volume, page 426, when, after recapitulating the tyrannical, arbitrary and oppressive legislation of early times, and the tyrannical, arbitrary and oppressive coercion of religious opinion in early times, he winds up with an observation which, perhaps, would not be pertinent except for the hon. gentleman's profession of belief that all this legislation is in force now and should be applied now; I would commend that observation to the hon. gentleman's careful consideration before he circulates the pamphlet containing his speech, because he might find that the old sword was a two-edged one. Sir Fitzjames Stephen says:

"Pages might be filled with further illustrations, but these are enough. I may observe, in general, that all opinions except those which were regarded as strictly correct, were pretty impartially punished. It was as dangerous to believe too much as not to believe enough—to be a Roman Catholic priest as to be a publisher of fanatical pamphlets."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman set out with an observation which challenged a statement made in some parts of this country since last Session with regard to the consistency which he showed last Session in endeavoring to get a reference of this statute to the Supreme Court of Canada, for an opinion as to its validity. I have not been one of his accusers in that regard. I have been pretty extensively criticised in various parts of this country, but I think I may say that I have not opened my mouth upon this question since I addressed the House upon it last Session. But since the hon. gentleman has challenged criticism of his conduct in that regard, and since he has desired this House to judge whether he was consistent in his endeavor to obtain a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, let me ask the hon. gentleman—

accepting all he has ever said on the platform and in Parliament with respect to the impossibility of getting the ear of the House for his proposed motion with respect to a reference to the Supreme Court, how he accounts for his consistency, when he has sat in this House, during this Session for fifteen weeks, and has never proposed that the statute shall be referred for the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada, but now proposes, instead of such resolution, a motion of want of confidence in the Government in that regard. The hon. gentleman should ponder on that point, and give an answer to that question before this debate concludes, if he can. The only possible answer he can give is, that the Act has passed into operation, that the question of allowance or disallowance has been passed upon, and that it is too late to make a reference now. The same answer would have met the hon. gentleman if he had proposed the resolution, when he states he would willingly have proposed it, last Session, because in January the Act had been announced as being free from any possibility of disallowance, that answer had been communicated to his Honor the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec, and the Act had practically gone into force and operation for all time to come, unless it shall please the Legislature of Quebec to repeal or amend it. So the hon. gentleman this Session, for the last fifteen weeks, was in as good a position to test the House on this question, if he pleased to do so, as at any time last Session. I listened with a great deal of care to the hon. gentleman in his references to the memorandum which I prepared for His Excellency the Governor General with respect to this Act, because his resolution contained the rather singular statement that that was an incomplete statement of the objections to the Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. No. The resolution does not contain that statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It says:

"But were merely to express an opinion, founded upon the incomplete statement made."

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to state that I have varied the language of the resolution somewhat, and if he takes the resolution I have submitted he will not find that statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I took the resolution as placed on the Notice paper, and I found it indicated that the statement I had made to His Excellency was incomplete. If the memorandum which I had the honor to prepare for His Excellency was not incomplete, upon what grounds will it be challenged as a fair statement of the case? If that statement is an incomplete statement, as the hon. gentleman's motion asserted, I hope he will explain to the House, at some stage of this debate, why he has erased those words from the motion he has put into your hands, Mr. Speaker, and why it is he does not ask the House now, as he proposed to do the other day when he placed his motion on the paper, to pronounce that an incomplete statement, although he has addressed an argument to the House occupying one hour for the purpose of showing that it was an incomplete statement. In what respect was it contended, that the memorandum was not a full and fair statement of the case? The hon. gentleman said that I had prepared a misleading statement, and that there was no evidence that the Bill on which the opinion was given was before the law officers of the Crown. Let me state what the memorandum itself was, and why it was prepared. In the ordinary course of the duty of the Minister of Justice, he is called upon to give His Excellency his opinion on every Act passed, as to whether it is suitable to receive His Excellency's sanction or not; and, in consequence of the agitation which had arisen in this country with respect to that question, knowing His Excellency might desire to report on the question to the Colonial Office, or knowing he might be called on for a report, considering the intensity with which the debate raged in this House for a number of days, it was only proper that I should put into His Excellency's hands a statement of the reasons by which the Government sought to justify their action on this question. The hon. gentleman asks this House to come to the conclusion, that the two first law officers in the United Kingdom who are charged with the duty of advising Her Majesty with respect to all colonial questions, the men holding the rank of Attorney General and Solicitor General, absolutely pronounced an opinion on an Act they never saw and under a misguiding statement from me with respect to an Act which was not before them. The hon. gentleman flatters the credulity of the public of Canada too much if he is confident they will accept such a contention. The hon. gentleman stated there was a clandestine reference to the law officers, and he stated that my references to the early English legislation were misleading, because, forsooth, they might indicate to the Crown officers, who, he supposes, apparently, to be entirely ignorant of the English law and legislation, that I was referring to legislation as early as Richard II. If I imposed on them so as to lead them to suppose that my reference was going back as far as Richard II, it was an imposition which the hon. gentleman made on the House today when he read more than one statute of that period as a reason for inducing the House to believe, not only that my statement was incomplete, but that the Crown officers of England were wrong in the opinion they formed on this question. The hon. gentleman stated, and it was about the only statement which the hon. gentleman could make with respect to the incompleteness of my memorandum, that I had omitted all reference to the statute of 10 George IV, in which the Jesuits are legislated against in stringent terms. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman to state in what respect that statute was pertinent to the argument I presented to His Excellency. I shall be glad to allow the hon. gentleman to interrupt me to answer, if he thinks it convenient to do so, in what respect that statute had the slightest reference to the position of the Jesuits in Canada; and if the hon. gentleman does not avail himself of the opportunity I hold out to him now, I must assume that the interpretation I have put on the argument he made on that subject is correct. I must assume that the hon. gentleman led, and intended to lead, the House to believe that the statute of 10 George IV, not being very ancient legislation, governed the whole subject, settled this question, pronounced penalties against any Jesuits throughout the Empire. He is not aware, I suppose, at this moment —although he placed a notice on the paper chal-

lenging the completeness of my statement, and has occupied the House for an hour in arguing that my statement was incomplete—that that statute has no more force in this country than it has in the United States, and that it never applied to this country. The hon. gentleman must have been misled by the words "the realm," supposing those words are equivalent to "the Empire," and he does not know, although he has spoken for upwards of an hour for the purpose of showing that my statement is wrong, that the statute was confined to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and that the words "the realm" cover the United Kingdom alone, and do not even cover the Channel Islands. If the hon. gentleman has made such a mistake in the argument he has addressed to this House, and it must have been a mere mistake, the House will hardly come to the conclusion that he is qualified to pronounce an opinion as to whether Sir Richard Webster and Sir Edward Clarke have made a mistake or not. I think the House, after listening to the early statutes and to Blackstone, and to everybody else who has ever written on this subject, will come to the conclusion that perhaps Sir Richard Webster and Sir Edward Clarke were right after all in their opinion. I desire to make another observation before I refer to the general question in regard to the reference of an Act like this, in justice to another as well as in justice to myself. The hon. gentleman made allusion to the speech which His Excellency delivered on receiving certain delegates who visited him in the city of Quebec and presented a remonstrance with respect to this Act going into force. The hon. gentleman made what I thought was a rather unhandsome reference to that speech, in which he stated, that the voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was the hand of Esau. His Excellency was Jacob, in the hon. gentleman's mind, and I was Esau. There was a close similarity, he said, between the language of my memorandum and the language in which His Excellency addressed those delegates. I cannot claim credit for having inspired the reply of His Excellency the Governor General, notwithstanding that the hon gentleman had attributed that honor to me. I have no desire to disclaim it, I have no desire in the least to avoid any share of responsibility which falls upon me with respect to it. But in justice to him whom I have to advise, and in fairness to those with whom I am associated, and in answer to the calumnies which have been circulated throughout this country for twelve months upon that subject, I will say now, that I prepared that memorandum and submitted it to His Excellency before he left Ottawa, before he went to the city of Quebec, before His Excellency was requested to receive the delegates, and before he knew that they were coming to wait on him, but that I never exchanged a word in writing or speech with His Excellency on the subject afterwards, and I did not know what reply His Excellency was going to make, or what reply he had made, until I read it in the newspapers afterwards. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me call the attention of the House to what the constitutional position is which the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) takes with regard to this question, and I admit that the question is one of great importance. It is one of great importance, not merely in regard to the Pro-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

vincial Act in question, but in regard to the practice which is to be followed when all similar questions arise. The hon. gentleman has asked that the Government shall be censured for not having made a reference under section 37 of the Supreme Court Act, which provides:

"The Governor in Council may refer to the Supreme Court, for hearing or consideration, any matter which he thinks fit to refer, and the court shall thereupon hear and consider the same, and certify their opinion thereon to the Governor in Council."

Let me call the attention of the House for a moment to what, plainly, is the purport, scope, and meaning of the Act. It is an enactment precisely similar to the statute which exists in Great Britain, enabling Her Majesty to seek the advice of the Judicial Committee of Her Privy Council, and it is framed in exactly the same words. Therefore we can obtain considerable instruction as to what use ought to be made of a provision of that kind, if we observe what use has been made of it in the mother country, where, not only questions arise as frequently as they do in this country, with regard to the validity of Acts of subordinate Legislatures, but where the legislation of the whole Empire has to be reviewed and revised. The object of this enactment plainly is to assist His Excellency in the discharge of his executive duties, and to assist his executive counsellors of the Government in the discharge of their executive duties, by advising them as to the course they should pursue. It would be inconsistent with the whole structure of our judicial framework, extending as it does to so many distant parts of the country, to suppose that it was ever intended to be a means of settling private litigation or of making private enquiries, or of even making enquiries to satisfy public interest and public curiosity. His Excellency is given, there, a means of resorting to the highest court in the country, for the purpose of instructing his advisers and himself, as to the things they should do, the orders which they should make, the authority which they should confer upon their officers, and the instructions which they should give to their officers from time to time. I said a moment ago that it would be instructive to refer to the use which is made of the English enactment. There are seven reported cases in Great Britain since that statute was passed in the reign of William IV. Let us see what they were. Every one of them is a case in which Her Majesty desired to be advised as to some act which she was called upon to perform. Out of the seven instances which are reported, one was a case in which Her Majesty desired to be advised as to whether it was proper that certain penalties should be remitted, it having been claimed that these penalties had been illegally imposed. One was a case in which Her Majesty had been asked to restore the precedence of certain judges. One was a case in which Her Majesty desired to be advised as to the revision of certain regulations made by a colonial court. One was in regard to a petition in which Her Majesty had been prayed to remove a colonial judge for misconduct, and one was a case in which Her Majesty had been asked to order that an advocate should be allowed to practice at the bar in the Court of Jersey, where the number of practitioners was supposed to be limited by regulation. In regard to the last case, there was an observation made by the Judicial

Committee of the Privy Council, which throws some light upon the views they take of the functions that devolve upon them under this enactment :

"With regard to our jurisdiction as well as to the argument of the inconvenience arising from a limited bar, we must observe that this petition is not referred to us as a legislative body, having legislative authority, or to advise the Crown in acting its legislative capacity, but as members of the Judicial Committee of the Council, possessing only power to advise the Crown judicially."

Now, Sir, what were the functions of His Excellency the Governor General in regard to this statute? I pass by for a moment the important circumstance, that when we were asked to make the reference, all power had passed—all right, at any rate, had passed from His Excellency's hands, even to disallow the Act. But if we were to regard the case for a moment, as a matter of referring to the Supreme Court the question of whether His Excellency should disallow an Act or not, that was a measure of a purely legislative character, and in that regard, under the present state of the law, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has declared that it is not one of their functions to advise the Royal Authority, with regard to legislative Acts, and that they had merely to advise the Crown in matters in which the Crown acts judicially. I might refer also to the Canadian cases which have arisen under that statute. We have had four or five references to the Supreme Court of Canada, and every one of them has been in the line which I have stated. One of them was made under the Canada Temperance Act. It came within the general principle which I am describing. It was incumbent upon His Excellency to decide whether he should instruct his officers of Inland Revenue to enforce the Act, notwithstanding the contention which had been made with regard to its validity, and every step with regard to the enforcement of that Act involved a question of administrative action, on which it was important that His Excellency should be advised. In another case the question was submitted to the court, as to the liability of the Dominion Government to provide for the maintenance of prisoners in certain cases. In another, there was a reference as to the validity of a statute of British Columbia, in relation to the judges living in districts and exercising their jurisdiction in districts, and in that case it was all important for His Excellency to know before he commissioned a judge, whether he commissioned him for the Province at large, or for residence in a particular district of the Province. The validity of the Act having been assailed, it was necessary for His Excellency to be sure of its validity, and to have as definite a decision upon that point as the courts could give, in order that the validity of His Excellency's own acts, in commissioning the judges, should not be brought in question and confusion ensue. There was a reference also under the Liquor License Act of 1883. That was made under a special enactment, and it was made for the reasons which I have referred to before: that His Excellency's Government had to put the Act in force, had to instruct its officers to collect the penalties, had to take proceedings before the magistrates to recover those penalties; and before proceeding with those measures, it was deemed proper that His Excellency should be advised as to the validity of the Act. There was another reference under the Railway Act. That reference was made under a special provision of the statute, and in that case the Railway Committee of the Privy Council desired to be advised as to their authority to make a particular order. These are the references which have been made in Canada so far, and every one of them concerned an administrative act which His Excellency was called on to perform; not one of them concerned the simple question which arose after this matter passed out of His Excellency's hands, relating merely to private interests, or to public curiosity regarding a legal problem. There was likewise a decision by one of my distinguished predecessors in office as to the way in which that Act should be applied; and I may cite that, not only on account of the high authority which it gives me for the course I advised, but also because the particular circumstances in which his report was made furnish a fair illustration of the oppression which would result from references being made in the way the hon. member for North Norfolk contends they ought to be made. In January, 1877, the Provincial Government of New Brunswick called the attention of the Government of Canada to the fact that certain statutes of that Province had been passed—some of them were in force, and one was about to come into force—to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in that Province, and respecting the licensing of houses for that purpose; stating that the House of Assembly was of opinion that the validity of those Acts should be determined by the Supreme Court of Canada, under the Supreme Court Act. The report made by the then Minister of Justice, the present hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) on that subject, on the 29th of January, was this :

"It may be laid down, as a general rule, that the power of reference to the Supreme Court by the Governor General in Council should not be exercised in matters which may, in the ordinary course of things, be brought judicially before that tribunal.

"The opinion of the Supreme Court on such a reference would be given without the advantage of hearing argument. Such a disposition of an important and difficult question could hardly be regarded as satisfactory by the parties, while it would be unfair to the judges, who might, in the event of the question coming judicially before them, be embarrassed by their previous action.

"On the whole I recommend that the Lieutenant Governor should be informed that, with every desire to meet the views of his Government, it is thought, for the reasons I have assigned, to be inexpedient to make the proposed reference."

And the proposed reference was accordingly not made, and very properly not made. The Provincial Government desired that that question should be tested by the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada. If that opinion were conclusive, then, in the event of the same question arising on any subsequent legislation, a suitor in a Provincial court, when bringing his suit, calling his witnesses, and desiring to have his counsel heard, would find himself precluded by the opinion of the Supreme Court, pronounced at the request of the Government of Canada, and in a case in which, perhaps, no parties having an actual interest had been heard before the court at all, and in which no evidence had been taken. Now, Sir, upon that subject, and for the purpose of showing that the Supreme Court Act was never intended to be used as a means of referring questions which are not simply for the consideration of the executive, but concern private rights or private litigation, or moot

questions of law, I might refer to another very high authority, the much-despised—by the hon. member for North Norfolk—authority of the law officers of the Crown. In this case the Attorney General for the time being was the present Lord Selborne. The question was an ecclesiastical question, as to whether Bishop Colenso should be prosecuted for heresy, and the difficulty was pressed upon the consideration of the law officers, that there was perhaps no other method of having the rights of the Crown and the right of the accused person defined than by a reference to the Judicial Committee. The opinion is:

"It has been suggested that the Crown, as visitor, or as supreme in causes ecclesiastical, or by virtue, and in exercise, of some other supposed power, may be able, either by commissioners specially appointed, or by means of the Privy Council, to hear and determine the points raised against Dr. Colenso.

"We are unable to find the slightest ground on which this suggestion can be supported.

"The Crown is supreme over all causes ecclesiastical in the same, and in no other sense, and to no greater extent than the Crown is supreme over causes temporal—that is, by law, and by means of the various established courts of law.

"The submission of the Clergy Act (25 Henry VIII, chapter 19) gave no such power to the Crown. Section 4 of that Act made it lawful for the parties grieved by any decision of an ecclesiastical judge in England to appeal to the King in Chancery, for which Court of Appeal the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is now substituted. This is an appellate, and not an original jurisdiction.

"The High Commission Court, established by 1 Elizabeth, chap. 1, is abolished by 16 Charles I, chap. 11, and the revival of the High Commission Court or any similar court is especially provided against by 13 Charles II, chap. 12.

"With reference to the authorities referred to, intermediate in date between 1 Elizabeth, chap. 1, and 16 Charles I, chap. 11, it is hardly necessary to observe that they state the law as it was in force under the former of these statutes, and which ceased to be in force on the passing of the latter.

"No argument in favor of the power of the Crown can be derived from 3 and 4 William IV, chap. 41, sec. 4, by which it is enacted that it shall be lawful for His Majesty to refer to the Judicial Committee for hearing or consideration, any such other matters as His Majesty shall think fit; and such Committee shall thereupon hear and consider the same, and shall advise His Majesty thereon in manner aforesaid.

"To make this section applicable to the judicial determination of an ecclesiastical matter, would be, in effect, to restore the High Commission Court. The section is to be taken as referring to questions not of judicial cognisance on which the Crown may desire to be solemnly advised by persons conversant with the law.

"The only remaining consideration is whether the merits of the case can be raised on a *scire facias* to revoke the letters patent granted to the Bishop of Natal.

"This manner of raising the question between the Bishop of Natal and his opponents was suggested by the Master of the Rolls in the case of the Bishop of Natal *vs.* Gladstone.

"The only grounds on which the letters patent would be revoked by such a proceeding is, in our opinion, that the letters were *ab initio* void, as having issued improvidently. This would leave the merits untouched.

"Indeed, if the view taken in the Bishop of Natal *vs.* Green as to the status of the colonies be correct, the letters patent might possibly be held valid.

"We are, therefore, of opinion that no means at present exist for trying before any tribunal competent to decide the question, whether or no Dr. Colenso, the present Bishop of Natal, has advocated doctrinal opinion not in accordance with the doctrines held by the Church of England; and, assuming the present Bishop of Natal to have been guilty of an ecclesiastical offence, no steps can be taken to bring him, as such Bishop, before any tribunal."

The hon. gentleman will say, I suppose, with regard to that question—a question vitally affecting the position of the Church of England throughout the Empire—that that was a clandestine reference too, that the Crown officers decided on the special plea of the defendant's attorney, and that Her Majesty's Government ought to have been left to fortify themselves by a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Let me say, with regard to all that mass of cobwebs and sophistry about special pleas and clandestine references, that the Crown has been advised in this matter as the Crown has been accustomed to be advised on questions of the kind for the last two or three centuries; and the Crown has been advised by men of great distinction in their profession, by men of very high rank, whom the Sovereigns of England have been accustomed to rely upon for more than two centuries in the administration of the affairs of the Colonies of Great Britain. I fail to understand, from the argument the hon. gentleman has presented this afternoon, or from the irrelevant, absurd and obsolete enactments which he has dug out of the back shelves of the Library, anything which would lead us to believe that the men who have pronounced their opinion upon this question are less worthy to advise Her Majesty than those who have advised Her Majesty and her predecessors so well that the exercise of the sovereign power has made the British Empire the illustrious Empire it is. Let me ask upon what points His Excellency could have desired to be advised in this question? The Act was passed by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec on the 12th July; the decision with regard to disallowance was made on the 19th January, 1889; and it was made by no means out of the usual course. I have examined the dates at which Provincial legislation, submitted to the Minister of Justice, has been decided upon from time to time. In a large number of cases, the intervals between the passage of the Acts and their ratification or disallowance were longer than in the present instance, but in twenty or thirty cases the reports of the Minister of Justice were made in shorter periods than that which elapsed between the passage of this Act and the announcement that it would not be disallowed here. The decision was not made out of the usual course, again, because it was made in response to the request of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, who stated that, for urgent reasons pressed upon his Government, his Government desired to be advised at the earliest moment of the view His Excellency the Governor General took upon the question of the validity of that Act, as to whether it would be disallowed or not. Therefore, between the 12th of July and the 19th of January, moved by the urgent request—a request with which we have never failed to comply, when made by a Provincial Government—we decided that the Act was sound and ought not to be disallowed. Although there were at that time three petitions asking for its disallowance, not one suggested a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. Not one of the petitions which were subsequently presented and laid before this House last Session requested a reference to any court or tribunal whatever; and of the petitions which were before us, when we announced that the Act would not be disallowed, not one suggested a legal objection as arising at all. They only suggested that it should be disallowed upon the general ground of the impolitic character of the legislation, and not one suggested a question of law

upon which the advice of the Supreme Court of Canada could possibly have been asked. I will not repeat to any extent the discussion which took place last year, in which it was shown that this question of validity was not raised in the Provincial Legislature and that there were no petitions questioning its validity there. The interpretations we put upon the Act were those put upon it by the men who were responsible for passing it. We had the declaration of the head of the Quebec Government of the construction he put upon it, and as to the sense in which he offered it to the House. I need not refer to all that, but the hon. gentleman asks that we be censured for not having made a reference to the Supreme Court before we made the announcement with regard to disallowance, although no man in the country suggested a legal question which could be referred to the Supreme Court, and although not one of the petitions against the Act suggested that it should be so referred. Having announced our opinion that the Act ought not to be disallowed, let me ask in what position we were, as regards disallowance, then?

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In continuing my remarks, I wish for a moment to go back, for the purpose of making good and enlarging a little on one or two points I have already taken. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution found fault with my statement that certain legislation, upon which he has relied to sustain the views he put forward, was obsolete. He contended that the statute of 10 George IV, which he read to the House at some length, so far from being obsolete, was, fifteen years ago, declared by high constitutional authority to be of the character of an effective statute, placing certain powers in the hands of the Crown, which the Crown might desire to use on a convenient opportunity. In order to show that the statement I have made, notwithstanding the high authority to which the hon. gentleman referred, is borne out by a higher authority, I refer the hon. gentleman to the author, whose name I mentioned a few moments ago, and who makes this observation with respect to the statute of George IV, on which the hon. gentleman has placed so much reliance. After citing at length the provisions of the Catholic Emancipation Act, which is the Act of George IV referred to, and after citing at large the restrictions against the Jesuits coming into the country, he observed :

"These provisions have never been modified, and I believe have been treated ever since they were passed as an absolutely dead letter."

Now, I want to make a few observations to the House in illustration of the position I took as to this matter having practically passed out of the hands of the Executive of Canada when the decision was given as to whether the Act should be disallowed or not. Whatever may be said with regard to the power still remaining with the Governor General as regards a provincial statute after he has announced that an Act should be left to its operation, it would be absolutely unconstitutional, absolutely contrary to the practice which has prevailed both in the mother country and in the colonies, and absolutely restrictive of Provincial rights, that, after making that solemn declaration, in response to the request of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, that Act should subsequently be disallowed. It is no new case, Sir, at all, that when Provincial legislation is adopted, requiring large expenditure of money, requiring the borrowing of money, requiring the construction of public works, the decision of His Excellency is applied for, to be given immediately before these enterprises are undertaken ; but, if the principle is to be established, on the sanction of any majority in this House, or of any considerable proportion of this House, that, when once the announcement has been made that disallowance will not take place, it is still open to the Executive to disallow, then not a single statute of a Province—whether, as I have said in the memorandum, for the construction of a railway or any other public work, whether for the borrowing or payment of any money—can possibly be made effective, even after the solemn announcement of the Governor General that the Act will be left to its operation, until a year has passed by, and the power has absolutely gone of disallowing a Provincial statute. That view, I am confident, will be sustained by this House, and by the opinion of any one who gives the subject an impartial consideration. Therefore, I stand with confidence upon the view that, when once the announcement has been made that disallowance cannot and will not take place, that decision is as absolutely beyond recall, and the statute as fully in operation as if more than a year had elapsed from the date it was assented to by the Provincial authority. I want, however, in this connection, for the purpose of showing how little reason there was to make this reference, to show this House what the principal ground was upon which it was contended that this Act was *ultra vires* of the Provincial Legislature. I have read carefully through the debate which took place in this House last winter. I did so before I prepared the memorandum which has been challenged. I selected from the speeches made in that debate every point which was taken—whether I thought it worthy of argument or not—so that every argument on that particular question, whether it was made by layman or by lawyer, might be placed before His Excellency. The principal point which was urged last Session, and was especially urged by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), was that the statute incorporating the Society of Jesuits in the Province of Quebec was *ultra vires* of the Provincial Legislature, and that, therefore, the grant subsequently made to them was of no avail, because it was made to a corporation which did not properly exist under the Act of 1887. I think hon. members will find that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was very guarded in putting before the House any statement that the Act of 1889 was *ultra vires* of the Legislature which passed it, but his declaration was that the Act of 1887 which incorporated the Order and established the body to which the grant was to be paid, was, to use his own words, not worth the paper it was written on. There could not have been any reference of the Act of 1887 to the Supreme Court. No objection had taken to that statute or to its constitutionality until the Act of 1889 was passed. The Government was never asked to make a reference of the Act

of 1887 to the Supreme Court or any other tribunal, and, in addition to that, the time had passed when it was possible to exercise the power of disallowance before this question was brought up. The statute of 1887 had become law as far as it was *intra vires* of the Province of Quebec, it was beyond our reach, and we were never asked to refer to any court any question whatever in regard to it. As I pointed out before, as far as any constitutional question was concerned, that Act of 1887 was the same as an Act passed in regard to the same body eighteen years before, the validity of which has never been questioned. Therefore we had to consider that, of the Acts that we were asked to refer for the consideration of the Supreme Court, the principal Act had gone into force two years before, and was practically a copy of an Act passed eighteen years before and which had been on the Statute-book unchallenged during that time. As I have already stated, the provision for the reference of statutes to the courts is the same as that passed in England in the reign of William IV, under which Her Majesty can refer any statute to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for their opinion. I pointed out that, after sixty years of the operation of this provision, it has only been applied in seven instances. I called attention to the fact that the limited exercise of the power which is vested in Her Majesty in Council would be significant in regard to the proper use of the like provision in this country. I pointed out that only seven times had that power been acted upon, and that in every case it was in regard to a matter which Her Majesty had to consider as to Her own acts. I would ask the House if it is not significant that, during sixty years, while the Crown has been governing colonial dependencies almost all over the world, in nearly every one of which there has been a Legislature, and each of which has sent annually a volume of statutes in regard to which Her Majesty has had the right of disallowance—is it not significant, that, while thousands and tens of thousand of colonial statutes have gone to England and have been brought under the attention of Her Majesty's advisers as to whether disallowance should be exercised or not, not one of these have been referred in the way proposed here? The power of disallowance has been exercised. The number of statutes of British North America alone which have been disallowed number upwards of 100; but, notwithstanding the multitude of colonial statutes which had to be considered as to whether they should be disallowed or not, notwithstanding the fact that more than 100 statutes have been disallowed of the British North American Provinces, is it not significant, that with this provision allowing Her Majesty to refer questions to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, not one single case has been submitted to that Committee by Her Majesty in regard to disallowance? That great prerogative of disallowance under which Her Majesty can control a free Legislature in any one of her colonies, was in every case exercised on the responsibility of her advisers, and in no one case did Her Majesty or her advisers seek refuge, by going before a judicial tribunal, from the responsibility which rested upon them in regard to its exercise. I did not rely for that statement or for the principle involved, simply upon the reported decisions. I thought that, while these seven cases appeared on the record as the only cases referred to the Judicial Committee, there might be some others, and I have had the records of the Privy Council searched in order to see whether there might not be one instance amongst the thousands of Colonial statutes of a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and this is the result:

"In reply to your letter of the 20th January last, I have the honor to inform you that, in the year 1856 a Colonial Bill, which was reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon"——

That is an entirely different matter. That is a case in which Her Majesty is asked to do something relating to her legislative functions.—

—"was, upon a representation of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, specially referred by Her Majesty's Order in Council to the Judicial Committee, to report their opinion upon the question whether Her Majesty might lawfully assent thereto. But I am unable to find any case in which a Colonial Bill has been referred to the Judicial Committee on the question of disallowance, and it is to the latter rather than the former case that your letter would appear to point."

We have, then, the significant fact that, with that power possessed by Her Majesty, it has never been used to refer a question of disallowance to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and yet, in this colony, where we have Legislatures which are not really subordinate to our authority, but which are supreme in regard to the subjects assigned to them, it is asked that we should be censured because, in regard to one of the statutes which they passed, we have not made a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada; and although the Act which we were asked to refer had long gone out of our view, because the decision as to disallowance had been already pronounced. Now, in that connection, let me recall to the House the language in which the hon. member, in making his motion, criticised the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, criticised the character of this application to them as clandestine, as an opinion given upon the brief of the defendants' attorney. Why, with regard to that great multitude of colonial statutes as to whether they should be allowed or disallowed, and as to a great multitude of questions with regard to colonial administration irrespective of allowance or disallowance of colonial statutes, it was upon the opinion of just such men as have pronounced on this question, the law officers of England, that Her Majesty has been advised; and it has been reserved to this late day for any colonial authority whatever, and I might almost say for any member of a colonial Legislature to impugn the respect which is due to the high authority of the law officers who advise the Crown with regard to colonial questions. In addition to the letter which I have just read as to the search which has been made for any precedents in the office of the Privy Council in England, let me refer to the letter of the registrar of that tribunal, with regard to the New Brunswick question, the letter of Mr. Reeve, dated from the Privy Council Office in England, 13th December, 1872. There was a request that the validity of the New Brunswick Act with regard to separate schools should be referred for the opinion of that Committee, and the answer which was made by the registrar, was this:

"SIR,—I have submitted to the Lord President of the Council your letter of the 9th instant, transmitting a copy of a dispatch from the Governor General of Canada, with enclosures, respecting an Act passed by the Provincial

Legislature of New Brunswick, with reference to Common Schools, and requesting to know whether the opinion of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on this question can properly be obtained.

"It appears to his Lordship that as the power of confirming or disallowing Provincial Acts is vested by the statute in the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada acting under advice of his constitutional adviser, there is nothing in this case which gives to Her Majesty in Council any jurisdiction over this question: though it is conceivable that the effect and validity of this Act may at some future time be brought before Her Majesty, on an appeal from the Canadian Courts of Justice.

"This being the fact, His Lordship is of opinion that Her Majesty cannot, with propriety, be advised to refer to a Committee of Council in England a question which Her Majesty in Council has at present no authority to determine, and on which the opinion of the Privy Council would not be binding on the parties in the Dominion of Canada."

Now, there is a distinction between that precedent and this. The hon. member has challenged us here for not referring to our own court a question as to the validity of an Act which at one time we could have disallowed, and the statement in the letter in question is that Her Majesty could not refer that Act to Her Privy Council for an opinion inasmuch as the question of disallowance was one for the Governor General and not for Her Majesty. That, however, does not go to the essence of the question, because when the question of disallowance was over, as it was on the 19th of January last, the demand was that we should refer an abstract question of law with regard to the validity of an existing Act, and if it were proper that we should refer that abstract question of law for decision, in order to satisfy public interest and public concern as to its validity, to our Supreme Court, it was equally proper that the reference should have been made in that New Brunswick case to Her Majesty's Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to settle the abstract question of law which arose there, irrespective of the question of disallowance. Now I come to the point which is indicated in a report of the hon. member for West Durham, which I referred to before dinner, the point that a reference ought never to be made when another remedy can be found. That hardly needs to be sustained by argument in a deliberative assembly. The principle was established too long ago in the mother country to need argument now. The principle that the settlement of disputes by litigation should be left to the ordinary tribunals of the country, to the ordinary courts of justice of the country, is as old in the mother country as constitutional liberty itself and the love of self-government. There existed in England two tribunals which for a long time exercised the jurisdiction which the member for Norfolk thinks we should have exercised here—the Star Chamber, having criminal jurisdiction, and the Court of High Commission, having jurisdiction over ecclesiastical offences. They were not the valuable works of a reformer like the hon. member for Norfolk, they were the works of aristocrats and Tories of the old school, who lived and ruled in the reigns of the Tudors and the Stuarts. But, Sir, one of the most valuable reforms which were accomplished long ago in England, was the complete overturning of those tribunals in order that justice might be administered in the ordinary courts at the option of the suitor, in the court of his choice, to go from the lowest court to the highest, by the steps which are pointed out by the established laws of the country. Not only were those tribunals overturned, but there is legislation absolutely prohibiting any attempt to erect them again by the Crown or anybody else. These were tribunals into which, at the instance of the Crown, at the instance of the Government, and for the purpose oftentimes of escaping political responsibility, litigants were brought, and when they were overturned, and when legislation was adopted preventing their restoration at any time as absolutely unconstitutional, it was in order that the people of the country might have recourse to the established tribunals and the established course of procedure of the country, to litigate their rights in the tribunals of their own choice, where their counsel could be heard, where their testimony could be produced, and where the investigation that took place could be aided by the ordinary procedure of the law. The hon. member for Norfolk has expressed a preference for this high tribunal of the Supreme Court for this very singular reason, among others, as he stated it in his resolution:

"If the matter had been referred to the Supreme Court, the question, after the submission of evidence and full argument by counsel on both sides, could have been definitely determined by such court."

The hon. member has made again such a fundamental mistake that I think we must gravely doubt his authority to criticise the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, because he is not aware that there is no provision on the Statute-book by which one tittle of evidence can be taken when such a reference is to be made to the courts, the fact being that under the present system the question would be decided there absolutely without evidence, and according to the practice of the court, without reasons being given for the decision. I have only to point out now what other remedies existed as indicating the reasons why this power should not be exercised. I am not driven to do that except to satisfy the condition contained in the dispatch of my predecessor, the hon. member for West Durham, because in the report of those distinguished authorities whom I read from before dinner, headed by Lord Selborne, then Sir Roundell Palmer, the Crown is advised against a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in a case in which, the report goes on to say, there is absolutely no other remedy. But for the purpose of satisfying the rule laid down by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), let me point out to the House that there were methods by which that question could be decided in the ordinary courts of law. In the first place, it was open to any person who had a special interest, and when I say a special interest I merely mean to distinguish between the interest which the ordinary citizen takes in current events and that which a man takes in his property or rights—it was open to any person who had any interest or any right in regard to property or moneys concerned to bring the question before the courts of justice; and it is a remarkable fact that at that very time when application was being made to us, there was a suit pending in the courts of the Province in which this Act was passed, in which that very defence of the unconstitutionality of the Act of incorporation was set up, and was then being tried and determined. I may be told that that suit was one commenced at the in-

stance of the Society of Jesus itself, and that the fate of that suit might depend on the disposition of that society to go forward with it. That would not affect the principle. I might answer that objection by saying that the suit has gone forward, that the point has been decided by the ordinary tribunals of that Province. But all that is apart from the question. If that suit were to fail, other suits might be brought from time to time, and we had to consider in that regard, not only that the remedy existed, by which the question could be brought before the tribunals of the country, but that we would be, to a certain extent, forestalling the decision of that and any other suit by seeking in this irregular method a decision from the highest court of appeal in the country, before which that question would subsequently come in the ordinary course of justice. There was actually, however, another and a very plain remedy for those who desired this question to be tested in the courts. The Code of the Province of Quebec provides that it shall be the absolute duty of the Attorney General of the Province, when any persons are improperly exercising the functions of a corporation, to take proceedings in the courts by which their right to exercise those functions as a corporation will be tested. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), constantly pressed with that fact this afternoon, made an attempt to answer it. He said it would have been vain to go to the Attorney General of the Province and ask him to litigate that question. I say no, because we have no right to assume that under the high command which says it shall be his duty to do so, he would refuse to do it. A second time I say no, because the request was never made; and it is unfair to any officer of the Crown to say that he would not do his duty until, at all events, he was called upon to do it. But I say no the third time, for the reason that, in the suit brought at the instance of the Society of Jesus, the Attorney General of the Province has intervened, and has submitted himself and his Government to the judgment of the courts of the Province, and ultimately to this very tribunal, the Supreme Court of Canada, for the purpose of having that question of validity of this Act tested, and the House will remember in that connection the bearing of the Act of incorporation upon the Act for the settlement of the estates. The Act for the settlement of the estates would fail entirely if the Incorporation Act were invalid, because the former Act provided that the money should be paid to the corporation, and if it were decided there was no corporation to receive it, the grant must fail. We have, therefore, a clear case in which there was not only an existing remedy in the ordinary course of justice by which this question could be raised, but we had the remedy actually being applied at the time this application was made to us. In saying all this with respect to the inadvisability of a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada under the provisions of that statute, excepting of such questions as his Excellency may desire to be advised upon for his own action, let me call attention to the fact that this was not by any means the case of an application for a reference to that court of an appeal under the provisions of the British North America Act, by which a minority, believing that an injustice has been done them, claims that remedial legislation should take place or a remedial order should be made. Upon that question, which is entirely distinct from this, it might have been said that His Excellency and his advisers had duties to perform in relation to giving or withholding remedial orders, and with respect to functions which should devolve upon this Parliament in case the remedial orders were disobeyed. To put it a little more plainly. In the provisions of the British North America Act, which provide that Provincial Legislatures shall have the exclusive right to legislate with respect to education, there is a limitation of their powers with respect to the rights of the minorities secured by law at the time of the Union; and there is this provision as to the rights of minorities accruing after the Union, that if those are invaded, there may be an appeal to the Governor in Council from the Provincial authority, and the Governor in Council may in such a case make remedial orders, and if those orders are not obeyed, this Parliament will then have power to deal with the subject of education *quoad* those orders and *quoad* those grievances. An application was made, in point of fact, by the religious minority in Quebec, claiming that the rights of the minority had been invaded. That question was dealt with upon a different principle. We were never asked to refer that question, we never heard that appeal, we never refused to make a reference, we never refused to hear the appeal. The petitioners presented their appeal, and it having been referred to myself, I recommended that a day should be appointed on which the appeal should be heard; and it is quite possible that if the claimants had established anything like a case for the interference of the Governor in Council on the ground that the rights of the Protestant minority of Quebec had been infringed, a reference of the question as to whether it was an interference or not might have been made to the Supreme Court of Canada. But before the day came which was appointed for the hearing of the appeal, the appellants withdrew the appeal, and they withdrew it on account of the statement made by the Premier of Quebec that the redress they desired would be conceded without any appeal being made. Therefore, so far as that question is concerned, it is not only distinct, but it must be dealt with on different principles, and we are in no way responsible for not having made a reference with respect to that appeal, or not having given any redress with respect to it. The point has likewise been mentioned by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which I shall only mention in passing, that this whole question of allowance and disallowance of the statute, after His Excellency had announced his decision on 19th January last, was discussed and debated at great length in this House. On the division of this question 188 members declared that the Government ought not to be directed to disallow that Act, as against 13 who voted on the other side, and notwithstanding the observations of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) I do contend that, disallowance being out of the question, to have referred this question to the courts of the country would have been to attempt to thwart the will of this House and to attempt to reverse the decision which this House had arrived at with respect to the question of disallowance. The practice being what I have stated as regards Canadian authorities and prece-

dents, the practice being what I have stated with respect to the mother country, it may be asked of us why it was necessary, under these circumstances, that we should seek advice in the mother country and should submit to the law officers of the Crown questions with respect to disallowance, and with respect to a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is necessary on that point that I should be perfectly frank. I never had, since the day I took the responsibility of reporting upon that statute to His Excellency in such a sense that when my report was approved the announcement was made that the Act would not be disallowed, the slightest doubt as to the propriety of that report and as to its soundness in point of law. I was not able to advise, nor did any of my colleagues desire I should advise, that my opinion should be reviewed on that question, and, the discussion which took place in this House, as well as the decision arrived at, would have removed any doubt on the subject, I think, even if a doubt had existed before. In this instance, however, a somewhat extraordinary course, although I do not find fault with it for a moment, was adopted by persons throughout the country who desired the Act to be disallowed, notwithstanding the announcement of His Excellency, that disallowance would not take place. The procedure which was adopted justifies, I think, the statement which I have made with regard to its being extraordinary, although in using that word I am very far from finding any fault with those who, rightly or wrongly, were under the impression that I was swayed by my own private opinions in tendering the advice which His Excellency had acted upon. While I feel that that impression was unjust to me, I was only too glad when His Excellency was disposed to receive the deputation and to give them his answer upon the question. When His Excellency subsequently took the course, not by our advice and not by our request, but for the purpose of removing, if it could be removed, the false impression which existed in this country, with regard to that Act, and with regard to his having made a mistake in his decision concerning it—when he took the course of requesting the Colonial Office to ascertain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown upon the constitutionality of the Act and likewise upon the propriety of making a reference of that question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; we expressed no opinion against such a course. We accept to the fullest extent any responsibility which ought constitutionally to devolve upon us with regard to what His Excellency did, but we are not to be accused of inconsistency in having declined to make a reference to our court. We are not to be accused of any want of respect to that court, because having decided that a reference ought not be made, His Excellency thought proper for very wise reasons indeed, to ask that the Secretary of State for the Colonies should consult those officers whom Her Majesty in Council is accustomed to consult with regard to such matters. Having done that, and having submitted the two questions: first, whether the legislation was *intra vires* of the Provincial Parliament, and secondly, whether there was any question to refer to Her Majesty's Judicial Committee upon that point. I think that the answer received was one that was convincing and satisfactory to every one who was willing to be convinced, or who was willing to be satisfied; and that the persons who are influenced by the feelings which the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has described as being more resentful and more dissatisfied than ever with that legislation, in consequence of the opinion of Her Majesty's advisers in regard to it, are persons who are dissatisfied and not convinced, because they are unwilling to be otherwise, and because the opinion was against them. I fancy that we should have heard very little from them, with regard to the propriety of our course, or with regard to the force and value of that opinion, if the opinion had been otherwise than it was.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that it was any source of gratification to me to learn that such a motion was to be made as that which is now attracting the attention of the House, nor am I certain, that any good results will flow from a renewal of the discussion upon the Jesuit question. In the observations I am about to make, although as hon. members will perceive, I am obliged to differ from some of the views which have just been expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice; and I dare say also, to differ from some of the views of gentlemen with whom I usually act; I do not desire to say a single word, in a sense which might aggravate any feeling of bitterness which may exist throughout this country with reference to this subject. I have felt from the beginning, that the question should be treated by those on either side who take opposing views, in a spirit, which I am sorry to say has not animated a great many of those who have acted on the lines of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have felt that it was a question which was pregnant with grave and important issues, and I do not deny in the slightest degree, the right, and even the duty, of those who feel as this gentleman did, to raise and to agitate it; I believe, however, that it should have been raised and agitated in a different tone and in a different spirit from that which many of them have evinced, if any good results were to ensue; nay, rather, if great calamities were to be averted. The questions which are immediately before us do not, I think, justify any severe motion of censure on the Government, nor do I think the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is to be considered as such a motion of censure, but rather as an expression of opinion adverse to the view which the Government adopted in this matter. Although I do not think the circumstances would justify a severe motion of censure, yet there are questions of high consequence involved, upon which there well may be differences of opinion, both upon an important constitutional point which the hon. Minister of Justice has advanced to-night—as he advanced it before in some of the State papers which he has produced upon this subject—and also upon a point which is certainly disputable, but I think, also, of greater practical importance. That is the question of political expediency, in the high and proper sense of that term, the question of policy, which is at issue between the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the one hand, and the Administration on the other. Now with reference to the constitutional point. I am unable for my part to accede to the full extent, to the argument made by the hon. Minister

of Justice, as to the effect of the action of the Executive during the currency of the twelve months within which the power of disallowance may be exercised, or to his view that this power cannot, after a declaration of a contrary opinion, be exercised during the twelve months with reference to a Provincial statute. The hon. Minister of Justice does not indeed deny that what he calls the bare power of disallowance continues. It would, I think, be absolutely impossible to affirm that that power had been blotted out. The law gives the power to the Executive to disallow at any time within twelve months from the receipt of the authentic announcement of the statute, and the power is therefore exercisible, at any period short of the expiry of the twelve months. There is no power whatever to allow a statute. The Provincial statute derives its force and vitality from the assent of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province. It is, if in the power of the Province, valid, operative and living from the hour of that assent, and it requires no other allowance in order to give it operation. There is no right in the Executive of Canada to assume to allow it at all. The right of the Executive of Canada is purely of a destructive order: it can destroy, but it cannot give validity; it can obliterate by exercising the power of disallowance, but it cannot vitalise by its approval. If that be so, and if the Constitutional Act awards to the Executive an authority to exercise their power up to the expiration of the twelve months, no prior expression of opinion on the part of he Executive, however positive, as to the validity of the Act, as to its expediency, as to its being such as ought not be disallowed, can absolutely take away all right and authority to disallow within the twelve months which the law and the constitution give. Sir, suppose during a meeting of Parliament, while the people's representatives are here assembled, the twelve months not having yet expired, that a motion is placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, or on the Notice paper, for an Address to His Excellency paying him to disallow a particular local statute; and suppose that during the debate, or before the notice is reached, the Executive, anticipating the period of or the termination of the debate, should exercise their right to pass an Order in Council declaring that in their opinion the Act ought to be left to its operation; could such a course as that thwart, annul or affect the power of Parliament to express its opinion by Address, requesting His Excellency to exercise his power to disallow? Why, the very circumstance that there are twelve months within which this power can be exercised, and that there must be, according to the law, a session of Parliament within twelve months, secures always to this Parliament its right, if it chooses, to intervene effectively in these matters. The Parliament of the country has a power not merely to approve and to condemn, but it has also a more important power with reference to every political and executive act—it has a power to advise. An approval may be gratifying to some, a condemnation may be gratifying to others, but neither the approval nor the condemnation of an accomplished act serves any purpose save that of criticism. The power of advice is the great power of Parliament, a power to be exercised with reserve, but to be maintained in efficiency; and to preserve effectively that power, it is necessary that we should deem that it has not passed beyond the

domain of Parliament to advise within the twelve months, no matter what the Executive may do, whatever action in the opinion of Parliament, the interest of the country requires. It is of very little use for Parliament to say to Ministers, who have decided that they think an Act ought to be allowed: "Gentlemen, we think you are wrong; we condemn you; we censure you." Are we to be told that if the twelve months still remain unexpired, we may condemn the Administration, forsooth, but the Act must remain operative; that we cannot make our advice effective; that we cannot take a step which will cause that to be done which the great council of the country decides in the interest of the country ought to be done? The power of Parliament itself would be thwarted by the proposition of the hon. Minister of Justice. I admit that there may be cases in which a great local convenience may be demonstrated to exist in favor of an earlier expression of opinion on the part of the executive as to the character of a local act; there may be such cases of public convenience as distinguished from party convenience. I have known a good many curious things to happen in connection with this question of disallowance. I have known a case in which, from motives of party convenience, a Lieutenant Governor held back a Provincial Act for months—aye, I believe for years—just in order that its fate might be left in doubt, it being inconvenient for the Federal Executive at the moment to deal with it as it intended ultimately to deal with it. I have known, on the other hand, a case—I was myself an actor, I may say a victim, in it—in which while a motion was on the Order paper for an address to His Excellency, for strong reasons assigned, praying that he would not exercise the power of disallowance with reference to a Provincial statute, that motion being, for some little time, delayed by the exigency of other business, a day or two before it was reached, the Executive acted and disallowed the statute; and when I rose, instead of making my motion, I had to say: "This motion has been anticipated by the Executive doing in the interval, between the time the notice was placed on the paper and the time when it could come on, the act which I proposed we should pray His Excellency should not be done; and, therefore, I have no motion to make." So I say we have seen strange tricks played with reference to the exercise and non-exercise of this power of disallowance, for the purpose of party convenience. But I admit that public, as distinct from party convenience, may indicate that early action is important; and where it does; and when the Executive takes the responsibility of coming to a conclusion in advance of the expiration of the time, I admit that the utility of coming to such a conclusion would be greatly weakened if it were understood that after all the conclusion meant just nothing at all—if it were understood that the exercise of the power of the Executive after that time, within the twelve months, should be absolutely free, should be deemed proper, otherwise than under very exceptional circumstances. But I hold that the hand of the Executive is not so absolutely bound, but that the occurrence of some exceptional circumstances, the development of some new state of facts, the creation of some new description of policy, a change of the administration, perchance, with all its effect upon the politics of the

country, should entitle the Executive, under special circumstances, to execute the duty and power of disallowance for which the constitution gives twelve months, at any time within that period. The power remains. In this particular case, Sir, the decision was reached at a very early time, absolutely and relatively. The hon. gentleman has said, that in looking over the records of the past twenty-three years, he finds some twenty cases in which the power was exercised earlier. As compared with the total number of cases in which the decision of the Executive has been reached, twenty cases are almost an infinitesimal proportion. In this case, I think it would have been wiser to have deferred the decision. I agree that that is a question on which opinions may differ. But my own opinion was, as it is now, that it would have been wiser to have deferred, at any rate not to have anticipated it. The first mutterings of the storm were even then audible; the Lodges were even then moving; some petitions had been sent in; other petitions were circulating; the public ferment had commenced and was increasing; and Parliament was about assembling; when the action was taken. It was possibly taken in the hope that such decisive action, as it is now stated to be, would quell the incipient agitation; that the Government supporters, at any rate, throughout the country, would no longer, seeing the matter was decided, press their objections; and that many people would say, to quote a homely proverb, "it is no use crying over spilt milk." If that were the idea, it turned out to be a very mistaken idea, because it was not the conception of the people at large that within the period of twelve months this decision was final or fatal. It was their conception that circumstances might still be brought forward which would render it proper for the Executive to take, and at any rate for Parliament to advise, that action which the Executive had, so far, thought fit not to take. I thought, then, and I think now, that it would have been the wiser course to have waited, and to have allowed the subject to be ventilated more fully and freely before taking action. The ventilation has taken place, notwithstanding the action; and it has taken place all the more violently for the attempted repression; and in a way and at a time which have greatly complicated the difficulties of the country. So much with reference to that point, and to the various positions which appear to be taken by the hon. Minister of Justice upon it. Without attempting a criticism in detail of those papers of his, to which I have referred, I may point out one blemish in the hon. gentleman's statement, which, I think, he himself will concede exists, in that part in which he is adverting to this point, and is accumulating objections which he conceives to exist to the proposition that the right of disallowance may be exercised after the announcement that the Act is thought unobjectionable. He says, that on that assumption even the Supply Bill of a Province could not be safely acted on until the expiration of the year, by which time the supplies would have lapsed. The hon. Minister of Justice forgot for the moment that the effect of disallowance is only to annul the Act from the time of the disallowance, and not from an hour earlier, and that whatever may have been done under the Act up to that time is well done. He forgot that moneys can be paid under a Supply Bill with perfect safety up to the hour of disallowance, and that there is not the slightest difficulty in acting upon a Supply Bill, even although in every case the Administration of the Dominion were to determine that they would never pronounce upon a local Act until the expiration of the twelve months, and were then to disallow the Supply Bill; and I will prove the case to you. In an early year in the Province of Ontario, a Supply Bill was passed which contained one objectionable provision, involving the payment of a permanent extra allowance to the judges of the Superior Court of Ontario, of some thousands in all. The hon. the Minister of Justice of that day, the present First Minister, decided that that provision was so objectionable that it must go. The then Attorney General of Ontario, a tolerably firm, not to say an obstinate man, as the First Minister knows, decided that it should not go by his consent. What did the Minister of Justice of that day do? He stayed his hand; he allowed all the supplies to be paid; he waited until after the lapse of the twelve months, of which the Minister of Justice of this day speaks; and when all the supplies had been paid, the Act remaining valid all that time, then he disallowed it. And that clause which contained the provision for the payment of judges in future years, went with the rest of the Act. But the payments were all made, and well made; and the trifling inconvenience which the Minister of Justice of this day suggests would arise, is found by practical experience to have no existence whatever. The hon. gentleman suggested that we are to suppose the case of an Act authorising the borrowing of money. I say if there is an Act authorising the borrowing of money, and if money is borrowed under that Act, and if, after that borrowing has taken place, the Act is disallowed, what had been done under it remains valid. The First Minister shakes his head, but it is perfectly plain I am right. Suppose a Provincial Act, authorising a loan, suppose the bonds of the Province given for it and the money received, will anybody seriously contend that the act of the Minister of Justice and the Privy Council of the Dominion, occurring later, annulling this Act, would render the loan void?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would destroy the security.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the security is in existence; it is made; it has passed; it is issued; and I deny that the disallowance of the Act would destroy the security. I admit, however, that if there be an Act authorising the construction of public works, of which, as in almost all cases, only a part can be accomplished within the time, the disallowance of the Act would theoretically cause inconvenience, as people might be averse to undertake such contracts, not being quite sure whether they would be allowed to finish the work. But such inconveniences are more theoretical than practical; for, in the vast bulk of cases in which there is provincial legislation, there never is any question, or risk, or doubt, about disallowance at all. It is only in view of exceptional cases that the doubt and difficulty—the shadow of doubt—as to disallowance at all exists. In the great and increasing bulk of cases, and I hope and trust the number and proportion will swell more and more as the years go by, an Act, when passed by a Provincial Legislature is and will be felt to be

at once as sound and free from attack by the act of the Executive of the Dominion as if the twelve months had elapsed. Therefore, I maintain that the power of disallowance remains ; and may, if the good of this country requires that it should be exercised, be exercised at any time within the period of twelve months, and that no premature determination of the Executive, as to what they think is right or politic, can absolutely divest them or their successors, or the Parliament of the country from the obligation and the power to do right, until the period given by the statute for action has expired. These conditions, I conceive, existed on the present occasion, and it was quite competent to this Parliament to review the decision of the Executive, and to come to a conclusion, one way or the other, as to whether this Act should or should not be disallowed, notwithstanding the Order in Council. I aver that this Parliament retains within the twelve months that power, even after the Executive has acted ; but I agree that it is a power to be exercised only under exceptional circumstances. As to the principles upon which the power of disallowance should be exercised, with reference to statutes which are *ultra vires*, on the ground that they are *ultra vires*, I stated my views only the other day, and I pointed out that, although the cases might be rare, cases there were in which it was agreed that *ultra vires* Acts might properly be disallowed on that ground, and I have thought always that this statute came within that category. and that, if *ultra vires*, it should have been disallowed. I do not enter on the constitutional objections which have been taken to the statute in times past, and which have, to some extent, been repeated to-day by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Indeed, after his frank statement, perhaps not highly complimentary to this Chamber, that there were not to be found in it twenty men who could decide reasonably well whether the statute was constitutional or not, I came to the conclusion that it would be of very little use to argue this question, and I came to this other conclusion, I must admit, that whatever else my hon. friend might have established, or failed in establishing, he had satisfactorily proved this at any rate, that he was not one of the twenty. I say that I do not enter into these constitutional objections, of which one was the question whether the Act offended against the 93rd section of the British North America Act—an objection which I thought not well founded, and which, if any weight attached to it at any time, has been, as the hon. Minister of Justice has said, solved. I thought, and still think, that the other objections were equally unfounded. If I had thought differently, I certainly would have voted differently from the way in which I voted last Session ; but, thinking as I did, and as I do, that the Act was *intra vires* of the Legislature, I would, under like circumstances, repeat the vote I gave last Session. I gave that vote in the belief that it was a sound vote in defence of the Canadian constitution, and in defence of Provincial rights and liberties, a vote which in my opinion was eminently safe and beneficial for all the Provinces, and especially safe and beneficial for, however unpopular it might be amongst, my own fellow-countrymen of the Province of Ontario. But, while this was and is my opinion, I also thought, before that Session closed, that there ought to have been, under the circumstances, an effort made to refer to judicial authorities the decision of these legal points. I did not believe it was well that we should, in the conditions of this question as they existed during that Session, and as they became more obviously apparent as the Session went on, assume to conclude this question finally by our own judgments. I referred the other day—and, I admit, with reference, with obvious reference, to those very conditions—to that state of public opinion and to those agitations which, in my judgment, would render it highly proper and expedient to refer legal questions of this kind to a judicial tribunal. Those conditions, I believed then, and I believe now, existed in this case. As I stated the other day, it is not necessarily decisive against such a reference that the Executive or the Parliament, or both, should be of the opinion that the law is *intra vires*, and that they should even have decided, that pending the reference, they will treat it as *intra vires*. That state of things does not at all necessarily preclude you from adopting the view that it might be wise, and politic, and expedient, and in the public interest to obtain a judicial solution of the legal question. I think that is very obvious; and I conceive that it is not necessary now to do more than to refer to certain precedents which have occurred. In the New Brunswick school question, what was the course pursued ? The Executive decided that the New Brunswick school law was *intra vires* of the New Brunswick Legislature. This Parliament decided, by a very large majority, that it was *intra vires* of that Legislature. In that case, then, you found the Executive and the Parliament both declaring that it was *intra vires*, and both declining to exercise the power of disallowance ; but at the same time, you found the Legislature deciding, and the Executive concurring, in the decision to obtain the view of high judicial authorities as to whether that Act was *intra vires* or *ultra vires*. I read, the other day, the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, then in office, though the decision was arrived at under a motion of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), as to the propriety of referring that question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council or the law officers. At that time, I need hardly say there was no Supreme Court. Then, again, in the case of the Liquor License Act, there was an Act passed by this Parliament under the auspices of gentlemen opposite. The Executive believed it to be a legal Act ; the House believed it to be a legal Act ; and expressed that view by large majorities. The House supported the Executive in the view that it was a wise and beneficial as well as valid Act. Yet the Executive promoted at the instance of the House a measure to refer that Act, which was believed both by the Executive and the House to be legal, to the judicial authority to ascertain whether it was legal or no. So I prove by these two cases, by the practice and the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, that it does not follow that, because the Executive believes the law to be *intra vires*, and the House, following the lead of the Executive, believes it to be *intra vires*, and because both act meanwhile on that view, you are precluded, if the public interest in any view requires it, from seeking further light, either to settle the question or to quiet public apprehensions. No doubt the machinery at that time provided was inadequate and the results were less satisfactory than they might have

been, but even then, as in the case of last Session, the machinery might have been improved, and, even though the machinery was unimproved, it was better than nothing, and good results for the immediate questions were obtained in the public interests—excellent practical results in the New Brunswick school case and also in the liquor license case. If such a decision had been obtained in this matter, I believe it would have been generally accepted, and an agitating question in some of its most agitating elements would have been so far settled. Therefore I deem it by no means inconsistent with my expression, if not by voice yet by vote last Session, contemporaneously with the expression of other hon. gentlemen which was concurred in by me, that this Act was *intra vires* of the Legislature which passed it, to say that I thought, as I did think, that we held ourselves free, if the circumstances of the case required it, to seek and obtain that further light to which I have referred. And so holding, it was, further, my view, last Session, that it was our public duty, as far as possible, to elimimate from this controversy the legal questions, and to provide for their disposition in some way by legal authorities; and it was my opinion that, as in the New Brunswick school case, and I may add the Liquor License case, the Government might well, at the instance of the Legislature, assent to and promote legislation or parliamentary provision which would have secured that result. Under these circumstances, having been unable, owing to circumstances, to take part in the debate, and having been obliged to leave my place here, it became more and more clear to my mind that a great public good would flow from the adoption of that course by this Parliament; and in the hope that it might be done at the instance of the Executive of the day, and having regard to the special circumstances of the case, I thought that I was not unduly taking a liberty when, during last Session, I made a communication to a leading gentleman on the other side of the House, and to a leading gentleman on this side of the House. On the 26th April, 1889, I took the liberty of telegraphing to a leading gentleman opposite in these terms:

"Allow me to suggest that the public interest would be promoted by parliamentary provision for early reference to highest available authorities, of validity of Jesuits' Estates Act. Easily accomplished by arrangement. I have not communicated to any one. Please let———see this immediately."

I telegraphed to a leading gentleman on this side of the House, and wrote to him later on the same day as follows:—

"It has for some time been pressing itself more and more upon my mind that some of those who are engaged in the fomentation of the present agitation are taking an undue advantage by their plan of presenting, as a main element of the discussion, their views of the legal questions on the validity of this legislation. They inflame the public mind in various ways; and they invite that tribunal so highly inflamed, and at the same time so imperfectly informed on the legal issues, to adopt their opinions on the latter, and to reach conclusions on the whole subject largely based on these opinions. In the case of the New Brunswick School Act we recognised the strong feeling and the deep interest of a substantial minority of the population as a reason for governmental and parliamentary action towards obtaining an authoritative settlement of the legal question. In the case of the Temperance Act we did the same thing, and there are other precedents. I think we might now act with great public advantage on the same lines. Had the complainants invited such action by a motion, I, for one, would have supported it. They have now had every opportunity to invite it; it has become plain that they do not intend to do so. But their inaction does not disentitle us to act so as to afford relief to the public anxiety they are creating; nor does it relieve us of our responsibility. There is a special reason for early and unusual action in the shortness of the time now remaining before the term for possible disallowance; though this is not a governing consideration. The aim should be to get the decision, upon argument, of the Judicial Committee. I know there are difficulties; but I think, that the representations of the Government, based upon parliamentary action, may over-rule them. At any rate the effort will be useful. Should it fail, there remain the Supreme Court and the Imperial Law Officers. I cannot see any harm that can result from an honest attempt to procure a speedy solution of the legal questions; I see great harm to result from the continuance of the situation with these questions unsolved. There is no impropriety in our calling for an authoritative solution, even though we have opinions of our own. The Government acted on this view in the New Brunswick School case. Assuming the sincerity of all the agitators (and I believe many of them to be sincere) they will all be glad that this question should be put in a train for easy and rapid solution; though some of them may be sorry that they did not propose the plan, and may accordingly decry it. My only object is to contribute, if in the least degree I can, towards the settlement of questions, whose agitation, in the temper and spirit now shown in many quarters, seem to me most lamentable. There are difficulties, great enough in our future, difficulties which we must meet, not shirk. But they demand treatment in a very different spirit from that now frequently evinced, if a fortunate solution is to be reached. For the moment, it seems to me, the best we can do for our country is to grapple with that part of the present problem, capable of solution by the machinery we can set in motion. I do not apprehend that the great body of the Roman Catholics, remembering how we acted in the case of the New Brunswick school law, would be so unjust as to decline acquiescence in the present proposal. But even in the face of opposition from that quarter, I would earnestly urge its adoption, in the confident expectation that second thoughts would reconcile them to it; and in the belief, that whether they think so or not, it is for the general advantage."

That was the view which I took leave to state in the only way which was open to me at that time, a view, I may add, which I have ever since entertained, and which I believe subsequent events have rendered more clearly evident to be the true one. Now, the Minister of Justice has adverted to a specialty attending the application which was made by a private individual, I think Graham by name, for a reference to the Supreme Court, a specialty in respect of which I conceive that the Minister of Justice was entitled to speak—that it was a proposition to refer the question to the Supreme Court after the period for disallowance had expired. I consider that the point of time may make a very serious difference between an earlier and a later proposition. There are also some other observations made by the Minister of Justice with reference to that particular proposition from which I do not propose to dissent. I do not understand this motion to be, it certainly does not read as being, based upon the question of Mr. Graham's application; it is a general statement as to what, in the opinion of this House, the Government should have done. In my opinion, as you will have just learned by what I have read, they should have done even more than what this motion calls for. I think, as a question of political expediency in the true sense of that term, as a question of policy, it would have been well to invite the House to take action in the way of seconding, and facilitating, and effectuating the reference, in the way, as I put it last Session, of making parliamentary provision for such reference. Having failed to do that, the next best thing, in my opinion, was to have referred it to the Supreme Court, and in referring it to the Supreme Court, in the circumstances in which

the country was placed, and for the purpose of obtaining further light within the period remaining for disallowance, I believe they would have done well, though I think they would have done still better to have adopted the parliamentary course to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman has adverted to a report of mine upon an application from New Brunswick with reference to a local Act, in which the proposition was from the authorities of New Brunswick, that we should use this particular power to obtain an opinion from the Supreme Court as to the validity of that Act, not at all with reference to the question of disallowance, nor for any purpose of the Federal Executive at all, but in order to obtain a short and easy cut to a decision, by the appellate court, of a question perfectly easy of solution in the ordinary way. So far from the cases being parallel in any respect, they differ in almost every respect. I have stated the character and object of that New Brunswick application. But as to this case now in hand, I have pointed out to you that during last Session, and after last Session, the reference of which I speak might have been made by the Executive, of its own motion, or at the instance of Parliament, for the purpose to which I have referred, for the purpose of enlightening them as to the course they should take. And as to the possibilities of there being an easy and rapid mode of obtaining a judicial decision on the case in hand, the Minister of Justice confined his observations, as far as I could gather his argument, to the question of the validity of the Jesuits' Incorporation Act and did not touch the other questions which are suggested. He said that as to that Act there was a method; that the Attorney General of the Province of Quebec might have been called on to deal with that question, and that the Society of Jesus itself in a libel suit, while it did not raise the question as to its incorporation, was yet resisted by the defendant who did raise it. By this time I believe, within a day or two, we have had the first decision of a single judge in the court of first instance on some preliminary stage of the trial of that case; and the decision is in favor of the incorporation; but the end is not yet; and after all that has been done, and all the time which has elapsed, the other questions which have been raised, be their weight what you please, remain untouched by that decision and incapable, so far as I can see, by any easy process certainly, and not by any process at all that I am aware of, of being ever touched. There are several classes of cases in which provincial legislation may be *ultra vires*, and in which it is difficult or impossible to prescribe a mode by which the question can be tried in the courts, and I believe some of these questions are of that description. Then the hon. Minister of Justice says, that the application to the law officers of the Crown has been improperly criticised. I think the phrase which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) used was not justified by anything I have heard; I do not understand very well the relevancy of the phrase clandestine on which the hon. Minister animadverted. I suppose all that was really meant was, that there should have been a public announcement of the fact that this reference was being made, which, I agree, would probably have been better. I think it would have been better not to have made any mystery about it; but if the word clandestine is applied in any invidious

sense, I am not disposed to concur in that application. But, I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the ground upon which the Minister of Justice himself says, that it was well and wisely done to get that legal advice of the law officers, to which he attaches such high importance, on this question. What was that ground? It was the state of public feeling, and it was on that account that it was thought important to fortify the Executive by an opinion. I agree. But, I argue, also, that this very condition existed during the Session, and it existed after the Session, and that its existence is the justification for the proposition that the public interests required the Executive itself to act, to act early, and to act by a reference which I think would have been more proper and more valuable than the reference which was made to the law officers. I do not well understand the attitude which the hon. gentleman assumed upon two points in this connection: first, with respect to this same application to the law officers; second, with respect to the reply of His Excellency to the deputation which he met. I am quite aware that the Governor General of Canada occupies a sort of double position, and that there are certain conceivable cases in which it may be alleged, perhaps, that he is acting as an Imperial officer, and that his advisers, the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, have no responsibility for such acts. It may be so. I decline to enter into a definition of those occasions. I hold it to be the duty of any representative of the Canadian people to narrow to the utmost possible extent the classes of cases to which the principles of responsible government shall not be held to apply, and I will only add that I perceive no circumstances whatever existing in this instance which should induce us to abandon for one moment the fullest application of the principles of responsible government to the action to which I refer. I am not condemning the action. I only say that it is an action in respect of which the Ministers cannot constitutionally shelter themselves under any suggestion that they are otherwise than absolutely and fully responsible for it, and we speak of it as their action, because we insist it must be advised by them. So with respect to the address of His Excellency in reply to the deputation. I maintain that no formal words, such as those used by the hon. Minister, "of course I assume all the responsibility that constitutionally devolves upon me," answer the exigencies of the occasion. There is a real responsibility, there is more than the formal and technical responsibility implied by the hon. gentleman, and hon. gentlemen opposite would have been deserting their duty, if they had done otherwise than advise His Excellency as to the answer which he should give to that deputation, and they are deserting their duty to-day if they ask us to treat that answer in every word and letter of it as anything else than an answer given under their advice. It is not necessary to trace at this day, the development of the principle of British Constitutional Government. Take the accounts of what happened in the course of the reign of the last William; take the interviews that took place even with peers; take the answers to addresses on much more innocent and less important questions on which the monarch expressed with some freedom his opinion, and you see that even at that stage of the development of the principles of responsible and constitutional government, the First

Minister of the day felt bound to remonstrate with the sovereign, and point out to him that he must have power to advise, and that without his advice such observations must not be made. The First Minister felt that he was responsible. So I say that this answer, which I am not for the moment criticising, is, in no formal or technical sense, but must be taken to have been really and substantially given under the advice of the Ministers of the Crown. This action then has been taken under that advice, and so taken, this action, which recognises on the part of Ministers the existence of that condition of public opinion to which I have adverted, it recognises the importance and propriety of taking notice of that condition of public opinion, and of fortifying the Executive by the assistance of dispassionate aid and advice as to the legal question. The hon. gentleman says the law officers have been treated by the hon. member for North Norfolk with some degree of disparagement. The law officers are law officers, and it will not be pretended that they are always of the same calibre. I am afraid that I would fall under the condemnation of the Minister of Justice, and that he would treat me as a very old offender, as one whom he would subject to the severer penalties to which habitual offenders are regularly exposed, in this regard. Not that I deny for an instant the uprightness, the honor and the transcendent ability of many, of almost all those who have filled the high positions of Attorney General and Solicitor General of England. As a rule they win that position by force of merit and they hold it by force of merit, and those who hold first places at the English bar, and who fight their battles in the face of day with the most eminent advocates in that country and in the halls of Parliament as well, must be, as a rule, men of great weight and mark. But what I say is this, that these are busy men as well; and that it is not their regular business to act judicially at all; that they are political personages; that their opinions expressed on these occasions are not entitled to the same weight as the opinions of judges; and I add that such has been the experience of the hon. gentleman opposite when it suited him to seek the advice of the law officers, and that has not been very seldom. I could go over a long bead roll of cases, if it were not pretty late in the Session and in the evening, in which the right hon. gentleman found it convenient to shunt off a difficult question by sending over to the law officers and getting their opinion, and some of those opinions have been placarded as great authorities when it suited him to do so, while other opinions were obtained from time to time to which he paid less regard and gave less prominence. I say that of the three possible sources to which we might apply, the law officers are unquestionably the third. I hold that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Supreme Court both stand in rank of suitability for that purpose higher than the law officers. That is enough for me. I do not condemn the application to the law officers, but I maintain it would have been more expedient and more in the interests of the country to have applied to the Supreme Court. Now, the Minister of Justice has declared that these views are in fact old High Tory views, and I suppose that was rather based once again upon the idea that we are being called upon to vote something in the nature of condemnation of the Executive, for not complying with Mr. Graham's application. The hon. gentleman brought into the arena the court of high commission and the old ecclesiastical courts, and he told us of these extraordinary tribunals, with inquisitorial powers created by the supposed prerogative of the Crown in earlier and more evil days, denounced for years, found to be productive of great abuses, in the end wiped away from the institutions of the land by an indignant Parliament, which prohibited their re-erection by prerogative—though, of course, that Parliament which had annulled them, could of itself have re-erected them. The hon. gentleman told us that those who supported this motion were advocating the doing something of the same sort, as the erection of these courts. What was the mischief of these courts? It was their coercive jurisdiction. They were unusual tribunals, out of the ordinary course of the law, by which the subject was to be vexed and aggravated, by which he was to be harassed in person and in estate, and that was the main objection to them. But the proposal which is made to-day is of another character. The hon. gentleman objected to this proposal at one time just because it was not coercive. He said the decision does not bind and you cannot make it binding, and, therefore, you should not get it at all; so that first of all he objects because it does not bind, and then he says it is like the court of high commission which was bad, because it did bind. No, Sir, the object in this case was not to vex and aggravate the subject. The object was, I think, a worthy object; it was to relieve the apprehension of the subject, by the opinion of an authoritative tribunal upon a legal question; upon which I quite agree a great majority of this House took a different view from that of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). We, of the majority, thought, as I believe we think still, that the objections which were taken to this Act were objections which would not be found to weigh in the balance. We thought they were objections which would not be maintained in the courts. But some of us at any rate—of whom I have shown you that I was one—thought, even during last Session, that the circumstances of the case were such, that we ought not to set up our judgments as absolutely conclusive upon this question; but that we might well resort to higher, to purer, to calmer, and to clearer light for a decision, which if given in the way we expected it would be given, would settle the question, so far as the agitators and those whom they were seeking to agitate were concerned; and which, if given in the other way, would furnish a just foundation for the exercise of that power of disallowance for which those agitators called.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). It is apparent to every student of the political questions arising in Canada, that the duties cast upon the men who are charged with the administration of public affairs in this Parliament, and with leading public opinion—the opinion of both parties in this country—are, in many grave respects, as difficult duties as are thrown upon any class of statesmen in any country on this earth. Our position is a singular one. The legal problems that arise in Canada are of peculiar subtility, partly because we have introduced into this country, in recent years, a system of Federal Government and at the same

time that we have maintained our colonial connection with the mother country. The very difficulties which arise to-night, in the matter which we are discussing, and which yesterday we had to deal with, in the matter in which the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) took the lead, and in the grave matters which we discussed last year, and in matters not so grave that we have been called upon to discuss during almost every Parliament in our twenty odd years of existence—these difficulties, in the last analysis, are found to grow out of this fact: that here we are, with a limited experience, undertaking to work out a system of Federal Government, and at the same time endeavoring to make this system work smoothly with the maintenance of our connection with the mother country. Out of this colonial connection grows the fact, that we have conferred upon the Executive of this Parliament the very singular power, the very grave and enormous legal power, of destroying our Provincial legislation. This is, no doubt, due to the fact that, whereas, before Confederation, Bills from the different Provinces—from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for example—were revised, and could be destroyed by the Queen ; after Confederation it was provided that such Bills should come up before His Excellency the Governor General, who stood in this country in the place of the Queen. Therefore, this power of disallowance, which has caused us so much difficulty—and which in the opinion of many of us is so necessary notwithstanding—is a power incident to our colonial connection. We have, it is true, four systems of Federal Government in operation ; one younger than our own, and two older than ours. We have one in Switzerland, from which, unhappily, we are not able to learn much, because of the great disparity between our system and that system. But we have one of long standing, right beside us, which every member of this House, in every day's reading of his paper is able in some degree to study. But when we look at the condition of affairs in the United States, unhappily we are not able to call to our aid their experience, for the very reason that there the Federal authorities have not the power of disallowance, and that they never had any such power. It is a curious historical fact that, in the formation of the constitution of the United States, a strong move was made, by some of the leading members of the then federalist party, to have this power of disallowance given to the President, the head of the Executive of the United States, but this proposition was over-ridden. Therefore, we have not the great advantage of the long experience of that country, in knowing how to deal with these questions, and we have to work them out for ourselves. Before I come to dwell upon the points of conflict, which are not many I think, and not very grave, between the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I may take occasion to glance at the conflict fought out years ago bearing upon this very question of disallowance, and the duty of the Executive in the matter, in which the hon. member for West Durham bore such a conspicuous and successful part. I refer to the controversy between Lord Carnarvon, then the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). when the question arose as to whether the exercise of the power of disallowance was to rest in the hands of the Governor General, as an Imperial officer, or whether it was to rest in the hands of the Governor General as the head of the Canadian Executive ; that is to say, whether the acts of the Governor General were to be on the responsibility of the Government of the day or not. Those who have read that memorable controversy, —and I take it for granted that most members of the House have read it—will remember that the English Minister took the ground that the Governor General could act independently of his Ministers, and that the hon. member took the ground and supported this largely by the text of the constitution, and by, I think, unanswerable arguments besides, that the Governor General must exercise that power in conformity with his Council. Some of us, last year, regretted, perhaps, that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) got the best of it in that memorable struggle. Some of us may have thought, last year, that it would be a happy relief out of the very difficult question we were called upon to meet, and some of us may think so to-night, when we have this question before us. Some of us may have a still stronger opinion ; when we hear, almost knocking at our doors, unfortunately, other and more troublesome and more dangerous questions coming from the Provinces, that the power of disallowance might better have been held to rest with the Imperial officers.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I do not say that is my opinion, but I say there are some who may maintain that opinion, and look to it as a means of relief from these difficult constitutional problems. But the practice is settled, and we have taken our position; all parties here following the rule that the Government must take the responsibility on themselves for dealing with the matter. I said a moment ago that the points of conflict between the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. Minister of Justice were not many, and were not very grave. The more important, as I followed the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, seemed to be these : He dissented from the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice that very much weight was to be given to the fact that, in the month of January, 1889, the Minister of Justice had reported that this Quebec Act, which we have discussed so much, was, in his opinion, *intra vires*. It was explained by the hon. member for West Durham that the constitution threw upon the Minister no such duty as that of allowing an Act, which is of course very true. It was explained by him that a Provincial Act, the moment it receives the assent of the Lieutenant Governor, is an operative law, and remains so until it is disallowed ; and until such disallowance is proclaimed in the *Gazette* of the Province, the effect of such disallowance is equivalent to the repeal of the Act by the Local Legislature itself. I did not understand the hon. Minister of Justice to say anything contradictory of that contention, or materially different from it ; but I did understand him to say that there could be no question that, under the British North America Act, the power of disallowance lay with the Ministry to act at any time within twelve months, and the reasons the hon. Minister gave, seemed to me to be strong reasons why it was desirable that the Minister should, at a reasonably early time, make up his mind what course he should advise his colleagues in the Government to take. On that question of policy, not of law, there seemed

to be a sharp difference of opinion between the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for West Durham. As I understand, the hon. member for West Durham thinks it impolitic to act at a very early day. His mind seems to incline to the opinion that it is better to wait until the twelve months are pretty well run out, from the time the Secretary of State has received the Act from the Lieutenant Governor, before the Ministry make up their minds what course to take. Now, it must occur, not only to the lawyers, but to the laymen of the House, that it is desirable, for many reasons, that, at as early a period as possible, the Ministry should make up their minds whether they will disallow the Act or not. For twelve months the Act is law, and into what uncertainty must the public mind be thrown by the danger that the head of the Act may be at any time knocked off? Who would invest money, or take any steps, if they were uncertain that the very law under which they were proceeding might not in four or five months be destroyed? I think public considerations of that kind would suggest that the Ministry should make up its mind at a comparatively early day. The point was also taken by the hon. member for West Durham, and it was the principal reason he gave in favor of withholding action until the twelve months are pretty well up, that Parliament might intervene, and might have something to say. I do not understand the hon. Minister of Justice in any sense to call in question the power of Parliament. It is one of the facts of our constitution, whether it is one of the theories or not, that the Ministry of the day is but a Committees of Parliament; they are recognised to be the simple servants of Parliament, who must obey its mandate; and if Parliament in April of last year had given a clear mandate in conflict with the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice, to be sure the hon. Minister and his colleagues would have had no course but to give effect to that mandate, or else to give up the seals of office. The hon. member supposes the case of Parliament having decreed the Act to be invalid. The answer is that if Parliament had given that decree, the Ministry must respect it or go out of office. But the Ministry understood the speeches and the vote of last year to indicate that the Act was a valid Act. I had the pleasure of hearing the whole or a part of every speech which was delivered in that debate by those lawyers who by common consent have taken a leading position in the House in respect to this class of questions, and if my memory is right, with the exception of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I did not hear one of those hon. gentlemen express a confident opinion that the Jesuits' Estates Act of the Province of Quebec was *ultra vires* of that Province. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) himself, if I followed his argument aright, rested his conclusions very much more largely on the question of policy than on the question of law. Now, there is one point more, and only one, to which I wish to call the attention of the House. The hon. member for West Durham has contrasted the action of the Ministry in the case of the New Brunswick School Act of 1872 and in the case of the McCarthy Act, so-called, of 1883, with their action in this matter. He said that in 1872 the Executive, which was then led by the present leader of the Government, held that the New Brunswick School Act was *intra vires* of the Legislature of New Brunswick—they had no doubt about it; that this Parliament also declared that that Act was *intra vires*—it had no doubt about it; and the Executive distinctly declined to disallow the Act, but advised its reference to high authorities, the law officers of the Crown or possibly the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, there being at that time no Supreme Court of Canada. The Liquor License Act of 1883 was also declared by the Executive and by Parliament to be, in their opinion, constitutional; but Parliament, in the same way, asked for a reference of that Act. These two cases may be sharply distinguished from the present case. In 1872 Parliament gave a distinct mandate that the Act in question should be referred; and in 1883 Parliament asked for a reference; but I did not understand that Parliament, in 1889, asked for a reference of the Jesuits' Estates Act to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The law officers of the Crown occupy a different position in relation to the Government; they are called upon to advise the Government, and there are innumerable instances of references to them. Although the hon. member for West Durham read a telegram and a letter to-night, in which he himself, having been necessarily absent from his place in the House, had expressed the view that Parliament should have taken the same course with regard to the question before it last year, it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman was not here to impress upon the House, with his accustomed ability and energy, his own views, which might have induced Parliament to have taken the course which he then advised.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that I was not in a position to speak if I had been here.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I did not know the hon. gentleman was disabled.

Mr. BLAKE. It is so, at any rate.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I can only say, in making that remark, that I am conscious of the very great assistance which the hon. gentleman has given this year, on two or three very grave questions, and I feel this—although he may not thank me for this compliment—that that hon. gentleman has contributed, to a degree that few men in this country have contributed, to the wise and admirable interpretation of our constitution.

Mr. TROW. I would just put a question to the hon. member for North Norfolk. It seems to me remarkable at this stage of the Session, after we have been sitting here nearly four months, that he should bring up this question which he seems to consider of vital importance. I would ask him the reason for this delay.

Mr. LAURIER. I can answer the question just put by my hon. friend, with the permission of the hon. member for North Norfolk. If that hon. gentleman did not bring the question before the House sooner it is at my own request. This question was one of such great importance that I asked him, in deference to my own wishes, if he insisted on bringing it up, to bring it up as late as possible; and I relieve him of any blame in that respect. I may say at once that I do not rise with the view of at all debating this question or of expressing my own personal opinion upon it. I do not presume to speak on this occasion in the

official capacity I hold in this House. Last year, when the disallowance resolution was brought before the House, it was not made, on either side, a party question, but every hon. member was allowed full liberty to vote upon it according to his best light and judgment, and on the present occasion I see no reason to depart from the course then adopted. I may say, however, that I deeply regret this motion has been brought up at all. I do not see that any good can be effected by it, and I believe this is the view taken by my hon. friend himself, because, if I understood him properly he said if it had not been for the taunts cast at him by a portion of the press, he would, on the whole, have preferred to leave it alone. As to the reasons which induced my hon. friend to take the course he has taken I have nothing to say ; but looking at the case from the point of view of the public, it seems to me that no good can be effected at all by bringing up this question again on the floor of Parliament. We have all to form our own opinion upon this matter ; and although I have listened carefully to the arguments in favor of blaming the Government for not having it referred to the courts, I can see no reason at all for agreeing in that opinion in any way. I cannot censure the Government upon the present occasion, though I have no spare love for them, and it would be rather a pleasure for me to censure them than otherwise. What is the reason adduced by my hon. friend for censuring the Government ? He did not allege any dereliction of duty on the part of the Government. He did not show that they violated any obligation resting upon them ; but, in his view, and that is his only reason for blaming the Government, the reference of the question to the courts would have pacified a portion of public opinion. That may be true. We all know there was a portion of public opinion excited throughout this country ; but we must take this fact into consideration, that if the reference to the courts would have quieted a portion of public opinion, it might have inflamed another portion. What is reason for one is not reason for the other. My hon. friend stated the reasons why the portion of public opinion to which he belongs is more or less incensed upon this question, and in support of them he referred to the old acts of persecution, which at one time disgraced the statutes of most European nations, the mother land included ; and he showed that the odium to which this law has been subjected, which was passed by the Legislature of Quebec in 1888, is largely due the feeling that still exists in regard to the Jesuit order. The same thing which inflamed public opinion in one part of the Confederation would have undoubtedly produced the opposite effect in another part ; and, on the whole, since it is admitted that the Province of Quebec acted within its own powers in passing that law, it seems to me the sooner the agitation ceases the better it will be for Confederation at large. If the Supreme Court were clothed with the powers suggested by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) yesterday, and which may be in a future day embodied in an Act of Parliament, I would not say that the reference would not have been effective, and that it would not have been wise perhaps to say to the Province of Quebec : Relinquish your rights and a part of your pretensions ; do something for the common good, and let us, if possible, quiet this agitation which has arisen. But the Supreme Court is not clothed with such power, and if it were not possible to compel the Quebec Government to be a party to referring the case to the Supreme Court, what would such a reference amount to ? It would not, if the Quebec Government refused to be a party to it, satisfy anybody. It seems to me the answer given by the hon. the Minister of Justice is conclusive upon this ground, that, at this moment, if there is any man in Canada who wants to test the constitutionality of the Act incorporating the Jesuits, the courts are open to him. The Attorney General can act of his own motion, but my hon. friend, who moved this motion, had forgotten that not only can the Attorney General act of his own motion, but he can be compelled to act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He can be forced to act.

Mr. LAURIER. He can be forced to act. The law provides :

"It is the duty of Her Majesty's Attorney General for Lower Canada to prosecute, in Her Majesty's name, such violations of the law whenever he has good reason to believe that such facts can be established by proof, in every case of public general interest ; but he is not bound to do so in any other case, unless sufficient security is given to indemnify the Government against all costs to be incurred upon such proceedings."

So that anybody can force the Attorney General to move in the matter, on giving security for the costs. The courts of the Province are open to him. and the Supreme Court, and possibly also the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. To me, this argument is conclusive, but it seems to me the Government have, in a measure, invited the action of my hon. friend. The reference to the law officers of the Crown, in my judgment, was an ill-timed movement, because it must have struck the Government that any such reference, in which the contentions of those who opposed the Act could not be heard, could not be satisfactory at all, and by making the reference, the Government created the impression that they were not sure of their own ground. At all events, whether they acted wisely or unwisely on that occasion, is not the question at this moment, and for my part, I cannot do otherwise than vote against the motion of my hon. friend. .

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any length, but there is an aspect of this question to which, with great diffidence, I would crave the attention of hon. members. The hon. member for North Norfolk has given us a reason why he has once again wantonly thrown this apple of discord on the table of the House, and his reason is the taunts of people outside these doors. Why, is it to be supposed, for one moment, that any hon. member, in the exercise of his duties in this House, is to listen to every *gobe mouche* outside these doors, and direct his course according to what some gabbler may say at a street corner ? In considering this resolution, I hold it is impossible to take the view of the hon. member for West Durham, that it is a very innocuous resolution which hardly amounts to a censure on the Government. He seemed to think that it was a very mild affair, but to my mind, looking at the wording of the resolution, there is over it the taint of hypocrisy,

and, if my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did not carry on his brow the stamp of ingenuousness, I could not fail to conclude that he also was tainted with hypocrisy. He tells us that the reason why he brought forward this resolution is the dissatisfaction which has been excited in the public mind. Who has caused the dissatisfaction in the public mind, and in what manner has it been created? It is a bad thing to have the public mind excited, especially if it is excited on the basis of senseless passions, but it is still worse when the stimulants applied to the public mind are ignorant and perhaps malicious. I will call the attention of the House for a moment to the position taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He appeared before us to-day as an historian. He quoted a pamphlet written by Mr. Hughes, and asked us why were the Jesuits expelled from France in 1804, from Naples in 1810, from Belgium in 1818, from Russia in 1820, from Spain in 1826, from France in 1845, from Bavaria in 1848, from Naples in 1848, from the Papal States in 1848, from the Austrian Empire in 1848, from Gallicia in 1848, from Sicily in 1848, from Paraguay in 1848, from the Italian States in 1859, and from Sicily in 1860? Nothing is more instructive than to bring the illumination of history to bear on the events of the present time. I remember that Lord Bolingbroke says that if a man desires to be a fruitful statesman, he should give his days and nights to the study of history. The great Arnold of Rugby says that a man who aspires to guide the destinies of his country, or even to be useful in her councils, should be a careful student of history; and, reading the other day some statements in regard to Bismarck—that great man, one of the greatest men who ever appeared on the stage of time—I learned that his favorite study was history. Thus we need not be surprised that an hon. gentleman like my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), who aims at high position, who aspires to put his hand upon the rudder, and, perhaps, to guide the Ship of State, appears, also, in the light of an historian. But those great men, my Lord Bolingbroke and Dr. Arnold, say that the way to make history useful is to find out the crises in history which would correspond with the crisis in your own country, and that you must note the measures which were successful at a given time and under given circumstances, and, if the circumstances in your own country are alike, you have a lesson by which to be guided. But how does the hon. gentleman deal out history to us? He flings barren dates to us. I might ask him a few questions about his dates. Does he know—and I will pause for a reply—does he know the circumstances existing at the time in any one of these countries from which the Jesuits were expelled? I will ask the attention of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), if he can tear himself away from the dulcet tones of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). He has mentioned to us the cases of about a dozen countries whence the Jesuits were expelled. Does he know the conditions under which they were expelled? Does he know whether, where there was an insurrection, it was the insurrectionary Government or the Government which the people rose against that expelled them? Has he examined the question? Does he know anything about it? I have no objection to sit down for a moment if the hon. member will tell us the circumstances.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to explain to us the circumstances under which they were expelled? I venture to say that the hon. gentleman knows nothing about the matter himself.

Mr. DAVIN. That is no answer. I did not being forward these cases. I may be a very ignorant person, and I would be willing to learn from a superior man such as my hon. friend; but I will go over the circumstances, and I will say that it is very extraordinary that, in many of these cases set out in this pamphlet—the Jesuits were expelled for meddling with such tyrants as have rarely existed in the history of mankind.

Mr. CHARLTON. What particular cases?

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. gentleman might keep quiet after he has declined to give the House the information I asked for; but with the sufferance of the House, I will go over the cases referred to by him for his information, and it may not be uninteresting. He says the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1804. By whom were they expelled? Does the hon. gentleman know? They were expelled by Napoleon, who had destroyed the liberties of France and who was at that time the Apollyon of Europe. A year before Napoleon had wantonly declared war against England, and, if the Jesuits were his enemies and were expelled by him, with whom were they asociated? They were associated with some of the best men the world ever saw; they were associated with the Connaught Rangers, who came from the North of Ireland; they were associated with the sons and the fathers of Orangemen who went into battle to the tune of the "Protestant Boys." So, if the Jesuits were expelled from France, they were in company with those whom my hon. friend, in his zeal for Protestantism, in his desire to destroy everything which is not in accord with his own cult, has associated himself with, and therefore he should not be angry with the Jesuits. In 1810, the Jesuits were expelled from Naples. Does the hon. gentleman know who expelled the Jesuits from Naples? They were expelled by an usurper. They were expelled by Murat, and it was very natural, if they were Neapolitans, that they, and many others with them, should show themselves hostile to the Government and for reasons which, if the hon. gentleman enquired into the circumstances, he might approve. Again he tells us they were expelled from Naples in 1848. But who was on the throne at that time? It was Ferdinand, a tyrant so base and so cruel that even misfortunes could not soften his disposition. Does the hon. gentleman know, in his zeal against the Jesuits, that he is drawing himself shoulder to shoulder with King Bomba? I think henceforth we must call him the King Bomba of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The King Bombast.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman shows us that he has an epic knowledge of history, and therefore he must be aware that the state of the people in the prisons of Naples at that time wrung tears from all Europe. In that very year he butchered his own people in the streets of Naples, and that city, surrounded by all that is beautiful

in sky, and sea, and air—to the use language of an historian of Italy—he made a very earthly hell by his crimes against liberty and toleration, aye, and against Protestants as well as Jesuits. In 1820, who ruled in Russia?—because in 1820 the Jesuits were expelled from Russia. I think they must have done something dreadfully wrong. Had Alexander I good reasons for sending the nobles and burghers into exile in Siberia? If the Jesuits were expelled in 1820 from Russia, they were expelled in the company of the noblest men that ever Russia produced. Then the hon. gentleman comes to Spain, in 1826. My hon. friend's soul is stirred that the Jesuits were expelled from Spain in 1826. The fact that they were expelled proves, of course, that Ferdinand VII had good reason to expel them. They must have done something very wrong. The despotism of Ferdinand VII became a by-word. Liberals were executed for the profession of Liberalism, so that my hon. friend, if he had been there, would have had the glory of martyrdom. He is a large souled Liberal, though I sometimes think when I hear him argue, that I could find a very small hazel nut in which his soul would find infinite room to wobble. The Bible was proscribed by Ferdinand VII—my hon. friend professes to love the Bible—so that if the Jesuits were proscribed they were proscribed in company with the Bible. To read it was dangerous, to preach it was death, and the Jesuits were happy in being only expelled and not slaughtered. Then take the Papal States. It is a curious thing, it shows what charming inconsistencies there are in human nature—the fact that the Papal States expelled the Jesuits seems a terrible thing against that body. The bare mention of the Pope in this Bill, although in a way which has often led me to say to Orangemen who have spoken to me about it, that if Mercier had entrapped me into the position in which he has entrapped the Pope in the extraordinary introduction to this Bill, I would have excommunicated him for all time to come; because he has got the Pope into this Bill not even with the dignity of an arbiter; he is brought in as a mere seal, to secure Mr. Mercier against any afterclap, and in effect to enable him to secure that the bargain in his Bill would close up the mouths of certain parties, namely, the Jesuits, forever, as far as this property was concerned—well, the mere mention of the Pope's name in this way has quite excited the hon. gentlemen. My hon. friend sees red at the sight of the word "Pope." Pope disagrees with him. I notice that he is not at best a very ruddy gentleman, but if the word "Pope" is frequently mentioned in this House, I notice that a greener pallor spreads across that brow.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is one over your brow now. How does it agree with the Minister of Customs?

Mr. DAVIN. There is no pallor across your brow. Your face is red by nature, not unassisted by art. In 1848 there was an insurrection, and the Pope fled. The Jesuits did not like this. What sort of men would they be if they did like it? They are members of his church. Do you suppose they would be worthy the name of men at all if they had not felt disappointed, and angry, and ready to be aggressive, because the Pope had to fly? That they were expelled would not necessarily imply much discredit on their part. Then as to the Austrian Empire in 1848. In March of that year there was an insurrection in Vienna, and, if I remember rightly, in Milan, in Venice and Sardinia. In the summer the Emperor fled to Inspruck, and the Archduke John took charge. Will the hon. gentleman tell me now, whether the Jesuits were expelled by the Government of the Empire, or by the Archduke John, or by the insurrectionary Government that was ultimately set up? Because, Sir, if the hon. gentleman has come here to-day and taken from a pamphlet these dates and flung them down on the Table and asked men who are representing Canada to draw the ignorant inference that he drew from them, that because the Jesuits were expelled by these tyrannical Governments they must have done something dreadfully wrong—if he has done that he is not worthy of attention at any future time in this Parliament. Now, he speaks of Gallicia. In 1848, the Jesuits were expelled from Gallicia. Well, I have a right to know which Gallicia. Will the hon. gentleman tell me which Gallicia? He is like one of the dumb dogs of Jupiter that cannot bark. There is a Gallicia in Spain, and there is a Gallicia in Poland. We will suppose, because it is much more likely, that he means Gallicia in Poland. Who expelled them? There was only one power that could expel them, in 1848, from Poland, and that was the most tyrannical emperor that ever sat on the throne of St. Petersburg, the tyrant Nicholas. I wish he had not borne that name. In Sardinia, in 1848, again they were expelled. Now, why were they expelled from Sardinia in 1848? They might not have been very desirable guests; but where is the analogy between their condition and ours? That was a critical time for Sardinia. Cavour, one of the greatest journalists and statesmen of Europe, had just started the *Revival* newspaper. The King had just granted a constitution and definitely espoused the cause of Italian regeneration against Austria, and that great work was commenced which, some years afterwards, was to receive a glorious consummation, when, with the sword for his talisman and liberty for his spell-word, Garibaldi was to chase, by the mere magic of his name, everything that darkened the prospects of Italy. Now, what analogy was there between that revolutionary state of things and a constitutional country such as ours, with liberty safe-guarded, such a country, I believe, for freedom as does not exist anywhere else in the world? What analogy is there between disturbed states like those, and a country like this? Yet the hon. gentleman comes here and flings down his barren dates. Now, in 1860, again, Garibaldi expelled the Jesuits from Sicily, and why did he expel them? He had made himself dictator; he defeated the royal troops at Calatafimi; he stormed Palermo; he won Melazzo; gave Sicily a new constitution, and in such a state of things the expulsion of the Jesuits may have been a necessity. It might be necessary under certain circumstances, even to expel the Knights of Labor; it might be necessary to expel any body of men in certain critical circumstances of the state, who were likely to menace the object that statesmen, having charge of it, have in view. But what analogy can there be between such a state of things and the state of things in Canada? Now, we were laughing a moment ago; but I think it is a great crime for a man occupying the high posi-

tion of member of Parliament to go through the country and, without ever enquiring into the circumstances in which these expulsions took place, to hold them up to ignorant mobs, ignorant multitudes and ignorant men—good hearted men, noble men in their way, but still not having sufficient time to test these things. He goes and reads out that they were expelled here, they were expelled there, they were expelled elsewhere, and he leads people to infer that they are a danger to every state, whereas in many cases they were expelled by despotic governments. We know very well that in the history of the world there have been men who would exercise tyrannical power themselves, but would not allow any one else to be tyrannical to the people; and the Jesuits, as the history of Europe shows, have at times interfered on the side of popular liberty against the tyrannical conduct of tyrannical men. I am not justifying the manner in all cases of their interference; but as a fact they have so interfered. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), I hope, does not mean to deceive the people, but I say that if he is aware of the misrepresentation, he is guilty of a very great crime and very great misdemeanor. I will ask the House to bear with me a few moments, because the hon. gentleman questioned the character of the Jesuits Act. The hon. gentleman is a Protestant, and I am a Protestant, and if the hon. gentleman has a right, or thinks he has a right, to sympathise with the men who are most alarmed by the cry of Jesuit, it must be remembered that I am an Irish Protestant, and hon. gentlemen well know that Irishmen feel strongly on most subjects, and especially on religion. If I had been in Mr. Mercier's place I would have been glad to have made the arrangement he effected. It was a good arrangement. Here was a property on which a cloud was cast which reduced its salable value by 50 per cent.. I know they had no right to cast a cloud upon it. What did Mr. Mercier say? I will read his words, because they have not been read by the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and have not been read by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but I will read them to-night, and I say I have reason in the interests of the people of Canada to complain that when this Act has been flaunted in the popular face, those parts of it that would have shown its true character have been kept back and only those parts thrust forward that were calculated to inflame passions. We will suppose I meet an Orangeman in my constituency, who approaches me and says: "Well, we did not think you would do that." "What have I done?" I reply. "Voted for that Jesuit Bill," he says. "Have you read the Act," I ask. He replies "No." I then say: "If you would like to read it, sit down and we will read it together." I then point out the various points and show that a cloud had been cast on that property, as Mr. Mercier says in his letter dated Rome, 17th February, 1888. I start out by saying that the Jesuits had no right whatever to that property. But here were eminent persons capable of casting a cloud on its title so as to affect it as a marketable commodity; the Province wants to sell it, and to remove that cloud. Now, what would a practical man do, under the circumstances, but ask himself how to get rid of that cloud? He would not balance metaphysical niceties as to right or wrong, and say the church has no real right to so act; he would not even care about building up an idea as to moral right as Mr. Mercier and others have done; but he would endeavor to make the best bargain possible in the interests of the Province. Mr. Mercier did so, and he said to the church: "Take off this cloud and I will give you $400,000." The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated on platform after platform, and has stated in this House, and my hon. and learned friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), than whom there is no one in Canada of whom I have a higher opinion, has stated—and I do not know how it has happened that he has failed to see the matter as I see it—that the Pope was brought into the transaction as a sovereign. That is one of the charges brought against the Act. Here is what Cardinal Simeoni says:

"The Pope allows the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' Estates as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See."

There is the condition. What would happen if he were a sovereign prince? As a sovereign prince he is *ex vi termini* sovereign and controls. He, however, lays down what he wants to be done. Look at Mr. Mercier's answer:

"In the matter of the Jesuits' Estates, the Government respectfully object to the condition imposed in the letter of Your Eminence of the first of March instant, and cannot expect to succeed in the settlement of this delicate question unless permission is given to sell the property upon the conditions and in accordance with the exact terms of my letter of the seventeenth of February last."

Why could he not expect to succeed? Because, as he makes plain in his letters and plain in the Act, the sovereign power was Her Majesty and the Legislature of the Province. Nothing could be more peremptory than the language of Mr. Mercier. Is that language you would address to a sovereign prince? No. What happens? Does the Pope say then: I will wave my crosier over you and you will disappear? Does he put them under a ban and send them into nothingness? Does he inflict pains and penalties as a sovereign prince might do? Not at all. He at once comes to Mr. Mercier's terms. We read:

"The Pope allows the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estate as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See."

Some orators have made a point with respect to the words "the sanction of the Holy See." But that language is necessary, because if the property was not disposed of with that sanction, how would Mr. Mercier know that further claims would not be set up and the cloud again raised over the property lowering its salable value fifty per cent.? In the letter addressed to the reverend gentleman who was authorised to deal with him, Mr. Mercier says:

"That in consenting to treat with you respecting this property the Government does not recognise any civil obligation."

Could anything be more distinct? He goes on to say in paragraph 7:

"That any agreement made between you and the Government of the Province will be binding, only in so far as it shall be ratified by the Pope and the Legislature of this Province."

His object is clear, to make certain that the cloud should be finally taken off. Further, in paragraph 8, it is stated:

"That the amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in the possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit, until the Pope has ratified the said settlement and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country."

And in paragraph 9 :

"Finally that the statute ratifying such agreement shall contain a clause enacting that when such settlement is arrived at the Protestant minority will receive a grant in proportion to its population in favor of its educational works."

Mr. Mercier deals with a sovereign prince, who is at the head of an infallible church, who believes all Protestants to be heretics, and yet one of the conditions he lays down to this sovereign prince is that a certain sum shall be given to support the Protestants, the assistance of whom, of course, must be exceedingly wrong! The answer of the Rev. Mr. Turgeon emphasises this point. He says in regard to clause 9 :

"As this clause does not touch the question in which I am interested to treat with the Government I wish you would dispense with my replying thereto."

Could anything more emphasise the almost high-handed manner in which Mr. Mercier dealt with this question. The Rev. Mr. Turgeon claims that two million dollars are due to the Jesuits; but Mr. Mercier disposes of that at once, and he says in effect, in his letter of the 4th June, 1888 : If you don't take the $400,000 you will get nothing. Then, when we come to the Act what do we read ?

"Whereas it is expedient to put an end to the uneasiness which exists in this Province, in connection with the question of the Jesuits' Estates, by settling it in a definite manner : Therefore Her Majesty, by and with advice and consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts as follows :—"

It is not the Pope whose name is brought in, but "Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts," and in the sixth section of the Bill we read :

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council hereby is authorised to dispose, in the manner he deems most advantageous to the Province, of the whole of the property, movable and immovable, interests and rights, generally whatsoever of the Province upon the said property known as the Jesuits' Estates."

I have no doubt that Mr. Mercier will find this a good bargain for the Province, and I have no doubt that the payment of that $400,000 will be found very advantageous to take away that cloud which rested on the property, and which, however groundlessly cast upon it, would have lowered its salable value by a ruinous percentage. As I used to say to some persons who discussed this question with me, in my part of the country : Suppose you had 160 acres of valuable land, and that there was a squatter on it, and the squatter thought he had some rights, although he really might have none, but he could give you some trouble, would you not give him $50 to get him out quietly. They always understood that argument at once. I have not spoken to a single man in this way, Orangeman or other, who did not feel that the manner in which the gentlemen on the other side have presented this question throughout the country was deceptive and misleading, and I will say that it seems to me almost wicked. One of the reasons for which the hon. gentleman condemns the Jesuits is, that they being professed ecclesiastics aim at some political power. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself stands self-convicted of the most sinister offence that is rightly or wrongly attributed to the Jesuit body. He makes in this Parliament a speech which admittedly could have no practical, no political end whatever ; which will be scattered broadcast throughout the country, and which is capable of arousing the passions of the people. For what purpose does he do so ? It is for the purpose of gaining political influence, for the purpose of gaining power, and to swell his own importance. What is that, Sir, but playing a Jesuitical part ? It is more than playing a Jesuitical part, because so far as my reading goes, I have never found a single case in history, where in so barefaced a manner, men openly declared that they were playing a part for an unworthy end, and not even assuming the appearance of virtue, whether they had it or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred in his speech to "Him whose Kingdom was not of this world." I believe, Sir, the hon. gentleman is a professed follower of Him whose Kingdom was not of this world. I believe he is a professed follower of Him who has left us teachings which so far as my reading goes—and it runs in a sort of way I suppose, over five or six literatures—there is nothing, in this wide world, that has been written from the birth of time, to compare with these writings. And what, Sir, is the cardinal doctrine of it all ? It is charity ; love to your neighbor, pity for mankind, kindness, making people love each other, and you loving your brother. That is the doctrine which runs through the teachings of Him whose Kingdom was not of this world. But here is a gentleman who makes professions which I would not presume to make, and yet, Sir, though he makes these professions, I would cut my right hand off, before I would take part in an agitation as he has done, so calculated to set man against man, and to raise up among our people, malignant, malicious, foolish, damaging and dangerous passions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not intend to delay the House more than for a few minutes at this late period of the Session and at this late hour of the evening, in dealing with a question which was so fully discussed last year, and which has been discussed in the press from that time until Parliament has met again this season. I must say at the outset, that I have no doubt whatever in my mind, of the propriety of the vote I gave last year, and I do not propose this evening to give a vote that will cast any doubt upon the position I then took. In my opinion, the conclusion arrived at by the vast majority of the House last year, was a proper conclusion. It was a conclusion warranted by the law, and by the facts, and I am not prepared in the smallest degree to retire from the position I then took. That being the case, I will support the position taken by the leader of the Opposition. I do not feel that there was any necessity for a reference to the Supreme Court under the circumstances, and I do not feel disposed to vote for a motion censuring the Government for, or expressing any regret because an Act was not done which in my opinion was altogether an Act of supererogation. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the motion which he put upon the Notice paper, and which is somewhat different from the one he has moved this afternoon, as a reason for the course which he asked the House to take last year, and which he now wishes the House to express regret for not having taken, declares

that it was desirable to obtain from the Supreme Court after an argument a judgment upon the subject. Now, Mr. Speaker, the action which the House took a day or two ago, shows that no such thing could have been accomplished, and that we were quite unable to obtain from the Supreme Court a judgment upon this case, and that if the Supreme Court were appealed to, it would have had to give its opinion without assigning any reason for arriving at the conclusion at which it arrived, and it would have been in no respect a judgment that would have been binding upon anybody, after that opinion had been expressed. There are, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) says, three bodies which might have been consulted, namely, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the law officers of the Crown. Now, the law officers of the Crown were consulted, and in their opinion they entirely concurred with the views entertained by the majority of this House. I know no reason for attaching more importance to an opinion of the Supreme Court, given without argument and without a case being presented, than to the opinion expressed by the law officers of the Crown. They are all eminent gentlemen. There is no doubt that their judgment is more advantageous to have than their opinion, but in the Act under which the hon. gentleman asks a reference to the Supreme Court, he would have merely got a bald opinion which would have been in no way more satisfactory than the opinion expressed by the law officers of the Crown. So that I am not disposed to censure the Administration, because of the three tribunals they have consulted the one which was most likely to give an opinion with the greatest expedition instead of some other one that would, perhaps, have refused to give an opinion at all. There is in my opinion no reason for supposing that if the Bill had been sent to the Secretary of State for the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that they would have done anything different from what they did in December, 1872. On that occasion, referring to the fact that the question of the New Brunswick School Law might come before them as a court of appeal, they said :

"This being the fact, His Lordship is of opinion that Her Majesty cannot with propriety be advised to refer to a Committee of Council in England a question which Her Majesty in Council has at present no authority to determine, and on which the opinion of the Privy Council would not be binding on the parties in the Dominion of Canada."

Nobody would have been bound by that opinion if it had been obtained, or by the opinion of the Supreme Court if it had been obtained, any more than they are bound by the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. And that being the case, it does seem to me that it would have been a wholly unnecessary proceeding and one which would not have in the smallest degree changed the opinion of any one on the question at the present time. Therefore, I say again, I am not prepared to cast doubt on the conclusion at which I came in my own mind and at which the vast majority of this House came, by reflecting on the course that has been taken. The hon. gentleman who has made the motion has after all attached very great importance to the question itself. In discussing it he has referred, as he did last year, to the statute of Roman Catholic Emancipation to show the disabling provisions of that statute. The hon. gentleman seemed altogether to overlook the fact that the disabilities created by that statute extended not simply to the Jesuits, but to every community of the Roman Catholic Church ; the Jesuits do not stand in a different position with regard to it from any other community. Then, I do not understand what particular object the hon. gentleman had in view in referring to those disabilities. The penal laws of England have never been recognised as extending to the colonies, except in cases where there was an established church. The penal laws against the Roman Catholic and various Protestant dissenting bodies were in the supposed interest of the established church, and where there was no established church, as Lord Mansfield said, the penal laws could not apply ; and so it has been held over and over again ; and there has been no special legislation imposing these disabilities. The hon. gentleman said that the Jesuits had no right or interest in these estates. That is a wholly erroneous statement. The Jesuits were an incorporated body, incorporated by a statute of the King of France one hundred years before the conquest. When the King of England acceded to the territories on this continent, he acceded to them by conquest limited by the articles of capitulation ; and those articles of capitulation conceded to the various religious communities in this country, the Jesuits among the number, the estates which they possessed. The House and the country, I believe, have been misled by an erroneous opinion given by Solicitor General Wedderburn, which was quoted by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last year, and by every speaker in the House who voted for the disallowance of the Act. That opinion contained the statement that those articles of capitulation were only temporary, and had force only until the treaty was agreed upon between England and France ; and that, as no provision was made regarding those various religious communities in that treaty, it was open to the Crown to do as it pleased with those estates. That opinion, however, was not shared in by the Attorney-General at the time, Lord Thurlow, who held that the king had acquired only the interest which had previously been held by the Crown of France, and that the various interests in the country were secured by the articles of capitulation against the conqueror. This difference of opinion has led to a great deal of confusion. The question came before the Court of King's Bench in England in the case of Campbell *vs.* Hall, and was very elaborately argued on four separate occasions by eminent counsel ; and the decision of Lord Mansfield was that the articles of capitulation were as permanent in their nature and as binding on the Crown as the articles of the treaty itself. It is also laid down in the judgment that the Crown could not acquire private property except during the progress of the war ; and if the Crown did not succeed to the property as an act of war and during the continuance of the war, it could not succeed to it at all. In that judgment Lord Mansfield said that the moment the conquest was completed, the parties who were before aliens and enemies became subjects of the new sovereign, and were entitled to the same protection of life and property as if they had been born subjects of His Majesty. And so, under that rule, the King of England be-

came the sovereign of Canada, and his rights as a conqueror were limited not only by the superior authority of Parliament, but by the articles of capitulation into which the King had through his officers entered. That rule is recognised by the Judicial Committee in the case of Cameron *vs.* Kyte, and in two other cases it was recognised by the Secretary of State. When the Secretary of State was framing the charter of Government for the Island of Mauritius, which was a conquest, he consulted the law officers of the Crown with reference to the provisions of that charter, asking them to examine it to see whether there were any provisions in it inconsistent with the articles of capitulation. The same rule is laid down, and the same advice sought, in the case of the charter of government for the colony of Berbice. So you have in the opinions expressed by the law officers of the Crown, by the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, and by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that the articles of capitulation by which a Government enters into possession of a conquered territory are as permanent and binding on it as the provisions of the treaty itself. Then all we have to do is to consider what the rights of the Jesuits were under the articles of capitulation. Now, the Crown could not succeed by right of conquest. That was impossible. The articles of capitulation, after the conquest, show what the rights of the various parties were. That being the case, the only way that the Crown could pretend to succeed to these properties was by escheat. The Crown issued instructions to the Governor that no new members were to be permitted to be added to the Order of the Jesuits. I maintain that the Crown, having lost its rights as a conqueror, and having only those rights which belong to it as a part of the Imperial Parliament, could no more issue such a mandate to the Jesuit body in Canada than it could issue to the Presbyterian church or to the Methodist church, an order that they should not ordain a new elder or deacon. It was in the power of Parliament to say, by Act of Parliament, that these estates should be taken away, but it could not be done otherwise. But the Jesuit body of Canada submitted to the action of the Crown, the last Jesuit expired, and the estates went into the possession of the Crown, but as I understand, however, by the law of Quebec the Crown could not succeed, because, under the Customs of Paris, the Crown had recognised so much of the canon law as related to church property, and church property escheats not to the Crown, but to the bishop of the diocese within which the property is situated. How did the Crown protect its assumed rights? The hon. member for North Norfolk asks why the Jesuit Order or the Catholic Church did not interfere and obtain possession by judicial process of this property. Why? Because the Legislature of Quebec, by a declaratory Act, made this the property of the Crown, and so the rights of either the church or the community are from that time forward simply moral rights. The legal right had disappeared. If the Legislature of Ontario choose to-morrow to declare that all the property on Sparks street should be vested in the Crown, the property holders could not maintain their rights in the courts, if that Act were allowed to go into operation. An Act was passed in 1832 declaring these estates to be the property of the Crown. Was it in the power of the church to set up against such a legislative proceeding the rights they previously had, and which were taken from them without any compensation? They did the only thing in their power, and that was to resist any attempt of the Crown to dispose of these properties, by making protest whenever the attempt was made, and that resistance was successful and the Legislature of Quebec was compelled to come to an understanding with the ecclesiastical bodies which made claim to this property. It was only in that way they could obtain free control and dispose of this property to advantage in the market. That is their business not ours. I say if there is anything in the jurisdiction of a Provincial Government which can be held beyond all question to be under the absolute control of the Local Legislatures it is what they should do with their own money. They may make a wise or an unwise use of it, that is their business, and the Government are responsible to the Local Legislature for that, and ultimately to the electorate of the Province. That is no reason why we should interfere. The hon. member said the Government should have disallowed this Act on grounds of public policy. Well, as I understand English practice and our system of responsible government, the Government of this Dominion can have no policy on a question over which they can have no jurisdiction. There must be either legislative authority or administrative authority. If you can show that any Act of a Local Legislature interferes with the legislative authority of the Dominion, you may pronounce it *ultra vires;* if you can show that it interferes with any administrative right of this Dominion, so that the Dominion Government cannot efficiently carry out the policy it has a right to adopt, you can disallow the Act as interfering with the paramount authority of the Dominion. But I know of no other ground. If the measure is unwise and improper, that is a question for the Local Legislature to decide, and with which we have nothing to do. Why should the Local Government appeal to the country and adopt a public policy if the Government of this Dominion interfere with them at any moment and frustrate that policy, by undertaking to disallow their Acts? Of course the power of disallowance is, in form of law, unlimited, but by the conventions of the constitution it is clearly a limited power; it has to be carried out and exercised in accordance with those well-understood principles which will leave the Local Governments free to adopt that policy which they consider best in the interest of the Province. If that be so, it is clear that the hon. gentleman is asking this House to take a course wholly at variance with the interests of the Provinces. We have maintained the principle of local self-government in the Provinces, not because we were upholding local sovereignty as against the sovereignty of the Dominion, but because we say that in the sphere of exclusive jurisdiction assigned to it the Local Legislature is as sovereign as is the Imperial Parliament itself, and so the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have decided. Let me take a case here. Many of us were of opinion that the appropriation of public moneys to the Province of Nova Scotia, beyond the sum fixed by the constitution was an unconstitutional proceeding. There was no doubt in my mind upon that, but the law officers of the Crown

were of the opinion that we had the power; and upon what theory can that opinion be upheld? Upon this, that being a sovereign legislature we could do what we pleased with our own money; we could apply it to any legislative purpose we pleased or give it away if we thought proper; and the Local Legislature, being sovereign in its own jurisdiction, having control of its own funds, can apply those funds as it sees proper, and to rule otherwise would be wholly inconsistent with the doctrine laid down in the case of the Queen against Hodge. I am not going to detain the House at this late hour by going over the question, which has been pretty well threshed before, but I see no reason for expressing any regret with regard to this matter. I believe I am right, I believe the majority are right in the conclusion it came to last year, and I am prepared to thresh this question out before the proper tribunal, and that is on the public platform before the people of this country.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I intend to say but a few words on this question, and I would not trouble the House at all only that I do not care to give a silent vote on the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I think that the question which was put to that hon. gentleman by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) was a very pertinent one. The hon. gentleman had the opportunity last year, although he declared subsequently, after the prorogation of Parliament, upon more than one occasion, that he was prevented from submitting a resolution he had prepared, declaring it expedient that the Jesuits' Estates Act should be submitted to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council for their opinion. I say he had the opportunity of presenting that to the House last Session if he had chosen to avail himself of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman in this matter. I submitted to the First Minister of the Crown a copy of a motion which I proposed to make. That motion was put in the hon. gentleman's hands on the 28th April, and I attempted to move it on the 30th April. I had received from the Speaker the assurance that an opportunity would be given me to make a motion when the House next went into Committee of Supply, but I was prevented from making that motion. It is upon the records of the House, and it now appears from the speech of the hon. member for West Durham, that two days before I put that motion in the hands of the First Minister, he had received a letter from the hon. member from West Durham suggesting that this very course should be taken. I had proposed to make this motion earlier, and for reasons which it is not proper to explain here, but which led me to believe the Government intended to take this course, I deferred making the motion. I attempted to move it in good faith, but I was juggled out of the opportunity to move it, as the First Minister knows. Here is the motion, a copy of which I put in the hands of the First Minister:

"That, in view of doubts which have been expressed by many leading constitutional authorities as to the constitutionality of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, entitled 'An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates,' this House is of opinion that the Government of Canada should without delay obtain the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or other competent courts of jurisdiction, as to the constitutionality of the said Act."

The hon. gentleman was aware two days before that I intended to make that motion. As a matter of courtesy, I put a copy of the motion in his hand, which gave him that opportunity to arrange to defeat my purpose, and yet I have been accused in the country, as to-night I have been accused by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), of not acting honestly in the matter.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It is not quite proper that the hon. gentleman, when he rises to make an explanation, should make a speech in regard to the subject. What I alleged was that there was an opportunity after the one to which the hon. gentleman alludes for him to present the motion he has read to the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is not so.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am aware that the hon. gentleman has, during the recess, made the same statement that he has to-night with the view of damaging the Government. I have no right to call in question the mode the hon. gentleman chooses to adopt in bringing this motion before the House, but he must take all the consequences of the course he has chosen to adopt. He has chosen to propose this resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply and, having done so, he must, of course, expect that those of us who usually act with the Government will not be disposed to vote for that motion as we might have done if it had been presented to the House in a different form. Those who are laymen, like myself, and are desirous to bring an intelligent judgment to bear on questions in regard to which—as I confess in my own case—we are unacquainted with the subtleties of constitutional law, must listen to the arguments of the legal luminaries on both sides in regard to such questions as that which was submitted to Parliament last Session. I then listened to all the arguments on the question which was brought up by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and, with all deference to the legal attainments of my hon. friend the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and those who argued with him, I confess that I thought the balance of the argument was in favor of the constitutionality of the Jesuits' Estates Act. I was brought to that conclusion reluctantly. I would have been better pleased to have been able to come to a different conclusion, but I deemed it right to give effect to the judgment I arrived at after hearing the arguments on both sides of the question. Notwithstanding that I was forced to the conclusion that the Act was constitutional, I thought, and I gave expression to the opinion on a subsequent occasion, that it would have been well if a legal opinion had been obtained as to its constitutionality from some tribunal outside of this House. I stated that on the occasion when the petition presented to the Government by Mr. Hugh Graham was discussed. I agree, however, with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that there is no reason why the expression of opinion by the law officers of the Crown as to the constitutionality of the Act should not have as much weight and as great a tendency to allay the excitement which has prevailed in certain portions of the community as a deliverance of the Supreme Court. Taking all these things into consideration and believing that no good would be accomplished by pass-

ing this resolution now—I do not attribute any improper motives to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); we know his zeal in promoting the cause which he, in common with some other gentlemen have undertaken to promote, and I know his desire, and a laudable desire it is from his point of view, to embarrass the Government—believing that no good object can be accomplished by passing this resolution, I shall therefore have to vote against it.

Mr. CASEY. One must regret that this matter should be again pressed upon our attention and must also regret the manner in which it has been discussed by the hon. gentleman who has brought it before the House. Instead of merely discussing the question whether the constitutionality of this Act should be referred to the Supreme Court or not, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) discussed at great length the merits of the Jesuits' Estates Act itself and the question whether it should have been disallowed or not. In fact, he re-opened the question we decided last year. I do not think the questions as to the merits of the Act or its constitutionality are matters for discussion just now. It is an *ex post facto* discussion which can do no good. It can only tend to maintain the agitation which has taken such a form in this country as to seriously endanger the relations between the two great races which inhabit it. However, when this question is forced upon our notice, we have to decide what action shall be taken thereupon. In the first place, I cannot avoid calling attention to the inconsistency of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or any other member of the fraternity who call themselves "the noble Thirteen," in moving or suggesting any reference to the Supreme Court or to any other tribunal in regard to this question. A year ago, these gentlemen urged upon the House in the strongest possible language that, without going outside of the walls of this chamber, we should decide that this Act should be disallowed. Immediately after, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposed to move a resolution similar to the present one, and now, after all possibility of disallowance is passed, he brings it up again. In the first place he supported a resolution that the Act should be disallowed without reference to any body for a legal opinion on its constitutionality. Now he proposes the motion which he had not a chance of moving last year, that it should, before being either allowed or disallowed, have been referred to the Supreme Court for an opinion upon its constitutionality. I do not think that arguments in favor of this resolution, coming from a gentleman who has shown himself so inconsistent in regard to this matter, can have great weight. Still, I cannot say that there are no arguments in favor of this resolution, or that it should not be considered on its merits, and I propose to consider the question upon its own merits apart from the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman who moved it. But I cannot proceed to do so without expressing on this first opportunity I have had to do so before the House, my total disapprobation and reprobation, in fact—if that be not an unparliamentary word—of the manner in which what is called the Equal Rights agitation has been carried on throughout Ontario. I would not be speaking honestly or conscientiously if I did not do so. I have not the slightest sympathy with the statements made by the promoters of this agitation in regard to our Catholic fellow-citizens, whether they be of French or English speaking nationalities. I would not have it supposed for a moment that I believe this country is at present suffering under ecclesiastical tyranny, or that there is any real reason for imagining that the Roman Catholic Church or any other church has usurped the power to control the Government of this country, or the members of this Legislature. I specially protest against the assumption so freely made by the gentlemen composing the noble Thirteen, and by none more freely or more offensively than by the hon. gentleman who proposed this resolution, that those who differed from him on that vote of last Session were not actuated by honest motives. I say that the noble 188 have just as much right to be proud of their vote on that question, just as much right to claim that they acted honestly and in accordance with their convictions, as the noble Thirteen. I do not admit that the fact of those gentlemen being in a small minority gives them any right to claim superior morality or superior patriotism to those possessed by the other members of this House. Now, on the other hand, I may say, and it may as well be said here, and perhaps better here than elsewhere, that there has been too much of that sort of influence in this agitation which, if it had been exerted by clergymen of the Catholic Church, would have been denounced by many Protestant people of Ontario as Jesuitism. When a Protestant speaks of Jesuitism in the bad and derogatory sense, he means to imply that the clergyman whom he denounces as Jesuitical, has used his clerical position, his ecclesiastical influence and the influence of the church to which he belongs, to compel members of his church to vote in accordance with his views, that he has used his influence for political purposes. Now, I say that any clergymen, no matter to what Protestant denomination he belongs who uses clerical influence, uses pulpit influence, uses the strong influence arising from his ecclesiastical position, to induce, or compel, or overinfluence members of his flock to change their votes on any question, is guilty of Jesuitism in the same sense in which it is attributed by Protestants to members of the Society of Jesus. I have as much objection to being dictated to by a Protestant Jesuit as by one who belongs to the regular order of that name. We cannot forget that this Canada of ours is not in any exclusive sense a Protestant country; it is not in any exclusive sense even an English country. We have no state religion, we have two state languages, we have a very large body of people speaking one of those languages, and a still larger body professing the same religion as those who speak the French language. We cannot attempt to legislate for this country as if it were in any exclusive sense a Protestant or an English speaking country. Many people seem to wish that we should do so. They wish that the French people and the Catholic religion were excluded from our borders. Whether they like that or not, they cannot help it; they must put up with the condition of affairs that exists, and they must try to live in peace and harmony, so far as possible, with their fellow-citizens of a different race and religion. It is only on those conditions that the continued existence of this Canadian nation, as we may not now properly call it, can be maintained,

and I assert strongly that any agitation like the present, which proceeds virtually on lines of race and religion, can only tend to the destruction of Confederation, and to the impossibility of continuing properly to govern the country. The gentlemen who call themselves the party of Equal Rights have, so far as I can ascertain, no distinct programme of what they would do if they obtained office in this country. During the recent election in this city I have asked several gentlemen what they would do if they had an Equal Rights Government in power to-morrow, and none of them could tell me anything more than that they would abolish the dual language in the North-West Territories, and the separate schools in Manitoba. Now, I consider these two items are hardly sufficient to form a programme for a great party; they are not even a couple of planks for a platform, because the changes proposed are so small in their practical working, even if they were carried out, as not properly to constitute even a couple of planks in the platform of a great party. I do not consider that there is any party in this country opposed to Equal Rights. I believe we are all, on general principles, willing and anxious to secure the equal rights of all members of the community, and when a party arises calling itself more particularly the party of Equal Rights, I think they should show us something more substantial than those two little items before they ask us to support them on the basis of the platform they offer to us. Although they have no definite programme, still, with their vague expressions of patriotism, their vague harangues, dictated by uneasiness in regard to French aggression, their vague assertions of something either having happened or about to happen, they have certainly obtained, for the time being, a very considerable following in many quarters. I have reason to hope, knowing the intelligence of the average Ontario elector, that when the matter is fully sifted, when it is found there is really no necessity for the creation of any revolutionary party of this kind, for its real object can hardly be attained without revolution, the following of that party will be smaller. Still we must recognise the fact that it exists just now, and on what it grows and feeds. In regard to this agitation and the manner in which it has been carried on, I do not feel that my prejudices, if you like, against that party and its management have anything to do with the opinion I am called upon to pronounce on the matter before the House to-night. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) objected that this was an amendment on going into Committee of Supply, and therefore members on the Government side of the House cannot freely express their opinions in regard to it by their vote because it was a vote of want of confidence in the Government. If the motion is not by its terms an expression of want of confidence, it is not so because of the fact that it is moved as an amendment on going into Committee of Supply, because within the last 24 hours an amendment moved by a leading member of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) on going into Supply was accepted by the leader of the Government and by this House, including the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White). Early in this Session an amendment on going into Supply, moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which, in its terms, might be implied as censure on the past conduct of the Government, was similarly accepted by the Government. That objection being put aside, we have to ask whether this motion has something that can commend itself to the opinion of the House by its own essence, and I may say at once that it does commend itself to my judgment. It expresses an opinion with respect to the procedure in regard to the Jesuits' Estates Act, which I think is the method that should have been followed. The motion does not involve any consideration of the merits of the Act, it does not involve any expression of opinion as to whether the Act should have been disallowed or not. If it stated on its face that the Act should have been disallowed without reference, I would not vote for it. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I would not do anything against my own opinion or the opinion of the House as delivered last year in regard to the question of disallowance; but I do not see that the vote I intend to give in favor of this amendment can possibly be so interpreted. I have always believed, with many members on this side of the House, that no Act of a Provincial Legislature should be disallowed by this Government until an opinion had been obtained from the Supreme Court or some high tribunal as to its constitutionality. We were forced to consider the question of the constitutionality of that Act last Session without information from any legal tribunal. We considered it, and we came to a conclusion which, so far as I yet know seems to have been the correct one. I make no apology for my vote of last Session; but I am free to say that the Government should, before that matter was brought before the House and before they had given any assurance to the Government of Quebec as to what their action would be, have taken steps to secure a reference to some higher tribunal, and have come before the House backed by that opinion. I have no doubt whatever that the decision would have been in accordance with that arrived at by the House; but whether that was so or not, we should only exercise the right of disallowance of such an Act after having obtained the opinion of a legal tribunal that it was an unconstitutional Act. This question is essentially a legal one. This House, although containing many of the ablest lawyers in the country, is not composed entirely of members of the legal profession, and there are many who can only listen and wonder when questions of constitutional law are discussed across the floor. To ask the House to decide a purely legal and constitutional question is to ask it to carry a burden that should not be placed on its shoulders. We have the Supreme Court for the express purpose of deciding such questions. It was one of the principal reasons for the creation of that court, and it should take its share of the work, although, as the hon. gentleman for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has very strongly argued, the expression of that opinion would not relieve the Government of an iota of their responsibility. I do not think this case should be made a special one, I am sorry we have had to discuss it as if it were different from other cases, for in my opinion all such cases should be referred to the Supreme Court before action is taken. Yesterday we adopted the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) to the effect that cases of importance should be submitted to our highest judicial tri-

bunal, and a decision given after full argument. I think that covered nearly all the ground. We might have been satisfied with that declaration, but when I am called upon to-day to vote for a resolution which is strictly in accordance with the resolution which the House adopted yesterday, I do not see how I can go back on my opinion so lately given, and I do not see how other hon. members can so soon depart from the opinion they gave on that occasion. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with whose general opinions on this subject I quite agree, has urged that in this case any opinion of the Supreme Court would not have carried more weight than the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. The ground on which he argued the proposition was, that there was no provision for hearing argument before the Supreme court, and an *ex parte* decision without argument would have no more weight than the other opinion to which I referred. That statement, so far as it goes, is quite correct. I have no doubt an *ex parte* decision by the Supreme Court would not have much weight. But it must be remembered that if the Government had not so hastily pledged themselves not to use the power of disallowance, they had the whole of last Session in which they could have obtained power and made arrangements for having an argument on this question before the Supreme Court. There might have been an arrangement made just as is suggested in the present motion, that a decision might be given after hearing argument on both sides. The Government had agreed this year to take that course in future. Why was it not taken last year? They could easily have passed a Bill through the House to have arguments heard before the Supreme Court; the reference might have been made, and judgment given. The objection of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) falls to the ground, for the reason that, although there was at the time the Government gave the assurance to Mr. Mercier, no provisions for having argument before the Supreme Court, the Government had it in their power to have made that provision, and to have had an argument and reference and decision. That was the time the reference should have been made. I do not see that anything would have been gained by having a reference when the time for disallowance was about to expire, when the delegation met the Governor General in Quebec. There were no means of obtaining a satisfactory reference then, and I believe the Government could hardly be expected, after having given their assurance to Mr. Mercier, that they would not exercise the power of disallowance, to adopt a course which might imply they would have to break that promise. But before the House met, arrangements should have been made for the reference, and after the House met, measures should have been taken to secure arguments on the reference and the judicial decision. That, in brief, is my position on the matter. There is another point in connection with this reference to which I would call the special attention of the House and it is, that I believe by such a reference and the decision obtained thereon, we would almost have entirely avoided the agitation which has since taken place. If the gentlemen who have been agitating since disallowance was refused, had had an opportunity of presenting their arguments before a legal tribunal, and had failed to convince that tribunal that they were right, they might possibly be satisfied themselves that there was no constitutional grounds for disallowance, or if they were not, the vast majority of the people would have been satisfied. The Government would have been in a stronger position, the members on this side of the House who voted with the Government would have been in a stronger position, and the country would have been saved from a vast deal of useless and annoying agitation since that time. For all these reasons I believe that the Government should have made that reference, and I shall vote for the motion expressing regret that they have not done so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). One word in regard to this question before it goes to a vote, just to show the position in which the matter stood in the case of the New Brunswick School Act. The only tribunals that we could then refer to were to the law officers of the Crown and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The latter having declined to take cognisance of the case, the law officers of the Crown gave an opinion. Afterwards when the persons who opposed the school law were dissatisfied with the opinion presented, a memorial was then presented to the law officers of the Crown, and they maintained their former opinion stating that the law was constitutional. Although that was a legal opinion, and fortified as it was after a second hearing, yet the parties were not satisfied, and we set to work in the courts, and had the matter fairly fought out before the courts of New Brunswick, and afterwards by the Privy Council which finally decided it. It seems to me that this is the principle which we should adopt in this case. My own idea was that the Government should have rested on the decision of the House last winter, and not have taken the responsibility of consulting the law officers of the Crown. I believe, however, that the Government had a right to consult them. My view of the case is, that if we had gone to the Supreme Court and got a certificate of their opinion, it would not have had any more weight throughout the country than the opinion of the law officers of the Crown had, because as the law stands we could not get the reasons of the judges for their decision. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be useless for us to have made the reference. I am satisfied, as I was statisfied last year, that this law is *intra vires* of the Provincial Legislature, and I shall vote against the motion.

Mr. FISHER. I desire to say but a few words on the vote which I intend to give in favor of this motion. I have no doubt or hesitation at all in regard to the Jesuits' Estates Act. I have no desire to reconsider the vote which I gave last year on the motion of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). I gave that vote after full consideration and due deliberation. I am not a lawyer, but I have carefully studied the question which came before the House on that occasion. I took care to consult those of legal capacity and knowledge in whom I had full confidence, and I fully satisfied myself as to the fact that that Act was quite *intra vires* of the Legislature of Quebec. On that occasion, and since that occasion, I have taken upon myself to carefully study and read that Act. I have read and re-read it, section by section, and word by word, and studied it, so that I think I might almost say that I know it by

heart. I have not been able to find in that Act any of these objections which are laid against it by the gentlemen who have carried on the agitation under the name of the Equal Rights Association. I have not been able to find in that Act any derogation of the Queen's Majesty. I have not been able to find any exaltation of a foreign potentate either in the Province of Quebec or in the Dominion of Canada, and I cannot in any way see how that Act is contrary to the constitution of this country. I, therefore, have no hesitation to-night, as on other occasions I had no hesitation, in stating that I believe that it was quite within the right of the Province of Quebec to legislate as it did, and that this Government could not have been justified in disallowing that Act. Believing so at that time, and believing so still, I have no desire to re-consider the decision which I gave last Session on the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). But, Sir, at the end of that Session the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) undertook to move a motion, something in the terms of the present one, and at that time I stated to him that I was prepared to support that motion, not because I had any doubt with regard to the Jesuits' Estates Act, but because I believed that by the reference of that question to some such tribunal as the Supreme Court, or some tribunal as would put beyond question the validity of the Act, the groundwork and the substratum of the agitation would be removed, and to a large extent, at all events, the excuses for the appeals to passions, which have been made by the agitators on this question, would have fallen flat before the people of the country. I believe, Sir, that had such a course been taken the deplorable agitation we have had going on since that time would not have been able to take hold of the people in the way it has taken hold of them. I believe it would have been wise and expedient in the interests of the country to have had such a reference made, and I regret that it was not made. In this view, and this view alone, I feel I ought to support the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In view of the expressions I have given utterance to, in my own county and elsewhere in this Dominion, upon the question of the Jesuits' Estates Act, I thought it was necessary I should make this statement so that the vote which I intend to give should not be misunderstood, or should not be supposed as indicating a change of opinion on my part with reference to this question.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated by hon. members in the course of this discussion, that when the question of the Jesuits' Estates Act was before the House last Session, no prominent legal authority with the exception of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), had questioned the validity of the Act. Now, Sir, I would venture to say that that statement is entirely erroneous. The hon. gentleman will remember that the question, first of all, received its great impetus in the country by reason of the legal opinions advanced through legal journals in the city of Toronto. Subsequently, when the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) introduced the matter into this House, he did so by a resolution in favor of disallowance, based upon one ground only, namely, that the Act was *ultra vires*. It was contended in the course of the argument to-night to a certain degree that the question of *ultra vires* was abandoned in this House. That the House may see that that was not so, I will just refer to the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka. After reciting, in the first clause, that the House regards the power of disallowance as a prerogative essential to the national existence, and after asserting in the second clause that this great power should be fearlessly exercised for the protection of the rights of the minority and for guarding the fundamental principles of the constitution, the resolution proceeds to the particular subject-matter in hand as follows :—

"That in the opinion of this House, the passage by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, of the Act entitled 'An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates,' is beyond the power of the Legislature."

The reasons for that proposition follow, and then the resolution proceeds to say :

"And this House therefore prays that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to disallow the Act."

Thus you see that the issue presented to this House last Session was that the Act in question was *ultra vires* of the Province of Quebec, and on that ground should be disallowed. The question thus became a pure question of law, which the House was asked to decide, and upon that decision it might be contended that the Government would be bound to act in either disallowing or allowing the Act. When the case came before the House in that form, it was manifest to any one who listened to the discussion, that no less suitable tribunal to determine that question could very well be found than was the House of Commons; and for that matter, probably the same statement might be made to-day. It is not necessary for me to point out in how many respects this House falls far short of being a judicial tribunal for dealing with matters, controversial and otherwise, involved in a religious discussion. That being the case, when I had the privilege of addressing the House on the subject, I urged on the Administration the importance of obtaining at the earliest possible moment a legal decision that would give satisfaction to the public in ample time to enable the Government afterwards to exercise their constitutional power to disallow the Act or otherwise. It has been contended here to-night that because the Government did, on the 19th day of January express an opinion in regard to the Act, they were never afterwards free to do so—that, in fact, although the constitution provides that until twelve months have elapsed the Act may be disallowed, yet, having expressed an opinion, the Executive are not free afterwards to express a different view. Looking at the spirit of our constitution, and bearing in mind that within twelve months the House must be called together, I attach great importance to that period. During those twelve months, should the Executive refuse to carry out the will of the House as expressed with regard to the power of disallowance, the House has a remedy in its own hands in dismissing those Ministers, and putting in power another Committee of the House that would carry out its will. Therefore, the period of twelve months named in the constitution has great significance. To apply these remarks to the state of affairs that existed in March last, we find that the time for the Government to act under the constitution had not expired. They still had until the following August in which to disallow or

not to disallow the Act. It was premature, therefore, to pass the motion proposed by the hon. member for Muskoka. It was due to the Administration, that when the question arose as it did, that the House should advise the Administration as to the course they should pursue, and that the Administration, after hearing the discussion, should take such a course as would meet the requirements of the case. Both during the discussion on the motion, and subsequently, during the Session, I pressed on the Administration publicly from my place in this House the desirability of their obtaining such a legal decision as would meet the requirements of the case and satisfy the public. Well, Sir, I am pleased to know that the Government did to some extent endeavor to comply with the demand of the people. The hon. Minister of Justice to-night argued that the decision of the House was the final decision upon the question of law—that 188 members of this House affirmed the validity of the Act, and that for the Administration afterwards to have applied to the courts would have been a slight on the decision of this House. Well, Sir, if that is the case, why did they apply to the law officers of the Crown for an opinion after this House had decided? If it would have been a slight on the House to have applied to the Supreme Court, it was equally a slight to apply to the law officers of the Crown. The Government knew full well, when they were applying to them for an opinion, that it was no slight on the House? They knew that they were doing to a very limited extent a good thing for the country, and I regret that in selecting a tribunal, they did not select one of our own creating. Not that I have the slightest doubt of the soundness of the advice given by the law officers of the Crown; but it would have been satisfactory to our people if the case had been submitted in such a manner as would have enabled them to hear arguments, and to have had a mode of appeal to the Privy Council. Therefore, I think the Administration erred in the selection of the tribunal. I would have favored the course that has been indicated to-night, namely a reference in the first place to the Supreme Court of Canada. On this present motion, I find myself to a certain extent embarrassed by reason of the manner in which the case has been discussed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I do not feel inclined to endorse all the arguments of my hon. friend from North Norfolk in introducing this motion, and much less many of his arguments on former occasions. Nevertheless I feel that it is necessary to deal with the motion stripped of the argument, and I do not think that in voting for it, as I intend to do, I can be taken as endorsing everything the hon. gentleman said. I advance my own reasons for voting for that motion. I think it is the right direction, but there is one thing about it of which I think the House can reasonably complain, and that is its being brought up as a vote of want of confidence in the Administration. I do not think a question of this kind, if there is any other mode of settling it, should be settled at the point of the bayonet. I feel more anxious for both the harmony and welfare of this country than the triumph of party, and I would gladly concede to the Government all the *kudos* they can obtain from this or any other measure, provided it can be so

Mr. MULOCK.

made as to promote the best interest of the country. I think the Government might have freed the members of this House to a certain extent, in which case they might have obtained a more candid expression of opinion. Yesterday the First Minister, in his most gracious way, accepted the proposition made by the hon. member for West Durham, which is very largely in the direction of the one at present under discussion, the only difference being that in the former an abstract principle is proposed which will govern our future conduct, whereas the latter has reference to an actual case. I, therefore, think the Administration might very fairly have given this House some undertaking in regard to procedure, which would have made it possible for the House to have come to a decision which would prevent trouble. The Government ought to have taken all reasonable means to allay public passion, and in failing in this duty they have done considerable injury to the minority in the Province of Ontario and, for that matter, in the Dominion of Canada. They have put them in an unenviable position, making them to some extent the object of attack at the hands of their fellow-citizens. No doubt that is unintentional, and I do not myself feel inclined to make any further observations on that point except to say that however unintentionally it was, it was an unfortunate act on the part of the Administration. It seems to me the Government having originally taken the bit in their teeth and come to a certain conclusion, rightly or wrongly, intend to stand by it instead of taking, as the First Minister has done frequently a sharp curve as the exigencies of the case demanded.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Charlton:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	McMillan (Huron),
Barron,	McMullen,
Blake,	McNeill,
Bowman,	Mulock,
Brien,	O'Brien,
Campbell,	Paterson (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Platt,
Casey,	Rowand,
Charlton,	Scriver,
Fisher,	Somerville,
Innes,	Sutherland,
Lang,	Tyrwhitt,
Livingston,	Waldie,
Macdonald (Huron),	Wallace,
McCarthy,	Watson,
McCulla,	Wilson (Elgin).—32.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Jones,
Audet,	Jones (Digby),
Bain (Soulanges),	Jones (Halifax),
Béchard,	Kenny,
Bergeron,	Kirk,
Boisvert,	Kirkpatrick,
Borden,	Labrosse,
Bourassa,	Landerkin,
Bowell,	Langelier (Montmorency),
Boyle,	Langelier (Quebec),
Brown,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bryson.	La Rivière,
Burns,	Laurier (Lieut.-Gen.),
Cameron,	Laurier,
Cargill,	Lavergne,
Carling,	Lister,
Carpenter,	Lovitt,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonald (Sir John),
Casgrain,	McDonald (Victoria),
Chapleau,	McDougald (Pictou),
Choquette,	McDougall (Cape Breton),

Cimon,	McIntyre,
Cochrane,	McKay,
Cockburn,	McKeen,
Colby,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Corby,	Meigs,
Costigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Coughlin,	Mills (Bothwell),
Coulombe,	Moncrieff,
Curran,	Montague,
Daly,	Montplaisir,
Davies,	Neveu,
Davin,	Patterson (Essex),
Davis,	Perry,
Dawson,	Porter,
Desaulniers,	Purcell,
Desjardins,	Putnam,
Dessaint,	Rinfret,
Dickey,	Robillard,
Dickinson,	Roome,
Doyon,	Ross,
Dupont,	Rykert,
Earle,	Ste. Marie,
Edgar,	Skinner,
Eisenhauer,	Small,
Ellis,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Sproule,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Stevenson,
Ferguson (Welland),	Taylor,
Fiset,	Temple,
Flynn,	Thompson (Sir John),
Foster,	Tisdale,
Freeman,	Turcot,
Gauthier,	Vanasse,
Geoffrion,	Ward,
Gigault,	Weldon (Albert),
Gillmor,	Weldon (St. John).
Godbout,	Welsh,
Grandbois,	White (Cardwell),
Guay,	White (Renfrew),
Guillet,	Wilmot,
Haggart,	Wilson (Lennox),
Hickey,	Wood (Brockville),
Holton,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Jamieson,	Wright.—130.

Amendment negatived, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee).

Territorial Accounts..... $10,100

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This vote is required for payment of militia service in connection with the rebellion in the North-West. The payments from the 1st of July, 1889, up to the present, have been made under Governor General's warrant, by Order in Council of 19th November, 1889. The expenditure from the 1st of July, 1889, to the 30th of April, 1890, amounts to $9,504.44. I have put upon the table a detailed statement of the different sums paid under the vote just submitted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears to be chiefly made up by payments to the York and Simcoe Battalions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount required for professional services at Medicine Hat amounts to $209. Then there is a payment to the Simcoe Battalion of $1,556.65. That is the kit-allowance. That matter was discussed fully in Parliament, and the Government decided to pay the kit-allowance. There is another amount for kit-allowance to the York-Simcoe Battalion of $383. Then there is an amount paid to O'Connor as an advance in the case of Ross *vs.* the Queen. Most of these amounts have been paid under judgments which have been obtained. Some of them were refused by the Crown, but were subsequently paid under a decision of the Court of Exchequer. John Ross was awarded by the Court of Exchequer for teaming $2,665. Thomas Kitching was awarded the difference between his contract and the market price, $510. R. C. McDonald was paid a balance of $323.

Mr. MULOCK. The amount per man paid to the York-Simcoe Battalion was $8.15, was it not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the interest should be paid to these men. The other men were paid in 1885 and, when the hon. members for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) and Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) were away at the front, I looked after their interests. I was informed by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) that some of these men who were in needy circumstances had disposed of their claims in a rather improvident manner.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I told the hon. gentleman that at Humboldt there was a pair of shoes issued to each man at $2.50, which usually forms a part of the kit, and it was arranged that these boots should go against the interest. That was explained to the men, and they were perfectly satisfied.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose it would be bootless for me to press the matter further, after that statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see here an item of $100 to pay J. A. Gemmill, Barrister, Ottawa, administrator of the estate of the late Francis J. Dickens, balance due on claim for compensation for losses during the North-West Rebellion. What were the losses in this case?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This must be for law costs.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is it put down in the amount to be voted for losses?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Because the case was lost.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is going it blind with a vengeance.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not as far as the Department of Militia is concerned.

Mr. McMULLEN. At any rate Mr. Gemmill will see it.

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation is not here, because I think it comes under the Mounted Police, but I will call the attention of the Premier to it, and I hope the Committee will allow the item to pass.

Mr. MULOCK. The item ought to stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have understood during this Session that the Government would give the explanation or allow the item to stand. It does not matter as to the amount involved, but it is the question of principle. We kept the Minister of Agriculture up for a whole night and until one o'clock the next day because he had not the High Commissioner's report, and it would be unfair to him to allow this to pass when it has been laid down that, unless we get an explanation, the item should stand.

Mr. FOSTER. That has not been laid down as a rule from which there has been no departure. The other evening when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was leading the House, four items were allowed to pass on my assurance that the information would be brought down, and I think the hon. gentleman should follow so illustrious an example.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry that the hon. member for South Oxford allowed them to pass, but I was not in the House at the time.

Mr. MULOCK. When my constituents ask me what that $100 was paid for, I shall not be able to tell them.

Mr. FOSTER. You shall have the information.

To pay holders of Dominion licenses the costs of prosecution and fines incurred for violations of the Provincial Act.....	$3,547 16

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is to pay any penalties imposed upon holders of licenses under the Dominion Act. The Dominion license was not issued to any applicant unless the applicant had been unable to obtain a local license, or had tendered his money and been refused. The most of these cases occurred in Ontario, a few in Nova Scotia and none in Quebec.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do they require local licenses under the Dominion Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; we took that ground.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that you issue licenses in Prince Edward Island where there was no local license required, and, of course, the same principle would apply if there was no local license.

Mr. McMULLEN. If a Dominion license were issued to a hotel-keeper and a local license also, and he paid fees for both, would the Government refund the Dominion license fees?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In all cases we refunded the $15, but no damages have been refunded. A party having a local license would not be prosecuted by the local authorities. But there were a good many cases where parties failed to get a provincial license, and on evidence that they had tried in good faith to do so, having tendered the money, a Dominion license was issued to them. In many cases proceedings were taken against them by the provincial authorities and they were fined.

Mr. McMULLEN. In case of a fine does the Minister propose to pay not only the sum that was paid for the fine, bnt to recoup them for the amount of damages they received from having failed to get a license?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Only the amount of the penalty and costs.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was a case in my section where a man got a license under the Act to which the hon. gentleman refers. He sold liquor to an unfortunate man who, while going home in his waggon, fell out of it and broke his neck. Now, he got his liquor from a man who had no right to sell, because his license was not valid. I want to know whether his widow has not an action of damages against the Government for taking the life of her husband, because the Government issued a license they should not have issued?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think this sum should be paid to the widow. I think it would be a better way to expend it. If those parties refused to take a provincial license they might have expected they would be fined, and they should not have the money refunded.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not in cases where parties refused to take a Provincial license, because if they had refused to take a Provincial license in Ontario they could not have got a Dominion license. That was a condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. In this case the man refused to take a Provincial license because he had the most unbounded confidence in the license law of this Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If he was refused a license from the local authorities we would have granted him a Dominion license. He must have applied to the Commissioner under the Dominion Act, and must have shown that he had applied for local license and had either failed to obtain it, or had tendered the money and been refused.

Mr. McMULLEN. He did make an application for a local license. Under the local Act only a certain number of licenses could be granted in a village or a town. This number of licenses had been granted and he could not receive a local license. Then he made application to the Dominion Government and got a license. He sold liquor under this pretended Dominion license by which one poor man lost his life. The question is what are you going to do with his widow.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Marry her.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not believe she would accept the hon. Minister.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; she has had enough of that kind of a husband.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister why he required an applicant for license under this Act to have a different license under the Provincial Act, when the reason assigned in passing the Dominion Act was that the Provinces had no power to issue licenses?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The reason was that in passing the license law it was never intended to be a revenue law, and we made the fees only nominal. It was made a condition in the Act that the Provinces should be in a position to receive a local revenue.

Mr. WATSON. Were all the fees collected by the inspectors paid into the Government, or were they retained in many instances by the collectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government receive a very small proportion of the fees. The fees were nominal.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much was the fee?

Mr. COSTIGAN. $15 was the whole fee. It was granted to the commissioners who kept the accounts and transacted the business, and it was never intended that this branch should be more than self-sustaining. Ten dollars were charged on the application being made, and $5 on the license being granted, and these fees were considered sufficient to defray the running expenses.

Mr. WATSON. What portion was the license inspector supposed to receive for his services?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The salaries were fixed by the Commissioners under law, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. They were fixed on a scale according to the importance of the district.

Mr. WATSON. Is it not a fact that, although salaries were paid by the Government to the inspectors, they collected from every unfortunate a fee of $15 and put it in their pockets?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no foundation for such a statement.

Mr. WATSON. How much of the $15 was paid the Government?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There was a licensing board of three commissioners generally and the secretary, and they had to employ a constable or bailiff, keep the accounts and pay the running expenses. No receipts were derived by the Government in any way except in Montreal and Toronto, at all events in very few cases.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much does this Act cost altogether?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The principal vote was for $150,000, and there have been one or two votes taken since.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In the village of Springfield, in the county of Elgin, a man took out a license issued by the Dominion Government. The inspector for the Local Government had him summoned before a magistrate and fined. He has since been making application for compensation on that account. Has this case been taken into consideration, and is it the intention of the Government to pay the man the amount of the fine together with the costs?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I adopted all possible means to ascertain the particulars of all cases. Circulars were sent out to the agents of the Department, and particulars of claims obtained. This circular was sent out about two years ago.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Were licenses issued to others than those who had applied for provincial licenses?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They were applied to parties who had applied for licenses which had either been issued or refused.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I know licenses were granted to hotel-keepers in St. Thomas, who had taken out licenses by local authorities. The Government treated him with indifference, and they never hardly paid any attention to his communication. He felt aggrieved because being a strong Conservative, and believing that Conservatives could do no wrong, and believing the statement of the First Minister to be correct, he took out a license.

Mr. FOSTER. Cut it short.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend says "cut it short," but I merely tell him what my friend said to me, and what I believe to be true. How am I going to know if this gentleman is going to obtain justice, if you are unable to tell the name of a single individual who will get a refund out of this vote? We ought to have the names, and unless we get them we have no guarantee that this money will not be given to favorites of the Government, who are not entitled to it at all. No doubt the Minister of Finance would like to have the discussion cut short, because he does not wish to give any information, but we should have the information before the vote is passed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The difficulty I see is, that this vote is not to refund the fees that were paid in, but as it says:

"To pay holders of Dominion licenses, the costs of prosecutions and fines incurred for violations of the Provincial Act."

The hon. Minister of Finance must admit that it is a peculiar thing for the Commons of Canada to vote some thousands of dollars to pay for fines which have been incurred for violations of Provincial Acts. We are bound to suppose that the penalties were imposed justly, and it is a strange thing to be asked to compensate for fines justly inflicted. There ought to be a good deal of reason given why this should be done. If I understood the distinction drawn by the Minister of Inland Revenue, it was that this was only to pay to individuals who were fined, and who had applied for a license and had been refused.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the rule of the Department was, that no one was to have a Dominion license issued to him unless he had a permit from the Local Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Unless he had applied for it, and tendered the money, and it had either been refused or granted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But then, when they did not get it, under what right had they to sell, if the Act, according to the Minister, did not seem to contemplate that a man could sell who held only a Dominion license alone?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He could do that. This condition was put in, as I understand it, so as not to conflict with the provincial authorities, and to show that we did not want to take the revenue from them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When they had not paid a fee to the Province, were they entitled to sell under this $15 license while others had to pay provincial license as well?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly, if the Local Government would not accept the fee.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister's explanation is hardly satisfactory. They did not recognise that the licenses issued by the Province were legal, and they treated him with indifference, whether the man had a local license or not. Therefore it could not have been for protecting the revenues of the Province.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is true, too. It made no difference to the Government whether the man had a local license or not. Whether they made application for the license or not, if they made application for the Dominion license they received it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I know that it is so. I know as a matter of fact that this man who was fined had not made an application, as I understood him, for a local license. You gave licenses whether a man was considered not fit to keep an hotel or not, or whether the license had expired. You took the fee from him, and where was the revenue to come from for the municipalities?

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation of the Minister of Inland Revenue was full and satisfactory. It was simply this. The fees that were paid by the persons to whom the Dominion license was issued was not a license fee for the sale of liquor in the proper sense of the term. There was a fee of $10 so as to provide that the

application was *bonâ fide*. Then, if the applicant received a license, there was a fee of $5 charged for its issue. Both of these fees were to cover a sort of current expense, and were not considered to be sufficient for the sale of liquor for the year. While the Provincial Government issued a license at a fee of $150 or $300, or whatever it was, this arrangement was made so as not to take revenue from the Province, and not to give a revenue to the Dominion. The Dominion license fees went into the hands of a body which was organised under the law, consisting of commissioners, and the commissioners appointed their inspectors who regulated the matter. These fees were accounted for to the commissioners and the commissioners arranged the salaries of the inspectors. My hon. friend says that that was done purposely, so as not to take the revenue for the sale of liquor away from the other Provinces. The Province of Ontario said: We have a right to issue licenses and we alone, and this arrangement my colleague speaks about was made so that there might be, if possible, no conflict between the two. The same party would sell with the authorisation of the Provincial and with the authorisation of the Dominion Legislature, so that, having the two he could not be prosecuted in either the one case or the other for selling without a proper license. But my hon. friend says that if it had been a condition of the law that the Provincial Government, by refusing a license to every applicant under the Dominion License Act, could have prevented selling, it might have rendered nugatory every application made under the Dominion law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But there is the difficulty of selling under the $15 license and ignoring the Province.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole law might be that, because it was assuming that the Dominion had that right.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Finance is a little confused as to what the arrangement was. When the Dominion license was issued $10 was paid for the application and $5 for the license, and the party applying had to comply with the provisions imposed by the municipality in which he lived, with regard to the amount it required, not the amount the Province required. Each city fixes the amount of the license in that city.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, and each township fixes the price charged by the township for a license, whether Provincial or Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the hon. gentleman is right in that, the Legislature only fixing the maximum and the minimum.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I cannot understand how it could be expected that some would have been paying $200 and some only $15 for a license.

Mr. COCHRANE. They had to come under the by-laws of the municipalities.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the matter stands thus. In 1883, the Dominion assumed that the Provinces, which, up to that time, licensed the liquor trade, had no right to do so, and passed a law under which license commissioners were appointed and licenses issued. But at the same time, I know in the Province of Quebec, and perhaps in the Province of Ontario also, the Local Legislature assumed that for the purpose of creating a revenue they could levy a fee for the license of selling liquor; that is to say, they could not be deprived of their power of obtaining revenue from this source. But it turned out afterwards that the law passed by this Parliament was beyond its powers, and parties who sold under that law were fined; and now, I understand, the object of this item is to enable the Government to reimburse those parties who were fined under the Dominion law.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If we could only find out to whom this money is to be paid, it would be satisfactory. I think that could be easily discovered by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and he ought to be prepared to give the House a statement of them before asking us to vote this money.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I want to satisfy the hon. Minister of Finance that I was right. I stated that it mattered little whether a license was issued by the Local Government or not, because the Dominion Government ignored that altogether. If a hotel-keeper paid to the municipality the amount exacted, this Government paid no attention at all to the provincial license, and did not attempt in any way to protect the revenues of the Province.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister says that he pays this money to parties who applied for provincial licenses and were refused. How do they furnish proof of that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When the inspectors collected any fees they were obliged to forward their accounts to the Department of Inland Revenue, where a strict record was kept of them. When I was obliged to ascertain who the claimants were, I placed myself in communication with the collectors of each Inland Revenue District throughout the country, asking them to ascertain the number of persons in their district who had paid penalties for having sold under the Dominion License Act. All that will have to be looked into before payments can be made. If this money were voted, my Department would be in a position to deal with the question. In the first place, we would have to take evidence to satisfy ourselves that each applicant belonged to that class intended by Parliament to be recouped, that he had a Dominion license, as to the amount of the fine imposed, and as to the fact that he had endeavored to get a provincial license and had been refused.

Mr. McMULLEN. To bring this question to a point, I wish to ask the hon. Minister how he comes to the conclusion that there is this record?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will bring down a statement in a couple of days showing the amounts claimed and the names as far as I can give them.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 1st May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (for Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD) moved :

That the House resolve itself, to-morrow, into a Committee to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient, in order to enable the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company to construct a railway from the town of Calgary to some point on the North Saskatchewan River at or near Edmonton, to enter into a contract with such company for the transport of men, supplies, materials, and mails for twenty years, and to pay for such services during the said term, eighty thousand dollars per annum, such payment to be computed from the date of the completion of the said railway.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adoption of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 6) relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are several amendments, some of them important and some unimportant. I will explain them, and ask the House to consider them separately. On page 6, line 24, begins a substantial amendment, but one that, I think, will not change the policy of the House with regard to the class of notes and bills to which the clause refers. It relates to the acceptance payable at a particular place. The Bill as it left this House, provided in effect, that an acceptance payable at a particular place was a qualified acceptance, but the Bill went on to provide that, notwithstanding that, it should not be deemed a qualified acceptance unless the words were added "payable there and not elsewhere," or some equivalent words. The change proposed by the Senate is in effect that that shall not be a qualified acceptance, but a further provision that we shall come to presently, provides that presentment shall be made at any place designated. The same result is, I think, arrived at, because it is provided by the Act that other parties to the bill shall not be discharged by reason of a qualified acceptance being taken, and this class of acceptances is taken out from the category of qualified acceptances. The meaning may be a little plainer, when I read the exact words of the amendment at page 6, line 84. It reads now thus :

"An acceptance is either (*a*) general, or (*b*) qualified : a general acceptance assents without qualification to the order of the drawer; a qualified acceptance in express terms varies the effect of the bill as drawn :

"2. In particular, an acceptance is qualified which is—

"(*a*) Conditional, that is to say, which makes payment by the acceptor dependent on the fulfilment of a condition therein stated."

Now it is proposed to add, after the word "stated," the words :

"But the acceptance to pay at a particular specified place is not conditional or qualified."

On the same page, at line 26, the Senate proposes to leave out these words :

"Local, that is to say, an acceptance to pay at a particular specified place, an acceptance to pay at a particular place is a general acceptance unless it expressly states that the bill is to be paid there only and not elsewhere."

That is to be left out, and the same object is to be accomplished by the provision that a bill payable at a particular place is not to be considered a qualified acceptance. The two amendments are for the complete accomplishment of that purpose. We come now to the provision on page 8, with respect to forged instruments. There was a good deal of discussion in this House as to the propriety of adopting a new provision to the effect that the forgery of an endorsement on a bill of exchange should not affect the bank. That proposition did not meet with the approval of this House, and was not pressed. The Senate, however, propose a change in the bill in that direction. They propose to add to section 24, as it passed this House, the following provision :—

"And provided also, that if a cheque, payable to order, is paid by the drawee upon a forged endorsement out of the funds of the drawer, or is so paid and charged to his account, the drawer shall have no right of action against the drawee for the recovery back of the amount so paid, or no defence to any claim made by the drawee for the amount so paid, as the case may be, unless he gives notice in writing of such forgery to the drawee within one year from the date at which he has received notice of such payment, by the delivery to him of such cheque, of any book or statement containing an entry of such payment, or otherwise ; and in case of failure by the drawer to give such notice within the said period, such cheque shall be held to have been paid in due course as respects every other party thereto or named therein who has not previously instituted proceedings for the protection of his rights."

The effect of this addition is that if a forged cheque payable to order is paid upon a forged endorsement, there shall be a special period of limitation, namely, one year after the payment has been brought to the notice of the drawer by a return of the cheque or by an entry which comes to his notice in the bank book. On page 9 there is an unimportant amendment in the line 26, to make the section begin with "and" instead of "but." In the same section on line 25 the word "and" is changed to the word "but." In the same section there is an equally unimportant change ; after the word "bill," the words "or note" are inserted. In line 43 there is an addition, after the word "right," of the words, "and without such words thereon, such instrument and any renewal thereof shall be void, except in the hands of the holder in due course without such notice of consideration." In section 32, with respect to the negotiation of bills, there is an amendment to sub-section 2, simply leaving out the words, "if he thinks fit." The next change is in section 42. The section reads thus :

"When a bill is duly presented for acceptance and is not accepted on the day of presentment or the next following day, not being a legal holiday or a non-juridical day, the person presenting it must treat it as dishonored by non-acceptance."

The amendment provides that a change shall be made to two days instead of one, so that when a bill is duly presented for acceptance and not accepted within two days thereafter, the person presenting it must treat it as dishonored by non-acceptance. The next change is in section 45, sub-section 7. It is quite unimportant, simply adding the words "or acceptance" where the place of payment specified in the bill is any city, town, or

village. The next amendment is in section 47. The section reads :

"A bill is dishonored by non-payment:—(*a*), when it is duly presented for payment and payment is refused and cannot be obtained ; or (*b*), when presentment is excused, and the bill is overdue and unpaid."

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, when a bill is dishonored by non-payment, an immediate right of recourse against the drawer and endorsers accrues to the holder."

The amendment is simply to add the word "acceptor" after the word "drawer," so that it will read : "An immediate right of recourse against the drawer or acceptor or endorsers accrues to the holder." The next change is in section 49. Sub-section 4 of that section reads :

"Notice or protest or dishonor of any bill payable in Canada, shall, notwithstanding anything in this section contained, be sufficiently given if it is addressed in due time to any party to such bill entitled to such notice, at his customary address or place of residence, or at the place at which such bill is dated, unless such party has, under his signature, designated another place ; and in such latter case, such notice shall be sufficiently given, if addressed to him in due time at such place, and such notice shall be sufficient although the address of such party is other than either of such above mentioned places ; and such notice shall be deemed to have been duly served and given over all purposes, if it be deposited in the post office at any time during the day on which such protest or presentment has been made, or on the next following juridical or business day."

It is proposed to add "with the postage paid thereon." At the end of the same section there is another amendment. Sub-section 5 reads thus :

"Where a notice of dishonor is duly addressed and posted, the sender is deemed to have given due notice of dishonor, notwithstanding any miscarriage by the post office."

After the word "posted" insert the words "as above provided," so as to mean posted with the postage thereon. In the 51st section there is a slight amendment. It reads thus :

"Where an inland bill has been dishonored it may, if the holder thinks fit, be noted and protested for non-acceptance or non-payment, as the case may be, but it shall not, except in the Province of Quebec, be necessary to note or protest any such bill in order to preserve recourse against the drawer or endorser."

It is proposed to insert the words "subject to the provisions of this Act with respect to the notice of dishonor," the impression being, though perhaps not generally prevalent, that the exemption from protest might imply the exemption from notice of dishonor, and to make that point clear this amendment is proposed. In the same clause there is another amendment. Proceeding with the section, we find it reads :

"But it shall not, except in the Province of Quebec, be necessary to note or protest any such bill in order to preserve the recourse against the drawer or endorser ; but in the case of a bill drawn on any person in the Province of Quebec, or payable or accepted in any place therein, in default of protest for non-payment and of notice thereof, the parties liable on the bill, other than the acceptor, are discharged."

It is proposed to insert words which will make the amendment read thus :

"In the case of a bill drawn on any person in the Province of Quebec, or payable or accepted in any place therein, if dishonored or protested for non-payment, as the case may be, the default of notice thereof—— "

There is an amendment again in the same section to sub-section *a*, which reads thus :

"When a bill is presented through the post office, and returned by post dishonored, it may be protested at the place to which it is returned, and on the day of its return, if received during business hours."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

After the word "return," insert "not later than the day of return or the next juridical day," which will make it read :

"When a bill is presented and dishonored, it may be protested at the place to which it is returned, not later than the day it is returned or the next juridical day."

There is an amendment in sub-section *b*. The sub-section reads :

"When a bill, drawn payable at the place of business or residence of some person other than the drawee, has been dishonored by non-acceptance, it must be protested for non-payment at the place where it is expressed to be payable, or at a place in Canada, situated not more than five miles therefrom."

It is proposed to leave out the whole of the sub-section *b*, which provides that when a bill, drawn payable at the place of business or residence of some person other than the drawee, has been dishonored for non-acceptance, it must be protested for non-acceptance at the place where it is expressed to be payable, and no further presentment for payment to, or demand on, the drawee is necessary. That was the subject of some discussion when the Bill was passed before the House, as to the necessity of presentment for non-payment again after the bill had been dishonored by non-acceptance, and it is proposed to remove doubt by striking out the sub-section. There was in former times the practice, not only of presenting for non-acceptance, but likewise of holding the bill till maturity and presenting it for non-payment, and the section seems to have been adopted with a view to that earlier practice. Now it is proposed to leave the matter simply optional. If the holder pleases, he can retain the bill until maturity, and protest again ; but the section as it was might be ambiguous as to whether it was not imposing the necessity for so doing, and it is proposed to strike it out altogether. In section 51, sub-section 9, protest is dispensed with in circumstances which would dispense with the notice of dishonor. The delay in noting or protesting is excused when the delay is caused by circumstances beyond the control of the holder and not imputable to his fault, misconduct, or negligence. It is proposed to insert a provision that no clerk or teller shall act as a notary in protesting any note payable at the bank, or any branch of the bank, in which he is employed. The amendment proposed to section 52, provides that presentation for payment is not necessary in order to render the acceptor liable. It is also proposed to insert a provision, which was suggested in this House but not adopted, that, if any suit or action is instituted before presentation, the costs thereof shall be in the discretion of the court. In section 56, it is proposed to add the words "and is subject to all the provisions of this Act in reference to endorsers." It is proposed to add a sub-section to section 71, as follows :—

"If a bill or note, presented for acceptance, or payable out of Canada, is protested for non-acceptance or for non-payment, a notarial copy of the protest and of the notice of dishonor, and a notarial certificate of the service of such notice, shall be received in all courts as *prima facie* evidence of such protest, notice and service."

In section 86, it is proposed to substitute for the latter portion of the clause, the following :—

"Where a promissory note is made payable at a particular place, it must be presented at that particular place in order to made the maker liable. In any other case presentment for payment is not necessary to make him liable, but the maker is not discharged by the omission to present it on the day it matures. But if any suit or action

is instituted, the costs shall be in the discretion of the court, if no place of payment is specified in the body of the note."

The next amendment is to sub-section 4 of section 88, which now reads:

"Where a foreign note is dishonored, protest thereof, except in the Province of Quebec, is unnecessary."

It is proposed to make the sub-section read:

"Where a foreign note is dishonored, the protest there of is unnecessary except for the preservation of the liability of endorsers."

The next amendment is to sub-section 2 of section 90, in which it is proposed to insert the word "duly" before the word "sealed." That is in the case of a corporation. There is a verbal amendment to section 93. It is proposed to omit altogether section 96 which provides that the rules of the common law of England, save in so far as they are inconsistent with the express provisions of this Act, shall continue to apply to bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. I understand, from reading the debates in which that amendment was suggested, that the section was understood to be unnecessary, and possibly leading to some uncertainty as to what should be considered, in this country, the common law of England, and whether we were not, in one sense of the use of that term, including too much of the statute law, and in another and more restricted sense, in which we use the term common law, were leaving out statutory provisions altogether. I do not understand that there is any provision in the statute of Anne which is not expressly embodied here; but the omission of the clause will leave the matter as it stands now, to be determined by the rules of the common law. In the first schedule there is an amendment, which is merely verbal, and is made to correct an error. The schedule was copied from the English Act and it included the words "a householder in said district," because the English Act provides for householders making a protest in cases where a notary public or a justice of the peace is not available. We have restricted the right of protesting in the absence of a notary to a justice of the peace; therefore, it is not necessary to say anything about a householder.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the Minister of Justice has no idea of pressing those amendments to-day, because they are neither immaterial or short, and unless we have an opportunity of seeing them in the speech of the Minister as it will appear to-morrow in *Hansard*, it will be perfectly useless to attempt to discuss them, and unless they are printed in the Votes and Proceedings as well.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not proceed to-day against the wish of any member of the House. It was well, I thought, to move it, in order to bring these to the notice of the House, but I will wait till the *Hansard* report of my explanations is published, and acquiesce in any further publication that is thought desirable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is very desirable they should be published in the Votes and Proceedings, or in the separate form, otherwise we never would understand them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the suggestion. With all the attention that we were disposed to give the Minister's explanations, and no doubt they were very full and explicit, it was utterly impossible to follow them, and more particularly owing to the number of alterations in the original Bill, and I think it will be necessary to see them in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 140) to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled "An Act respecting Interest." He said: I will explain the Bill shortly, but I will not ask the House to go into Committee until the hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is in his place, because he has some amendments that he wishes to propose. There is a provision in the statute relating to interest, which was adopted, I think, some eight years ago, to the effect that when a mortgage is payable at a longer period than five years, the mortgagor may redeem at any time after the five years by paying all amounts due upon the mortgage. The operation of that section has led to considerable inconvenience in the case of parties applying for loans for long periods. Railway companies, for instance, desiring to make loans payable in 20 years, have been met with the objection that in Canada the law is such that the mortgage may be paid off at the end of five years; and lenders, of course, have found a material objection, that, inasmuch as the rate of interest may have fallen at the end of five years, they should be compelled to take payment of principal and interest then due in anticipation of the time contemplated in the contract. For that reason, and to meet that inconvenience, a number of those companies themselves have requested that the Act shall not apply to mortgages made by companies, and I shall acquiesce in that proposal. Other provisions of the Act are simply to repeal certain provisions in the Interest Act against usurious transactions. These were retained for a time after the repeal of the usury clauses, in order to meet outstanding cases, and it seems obvious now that they are no longer useful, and it is well to obliterate them. The amendment which I understand the member for St. John intends to propose, is that certain other provisions of a like kind, applicable to his Province, shall be repealed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

GAS INSPECTION.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 137) to amend the Gas Inspection Act, chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain the object of this Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When the Bill was introduced I gave my explanations. The first change made was in order to bring natural gas under the operation of the law. The next was to provide for an increased revenue, by increasing the number of times the meters should be examined and returns made. Another section was to amend the law, so as to remove doubts as to connecting gas manufacturing establishments with the testing houses, whenever such are established in any such locality where gas is manufactured. The House will remember, that when the Estimates with respect to gas inspection were under consideration, I then

stated that I would introduce amendments to increase the revenue, so as to decrease the deficit that stood against this branch of the service, on the ground that it would be more equitable to cause the financial burdens in this connection to be borne by the cities and towns, rather than by the rural population that receive little benefit from the Act. The method I suggested for the purpose of increasing the revenue was, as I stated, to introduce a section to make the inspection of meters more frequent, the same fee being retained, we securing by this means an increased revenue of about 30 per cent. Representations have, however, been made to me by interested parties, if you will, by the representatives of the gas companies in different parts of the country. They called my attention to a very important fact. They said that, while you are desirous of increasing the revenue from gas inspection, you are at the same time adding to our burdens by causing an unnecessarily frequent inspection of meters. On reference to our own reports of the inspection of meters I had to acknowledge the force of the argument, because a five years' term is a pretty satisfactory term of inspection, and there is a very small percentage of imperfect gas meters proved by our inspection returns within the term of five years. I, therefore, propose to increase the revenue in another way, and instead of changing the law with regard to the inspection of meters, I propose to simply add a cortain percentage to the fees all round, which will give from 10 to 12 per cent. increased revenue. Another matter brought to my attention was that while the gas companies had to compete with petroleum used for illuminating purposes and with the electric light, which is coming into general use, they were under no restriction of this kind, and it was only fair that a portion of the revenue should be obtained from the electric light companies, and that they should also be brought under the operation of the Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the deficit annually?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The receipts average only about one-half the expenditure. The increase in the expenditure is due to the fact that within the last two years we had established gas inspection offices at eight or ten towns and cities where such offices had not been previously established. The deficit, I may say, must reach about $20,000 a year. I retain in the Bill a clause which will bring natural gas under the operation of the Act. The question of bringing the electric light under its operation I defer, until the necessity for doing so is shown in Parliament or in the press, and the subject may be considered before next year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand a strong representation was made with respect to this Bill by the gas companies, who object to the increased expense thrown on them in frequently removing meters. The deficit in this branch of the Department has generally arisen partly from the fact that the hon. gentleman has been filling his office with many additional clerks and adding so largely to their salaries year by year, and now the Minister finds himself compelled to obtain more revenue from the gas companies, With the present overflowing Dominion treasury, I submit this deficit is a small affair on account of which we ask this House to change the whole system of gas inspection. It will cause great annoyance and inconvenience to the gas companies, which will place the increased cost on their consumers, and this dissatisfaction will be created. Each year the hon. gentleman appears to seek an additional amount of revenue, and this is a branch of the public service in which the salaries and expenses have more steadily increased than in any other. Under all these circumstances it is advisable that the Bill should be left over, especially in view of the late stage of the Session, and the fact that the gas companies strongly object to it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will ask the House to allow me to drop the clause respecting an increased tax on the gas companies. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has raised the question, that if it has become necessary to increase the revenue of this branch of this Department it is due to extravagance in employing unnecessary clerks. In reply I may say that no additional clerk has been appointed in the inside Department, I think, since that branch was first organised. As regards the outside staff the increase has been considerable. The inspection of gas has become necessary wherever it is manufactured, and gas inspection districts have to be established. I de not desire to draw a comparison between the policy of the present Government and the policy of the past Government. The former Government appointed inspectors, and I do not say they did wrong, but they paid them salaries ranging from $1,000 to $1,400. For many years there was not much done, but for the whole eight years that I have been in office, I have not appointed more than two men to be gas inspectors in all the vacancies that occurred purely as gas inspectors. I have always acted, as I have explained on the Estimates, on the most economical system; that if a gas company was started, for instance, in the town of Brockville, we would make the Inland Revenue officer or the Customs officer discharge the duties of gas inspector, and give him $100 for the increased work instead of making a special appointment. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, see that it is unjust to me to say that the necessity for increased taxes has grown out of the extravagance of the Department.

Mr. LISTER. What clauses of the Bill do you propose to strike out?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Clauses 16 and 19 will have to be dropped.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then, as I understand it, the hon. gentleman is simply going to alter the Bill he has submitted to this House, in relation to the verification and stamping of gas meters, and that he proposes to change the three years, mentioned in the Bill, and leave the law as it originally stood, namely, five years.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. That matter, of course, must be settled by experience, and the hon. Minister will know from his officers what is required in that particular, better than perhaps the general public would know. As I understood the Minister, he went on to say that he is deficient in revenue, and the object of the changes he proposed by this Bill was for the purpose of getting additional revenue to make up the deficiency, but in consequence of representations made by interested parties—I think these were the words he used—he had de-

termined to alter that, and to let the law remain as at present, in relation to gas companies and the inspection of gas and the period of examination of the meters.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understood also that he proposed to make up the deficiency by additional fees.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not the whole deficiency.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, in the first place, I want to say, about the gas company of the city I know something about, that the inspection and supervision held by the Department over the gas company of the city of Montreal was very lax indeed. Some time ago, during a period of from ten days to a fortnight, everyone throughout the whole city was complaining of the poisonous and inferior character of the gas there. I presume the same thing exists in Ottawa and elsewhere, and if the presidents of these gas companies are to come here and make representations, and that the legislation is to be altered upon their representations, I do not think it is a sound basis to go on. It is well known that there are no investments in this country which have paid as these gas companies have paid, and it is also known that there are no closer corporations in Canada. It is almost impossible to get up any competition to them, and when competition is attempted, any amount of money, it is alleged, is provided to defeat the necessary legislation, as was experienced in Quebec some Sessions ago, when competition was attempted to be got up to the gas company of the city of Montreal. I am prepared to support any reasonable measure which the hon. Minister submits to this House for the purpose of getting a strict investigation into the character and quality of the gas supplied to the cities, and I know of no instance to which he can better direct himself, for the promotion of public health, than he can in investigating and keeping proper supervision over the gas supplies of this Dominion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is not the object of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. The object of the Bill, as I understand it, is to raise additional fees to make up the deficiency which the cost of supervision has involved as a charge on the country. I think the hon. gentleman would do well to direct this legislation to secure a better and more efficient supply of gas, whether or not he increases the revenue that is necessary to make up the deficiency. The hon. gentleman stated that he thought of having an inspector of petroleum lamps and electric light.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That was brought under my notice, and the deputation asked why it was not done.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is no doubt that a deputtation composed of the presidents of the different gas companies would recommend that, but they are about the most dangerous persons you could have to advise you in relation to it. There has been no demand that I ever heard of on the part of the public for the inspection of electric lights.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is what I told them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the Minister takes that view. With regard to the petroleum lamps, I do not see what other inspection is wanted than an inspection of the standard of oil to be used. There is no doubt that these presidents of gas companies, possessing the monopoly that they do, with their stock watered in some cases to the extent of two or three hundred per cent., and with immense dividends and large rests, should make these representations. But what the Government, and what this Parliament should look at in the interest of the people, is, how the best gas can be supplied for the lowest price. I think it would be well if the Minister would adopt the suggestion of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and let this Bill stand over until next year. The hon. gentleman could then revise the whole gas inspection system, with a view of securing a better quality of gas at a cheaper rate, if it were possible. With regard to inspection of electric light, nobody has asked for it. It is well known that the insurance companies countenance and support people in putting electric lights in their establishments, as a greater security against fire. There certainly is no necessity for inspection of electric lights, and in reference to petroleum oil lights, I do not see how we can get better security than at present, in fixing the inflammable standard of the oil.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint inspectors in every town and city in which there is a gas company?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; we are doing that by degrees.

Mr. LISTER. I think it would be well for the Minister to take into consideration the suggestion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I believe that those interested in the gas companies throughout the country consider that the Bill in its present shape is imperfect, and that it is, in consequence, unsatisfactory. I believe the Minister should adopt the suggestion of the hon. member, and at the next Session of Parliament bring in a Bill dealing with the whole question. So far as the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland is concerned, that the gas companies of this country are receiving immense dividends, that may apply to the city of Montreal and the city of Toronto; but in the smaller cities and towns throughout the Province of Ontario the gas companies are not successful and are not paying large dividends. In my own knowledge, some of them have paid only one or two small dividends in four or five years, and so far as these small companies are concerned, I do not think that legislation which has the effect of increasing the cost of working them, should be passed by this House. It is satisfactory to hear that the hon. gentleman proposes to eliminate some sections from the Bill which would have involved a very large increase in cost to the companies without any corresponding advantage. If it is the intention of the Government to increase the fees payable to the Department for the purpose of covering the increased expenditure, the expense must fall ultimately on the consumers of gas. So far as the smaller companies are concerned, I think he would be meeting their wishes if he would postpone his legislation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With reference to what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said, I think there is very little difference between

us. When I stated that I had changed my mind as to the mode of getting additional fees, it was for this reason: I at first thought, after consulting the Department, that the best way to get the increased revenue would be to shorten the term of inspection, and to have more frequent inspections; but these gentlemen, who, though interested, were entitled to have their views listened to with respect, represented that a more frequent inspection, besides increasing the revenue, would impose additional expense upon them. That was a fair argument, and was presented so strongly that I agreed to abandon that provision for the present, and ask the House simply to leave the terms of inspection the same as before. The hon. gentleman said that I should deal more broadly with the question, as what the consumer wanted was pure gas. These gentlemen first objected to the manner in which I wanted to increase the revenue, and then to the stringency of section 6, which imposes a penalty for furnishing impure gas. In that case I said I would stand by the consumer. They also objected to the last section, which provides power to regulate the pressure. They said the pressure in one place is not the same as in another. For instance, the pressure in Quebec will not be the same as the pressure in a level city like Montreal; we have to regulate the pressure according to the locality. So that I am doing in this Bill just what the hon. gentleman said I ought to do.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite approve of the hon. gentleman endeavoring to secure as pure gas on as economical terms as possible for those who consume it; but I do not see, that increasing the fee and lessening the number of inspections is going to accomplish anything but getting a little more money for the Department, which I do not think is sufficiently important to justify legislation this Session. That is the only point on which we differ; but I think that if some comprehensive scheme were devised for getting us purer gas, it would be a benefit to the public.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the change in the new section from the old?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It makes the penalty arbitrary for furnishing impure gas, for every day the company furnishes it.

Mr. BROWN. I am informed by gas company managers that in the very best managed companies in the world, there will be now and then traces of sulphuretted hydrogen in the gas. There ought to be a distinction made between cases where the traces of sulphuretted hydrogen are very light, and those cases to which the hon. member for Northumberland referred. The hon. member for Northumberland is entitled to a great deal of credit for drawing the attention of the House to this matter, but there ought to be a distinction made between really bad gas, and that in which there are only, by accident, occasionally traces of sulphuretted hydrogen.

Mr. BLAKE. They ought to be allowed to plead—it is only a little one.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any provision for recovering the penalty for bad gas?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is in the general law and in the Gas Act itself.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Privy Council Office..... $11,100

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the object of making an appropriation for further Civil Service examinations, when 3,000 persons have passed the examination, for whom no places can be found? It would be better to discontinue these examinations, or hold them only once every two or three years.

Mr. FOSTER. They were formerly held twice a year, and are now held but once a year. The law requires that they shall be held once a year, and an appropriation must be had to pay the salaries authorised by the Act. There are a number of persons who have passed the examinations and have not yet places, but at the same time, it would be scarcely fair to debar future applicants from having their chance of becoming eligible for situations in the service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With 3,000 persons unprovided for, not much wrong can be so done, by refusing to allow others to swell the number. It would be more proper to suspend this Act for some time, than the operation of the Franchise Act, as the Government have done with regard to the revising of the voters' list.

Mr. COOK. I think this is an absolute injury to the people who are fitting themselves for the Civil Service examination. There is a chance of about one out of 500 obtaining a situation, and a great many of these parties fit themselves for the position of civil servants, and they are relying upon that as a vocation for life. In this way their hopes will be entirely destroyed. I think the law should be repealed altogether. I should like to know, while I am on my feet, whether the gentlemen who have recently come from England and other parts of the world and have received appointments in the Civil Service, have passed the examination?

Mr. FOSTER. What parties does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. COOK. To those who were sent out by the High Commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will give us the names, we may be able to get the information.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not suppose that one in 500 of those who go up for Civil Service examinations, does so in order to get a position in the Civil Service, but the fact of passing that examination gives them a certain standing when they seek for other employment.

Expenses in connection with *Patent Record*..... $10,000

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Is this vote to be continued for the printing of the *Patent Record*, or is it hereafter to be printed in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I understand from the explanations already given in the House by the Minister of Agriculture, there is a contract

running now, but after the expiration of that contract, the *Patent Record* will be printed by the Printing Bureau.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). How long has that contract to run ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think a little over a year.

Salary of the Deputy Speaker..... $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to add, that this shall be paid at the end of the Session. The Auditor General thinks that the Deputy Speaker would have to be paid by the month unless such a provision is inserted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What would be the effect of this if there was a second Session held in the same year ?

Mr. FOSTER. That would remain in the hands of the House.

Royal Military College..... $77,000

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that the cost of the Royal Military College is increasing very rapidly. It used to be $40,000 or $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation is this : Formerly all fees received went into the Department, and the money was disbursed by the Department. We have adopted the principle, which is, of course, the correct one, that all fees shall go into the hands of the Receiver General and all payments should be made by cheque, so that while the amount to be voted is a larger amount the fees now go into the revenue. There is really no increase.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is a decrease, in fact. We charge now $100 additional to the cadets. As the Minister of Finance has explained, the difference is caused by another mode of bookkeeping.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the great and immediate necessity that exists for a proper hospital in connection with that institution, the Royal Military College. You have got there 100 young men from all parts of Canada, and there is no attention whatever paid to them, or to their comfort, or to the restoration to health in case of illness. The place now used for a hospital was never intended for that purpose. It is down stairs in the cellar, with large steam pipes passing through it, where the temperature is never below eighty. It is in a dreadful state, and if an epidemic broke out and any loss of life occurred, the Government would be held responsible. I speak of this because I know that the parents of the young men who have been ill there, are very much alarmed about it. It is a matter which, I think, the Government and the Minister of Militia should take into immediate consideration, and prepare some place where, in case of illness, these young men could be taken care of and their lives saved.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course, I fully agree with what the hon. gentleman has stated as to the necessity of a hospital, but I think the most important thing to be looked after is giving dormitory accommodation. My hon. friend knows how inadequate that accommodation is, and I think we could make some arrangement with the City Hospital to receive our patients in case of need. I would prefer, if it can be done, that the first expenditure we incur on the Royal Military College, should be for the purpose of giving more dormitory accommodation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask the Minister if the returns moved for in the early part of the Session relating to the examination of cadets in that college, who had obtained commissions, have been brought down ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am under the impression they were brought down some time ago, but I will ascertain, and if they have not been brought down, I will send them over to the hon. gentleman.

Government Printing Bureau, including Electric Light Plant..... $32,000

Mr. MULOCK. Does this item of $32,000 complete the expenditure on Printing Bureau building construction account ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the amounts in the Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates this year will complete the account.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I again call the attention of the Government to the expenditure on Major Hill Park. Is it the intention of the Government to continue to expend large sums on that park ? I fail to understand the ground on which we are called upon to vote money to maintain a park for the people of Ottawa.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount charged in connection with the park was reduced last year and again this year. In Supply I stated that we have given a contract for the maintenance covering the year ending 1st July next, and tenders will be called for the following year. This park is merely an appendage of the Parliamentary grounds, and the sum expended is not a large one. The amount is being reduced every year, and I suppose after this year only an expenditure for maintaining the grounds, without any outlay for improvements, will only be necessary.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Can the Government resume possession and ownership of the park ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It belongs to the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the Government possession now ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much was the contract for keeping the park in order last year ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $4,500.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... $125,500

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Early in the Session I obtained an order of the House for copies of the report respecting Port Stanley Harbor, but up to the present time it has not been brought down. I have enquired from the Government on several occasions, and they have promised to bring it down in a few days, but I have not yet seen it. I took the precaution to enquire at the Department to-day, but I have not received the report. The Minister will remember that a deputation waited on him and pointed out the serious condition of this harbor, and how its improvement was necessary for railway and other interests. He, has, how-

ever, treated those representations with apparent indifference, regardless of the condition of the harbor, the inability of vessels to come there, and the lack of proper facilities for trade. The hon. gentleman may have some object in not bringing down the report, if so, what that object is I do not know. I now ask him again, whether he intends to have that report this Session, or whether I will have it next Session, if not this Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am glad the hon. gentleman did not say I had any sinister motive in not giving him the papers, because I have not. I made a recommendation to the Privy Council, and the report had to be before the Council. The minute in Council had to be sent to His Excellency the Governor General to be signed, and as soon as that comes back, I will be able to give him the decision which we have come to, and then the papers may be brought down.

Mr. COOK. Some time ago a deputation from the town of Midland, waited upon the Minister in reference to this work, and I find the following in the Midland *Free Press*, of 3rd April :—

"Our deputation returned from Ottawa Saturday. They saw the Minister of Public Works in reference to changes in plans of esplanade, and the Minister of Marine about lighthouses. It was intimated to them that they were rather late, the Supplementary Estimates have been brought down. If the dredge is at Penetang this summer we will get it, otherwise it is doubtful if the dredging will be done this summer. The deputation did all in their power, and if nothing comes out of their trip to Ottawa this year, there may later on. Instead of there being enough money to our credit to make the change, there is only some $200 of the esplanade grant unexpended."

The Minister evidently forgot to tell them that there were other Supplementary Estimates to come down. I would like to know if only $300 remains unexpended, as the newspaper states?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The local authorities voted $11,000 and the Government voted a certain sum of money, and now these $6,000 are to complete the works undertaken. We expended partly the money voted by Parliament, and the money subscribed by the local authorities, which had been deposited in my name as Minister of Public Works. When the deputation came down, they wanted some change in the contract work. I thought we could not make any change, that would require a larger sum of money than was intended in the first instance; but after looking into the matter well, I saw that we could accede to a portion of what they asked without exceeding the grant, and some of the gentlemen on the deputation seemed to be satisfied at this. My intention has always been to make that work as good as possible, but if the required changes entail a larger expenditure, I shall have to obtain the consent of my colleagues, and then come to Parliament for an additional amount. These $6,000 which are now voted, with the balance which remains in the hands of the Department, will complete the works which have been undertaken. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that the dredging will go on with the remainder of the work as required.

For three lines of steamers running between the ports of Halifax and St. John, or either, and the West Indies and South America.... ..	$85,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see by the return brought down that the Government had a tender from Mr. Wood, of Halifax, for the line between Halifax and St. John and the West Indies. He offered to run a steamer of 700 tons, built at Glasgow, of a speed of twelve knots an hour, making ten trips in the year, for $2,000 per trip. The Government seem to have ignored that tender and to have given the contract to the line in which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) is interested, for $4,000 per month. The hon. gentleman stated, when this matter was before the House on a previous occasion, that that payment was per trip, but I find by the return that it is per month. On what principle the hon. Minister of Finance made that contract for just double the amount of Mr. Wood's tender, I cannot understand. On its face, it requires some explanation, for it appears to be unjustifiable.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that Mr. Wood, in the first place, proposed to have only one vessel, and that of 700 tons, and making but ten trips in the year; and it is impossible, with a vessel of that size, and with only ten trips, to perform that service satisfactorily. The minimum capacity which we wished the vessels for that route to have was 1,000 tons; and subsequent events have shown the objection to Mr. Wood's tender on that ground to have been a well-considered objection. So far two trips have been made, and the vessel is now preparing to make her third trip, and the amount of freight offering has been more than the larger vessel could carry. The hon. gentleman will see by the return that Messrs. Pickford & Black also tendered for a 700-ton vessel, which I did not accept, largely because of the smallness of the vessel, although there were other objections also. When you take into account that Mr. Wood had no vessel and proposed to build one, and that a small vessel, and proposed to make only ten trips per year, I think the Government were justified in taking the larger vessel and the greater number of trips.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the answer of the hon. gentleman is hardly satisfactory. The successful company were in precisely the same condition as Mr. Wood. They had not a vessel of their own, but they were proposing to have one built. The Government stated themselves that this was in the nature of an experiment, and if they had taken a smaller vessel of greater speed, and at half the rate, they would have been able to ascertain whether or not the undertaking would justify the subsidy; but they took the larger vessel, and the moment the crop is over that vessel will be obliged to come back with ballast. I venture to say that the vessel has never been half full on the return trip, although I dare say she has all the freight she can carry on the outward trip, because she carries it at half the usual rate, in consequence of the vessel being too large for the route. If the Government had taken a smaller vessel and worked up a business in time at a lower rate, it would have been a much more defensible policy than the one they have pursued.

Mr. ELLIS. I see, according to the paper brought down, that the contract is not executed. Is it according to the author, Mr. Van Wart, and how much a month is it?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract is according to the offer, and the amount to be paid is $4,100 per round

trip. The contract has been executed, and was returned to me the other day.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have waited in the hope that the acting Minister of Marine would be present before these Estimates were finally concurred in, because he promised to give us some information with regard to the vote of $8,844.32 to Mr. Jotham O'Brien. The acting Minister of Marine said this amount was recommended by the inspector for the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I have looked through the returns which have been brought down, and I am unable to find among them any document from Mr. Cocker recommending any payment on this account. His report refers only to the building of the vessel, saying that the work was well done ; but there is no official statement from him that Mr. Jotham O'Brien was entitled to this money. I have since learned, that after this transaction was closed, Mr. Jotham O'Brien moved to the United States, but that his services being required in the County of Cumberland in the last election, the High Commissioner promised him, that if he came back and assisted at the election, his claim, which had been refused up to that time, would be entertained ; and that is the reasan, I suppose, why this vote is in the Estimates to-day.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

(In the Committee.)

On section 66,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), before leaving, asked me to have the words "which has accrued and become payable" in this section struck out. He objects to them on the ground that an advance may be made to a party who holds stock, knowing that there is a lien upon it, and that they may deprive him of his rights.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. These words are an addition ; they are not in the law as it stands, and I do not think they are necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not appear to me that this is an advantageous addition. I do not think there is any use of inserting words which can very easily be evaded, and the practical effect of which will be to introduce a system of evasion. Under the present law, although a bank is not entitled to advance on the security of its stock, if it does advance upon other security, it obtains a certain statutory lien—at any rate, it has the right to say that the stock shall not be parted with until the debt is paid. The proposal now is to say that that right shall not accrue until the debt has become due. The practical result of that will be just this, that you will have a fictitious system of loaning ; you will have a due bill or a sight draft or a demand note representing the loan, and a demand made at once, and a debt becoming due at once, but left lying until the time comes when it is understood tacitly that the borrower shall settle it. The clause can be overcome by that easy and simple process, so that all you are doing is to promote a fictitious set of transactions.

Mr. COCKBURN. I believe the hon. member for West Durham has stated the point very clearly. I may only add the other possibility, namely, that it would be quite possible for a bank to make an engagement under those circumstances that as soon as the borrower began to sell any shares, the debt should become due, so that it is really impossible to meet a provision of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. We will allow that clause to stand.

On section 67,

Mr. FOSTER. That section will stand.

On section 69,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I wish to call the attention of the Minister to this section. It is true that it is the present law, but it opens the door to great abuses. It speaks of additional security, and this is what has been done to my knowledge : A note has been discounted on the endorsation of a party, who is entirely irresponsible, but the real security of the bank—although it is supposed to be only an additional security—is a mortgage or the transfer of a timber limit. I know of some banks which have been holding timber limits for a number of years, and those limits were obtained as additional security. Really, the only security at all was the timber limit or the mortgage itself. Some provision should be made to prevent such an abuse.

On section 70,

Mr. FOSTER. In the 52nd line, after the word "by," I propose to add these words :

"A mortgagee or other encumbrancer, having priority over a mortgage or other encumbrance held by a bank or offered for sale by it."

On section 74,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If that is the present law, it has given rise to the greatest difficulties as to its construction. A decision was given by the Court of Appeals in Ontario, which was reversed by the Supreme Court, in its interpretation of the clause which corresponded to this one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the question the hon. gentleman refers to had better come up on the next clause. I suppose it is the question of banks being allowed to loan money on warehouse receipts.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The case I refer to was from Toronto, where the Court of Appeals decided that it was not a legal warehouse receipt, and the Supreme Court decided the other way. I know there is a strong opinion in the Province of Quebec that the decision of the Court of Appeals of Ontario was the right one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman desires to apply this to all the clauses referring to warehouse receipts ?

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest, that, irrespective of the question which he proposes to raise, we might pass these clauses, reserving the right to the hon. gentleman to come back to them

and make his suggestions at a future time. We have already passed a number of sections to which we intend again to call the attention of the Committee.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I am not raising the question as to the authority of Parliament to deal with this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was the question raised in the case of Smith.

Mr. BLAKE. That was one of the questions. There was also a question raised as to whether it was a good warehouse receipt, because it was given by the owner himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said that his remarks would apply to all the warehouse receipt clauses. In view of the decision in the Smith case, this clause might stand.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman proposes that we should even formally pass the very important clauses which add to the lien power of banks. I think we had better let them stand instead of passing them and coming back to them again.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was referring to the request of the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), to allow that clause to stand.

On section 75,

Mr. BLAKE. I think that clause demands some exposition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will state briefly the change which is proposed, and, in order to do that, I must refer to the previous legislation on the subject of warehouse receipts. That legislation is, I think, based on bailment. The warehouseman is supposed to have custody of the goods of another party, and to give a receipt indicating that he holds those goods for delivery to another person. In the legislation which has hitherto been adopted in regard to banking, that has been made much wider. Producers of nearly all kinds have been allowed to give such securities on goods which were in their own possession without their being transferred to the possession of any warehouseman. In fact, the words in the statute have been so wide in their application that almost any person in business could give such a security on goods in his own possession. That was originally restricted to certain classes of manufactures, but one class of manufacturers after another applied to Parliament for like permission, and it came to be a mere question as to what classes of manufacturers or producers this privilege should be given to without regard to actual warehousing. I think it is very undesirable that this provision should be widened as it has been, and this Bill proposes to observe two principles. One of these principles is, that a warehouseman having actual possession of the goods of another party, may issue a warehouse receipt, and that upon that the bank may make advances. So far as that is concerned, we adhere to the primary principle on which these warehouse receipts are based, and I think it is a perfectly safe principle to act upon, and one that would not interfere with the principles of chattel mortgages, because there is an actual change of possession. We propose, however, in view of the convenience which these warehouse receipts have afforded to the manufacturing classes in the country, and to commercial men generally, not to confine it exclusively to the case of mere warehousemen holding property of other persons, as that would make a very radical change in the present law. We propose, on the contrary, that there shall be a second principle introduced, namely, that a manufacturer or producer of any article of merchandise or commerce, may give a like security upon his own goods, without their actually going into the possession of a warehouseman. The advantages of allowing this are demonstrated by past experience. The experience has been that, in aid of the manufacturers and producers of the country, advances to an enormous amount in the aggregate have been made by the banks, with safety and with great convenience to the producers themselves, by enabling the means to be procured for carrying their stock until it is ready for the market, until it has gone through all the changes in the course of manufacture which makes the product ready for sale. I think experience has also developed that this practice has not led to inconvenience to the public as regards those frauds, to prevent which the chattel mortgage system, in force in all the Provinces, was designed. The principal abuse which the chattel mortgages are intended to prevent, is the securing of past debts upon merchandise or movable property by secret transfers; and to prevent that, as well as to prevent the acquisition of credit upon goods which are really pledged to other persons, it is provided by the chattel mortgage system that such transfer or conveyance of personal property shall only be by an instrument which becomes notorious by registration. To insist upon the application of that rule to the goods in course of manufacture, in view of the past practice with regard to these warehouse receipts, and the latitude heretofore allowed, would be a very severe restriction; it is one which would absolutely prevent advances being made, because the public, and especially the business community, have come to regard chattel mortgages and bills of sale as indicating a state of embarrassment; and in a mere loan or advance to carry the goods which are in course of manufacture until their manufacture is complete, the system of advancing upon chattel mortgages, could not be applied in the very class of cases in which warehouse receipts, in regard to manufacturers and producers, have been applied under the present banking law. We think that danger and that inconvenience will be very largely removed by this circumstance, that the system can only be applied in relation to an advance upon goods, and cannot be used in relation to a past debt. When we come to apply that principle to banking institutions, managed as they are, as we all know, upon methodical principles, and with books kept in such a way that the transaction as regards the advance, is susceptible of clear and ready proof, the danger of the security being taken for other than the actual advance, is practically reduced to a cipher. Furthermore, we have come to the conclusion that it would exceedingly disturb business to overthrow the present system, and that it would be well to make the restrictions which we now propose, namely, restricting the securing by the owner to the simple case of advance to a producer, or a manufacturer, in a wholesale way. The danger of abuse in that regard is very slight indeed, the more so as the principle that has grown up of making this

advance to manufacturers and producers, is so well recognised and understood in the business community, that it is generally recognised that goods in course of manufacture are liable to have a lien like this upon them. These are the principal changes that are made in the warehouse receipt clauses.

Mr. BARRON. I do not know that I ought to question the statements of the Minister when he speaks as to what the law has been in relation to warehouse receipts, but I do not understand the law to have been that anybody heretofore could have simply given a warehouse receipt on being the owner of the goods. I understand the law in the past has passed through three different periods. At first, only a bailee of goods could give a warehouse receipt; then it became law that a warehouseman could give a warehouse receipt on his own goods, but he had to be a warehouseman, and I understand that up to this period it has been the law that we could only get a man to give a warehouse receipt upon his own goods, provided he was a warehouseman. Now, this law proposes to extend it to such an extent that anybody, provided he comes within the category of the persons or characters spoken of in this Act, can give a warehouse receipt upon his own goods. Now, I think this rather a dangerous innovation, because it is enabling a person to give a secret conveyance upon his own goods which will be a most dangerous thing to the community at large. I would refer the Minister to the statement of Chancellor Boyd in the case of Banks *vs.* Robinson, when speaking upon the principle involved in giving secret conveyances upon goods as security for advances. We have had a law in the Province of Ontario relating to conditional sales, which law enabled a manufacturer to dispose of his manufactured goods, retaining in himself the property in those goods; in other words, a manufacturer was able to sell a manufactured article, deliver it over to the possession of the vendee, and retain in himself the property in those goods, enabling the vendee thereof, to all intents and purposes, to appear as the owner, and giving him a fictitious credit. It is that state of things that induced Chancellor Boyd to express the opinion I have mentioned—I am not able to give the text of his language from memory—but it is that state of things that induced him to characterise the evil as being a very vicious one. It seems to me that the system is about being introduced here by this section. But if it is necessarry, and I am not prepared to say it is not necessary, in the interests of the banks, then I say it should go a little further, so as to point out clearly and plainly what is meant by the term wholesale producer. I observe by the section that any person who is a "wholesale manufacturer or producer of any goods, wares or merchandise," and so forth. The words "goods, wares and merchandise," in the interpretation clause, include agricultural produce and other articles of commerce. Hence I say that a farmer apparently comes within this clause. I do not object by any means to the farmers coming within this clause; but if it is so intended, or if the section is to be made as wide as it is being made, it should be made as clear as possible that the farmer does come within it beyond dispute. I see no reason why a farmer, having a quantity of grain in his barn, should not be able to go to a bank and pledge it as security for a temporary advance.

Mr. COCKBURN. He is not a wholesale man.

Mr. BARRON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would define the meaning of the word "wholesale." A farmer certainly comes within the section, by reason of the fact that goods, wares and merchandise include agricultural produce. Then the question is as to what is a wholesale manufacturer or producer. It is difficult to say. One man produces agricultural products on a large scale, while another does so on a small scale.

Mr. BLAKE. For instance, Sir John Lister-Kaye.

Mr. BARRON. Yes; but if the right is only to be given to Sir John Lister-Kaye, or such gentlemen, to obtain loans of money from banks on the security of grain in their barns, we are making very invidious distinctions. I complain that the section is too wide, and that it should be somewhat limited for the reason I have stated, that it will create a general feeling of distrust, when it is known that any one with whom you do business may have all the time his goods pledged to the banks, when he appears to be the owner of them to all intents and purposes, and thereby he is given an artificial and fictitious standing in the community. If the clause has to be as wide as this is, then in the interests of the farmers it should be made perfectly clear, that they are included, and they can go to the banks and get the same advantage as others. If it is not altered in the direction I have indicated, I shall move an amendment on the third reading, so as to make it plain that farmers are included.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true, that by the interpretation clause of the present law, the term warehouse receipt is so defined as to only apply to one who is engaged in carrying on the warehousing business, and not to a person who is giving a pledge on his own goods. Section 54 enumerates certain persons who may give such securities. That provision was not in the original Act, but it was introduced in consequence of the restricted interpretation which the courts very naturally placed on the interpretation clause as to what the warehouse receipt was. There can be no question that the wording is sufficiently wide to permit owners, even although not engaged in the business of warehousing, to give warehouse receipts for their own goods.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whence does the hon. gentleman think he has power to legislate on this subject? Is it under the provisions respecting banking, or those respecting trade and commerce?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think they are banking provisions, inasmuch as we are permitting the banks to loan on this kind of securities, and stating what their right shall be in that regard.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the Minister's attention to the fact that we are not merely giving the banks the capacity to enter into engagements of this sort, but we are stating how rights and properties shall be acquired other than the stocks of a bank, that is to say, property outside of the bank. We are stating what may be the security, and how it may be secured. These sections seem to be altogether outside of the provisions respecting trade or commerce, or banking.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course I can only state my own impression on the subject, but I think it seems to have been decided in the affirmative by the highest court.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Under the present law, as I understand it, persons can give warehouse receipts when they are themselves the owners of the goods, with this restriction, that they must be ostensibly occupied in the business of warehousemen. Under the present law not all owners have this privilege, but certain owners who are enumerated. The proposed change in the law is to do away with this restriction as to the classes of persons enumerated, and it is proposed that they shall not be required to be persons engaged in the warehousing business, or the persons enumerated in section 64 of the present law. That is an important alteration in the law as it has existed up to the present moment. I do not say it is a bad change, but I would like to have it made clear upon that point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not read section 74 as the hon. gentleman does. I understand his view to be that section 74 confines the right to give a warehouse receipt to a person who is engaged in the business of warehousing, although he may give a receipt for his own goods. I think that is not the interpretation, because the persons are enumerated who can give a warehouse receipt, and some of them are persons not engaged in the ostensible business of warehousing, such as a keeper of a yard, wharf or warehouse, millers and so on. It enables these persons to give a lien upon their own goods, and the hon. gentleman will see from the enumeration that takes place in section 74, that some of them are persons who cannot be engaged in the business of warehousing, such as masters of vessels. It was distinctly intended to widen the class of persons who could give liens on their goods beyond warehousemen.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is one point I would like to be clear on in reference to this clause, which I think is a new one. I would like the legal gentlemen of the House to determine whether it does not enable the banks to become, at any time, prior creditors, by putting them in a position better than other creditors. They may take, as I understand it, a warehouse receipt upon all the goods in the possession of a manufacturer, or wholesale dealer, and it gives the bank an absolute right and priority. That will be done, as I understand, without any notice whatever being given to the public, and its effect will be as legally binding as a chattel mortgage, although in the case of a chattel mortgage the public are notified of it, and the person soliciting credit is known to have given that mortgage by everyone, which of course puts the person from whom credit is solicited on his guard. I wish to ask the Minister particularly to explain: Could the banks, under this, take a warehouse receipt which would in effect transfer the whole of the property that a manufacturer might have into their hands, and, for their safety, shutting out all other creditors?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, is not that a point to be considered? Section 76 says:

"The banks shall not acquire or hold any warehouse receipt or bill of lading or security under the preceding section, to secure the payment of any bill, note or debt, unless such bill, note or debt, is negotiated or contracted at the time of the acquisition thereof by the bank."

The Minister laid great stress upon this when stating that it would not be the recovery of a bank debt, but it would be simply transferring the property at that time. But the clause goes on to say:

"Or upon the promise that such warehouse receipt or bill of lading, or security, would be given to the bank."

Well, under that, could not a bank, in dealing with any one, say: I make you this advance, but you will give me a warehouse receipt at any time I want it. "Oh, yes," the customer may say, and the transaction may run along. His credit is good and the public, meanwhile, supply him with raw material for his manufactures. By-and-bye, if he should become embarrassed, under the provisions of this Bill, could not a warehouse receipt be given, not only to include the last loan he had with the bank, but also to cover all other loans, and thus the bank would become the absolute possessor of all he has, to the exclusion of other creditors who may have supplied him with goods, in total ignorance of his position with the bank? He could not be in that position without the public knowing it if he had given a chattel mortgage, because notice would be given. I am not a lawyer, but I mention this point as a suggestion to gentlemen of legal knowledge in the House, and I would like to have it discussed by the legal gentlemen present, so that we may know what the effects of this clause will be, in the way of giving banks a preference over other creditors who may have been deceived in selling goods to these persons whose property was in the hands of the bank.

Mr. HALL. What would be the effect if there is to be no change of possession and no registration, of giving notice to the public? What would be the effect of a chattel mortgage given to a manufacturer and to a bank at the same time? How is the question of priority to be determined?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The warehouse receipt will take priority over any subsequent lien, whether by chattel mortgage or otherwise. It is simply a question of which was given first, and that is a matter that must depend upon proof. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is quite right in stating that this enables the wholesale manufacturer to give a lien without the notoriety that a chattel mortgage has. I think, however, that it does not permit such a transaction as the hon. gentleman has described, with regard to a vague promise that the debtor would give some warehouse receipt at some future time.

Mr. BARRON. That was the case in the Merchants' Bank and Smith.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is sometime since I read that case, but I do not think it was such a promise as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has described.

Mr. BARRON. The understanding was, that when the coal was received the warehouse receipt should be given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It applies only to the case of an advance and warehouse receipt given simultaneously, or to the case which was decided by the Supreme Court of Canada; that in which there was a promise that when certain goods arrived, and came into possession of the debtor,

the debtor would give a warehouse receipt upon those goods. It would not cover the case of a vague promise, which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated, namely, the case of a man obtaining an advance, and saying: If I get into difficulties I will give you a warehouse receipt upon all the goods I may have at that time. In the case I have referred to there was a distinct promise to give a warehouse receipt upon certain goods. That is the only instance that is saved from the general rule, as regards the necessity for the advance and the receipt being given at the same time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I were quite satisfied of the jurisdiction of this Parliament to legislate in this direction I would be in a better position to discuss the details. The grave question which appears to me to deserve attention at the hands of the Minister is, whether we have the power to pass the Act at all. It is perfectly clear to my mind, that it practically repeals the Bills of Sale Act, as we have it in the Maritime Provinces. This section enables a person in possession of goods to give a lien upon them which is void under the local law, and which, but for the intervention of the Dominion statute, would not be operative at all to transfer the goods. Under our law—and I think it is the same in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—if a person in possession of goods wants to give a lien upon them to another person he must give a bill of sale, and that bill of sale must be registered in order to give public notice. We are now practically attempting to repeal that law. I understand that the Minister seeks to defend it under the principle laid down in the decision of the Merchants' Bank and Smith. While it is possible it might be defended on the principle of that decision, I cannot, myself, say that I fully appreciate or understand that decision. I know that leading judges of the court decided the case on side issues, and I must say that I cannot accept the decision unreservedly. Perhaps it may be through my not thoroughly understanding the reasons given by the judges; but I notice that one or two of the judges expressly refrained from passing an opinion on the constitutionality of the clause which they were called on to pass an opinion upon—evaded the question, in point of fact. I am very strongly of opinion that our right to pass this section is subject to very grave doubts. It is not confined to wholesale producers or manufacturers of goods; the second sub-section extends to almost everybody engaged in trade—in the Maritime Provinces at any rate—and it practically amounts to a repeal of the Bills of Sale Act in force in those Provinces. It may be that we have the power, but I am strongly of the opinion that we cannot have it under the power to legislate on banking. So far as I can see, it is not a necessary incident of banking; and unless my hon. friend the Minister of Justice can bring it under the head of trade and commerce, which I think he will have difficulty in doing, I fear it will not be possible to sustain the constitutionality of this clause. If we had the power, I should not cavil at the exercise of it, or the manner in which it is exercised. I merely enter my dissent from the assumption, which might be inferred from my remaining silent, that I assented to the position that we have power to pass this clause.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Under this clause a dishonest producer or manufacturer might go to a bank and get an advance, giving a secret conveyance of his goods as collateral, and the next day he might go to his neighbor and get a further advance from him, giving him a chattel mortgage; but under the clause the bank would have the advantage, and the private lender might lose his money. I think that when a conveyance is made, public notice should be given of it to everybody, otherwise a dishonest person might carry out a transaction of that kind, which would certainly be very injurious to the public at large?

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Justice precisely in what regard he considers that this clause restricts the powers which are found to exist under the present law, and whether there is any particular, and if so, what, in which he thinks the clause extends the powers that exist under the present law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will answer that with pleasure. But I want first to allude to what my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has said in relation to the chattel mortgage system. If the hon. gentleman will read the sections again, I think he will find that they do not conflict with the chattel mortgage system or the bill of sale system, as it is called in the lower Provinces, because they simply refer to the warehouse receipt given by the bailee, and that would be effectual, I submit, notwithstanding any bill of sale by the owner of the goods. Because the warehouse receipt is given by the bailee, the bailee is estopped, as between him and the person making the advance, from disputing the title to the property, whether the title is affected by any conveyance of his own or by a conveyance or want of title in the owner of the goods. So that, when a bank makes an advance to the person keeping the warehouse, the latter acknowledging that he holds so much property, the bank has recourse against him, no matter how many bills of sale there may be, either by the warehouse keeper or by the real owner of the goods. That would be so, even under our bills of sale or chattel mortgage system. As to the two questions of the hon. member for West Durham—first, in what particular this restricts the present system—I contend, that it restricts the system which has been set up under section 54 of the present Act, because my view of that section is, that it allows the owner of the goods himself to give a warehouse receipt upon his goods, even though he be not engaged in the business of a warehouseman; and includes almost all large producers in this country. It widens the present law, by enlarging one class of persons who can give warehouse receipts upon their own goods, extending that right to all wholesale manufacturers and producers. I am laying aside for the present moment, any criticisms upon the appropriateness of those words, or as to whether more convenient words may be suggested.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you not admit wholesale purchasers, too?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; we require that these goods should be in the possession of the bailee. We restrict the clause by limiting the right to the wholesale manufacturer or producer, while section 54 extended, for instance, to carriers,

or to keepers of yards or sheds or wharves. We enlarge it in so far as wholesale manufacturers and producers are concerned, by extending it to the whole of that class; and I think there is safety in doing that on account of the practice which has grown up of making these advances to persons of that class, it being generally understood in the business community—I speak subject to correction, and on the information of those acquainted with the operation of this clause, especially in the larger Provinces—that those persons are known to be likely to have obtained advances on warehouse receipts for the purpose of carrying forward their products from the time they enter into their manufacture until the products are finished and ready for the market. And as I have already said, experience has shown that transactions of this kind are subject to very little danger and risk.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this clause by giving us a few examples of what he means by the "wholesale producer" as distinct from the "wholesale manufacturer?"

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was not intended, by the use of those two words, to make any distinction between the two classes. There are classes of manufacturers, as popularly understood, to whom the term "manufacturer" might not strictly apply. There is the case of the distiller or the brewer. No doubt, the product of their industry is a manufacture in the legal sense of the term. The term "manufacture" of whiskey or ale or porter would probably be correct in a legal sense: but, as popularly understood, the term "manufacture" is rather applied to products which do not so entirely change the substance and appearance of the articles from which they are made as do distilled or malt liquors. No one could misunderstand the use of the term "manufacturer" as applied to a person who makes boots and shoes by wholesale, or produces cotton goods. The term is generally understood as applying to products of that description, but not as applying to the products of the distillery or brewery.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would it apply to the miner? He would be a producer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think not.

Mr. BLAKE. The section reads: "a wholesale manufacturer or producer of any goods, wares and merchandise." On turning back to the interpretation clause, I find that:

"The expression goods, wares and merchandise, includes, in addition to the things usually understood thereby, timber, deals, boards, stays, sawlogs, and other lumber, petroleum, crude oil, and all agricultural produce and other articles of commerce."

We have thus the wholesale manufacturer or producer of agricultural products, as well as of other things; and, therefore, the section seems to me to include the whole farming community, unless the term "wholesale" is to except the whole farming community; or if it is partly to except and partly to include, I would like the line of demarcation drawn.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not propose to discuss the question as to whether this warehouse receipt is going to cut out the chattel mortgages given subsequent to it. I think that is a very nice question, and I would not advise any bank to lend upon the security of such goods without also taking a chattel mortgage and registering it, and giving notice of such security having been taken. I propose rather to address a few words to urge the necessity of making this Banking Act more popular among our farming community than it is, by giving the farmer some interest in banking and some way of getting accommodation from the banks. At the present time they believe they are shut out altogether from benefiting by the Act, that they have nothing to do with the banks, that if they want to get any advance on their goods, they must go to the shaving shop and pay 10 or 12 per cent. discount to the shaver, who then takes their notes and discounts them at the bank. There is a great feeling among the farming community against the banks on this account. I think, when a bank is allowed to discount the paper of the manufacturer and to take security upon what he manufactures, it should be allowed to do the same with regard to the farmer. The farmer should be put in just as good a position with regard to the banks as any manufacturer, even any small manufacturer who makes any petty goods in our cities and towns. Such a manufacturer can go to the banks and get a discount on the security of a warehouse receipt, under this clause, on placing those goods as a pledge for the loan, but the farmer cannot do that unless he is a wholesale producer. What does that mean? Is a wholesale farmer a man who has half a dozen farms, or half a dozen acres, or fifty acres? Where are we to draw the line? A farmer has a farm of fifty acres; he has the product of those fifty acres; he goes to a bank and asks for a discount of a few hundred dollars, offering security on his products. Can he get the advance on giving this security? Or must he give some additional security, which the manufacturer is not bound to give? It should be made clear that this Act enables a farmer to go to a bank, and to give as security for a loan the products of his farm. The clause should be amended so as to distinctly provide for that. It seems to me that if we were just to transpose these terms in the clause, by making it read that a bank may lend money to any person engaged in business as a producer or a wholesale manufacturer of any goods, wares and merchandise, that would include the farmer. Then the farmer would have the right to go to a bank, and say, I will pledge my goods, wares and merchandise—since these terms include agricultural products—as security for the loan I get. If such a transposition were made, this clause would render the Banking Act much more popular.

Mr. BLAKE. The object I had in view in asking my question was to obtain the opinion of the Administration as to the meaning of the clause, as it now stands. I am strongly impressed with the view that the clause, in its present shape, accomplishes the object desired by the hon. member for Frontenac. Whether it be laudable or advantageous to the farming community and the country, or not, may be more disputable, but it accomplishes the object. I am not versed in these things, but I suppose that the wholesale manufacturer is the person who manufactures for sale in bulk to those who sell in retail to others. He is the person whose goods reach the ultimate consumer, not directly but through an intermediary distributor. That I under-

stand to be the wholesale manufacturer. To the wholesale producer the same interpretation will apply. He is the man who produces articles which he does not, as a rule, proceed himself to retail directly to the ultimate consumers, but which, in whole or part, he disposes of in bulk to some intermediary, who is the vehicle of transmission to the ultimate consumer. Every farmer, or almost every farmer in the country, is a wholesale producer under that definition. His cattle and grain may go to England, or the States, or to the towns of Canada; his products may go through half a dozen hands in bulk before they reach the man who eats them. Therefore it is, I ask what was intended by this clause? What is the line of demarcation? If in the term "wholesale producer" you include the producer of agricultural products, what farmer does the clause include, and what farmer does it exclude? It may exclude the small market gardener, who, having "three acres and a cow," proceeds daily through the streets of the city near where he lives, and peddles his goods from door to door, and so, himself producing, reaches himself with his produce the ultimate customer; but, even as to him, if he goes into a market town and sells those very articles to a huckster, or another vendor, who is the intermediary between the producer and the consumer, I do not know on what principle you can call even a small market gardener other than a wholesale producer. So it seems to me that practically, although with, perhaps, great profit to the legal fraternity as to determining the exact line of demarcation, and with the prospect of many interesting law-suits before the question shall be determined definitely and substantially, the whole farming community are to be the recipients of those countless blessings which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) would ask this House to shower on their heads. At present we should first know what it is proposed to us to do, and then we can discuss the question on its merits.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think, in our new-born zeal for the farmers, we should not lose sight of the interests of the banks. At present there is no difficulty in regard to the farmer ranking as a wholesale producer, because there is no trouble in arranging with the banks, if he is prepared to export cattle or other produce.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The farmer does not export cattle. It is the dealer who buys the cattle from the farmer.

Mr. COCKBURN. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) proposes that the farmer should be placed in the same position as the wholesale producer. The difference is that the products of the farmer are, as a rule, so perishable that I should be sorry to invest in them as security.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Do you not invest in wheat and in cheese?

Mr. COCKBURN. Advances are made regularly on wheat and cheese.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. But not to the farmer directly.

Mr. COCKBURN. These advances are generally made on the security of the farmer, and it is upon the knowledge which the banks have of his standing. I trust that any amendment made in our zeal for the farmer, will not cause us to fall into trouble.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are two questions involved in this matter. One is as to the right of Parliament to pass any legislation on this subject, and the next is as to how far we ought to go if Parliament had the right to legislate. I say nothing at present in regard to the second question, but I failed to obtain from the Minister of Justice what his opinion was in regard to the constitutionality of this provision. In the Provinces of whose statute law I have any knowledge, it is provided that any one in possession of personal property and desiring to secure to another a lien upon that property, must do so by registered bill of sale, to protect it against executive creditors or subsequently registered bills of sale. Secret bills of sale are discountenanced. I believe that is the same provision in Ontario. We are now asked to adopt an Act declaring that a man may remain in possession of property of which he is the ostensible owner, and may give secretly a lien on that property to a bank without notice, and that is to operate not only against the man who gives the lien—which may be an equitable and a legal thing to do—but that it shall be operative against outsiders, against execution creditors and others. I press upon the Minister of Justice the necessity that he should give an opinion upon this subject. Suppose a man has 100,000 bushels of grain, and he gives the bank a lien of $10,000, or $20,000, or $30,000, and at the same time he gives a bill of sale to an innocent party who advances the money believing the farmer to be the owner of the grain, does the hon. gentleman believe that this Parliament can legislate on a question of that kind, and override the local legislation declaring that such a lien must be registered, so that the public may have knowledge of it?

Mr. SPROULE. I think there was a good deal of force in the observations of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). The farmers to-day find that they are outside of the banking institutions because, though a farmer may own fifty or 100 head of cattle, he cannot get anything on them from the banks, though, if he sells them, the buyer, who may not have a dollar's worth of property, can raise money upon them. If a farmer gets any money from a bank, it is not upon his stock or his property, but upon a good endorsed note. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), says we should take care that we should not go too far in this direction. There is not much danger of that when the banks have so many representatives in this House looking after their interests. Though the farmer may have his horses, and his cattle, and his grain, he cannot get a dollar from the banks on that security; but, if his stock passes into the hands of some one else worth nothing, the purchaser can get what he wants from the banks on the same security. The result of this is that private banks are starting up all over the country, and are doing the business which the chartered banks should do. Of course, they charge a much higher rate of interest, because they give accommodation to the farmer in cases of stringency when he could not get it from a regular bank. If the interpretation is to be put upon the law which was given by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I think it would be a fortunate thing. I think it would do away with the difficulty which has caused

these private banks to be established. This subject has been discussed by the Granges and the Farmers' Institutes, and at other meetings of the agricultural class, and, although they have been unable to devise means for meeting the difficulty, they have agreed that there is a great necessity for the establishment of farmers' banks if they can be properly worked out. I believe that the farmers give the best security. They have their farm, though there may be a mortgage upon it. They have their wheat and their cattle. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) says that their security is so perishable that they cannot raise money on it. Is it less perishable when it goes into the merchant's hands than when it is in the hands of the farmer? But, while the exporter can raise money upon it, the farmer cannot. The farmer is a much more established man than many other traders, because he has his land and his money is invested in it, and he is not travelling around all the time, and, therefore, his security is better than many of those securities which are taken by the banks to-day. I agree with every word which has fallen from the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on this subject.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I do not see why any distinction should be made between the farmer and any other producer, or why the farmer should be put at a disadvantage. Surely you have just as good security in lending money to the farmer on his grain and cattle, or anything else he may have, as you have in loaning it to the manufacturer or the producer of anything else. I really think that it is an injustice to the farmers of the country that they should not be allowed to get money when they have property to represent it, equally as others who are in business throughout the country. I hope if anything further is required in this clause to enable the banks to do what is, I believe, only fair towards the farmers as compared with others, it will be introduced and embodied in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Once again, I repeat the suggestion that our discussion would be confined in much more practicable limits if we could learn first whether it is the intention of the Administration to propose to us by the clause, that which the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) has just advocated, and which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) think so desirable, namely, that the farmer should be in a position in which he can, by a security note of this description, unregistered, grant to a bank security for advances upon articles which he produces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was not the intention in framing this clause, to make it apply to farmers. As I indicated to the hon. member a few moments ago, the view we took was that the words "manufacturer and producer" were to be taken almost as equivalent expressions. If the sense of the House is decidedly in favor of including the farmer in this clause, we will agree to it, but that was not the intention when the clause was drafted.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether in view of the suggestions I have made that the interpretation clause expressly includes agricultural products, and that you thus find the phrase to be "wholesale producer of agricultural products"—whether he does not think that almost all persons who come under the denomination of farmers are embraced within this provision at this moment?

Mr. DALY. I have been waiting to hear the remarks of the Minister of Justice as to what interpretation he places upon the words "manufacturer and producer" in clause 75. I came to the same conclusion as the member for West Durham, upon reading the clause, that, literally interpreted, the words would include farmers. According to the interpretation clause, the words "goods, wares and merchandise" include agricultural produce, and if the farmer is not a wholesale producer of agricultural produce, who is? Particularly in the Province from which I come they are certainly wholesale producers of oats, wheat and barley. Now, I have personal knowledge of the fact that at this time of the year, in our Province, farmers are compelled to borrow sums of money of from $100 to $150; they are not able to go to the banks, and they have to go to men who have money to lend upon chattel mortgage security, and pay 12, 15 or 24 per cent., besides the cost of the chattel mortgage; whereas, if this clause could be extended so as to include the farmers, they would be able to go to the bank and get their money at 10 per cent., which is the outside figure which has been charged by any banks in lending money in the Province of Manitoba. I have discussed this matter with some friends of mine in the House, and had written out an amendment some days ago which I submitted to the Minister of Finance, but I have not yet heard what his views on the matter are. The amendment I prepared is as follows:—

That clause 75 be amended by adding the following as sub-section 3: "A bank may also lend money to any person engaged in the business of farming, upon the security of goods, chattels and movable property of such person, which he may have upon his farm at the time of making such advance.

The words in this amendment are as like those contained in sub-section 2 as possible. The Minister of Justice having announced that the section does not include farmers, I beg to move this amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for West Durham asked me a question as to the meaning of this, in view of the interpretation clause. I think it is susceptible of the construction he put upon it, in consequence of the use of the words "goods, wares and merchandise," and I think that the sense of the clause should be more clearly expressed, enlarging it so as to make it plain that farmers are included, or in a contrary sense. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) desired me to state on what grounds this Parliament could claim jurisdiction over the subject-matter. I cannot do better than refer him to the decision pronounced upon that subject, and I think the reasoning in that case of the judges who took the view that this legislation was within the powers of this Parliament, was that it relates to banking. I am not at all disposed to say this could not be sustained on other grounds also. In view of the fact that the Act has been upon the Statute-book so long, that commercial usage has availed itself of this provision, and that it has been decided that these provisions are *intra vires* of this Parliament, we ought to satisfy ourselves by listening deferentially to the protest of the hon. gentleman, without being

called upon to reason upon the theory as to whether this is within our powers or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to know if the hon. gentlemen himself assents to the conclusion arrived at in that case ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes ; I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the decision which is referred to is based, as far as that subject is expressly dealt with, upon the article of jurisdiction to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, namely, banking ; and it is founded upon an expression used in the case of Cushing *vs.* Dupuy, which is there cited, and to which we had reference the other evening. I think that some force is certainly due to the consideration which the Minister of Justice has addressed to us, namely, that for a great many years, ever since Confederation, more or less, we have assumed this power, and the assumption has been accepted to a very large extent in the practical execution of the business of the country, by the banks and by the public at large. But when we are called upon to deal with enlargements of the proposition, when we are called upon to go a great deal further, as it is now claimed we have been, perhaps, unconsciously called upon to go, and as we are in fact clearly, by the proposition now before you, called upon consciously to go, it is perhaps well to direct attention to the alarming consequences to which, stretched to the extent to which they are proposed to be stretched, that proposition extends ; because, you will see that if it is to apply to the case of the farmer, it may be very proper and equally within our power to apply it, so far as banking purposes are concerned, to the case of every person who owns any tangible thing whatever. And it is being proposed to be extended, and it is, in the judgment of the Minister of Justice and of my own, whatever the latter may be worth, by this clause now extended to certainly very much the largest single class, and to a class probably equal to one-half of the whole of the community at this moment. And, therefore, you have it, I do not mean to say, with respect to all the goods belonging to that class, but with respect to the goods they produce, that the general principles of law in all the Provinces, so far as I know, principles founded upon a fundamental proposition as to public convenience, in which the masses of the community are interested, with respect to the degree of credit which is attached to the visible possession of personal properties and to the securities which are required to avoid mistaken credit being extended, are to be wholly departed from. I agree in the general principle which the hon. Minister of Justice has stated, in defining what was understood to be the intention of this clause. I can quite well understand that under the general interpretation of the term there may be very great difficulties, twofold in their character, in carrying out in practice, as applied to manufactures, the general principle of non-recognition of a claim on or of conditional ownership in property not in the visible possession of the claimant. The first difficulty is the constant mutation of the object, the log being transferred into lumber, the fleece being turned into cloth ; and so forth ; and lumber, cloth and so forth being constantly sold to the public, and replaced by the manufacturer ; and the second difficulty is the difficulty of credit to which the hon. gentleman adverted. I can well understand and appreciate as sound the proposition that, so long as you are able by your definition to point the attention of the general public to this fact, that the law declares that in the case of certain persons the visible ownership of the stock in trade does not give you the slightest security that he really owns that stock ; that it may be all the property of a bank, and may be mortgaged for more than it is worth ; and that you, therefore, are not entitled to give him credit on his visible possession of it ; you may in that way get rid of, or minimise at all events, the inconvenience which is generally felt throughout those portions of the world which adopt our principle of jurisprudence to arise from the recognition of the principle of ownership, conditionally or otherwise, apart from the visible possession or notoriety of claim. But if you are going to adopt a provision so extensive as that now suggested, you must consider what the convenience of the farmer is, and it is in the light of his convenience as a class that you must consider it ; and you must also consider the enormous change you are going to make in the Provincial regulations with respect to the ownership of property. It is not to a small class or for particular circumstances, but, substantially, to a very large proportion of the persons and with respect to a very large proportion of the property owned throughout the whole of Canada to which the new principle is to apply, not indeed the principle that the farmer shall not be able to secure a loan from anyone upon his property—it would be monstrous to say he should not—but the principle that the farmer shall be deprived of the credit and facility for obtaining money and supplies which exist under the present law. Because no man, after your proposed change takes place, can tell whether a farmer really owns one bushel of the grain in his barn or any of the cattle in his stable. They cannot go anywhere to find out this information ; they cannot go to any place where there is a register of the chattel mortgage, and they cannot ascertain anything about it ; but there may be a note in some bank, which we will not call a "shaving" shop, which is said to be the farmer's present resource, which note really represents the goods. That is one aspect of the case. The other aspect of the case is that it is proposed to effect, not merely a partial innovation, to a limited extent and for defined reasons, upon the ordinary law as to personal property, but it is proposed practically to revolutionise that law ; and then you come necessarily to the consideration as to how far it was really intended, under the constitutional power, to legislate on "banking," that you should thus interfere with the right of the Provinces to regulate the disposition of personalty and indeed of real property as well. I know no reason, none in the world, why, if this power does exist, you might not apply it to the land. I do not know why you cannot say by another sub-section that by a note of hand or by a verbal promise made by a farmer to a bank, a mortgage may be made on his land. The legislative rights of the Provinces cover property and civil rights. The same words embrace both, and you may as well, so far as the jurisdictional question is concerned, provide for an oral charge upon lands by the farmer or the owner in favor of a bank or for a parol charge or a charge by an intrument not under seal and not registered. So this opens a

very large question, and it is sufficient to say that while I would acquiesce in the view of the hon. gentleman, reserving my personal opinion as to this question—while I would acquiesce in the view that he might not unfairly call on this Parliament to re-enact substantially those provisions which have been assumed to be the law of the land, in regard to which there is some color of support, at all events of judicial authority, yet when the Minister of Justice calls upon us to make a change so extensive as the change which now appears to be clearly involved in the amendment, we are bound to consider the whole question, seeing that we are further invading the Provincial power, however strong the position of the Province may be, by the proposed application to these new conditions of the propositions we are invited to accept. With respect to the question of the farmer's advantage to be obtained by this extension, I suppose that the great bulk of the representatives of this House are representatives of rural districts or of districts in which the farming community forms a great majority. I suppose they have at heart the interests of those classes of their constituents, and no suggestion to do them a real benefit could possibly meet with anything else than the most respectful attention and the most earnest desire to give it effect. The question whether you can provide cheap money and easy money for the farmer is a question which has puzzled so-called theorists and speculators upon financial questions for a long time. You have had the proposition of the land bank, the proposition for farmers' banks, the proposition for a national currency based upon the land, or an irredeemable currency, you have had numerous proposals to help the farming community to cheap and easy money; but the conditions upon which cheap and easy money are to be obtained are absolutely opposed to the principles which, in regard to the production and manufacture of goods, are found to be sustained by this House and by this country at the present day. It is the law of supply and demand and of free competition, which is the vital and effectual law in this regard. The moment the farmer can show that he can give the same prospect of a return, with the same rapidity, with the same advantage, with the same security that other competitors for the stock of available money can give, he will get all the money he wants; and to the extent to which he cannot show that he will never get it; and if this Parliament sit from now to Christmas, it will never be able to give it to him.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes; it has been done in Germany.

Mr. BLAKE. How?

Mr. SPROULE. There are farmers' banks there.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not talking of farmers' banks. The hon. gentleman says he knows about it—and he knows about everything—but he told us himself that the farmers have been considering the question of farmers' banks for a long time, and that they have not been able to find the way of working them; nor has the hon. gentleman done so. I advise him to go to Germany and find out.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may have as much time at his disposal to go there and find out as I have.

Mr. BLAKE. I will try and find out the next time I am there. In the meantime, as we have not the information from Germany, and as the condition of German farmers, and the condition of German operatives, and the condition of German society, and the condition of German manufacturers, and the condition of German politics at this moment, is not the most favorable in this world, we had, perhaps, better not attempt to find light from Germany, for the purposes of this debate at all events, and proceed to consider what else we can do. The present proposal is not to find the money in Germany or to adopt the plan of Germany; but it is to establish it by arranging—although I do not think that would be the effect of the hon. gentleman's amendment—that the farmer may be able by this cheap and easy process to pledge his property to the bank. I think that the hon. gentleman's amendment, which simply says that the farmer may obtain money upon the security of his property, is an amendment which does not alter the position of the farmer one whit. He can now obtain money upon the security of his property if he only finds any one who will lend it to him. There is no objection at present to his giving a chattel mortgage or to his giving security, according to the Provincial law, to private lenders. The question is what the advantage or detriment to him may be, if the provision be introduced which permits him to give a security note to a bank, instead of a chattel mortgage to a private lender, which security note puts him, as an agricultural producer, in the same position as the producer of other produce, or the manufacturer of other goods. The position of the farmer then will be just this: By his giving a security note, that is to say, without divulging to the rest of the world that he is giving a mortgage—he will be able to secure the bank for the advance. That is all that can be proposed in this regard, and the question we have to consider is, would this be to the advantage of the great mass of the farmers, who, I am happy to believe, do not want to borrow upon personal security, but who do want to be able to retain and use that security in their ordinary transactions which is due to the realisation of the fact by those with whom they deal, that they are the owners of certain property, upon which general credit they are supplied with goods and given money. The general basis of credit which the farming community enjoy at present would be destroyed by this proposal, and any advantage which it may give them will be counterbalanced, far more than counterbalanced by this loss. My own opinion is that the mass of the farming community would be seriously damnified by this proposal. I believe there would arise a degree of uncertainty with regard to the ordinary basis of credit, in reference to the whole farming community of the country which would be most calamitous, and that instead of helping the farmer, we would do him a serious injury. I do not think it makes much difference to the banks at all, for it is not so much a banking question; but as far as the interest of the farmer is concerned, I believe he is better off as he is now, than he would be if this amendment were introduced into the clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, at the present moment at any

rate, and, until further consideration, I cannot agree that by simply enlarging the class of persons to whom this principle is to be applied, we violate, to any extent, the rule of the construction of the British North America Act, which was laid down in the Smith case.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear. I agree.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought the hon. gentleman differed from that. I agree, however, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, will agree with me in the view that this, being a subject open to concurrent legislation—and in saying "concurrent legislation," I am assuming to be correct the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada as to our powers—we have the system established in all the Provinces of chattel mortgage; the necessity for notoriety, in regard to chattel mortgages, and the effect which is put upon the change of possession of property in relation to credit. We have, as concerns a limited number of persons, a restriction by this Parliament upon that general principle. I do agree, most decidedly, that it is unwise for us to invade the principles and the rules of procedure, and the rules of business, established by Provincial legislation, further than we are called upon to go in legislating, according to the line which has been followed since the Banking Act itself was established. I think that we can follow out the principle of this clause, in so far as to make it applicable to all classes of manufacturers of produce, and that in doing that, even if to some extent we are widening the definition of the persons to whom the present clause applies, we are still acting clearly within the principle of the clause. I agree thus far with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that we would be widely increasing our invasion of Provincial practice, and of Provincial legislation, with regard to liens, and invading it to a very material extent, indeed, by adopting the amendment which my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) proposes. Now, let me call the attention of the Committee to what the hon. gentleman's resolution is. It says:

"That the bank may also lend money to any person engaged in the business of farming, upon security."

Before I read what the security is, let me refer to the reasons given why advances should be made to farmers. We are told that it is reasonable that the products which are intended for market; the grain stored in the barn, the hay, the apples, the fruits of any kind, should be the subject of advances by the bank, but the resolution of my hon. friend goes much further than this. It says:

"That the bank may also lend money to any person engaged in the business of farming, upon the security of the goods and chattels and movable property of such persons which he may have upon the farm at the time of making such advance."

Therefore, that amendment goes far beyond the products of the farm which are intended for the market, and it authorises a lien upon the agricultural implements, and upon the chattels on the farmer's premises; altogether introducing a new principle, and one which, I think, it is doubtful, both as a matter of policy and as a matter of law, we ought to adopt. There is another reason why, irrespective of the wide extent of my hon. friend's amendment—and this objection applies to all the remarks which have been made in favor of including the farmers within the classes of persons who may give warehouse receipts upon their property—there is this reason against the change; that by the provisions of this Act, we are only allowing two classes of persons to give warehouse receipts. The one class of persons are the bailees, the keepers, the custodians of the property of others. If the farmer has his grain or his fruit ready for the market, he can now, under the provisions of this Bill, even though this clause may not be applied to him at all, put his property into the hands of the warehouse man and raise a loan upon the warehouse receipt which he obtains. The only other class of persons to whom we propose to give the power to issue securities on their own property, are the manufacturers who are carrying goods, wares, and merchandise to the point of completion; as, for instance, the boot and shoe manufacturer who takes the leather and the hides into his warehouse, or into his factory, and carries them forward to the time when the boots and shoes are completed and ready for the market. This is done in order to enable them to carry on the process of manufacture. And so of the cotton manufacturer, who takes into his factory the raw cotton, and manipulates it until the finished product is turned out and ready for the market. The same principle is not applicable to the farmer, because it is only proposed, so far as he is concerned, that we shall apply this system to his product in its finished state when it is ready for the market. So that, on the principle on which the warehouse system is based and on the principle on which it is restricted for the purpose of enabling manufacturers to carry on their manufactures to completion, it seems to me the argument fails to be applicable to the farming class. I am unable, therefore—and I think I express the view of my colleagues—to concur in the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. Coming to the question of the manner in which we shall restrict the section—admitting, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, that it is capable of a construction that would make it applicable to the farmer—I think we should strike out the words "or producer," so as to make it apply to the manufacturer alone. It may be possible that a better form of words could be devised; but I am now discussing the question of principle; and, so far as the principle is concerned, it was not intended that this section should apply to the farmer; and I think it would be unsound, from the farmer's point of view, the banker's point of view, the Provincial point of view, and the warehouse receipt point of view, that we should extend it to that class or to any other class than the simple warehouseman and the manufacturer. We must remember that in extending it even to the manufacturer, we are departing from the original principle on which the warehouse receipt was based, namely, the principle of bailment, the man who gives the warehouse receipt being supposed to be the custodian of property, and giving a receipt which will bind him; and in the operation of that principle of bailment, Provincial legislation, as regards notoriety of the lien, or possession of the goods, is amply satisfied if there has been a deposit of the goods in the hands of another person, who himself gives the receipt on which he is responsible, and by which he

is estopped. We have widened that principle to make it apply to the manufacturer; and if I am right in my view of section 54, we went beyond the manufacturer, and allowed certain classes who are not manufacturers, but not including so large a class as farmers, to give warehouse receipts in respect of their own goods. We do not extend the right to so large a class to whom, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, it would be a doubtful benefit; but whether detrimental to the farmer or not, it would decidedly be detrimental to the business principles of a community, who have been accustomed, in so plain and ordinary a business as farming, to look to the products as the property of the producer, unless the bills of sale register, or the chattel mortgage register shows that there has been a change of title.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If I understand the argument of the hon. member for West Durham aright, it is that the attempt by this House to legislate on what he calls the security notes is an infringement on Provincial rights; that it is a clear infringement of the civil right in property for us to legislate that any security on the class of goods mentioned should be a prior lien, unless there was a change of possession, or unless we complied with the Provincial laws in regard to registration; and he showed that the matter was liable to great frauds. On that point, I think there is a great deal in what he says. I stated, in my previous remarks, that I thought there should be some additional security taken by any bank lending on such a class of securities; but, after showing that these security notes were so much worthless paper, the hon. member for West Durham proceeds to state that the farmer, by giving this worthless security, is endangering his own credit.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that the security notes were so much worthless paper.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. gentleman said it was an infringement of civil rights, and that in order to become a security, there must be a registration or a visible change of the property.

Mr. BLAKE. What I pointed out was that it was highly questionable, in my present judgment, whether we had the power to so interfere with the Provincial laws on this subject; but discussing the policy with respect to the farmer, I assumed, both in his case and in the case of the manufacturer, that the security note would be valid, because, if void, it would make no difference.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. First, it was highly doubtful whether it was worth anything; and, in the second place, it was injuring the credit of the farmer. If it injures the credit of the farmer, it injures the credit of the manufacturer, and, therefore, the clause is altogether objectionable. The clause, originally, was confined to warehousemen who had the property of others committed to their care, and who could properly give a warehouse receipt; but now it is proposed to extend it to manufacturers of goods.

Mr. BLAKE. It is already extended.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The manufacturers and producers of goods have a right to give a warehouse receipt, and if they do, I do not see why the farmer, who is a producer, should not give the same receipt and get advances of the security of the goods he manufactures. I think perhaps the amendment of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) goes a little too far in proposing that the farmer shall have the right to give a security on his machinery or movable effects. There is no proposal here that the manufacturer shall give a security on his machinery, but only on the goods he manufactures. A warehouseman, who is simply a bailee of other persons' property, can go to a bank, and say: "I have so much property in my care, and I will give you my receipt for it, and I shall be liable to penalties if I dispose of it," that is one class of security. But if you give a security on the goods manufactured by a manufacturer, I do not see why you should not give a farmer an equal right to go to a bank and say: "I have a thousand bushels of grain in my barn, I want an advance on it, and I will give you a security note for it."

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can he not do that now?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; he cannot.

Mr. BLAKE. Fortunately for him.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not think it is fortunate for him. The consequence is that if before he can sell his grain, while waiting for a rise, or for some other reason, he wants to get an advance, he cannot get it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Because he cannot give that as a security. He has to get an endorser, and go to a shaver outside before he can get an advance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you go to a bank, do you not have to get an endorser?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; I would have to give a chattel mortgage. But the farmer cannot, as this manufacturer can, go to a bank and say: I will give you the security on this 1,000 bushels of grain; but he must go to a note shaver and pay him a large discount. Whereas, if he could go to an incorporated bank and get money at a fair rate, on giving security as the manufacturer does, it would be a great advantage to him. At all events, if this advantage is not given to the farmers, I do not see why it should be given to the manufacturers. If it is good for one class of the community, it is good for the other. I would suggest to the hon. member for Selkirk that in his amendment he should ask simply the transposition of these terms, so as to make the clause read: "any person engaged in business as a producer or wholesale manufacturer of any goods, wares, or merchandise."

Mr. BLAKE. That would do it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If the sentence were so transposed, that would test the sense of the House on the question whether or not this class of secured notes should extend to the farmers as well as to the manufacturers; it would not create the objection pointed out by the hon. the Minister of Justice, that it would give the farmer the right to give security upon his machinery.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the amendment he suggests would be the way to put the farmers in just the position in which he proposes to place them. Let me give a practical illustration of the difficulties of the situation and of the difference between the two classes to which he refers. The manufacturer who gives a

security note is, of course, in constant relations, perhaps too constant relations for the comfort of both, with his banker; and the banker, if he knows his business, keeps a pretty close eye upon the customer whose security note he has, and there must be always a good deal of trust and confidence in the business. The banker has confidence that the manufacturer, who is constantly disposing of his goods, will, notwithstanding this, keep in stock, on the whole, the security of manufactured stuff which is represented by the secured note. That is the position of the manufacturer, and that is the way in which the thing is worked. Then the banker if he knows his business, knows whether the manufacturer is keeping two banking accounts; and if the manufacturer clandestinely keeps a second account with another bank, he generally comes to grief, to the loss of one or both. There again you have the trust, the confidence, the watchfulness and vigilance which it is possible to apply to that class of cases. But these conditions do not apply to the farmer. He resides a little way, let us say, out of Kingston, where there are several banks, or a little way out of Toronto, where there are a great many banks. He may or may not have come into town, and at one of the fifteen or twenty banking offices may or may not have obtained a discount by giving his security note upon his grain or cattle. Who is to tell whether he has done so or not? How are you to know at any time whether he really owns the grain or cattle which he offers as security, or whether, if he wants to sell, they are his to sell. A degree of uncertainty necessarily exists in his case which does not exist in the other; and in order to enable the borrowing farmer, who has not credit enough in his own locality, to borrow without giving a chattel mortgage, every farmer in the country is to have the assumed title to his property placed in doubt and the facilities for the sale and disposal of his property considerably impeded.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Does a grain dealer buying grain go to a registry office to see whether a chattel mortgage is registered against it?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No more would he go to a bank to see whether there was a secured note against it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The difficulty I have observed in the past has been that the borrowing powers of the farmers exceed their real requirements, and the consequence is that many a farmer has been enabled to borrow, not only from the banks, but to run accounts with merchants and others beyond what he really requires. That is where the difficulty arises. The hon. member for Selkirk says that the farmers in his county cannot get a dollar on credit at the bank. He is not saying very much for the stability or reputation of the farmers there; in the part of the country I come from the farmers are regarded as the best security, and the banks are willing to discount their notes.

An hon. MEMBER. What about all the farm mortgages?

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the result of the National Policy. The farmers are regarded by the banks as the most safe and solvent people to deal with, and the banks are quite willing to give them money; and how it is in Selkirk and in Frontenac those farmers cannot get money I do not understrand.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They can get money. It is for your farmers I am speaking.

Mr. LANDERKIN. My farmers can get more credit than is good for them. That is the difficulty. If their credit were abridged it would be very much better for them. Instead of encouraging them to put out lines of credit, it would be very much better to bring them down to the grangers' platforms, or a cash basis. The grangers have done a great deal of good in inculcating the principle of cash payments in farmers' transactions. There are very few farmers where I come from who require to borrow money, and if they do they can get money from the banks at cheaper rates than can business men, because their security is infinitely better. There is no class of men whose characters and reputations are as good as the farmers, and no class of men can get money as cheaply.

An hon. MEMBER. I thought they were all bankrupt.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are apparently bankrupt in Frontenac and Selkirk.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Grey has given a convincing reply to the number of speeches he has made in this House during the Session, in which he proved, to his own satisfaction, that the farmers of this country were in a deplorable condition. Now he says they are the very best security in the country. I believe he is right, and I have always held that view. I wish to refer to some observations that were made by the hon. member for West Durham. I understood him to say that a farmer could get money upon a chattel mortgage from a bank. Perhaps I misunderstood him.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to say with regard to the arguments of the hon. member for West Durham, whether valuable or otherwise I am unable to say, that while there is no doubt that his legal knowledge and high standing enables him at any time to give valuable information upon this or any other subject, I would like him to understand that while I hold the position I occupy in this House, I have the same right as he, though not possessed of as high legal attainments or great common sense, of expressing my views on any subject which may engage the attention of Parliament. There is too much disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen to sneer at common members when they attempt to say a word on behalf of the farmer. There is too much of that kind of thing, and I do not think it becomes the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or any other hon. member of this House. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) spoke of the impossibility of establishing banks which farmers could take advantage of in the manner which I had referred to, and I then stated that I understood, from reading political economists, that they had been established in Germany and had been successfully worked in other parts of the world, and that I thought it was not unreasonable to suppose that we could establish them here. Should that be sneered at? Every hon. member here who represents an agricultural constituency, and knows the

difficulty the farmers have to contend with, will appreciate my statement, that if such a law could be placed on the Statute-book here, and if the farmers could take advantage of it, it should be done. I do not think it is in very good taste for the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or any other hon. member, to refer in such a sneering manner to a suggestion coming from a common member of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that I did not make any observations on his remarks with any sneering intent. I may say that I do not know of any common member of this House, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that, so far from regarding him as a common member, I regard him as a most uncommon member.

Mr. SPROULE. Any one who heard the hon. gentleman's remarks, and the warmth he displayed in delivering could come to no other conclusion than that they were made in a sneering spirit.

Mr. BARRON. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirpatrick) was one which I intended to make later in the Session. My opinion has been somewhat shaken by this discussion. I can see that, if it is known to the world that a farmer can go to the bank and obtain a certificate on the grain in his barn, it will create a doubt as to whether any farmer is or is not encumbered by these certificates. I, therefore, think it is open to grave doubts whether the amendment which I proposed to suggest, and in which some hon. gentlemen opposite agreed with me, should be adopted. But, if the law is made as it is proposed to be by this Bill, there is no reason why we should not transpose the words as suggested by some hon. gentleman. The Minister of Justice says we are widening the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In regard to one class.

Mr. BARRON. Quite so. Therefore everyone dealing with that particular class runs more or less danger. In the Province of Ontario we have had experience of the evils resulting from this class of legislation. It was the law that any manufacturer could sell an article retaining in himself the title, and, if his vendee sold that article to any one else, the latter would find that the property remained in the hands of the original vendor. I think it important to read to the House an extract from a judgment of Chancellor Boyd in the case of Banks and Robinson, which shows the danger of this kind of legislation, which puts it in the power of certain persons to commit a fraud. Chancellor Boyd says:

"Better to safeguard commercial morality, it would be expedient to make provision for giving publicity by registration to dealings such as this. The effect of the transaction (though it may not be contrary to the law) is to protect the credit of a trader who is yet heavily weighed with undisclosed obligations. Grave suspicions must always arise in the minds of creditors whose claims are superseded by some instrument of peculiar character, produced at a period of crisis, by which all the assets of their debtor are secured to a mere relative."

I say that this Bill, widening the law, as the Minister of Justice admits it does, gives the chance to certain persons of going to the bank, depositing their receipts, giving themselves a fictitious standing in the community, and doing a great deal of injury, particularly to those who have to do business with them.

Mr. SPROULE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have very great hesitation in interfering in a question so purely legal as this, but it does occur to me that the gentlemen who speak more particularly on the part of the farmers would do well to consider whether, as business is carried on in our country districts, they would not be creating a weapon of oppression on the farmers by passing this provision. We know that it is the custom for country merchants to give large credits to the farmers, and in times of distress you will generally find that the farmers are largely indebted to the merchants. It occurs to me, that if such an amendment as this is pressed, the merchants will insist upon the farmers signing notes, and, if that were done, and if these notes were placed in the hands of the banks, and if this lien was attached to these notes, the latter condition of the farmer would be much worse than the first. I believe that would be the case in many districts in Ontario—I do not speak for other Provinces—and, if I have followed this discussion correctly, the practical effect of bringing the farmers under this clause might be enormously to multiply the chattel mortgages or securities equivalent to chattel mortgages, and I do not think that is what any advocate of the farmers' interests would desire.

Mr. DESJARDINS. From what I understood of the clause, I thought it would be desirable to enact it in order to help the wholesale manufacturers to manufacture their goods or to assist a shipper of those goods when he wants to expedite his merchandise; but, if you extend that further, I think you are legislating in a dangerous direction which will not produce the benefit expected, especially if you extend it to the farming class. I do not think the farmers would benefit in any way by having the privilege of mortgaging their grain or their goods by that process. They are very well known where they live. The banks which are willing to loan them money when they are in good standing, will not go to the trouble of securing their notes upon the goods the farmers have in their hands, because if the banks will not trust them for the money they desire to use until they can realise upon their grain, they will not be likely to take a mortgage on that grain, because they will not put a man there to watch it, as they would have to do in every district where they made loans. So I do not think the farmers would obtain any benefit from this proposed law. The opportunity you would give them of mortgaging their goods in that way would be to their detriment rather than to their advantage; and I do not think the banks would be willing to engage in that business at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. As a farmer I am not able to decide a question where lawyers disagree; but it does seem to me a strange doctrine that if I want to get a loan on a thousand bushels of wheat I must take it to a storehouse and get a warehouse receipt before I can get a loan at the bank. I cannot see why my thousand bushels of wheat is not as good security for the bank in my barn, as it would be in the storehouse. I am aware of the fact that I can draw my thousand bushels of wheat to the storehouse, and other farmers can do the same thing, and we can get our receipts, and the man who purchases the wheat can go to the bank and raise the money to pay for our wheat.

I cannot see why the farmer should not be in the same position as the manufacturer. We are told here that the banker keeps close watch of the manufacturer to whom he makes an advance. As I understand it, many manufacturers in this country are carrying on their business altogether on capital furnished by the banks, and the banks are partly keeping the manufacturer up all the way through. It is only at certain times in the year that the farmer wants any advantage from the bank. I can conceive that it is just at that season of the year when as one hon. gentleman says, we are getting into difficulty with the merchants, that we want the very relief the amendment proposes to give us. For instance, I am owing a merchant, and I have a thousand bushels of wheat to dispose of. The merchant comes around and presses me for the payment of that account. Well, if I cannot raise money on my wheat in the barn and get an advance, according to the doctrine laid down to-night, I must draw my wheat away to some storehouse and get a storehouse receipt before I can get an advance from the bank for the grain that I had in my barn. Now, at present I cannot get an advance when the grain is in my barn to pay the merchant who may be hard up, but, according to the amendment that has been offered, I could get an advance on that wheat and thus be able to tide over the difficulty, and at the same time benefit from any advance in the price of wheat which might take place. Now, why should I not be in the same position as anybody else who wants to get money from the bank? It would help me to pay my debt, and at the same time it would relieve me of the necessity of paying some lawyer for drawing out a chattel mortgage. I cannot conceive why a farmer, if he is able to give a security, should not be in the same position as a manufacturer or anybody else.

Mr. WATSON. Like some other farmers in the House, I am at some difficulty to know where I am located on a question on which the lawyers themselves cannot agree. Having some knowledge of the requirements of the farmers I can speak as to what would be in their interest, at least. Now, I conceive that there are some difficulties in the way of accepting the whole amendment moved by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly); that is, when you take in agricultural implements, because in many instances it is very hard to find out, even in Manitoba to-day, as the hon. gentleman knows, who is the actual owner of those implements. In many cases the implements do not belong to the farmer, who is usually paying a very high interest on the notes, which they call out there cast-iron notes, and the implements are actually the property of the manufacturer until the notes are entirely paid. I agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) that the farmers should be placed in the same position as any other grain dealer. Take the case of a farmer, as suggested by one hon. gentleman, who has 5,000 bushels of wheat in his granary, or on his farm. Why should he not be able to go to the bank and borrow money on that grain, the same as the warehouseman after that grain passes out of his hands? The difficulty we have in the West is the fact that a great number of farmers want a small amount of money for a short time, and under the present system they have got to have an endorser. When the bank wants security it will take a farmer, in our country, as quickly as any other man, that is, if he has a lot of chattels and a lot of loose property, or more than 160 acres of land; because in Manitoba they have an exemption law, which exempts 160 acres of land, three horses and certain other articles, which cannot be touched for any debt, unless the man sees fit to encumber those articles by a chattel mortgage. That being the case, if a farmer wants money he has got to get an endorser, and he goes to his neighbor, who is another farmer, but the bank hesitates to advance the money if these farmers have only 160 acres of land each, because, under the exemption law, the bank cannot recover from the endorser, because he is the possessor of only 160 acres of land, and the bank cannot touch that for debt. The great trouble is that the farmers, when they want a loan for four or five months, borrow money at this season of the year for the purpose of tiding them over until after the harvest. They may want $200 or $300, and they cannot acquire that except by mortgaging their farm or going to a loan company, and the loan company will not loan money for a less period than five or seven years. Any man who has a farm can borrow money on his farm by mortgage; but there is a difficulty in giving too great facilities for borrowing money, as has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen here. When a farmer wants to borrow money and has to pay $10, or $15, or even $25 for the purpose of making out that mortgage, although he may only want one or two hundred dollars at the time, he will say to himself that inasmuch as he has to go to the expense of paying a solicitor to make the mortgage, he may as well borrow $500, and the result is that the farmer will borrow more money than he requires, and he is thereby tempted to engage in risky speculations. That being the case, I say the farmer ought to be enabled to go to a bank, and give such security as may be satisfactory to that bank for a short loan from three to six months, for the exact amount which he requires. Under the present system he has to go to those shaving shops, as they have been well termed, where he has got to pay 12, 15, 20 and I have known as high as 25 per cent. for money, and any person knows that no man can engage in business and pay that percentage on money for several months. I think the farmer should be put in the same condition as the manufacturer or producer. He is a producer, and why should he not be able to raise money on that produce, the same as a manufacturer on his goods? The hon. member for West Durham suggests that the manufacturer who sells to retailers is the only person, according to the Interpretation Act, who is able to take advantage of this clause. In what position would that place some of our manufacturing industries? Take for example manufacturers of agricultural implements, who are some of the largest manufacturers in Canada to-day. They manufacture their goods and sell them to the farmers direct. According to the interpretation of this clause given by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), such a manufacturer, employing a thousand men, would not be able to take advantage of this provision if he sells his goods direct to the farmers. From the position taken by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House it is appar-

ently not the intention to accept this amendment, and if it is not adopted I have a proposition to make which should be accepted, and that is, that the banks also may loan money to any person engaged in farming on real estate security. No doubt some hon. gentlemen interested in loan companies may object to this provision, but if this were inserted it would entirely fill the bill as regards Manitoba and the North-West Territories, because there we have a different land title system to that prevailing in other portions of the Dominion, namely, the Torrens system. A farmer should be able to go to a bank with his Torrens' certificate, which forms the title to his land, and state that he wished to borrow one, two or three hundred dollars for six months, and he would hand in his certificate for security. This certificate would be deposited in the vaults of the bank, and be perfect security for the loan. A loan could thus be obtained without any unnecessary expense to the farmer. If the farmer is not able to do so with the bank, he is sometimes obliged to give a chattel mortgage on some of his stock, and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) could probably give the House some particulars in regard to the cost of a mortgage, but I know a great expense is involved. If farmers are allowed to borrow money under the system I propose, they could obtain it in Manitoba at 8 per cent., which is the regular rate of discount to merchants in that Province. I hope the Minister of Justice, if he does not see fit to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), will be willing to adopt the amendment I suggest. I can see a great difficulty in a farmer being allowed to chattel-mortgage his implements, because it is difficult to find out who is the real owner, because they do not pass from the manufacturer until the last dollar has been paid on them.

Mr. DALY. In reply to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) I may say some of the farmers in our part of the country are not only in a position so that they do not require to borrow money from the bank, but they are in a position to lend money themselves. But neither a farmer in Grey nor elsewhere can go to a bank and obtain a loan unless he gives a security in the shape of an endoiser. We want to prevent farmers being compelled to go to banks and give such security, because a farmer feels under an obligation to oblige his neighboi when in turn he is asked to endorse. I draw attention to clause 65, which says that banks shall not make either direct or indirect advances on security, mortgage or hypothecation of any land, tenement or movable property, or upon the security of any goods, wares or merchandise. The Act prevents the banks making loans on goods, wares and merchandise, and I have moved my amendment so that the farmer can go to the bank and give as security his chattels the same as the producer and manufacturer can secure advances on his own goods. With respect to the difficulty as to the security, I will strike out the words "and chattels and movable property." As to the difficulty with respect to banks and as to granting a loan on products of the farm, on securities not registered and as to which the general public might be ignorant, I will add to the clause the following: "provided that in addition to the security that may be given under this section the bank shall take a chattel mortgage on his goods." So that notice will be given to any persons dealing with a farmer that the bank in addition to the security under the clause itself, has a chattel mortgage on these goods.

Mr. WALDIE. The discusson has taken a wide range, but it has not dealt with the question from a business point of view. The banks are the creation of this Parliament and are specially privileged, and they are surrounded with restrictions in regard to their dealings with the public. We discussed a few nights ago the desirability of banks having ample reserves to meet their circulation, and the liabilities which the banks were under to their creditors in regard to deposits which might be called for. To-night we are discussing a proposition to permit banks to lend moneys for a period of time that would absolutely lock up their assets in unavailable securities and make their assets unavailable to meet the demands of depositors and the circulation. These two matters must be considered together. You must consider that, if you permit the banks to loan money on mortgage of real estate, their assets would become locked up, and the availability of the security for converting securities into gold to meet a demand that might be made on its circulation and deposits, would not exist. I take it that the extension of the warehouse business has been the outcome of the necessities of the country. Within the last twenty or thirty years, the manufacturing industries of the country have largely increased, and it has become a necessity that the larger manufacturer should have banking accommodation. It was found inconvenient for them to transfer their raw material, or the products of their warehouse into the hands of a bailee, and the wisdom of Parliament, four or five years ago, extended to a number of manufacturers and producers, the right to borrow and to give security upon their material and their manufactured goods. For instance, the lumberman has been enabled to give security to the banks upon saw-logs when produced, and to continue that security until it was in the shape of lumber in the mill-yard. The cotton manufacturers are able to arrange a credit with the banks and to import their cotton—consigned to the banks, perhaps—the banks allowing it to go into the hands of the mill owners to be manufactured into cloth, and the cloth still held as security for the loan. I do think it would be unwise for this Parliament to restrain the banks in their modes of accepting that security, which the necessities of the country has created. I am quite sure that the banks do not object to the farmers borrowing money or to Parliament allowing them to borrow money from the banks, by giving any kind of security; but if the farmer gives security to the bank, he, of course, weakens his security to any other person from whom he receives credit. It is undesirable that the assets of the banks, which should be kept easily available, should be locked up in real estate. As to the rights of the Provinces to pass legislation on this question, I have no hesitation in accepting the doctrine that if this Parliament has a right to constitute a bank and to give it certain privileges, it has also a right to extend these privileges, so that the functions it has created may be used in the public good and for

the welfare of the country. Parliament has created the banks for the purposes of promoting trade and commerce, and I think it should give them every facility for transacting the business of the country. The fact is that the Provincial Legislatures by permitting liens to be retained on manufacturers' goods, have to a large extent done away with the registration of chattel security. I think we might move in the same direction, that security may be given by manufacturers and by wholesale dealers upon their products in their own hands.

Mr. MITCHELL. This debate has taken a very wide range, and, I suppose, very few of us imagined, when we came to consider, that this celebrated section would have taken up so much of the time of the House. There are two sides to this question. We may pass whatever legislation we like in relation to giving banks the power to loan money to farmers, but my impression is that the great difficulty will be for the farmers to get that loan from the banks. After the elaborate and full discussion we have had upon this particular section, I think that the Minister of Finance, now that he thoroughly understands the sentiments of the Committee, if he does understand them, would do well to pass this section over, with a view of amending the clauses so as to meet the expressions of opinion he has heard to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be very difficult to meet them all.

Mr. MITCHELL. It will be difficult to meet them all, but I think it will be more difficult to meet the views of the bankers, if the object is to get them to make advances, to any extent, to the farmers of the country on the security of their chattels. It is contrary to the policy of well managed banking institutions in this country to make advances on fixed property. I presume that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, in preparing this section and its sub-sections, had in view the facilitating of trade and commerce, and the giving of facilities to men who are largely engaged in manufacturing, to get the necessary advances to enable them to carry on their business during the process of manufacture. There have been a great many questions of grave importance raised as to the value of that security when it was given; questions arising out of property under civil rights, the jurisdiction of the Provinces as against the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and I do think that the manner in which the subject has been discussed to-night, and the light thrown upon it by the legal gentlemen who have spoken, should induce the Government to consider what has been said on the subject, with a view to amending this clause for the purpose of meeting the object they have in view. The next question is the security that has to be given. I think that the legislation in some of the Provinces in this Dominion, in reference to the methods of giving security upon chattels, is very important, and I think the Minister of Justice would do well to pass over this section for the present, in order to see if he cannot frame it in such a way as to meet the views of all parties interested in this matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It seems to me that a great many hon. gentlemen are of opinion that all we have got to do is to empower the banks to lend money to farmers on warehouse receipts on their own grain, and then the farmers will get all the money they want. If this power were granted to the banks, I do not believe that one farmer out of twenty-five would be able to take advantage of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. One, out of the twenty-five hundred.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Perhaps not one out of twenty-five hundred. No wise, shrewd, sensible banker would advance money upon a warehouse receipt to a farmer, or to anybody else who lives ten or twelve miles away from his place of business and where he cannot have the grain under supervision. I know from my own experience that a shrewd banker will not lend money to a farmer or anybody else upon a warehouse receipt, unless he can send a clerk or somebody else to watch that the grain is not taken away. To suppose that a banker is going to lend money to any farmer who can produce a warehouse or a supposed warehouse receipt for 800 or 1,000 bushels of grain in his own barn, is to my mind perfect nonsense. A farmer or any one else can get all the money he wants in this country if he has the security or the credit necessary; and I think a great deal of the discussion on this clause is useless. We should take great care, as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Waldie) said, to see that the funds of the banks are not locked up in unavailable assets. We charter these banks for the convenience of the public, and authorise them to receive deposits from people all over the country; and we should see that they are not allowed to lock up their funds in unavailable assets, so that when a crisis comes or the depositors want their money, it will not be forthcoming. To allow bankers to lend money on warehouse receipts to those engaged in handling the great products of the country, or in the manufacturing industries of the country, is a wise and legitimate provision; but I think it should not be extended any further; and even if it is extended, I think it will not be used, for a wise banker will not lend money on a security which it will cost him perhaps as much as he lends to look after.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had a pretty thorough and long discussion on the section at which we have stuck, and my hon. friend opposite has suggested that it would probably be as well to allow the section to stand, in order to see whether one could not be framed that would meet the views of the House. I scarcely think, with the diversity of opinion which has been manifested here to-night, that we should be able to frame a clause which would meet the views of the whole House; and, therefore, I think it would be well to clear the air by taking a vote on the amendments which are proposed to section 75. In preparing this section, the idea that was prominent was this: in the first place, that the regular warehouse receipt, which for a certain number of years was the principal security on which money was advanced, should be allowed to remain; but year by year there came to be an extension of that principle, and during the last two years and this year amendments have been pressed with the view of widening the application of the clause. The idea, therefore, was to frame a general clause which would be confined in its application to manufacturers, but which at the same time would be general, so as to avoid constant pressure year after year on behalf of particular

classes of manufacturers; and so the phrase "wholesale producer or manufacturer" was placed in the section. No doubt it is indefinite. I must say that my own preconceived opinion against allowing these facilities for obtaining advances on the goods or chattels on farms, has been greatly strengthened by the discussion which has taken place here to-night; and, without going into the merits of the question, so far as I am concerned, I would rather not see the clause widened to include that kind of security. I think it would be well to take the sense of the House to-night on the amendments, and after these are disposed of, if the sense of the House is against them, as I hope it will be, the clause as it stands in the Bill will be amended so as to restrict it somewhat, and make it more definite.

Amendment negatived.

M. WATSON. I beg leave to move:

That banks may also lend money to any person engaged in farming on real estate security.

I do not know how this would affect other portions of Canada, but in Manitoba and the North-West it would be a great benefit. If it is thought desirable—and I would like the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice on this—I am willing that this should be confined to lands under the Torrens system. Where a farmer can produce his whole title to the banker, and has sufficient security for a loan for a short date, the bank should be allowed to accept that security.

Mr. HALL. I rise to a question of order. We have passed section 65 which expressly prohibits banks advancing money on mortgages.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I shall have to rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. WATSON. I do not propose that the money should be lent on mortgage.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In the absence of my hon. friend for North Renfrew (Mr. White) I would call the attention of the Committee to one class of security, which is a very valuable one, and the owners of which require large advances from the banks from time to time; I refer to licenses to cut timber. In the absence of my hon. friend I would move that the following be added as sub-section 4:—

The bank may also lend money to any wholesale manufacturer or producer of timber, logs or lumber upon the security of licenses and rights to cut trees, logs and lumber.

These licenses are very valuable securities. The owners have to pay large bonuses for them, and require large advances to work them. It is very desirable, therefore, that the banks should have authority to take them as security, and I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think this amendment proper to the section we are considering.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The section we are considering deals with the power to lend on warehouse receipts and pledges of that character, pledges which, under this Bill, are to be of the nature of warehouse receipts, by fiction or otherwise; and I think the amendment the hon. gentleman proposes raises a substantive question and cannot be taken as an amendment to this section.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If the opinion of the Committee is that it should be adopted, it might be put in as a separate clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to section 75, now that we have settled the principles on which that section should proceed, I would ask that it be allowed to stand for the purpose of making with care any amendment to remove any uncertainty.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I move as a substantive clause the amendment I have just proposed—75*a*.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can see no harm in giving the banks the power to lend on that security if they think proper. It would be a question entirely for the gentlemen who manage those institutions to decide whether they thought the securities sufficient or not.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two sides to this question. One is with regard to those who desire the advance, and the other with regard to the banks, and the general principle involved as to what security the banks should lend upon. The security of a timber limit license, or a right to cut timber, is rather incorporeal security. It is a long way from the material which is to be in a marketable state. The right to cut on a timber limit license is possessed only for a single year, though it may be renewed. There are always certain conditions to be complied with, even if the licenses are renewable, and it may be a fine point for the power which grants the license to decide whether or not there is sufficient cause to revoke it or refuse to renew it. It is rather a shadowy kind of security to make an advance on.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman will recollect that the Province from which he and I come has granted licenses for a term of ten years. In the Province of Quebec, some of the most valuable properties of the country have been comprised in those timber limits; and, while it is true the owners have to pay a yearly rental, I have never known an instance of a license having been taken away where the yearly rent is paid. Experience has shown us that these timber limits are very valuable; and if the banks choose to lend money on timber licenses, that is a matter for them to decide, even if the security be rather uncertain.

Mr. FOSTER. You might take away all limitations.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; this is a matter in which the banks should be left to exercise their discretion. I would not limit their power to lend, when, by lending, they facilitate trade and commerce by giving facilities for lumber operations, and on what is considered in the Ottawa district very good security.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose that, under clause 69, it would be possible for a bank, on the same condition and under the same circumstances under which it may use this interest in real estate to take as an additional security, the security of a timber limit; but I apprehend what the hon. gentleman wants is that the banks should be permitted to lend upon the security of timber limits directly and at once. That would be practically adopting, perhaps in the most objectionable form, the principle of land banks. Our banks are not based on the principle of

land banks. That is not the principle of our present banking system. It is not to lend upon real security, or upon future, unrealised values. You do not allow a bank to lend upon the security of the most highly productive fee simple of valuable real estate, producing great rents. You allow it to take a mortgage, under certain circumstances, as additional security for its contract in ordinary business. You may do the same thing in reference to timber limits. If you introduce the principle of lending directly, on the security of a timber limit, why not allow the banks to lend directly on the fee simple of a warehouse, on the real property of any person, and you at once establish the principle of a land bank, contrary to that on which our banking system is based.

Mr. WALDIE. The fact heretofore is that the security was given on the logs, and unless the license to cut timber was clearly transferred with the logs, the property did not go together, and it has been held necessary for the banks to hold the license or the right to cut timber so as to continue their right in the lumber. It has been the common practice of the banks to make advances to manufacturers of lumber, who have purchased the right to cut lumber.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend misunderstood me if he supposes I am objecting to that. I understand it is perfectly legitimate, that a bank which makes an advance to a manufacturer for the purpose of enabling him to cut his timber, should take as an additional security, even now, the security of real estate. The hon. member for Frontenac however wants something more, but what definitely I do not know; but I assume it is this, that instead of making the transaction a legitimate banking transaction, which is an advance to a person in the course of his business, and on his general credit for the doing of work and upon the prospect of a *bonâ fide* mercantile operation, you are going to authorise an advance upon the security of his chattel interest, whatever it may be in real estate. That is not the principle of the present Act. The principle of the present Act is that you make it upon the personal security, and, with reference to the mercantile operation, having the right under certain circumstances to take as an additional security, a charge on real estate. But I am bound to say that this Bill seems to contemplate the statutory recognition of that which is new in law, though I fear not in practice, the loaning directly and primarily on chattels, instead of restricting the basis of loans as does the present law. This is a questionable extension.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I understand that timber limits require a great deal of capital to work them. The owner generally goes to a bank to obtain that capital, and it is for the security of the bank not only to have the security of the timber cut, but the security of the license.

Mr. BLAKE. So they have. I am told that half the limits in this country are in the hands of the banks.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It should be expressed that the banks have authority to lend upon such securities. It is similar to lending upon real estate. It requires capital to develop and work these limits, and the security should not only be upon the product but the bank should have the right to go on cutting in case anything happened to the owner.

Mr. MITCHELL. Suppose a man owns a valuable timber limit and cuts $10,000 worth of timber. Surely the bank can advance money upon the cut timber. If he goes to them and wants $10,000 more, why should he not be allowed to give them the security of the timber which is yet to be cut. It is for the banks to consider whether they will advance that amount, but it cannot do any harm to pass the motion.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think my amendment was out of order, if the amendment voted on was in order.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman's motion being put as a substantive motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I probably acted rather hastily in ruling that out of order, because I was under a misapprehension. It is now moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson):

That the bank may also lend money to any person engaged in farming upon real estate security.

Mr. WATSON. It might be well, if the Minister of Justice should think so, to add a provision that it should be according to the Torrens system, which certainly is much better security than that proposed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in regard to the timber limits.

Amendment negatived.

On section 76,

Mr. BARRON. It occurs to me that it is rather dangerous to give the bank power to lend money upon a warehouse receipt which is promised to be given at some future time.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be well to make it a written promise?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that suggestion should be adopted, as it would save a great deal of litigation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that we should insert the words "written agreement" instead of the word "promise."

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is due to the legal profession to say that there is a vast amount of philanthropy and patriotism on their part in endeavoring to make it so that we cannot have any litigation.

Mr. DALY. I think the provisions of this clause should be extended. It reads now that every one is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to imprisonment, who wilfully makes any false statement in any warehouse receipt, bill of lading or security. Cases have arisen where, after the warehouse receipt had been given to a bank, and a short time had elapsed between the giving of the receipt and the falling due of the note, the person who had given the receipt had cleaned out the warehouse completely, and when the bank went to look for the security, the grain was entirely gone. It seems to me this clause should go further and meet such cases as these. I would suggest that it be amended by adding after the word "security" the words:

Or in relation thereto as to the quantity, quality or value or otherwise of the goods, wares or merchandise

covered by any warehouse receipts, bill of lading or security, after the same has been delivered to the banks.

Mr. HALL. That omission has occurred to me, and I had copied the exact phraseology of the criminal law about the conversion of goods that had been pledged. It may be better to adopt the precise phraseology.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to adopting that clause. The Larceny Act covers the case. We are providing for cases in which there is no warehouse receipts and a certain security, and we want to extend the provisions so as to cover the security.

Mr. DALY. I will withdraw my amendment in favor of the amendment of the member for Sherbrooke.

Mr. BLAKE. It rather strikes me as if the man would be liable, if he did not deliver possession to the bank of the goods, no matter for what reason they were not delivered. Suppose, for instance, they were burned up.

Mr. HALL. The non. delivery must be wilful.

Mr. BLAKE. The Act says "if he does not deliver to the bank possession thereof;" the word "wilful" does not appear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The section as the hon. member has stated, is just adapted from the Larceny Act, and we can remove any difficulty by adding these words "or wilfully withholds from the bank possession thereof."

On section 77,

Mr. CASEY. Does not this clause involve the purchaser of manufactured goods in some doubt as to whether he can really get the goods delivered to him? If the bank has a lien on the goods manufactured from certain raw material, is not the purchaser of the finished article at some risk in buying any goods exposed for sale?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is incident to the system of warehouse receipts, and to the principle of allowing the manufacturer to pledge them without change of possession, or notoriety of the instruments itself. We have discussed that at great length, and have concluded that we ought not to prevent that lien being so created.

Mr. CASEY. Suppose a manufacturer bought certain raw material, we will say Australian wool, of which he made a fabric known as tweeds; suppose somebody else bought those tweeds, and that the manufacturer of tweeds from the Australian wool had obtained an advance from a bank and had failed to satisfy the claims of the bank, would not the merchant who had bought those tweeds, have to lose what he had bought from the manufacturer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Is that a fair proposition that an innocent third party not knowing of the transaction with the bank is to lose what he bought and supposed was his own, because the manufacturer has failed in his obligation to the bank?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is open to that danger, but we cannot have the principle of having these liens without providing that the lien shall be absolute. The hon. gentleman puts the case of the manufactured article being sold to an innocent purchaser who then will lose the money. Shall the purchaser lose the money or shall the loss fall on the bank? If the loss falls on the bank it has the warehouse receipt or security which is its equivalent. This clause is involved in the principle already settled by allowing these securities at all.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister is right in saying that the principle is involved in what has already been done, but then if he looks at the consequences of what has been done already, he will have reason to change his mind as to the judiciousness of that action. It is an outrageous proposition that an innocent third party purchasing from a manufacturer has to lose the goods, because that manufacturer has not paid certain obligations to the bank which advanced money for the purpose of his manufacturing the goods. It introduces absolute uncertainty into all commercial transactions, and this policy of allowing wholesale merchants to give warehouse receipts on raw material to banks from which they obtain advances, thus giving a permanent lien on that raw material, no matter into what form it may afterwards be manufactured, is a false and pernicious policy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I do not quite understand that the Committee has gone so far as the Minister of Justice has stated. I understand that section 75, to enable banks to loan money to wholesale manufacturers of goods, has been allowed to stand, and this section should also be allowed to stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true that section 75 was allowed to stand, but that course was followed in order to more carefully consider the wording of the clause to carry out the principle arrived at by the Committee.

Mr. CASEY. Section 75 having been allowed to stand, and the Committee having taken no action on it, the present section, which depends on it, must be allowed to stand also. I urge on the attention of the Committee the risk to which the ordinary purchaser is exposed by the adoption of these sections. Take a wholesale manufacturer of agricultural implements. The people buy implements every year, and they have no means of knowing whether the reaper or mower they purchase is pledged in advance to a bank under the operations of these two sections or not.

On section 80,

Mr. MITCHELL. There is very great objection to be taken to this section. I think that the moiety system of penalties should not be introduced into this Bill and that the prosecution should be by an officer of the Government, and not by public informers. It should be the duty of the department of the Government which takes charge of the financial affairs of this country, to conduct the necessary prosecutions. I know as a matter of fact that there are a class of men in the city of Montreal, so-called professional men, who make a livelihood by taking up unintentional violations of the law, and bringing actions. We had an action brought against *The Herald* two or three years ago because we published the notice of a change of a proprietorship in only one office, instead of in two distincts places. That action was brought by one of these legal scavengers who make a living out of accidental omissions which take place.

Mr. FOSTER. This section although new in this Act is law at the present time.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. This section provides for penalties "for any violation of the sections numbered 65 to 79, inclusive;" but, when I refer to section 68, section 69 and section 70, I find that there is nothing at all in these by which a bank could incur a penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. It only refers to these clauses which have the penalty attached.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Then that should be stated, instead of the way it is at present in the section.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps it would be better.

Mr. WALDIE. If the moiety system of penalties is in the criminal law let it remain there, but it should not be introduced into an Act of this kind to encourage discharged employees to turn informers.

Mr. DALY. I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that no action should be taken for the recovery of these penalties by a common informer, and that the Crown should take necessary action. Without taking up the time of the House I beg to move:

That all the words after "dollars," on the fourth line of section 80, be struck out.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me that there is a very unequal dealing in this clause, with the banks as compared with their customers. Sub-section 3, of section 73, says:

"Everyone is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, who wilfully makes any false statement in any warehouse receipt, bill of lading or security, as aforesaid."

False statements on the part of the customers of the bank are made a misdemeanor, and the man who makes them is liable to imprisonment, while on the other hand, if the bank violates its obligations towards its customers, it is only liable to a fine not exceeding $500. There is no provision that any official of a bank, who may be responsible for any such violation, is to be subject to criminal procedure. A bank official might make any false statements he chooses to his customers, without incurring any personal penalty, and without bringing the bank under any other penalty than a fine of $500. I think there is a great inconsistency between the penalties provided in the two cases. There should, be a criminal liability attached to an official of the bank who violates this Act as well as to the customers. I would like to know from the Minister of Justice whether such criminal liability exists under the common law or any other statute? If it does exist, I think it should be incorporated in this Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Such a penalty exists under the common law, and section 100 of this Act provides:

"Every person committing an offence declared to be against this Act shall be liable, on conviction thereof, to a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or both, in the discretion of the court before which such conviction is held."

I would say, with regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), with reference to the penalties, that we can review them better and consider the mode of procedure better when we come to discuss the four or five clauses of the Bill which refer to convictions and penalties. I therefore would acquiesce in striking out the words after "dollars."

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister has pointed out that there is a liability of a fine or imprisonment in the case of any person violating any section of this Act, which of course would include a bank official. In the case of any person who makes a false statement in a warehouse receipt, there is imprisonment without the option of a fine, while in the case of the bank official there is the option of either a fine or imprisonment. We know that there are many bank officials who may make errors involving great loss to the bank, from whom you could not possibly collect $1,000 under any circumstances, and, therefore, the fine would be an illusory remedy. I think if there is no option in the case of the customer of the bank, there should be none in the case of the bank official, and the bank itself should be liable to a much higher penalty than $500.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Section 81, I understand, is a repetition of the old clause. Is it necessary to fix the maximum rate of interest at 7 per cent., beyond which it must not go under any circumstances?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a high enough rate, is it not?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Many considerations enter into that question. I know that in the Maritime Provinces the banks sometimes charge more than 7 per cent., and very properly so. I do not believe in the principle of limiting the rate to 7 per cent. at all. Make it 8 per cent.

Mr. CASEY. I do not agree with my hon. friend; I do not think we should make it 8 per cent. or any other rate. I say that this section introduces a principle which we have time and again rejected in this House, namely, the principle of limiting the rate of interest. The rate of interest should not be regulated by any legislation of ours, and it cannot be. Whatever you put in an Act here, the man who lends money will get the rate of interest for which he is willing to lend, and I am quite satisfied that whether this section passes or not, the banks will get the current rates of interest for their money. Any attempt to limit the rate of interest is contrary to all sound principles of finance. The current rate of interest obtainable for money is regulated by the demand for capital, just as truly as the price of a bushel of wheat is regulated by the demand and supply in the country, and it is as impossible by any legislation of this House to regulate the rate of interest payable to a bank by a borrower as it is to regulate the price of wheat. In introducing this clause, the Government are going back to the old laws with regard to usury, and they are introducing a contradiction of terms in the clause itself. We have penalties for everything else in the Act, but it is here specified that the banks shall not be liable to any penalty for doing that which this clause says they shall not be allowed to do. If a breach of the other clauses involves a penalty, I do not see why it should not be the same in regard to this clause.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think we need not trouble ourselves with regard to the old statutes on usury. You cannot fix the value of money by legislation any more than you can fix the value of other commodities. Leave it to free trade, to the free laws of supply and demand; the only rule to take it simply to

omit that clause with reference to usury. I would move in amendment that the following words be struck out :

Not exceeding seven per cent. per annum, and may receive and take in advance any such rates, but no higher rate of interest will be recovered by the banks.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is perfectly absurd for us at this time of day to attempt to pass a usury law. Anybody who has any knowledge of business knows that money is like every other commodity, a creature of supply and demand, and that what you can get for it depends altogether on the demand. The Bank of England charges for discount one day 2½ per cent, and the next week 5, 6 or 7 per cent., and it is absurd to say you can put an arbitrary value on money by limiting the rate to 7 per cent. We are ignoring the common law recognised by all intelligent men to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. Why have we a legal interest to-day?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have none.

Mr. SPROULE. We have. In transactions between two individuals, in which the rate of interest is not stipulated, the law allows only 6 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But there is no attempt to interfere with the contract made between the parties. The parties can contract to pay any rate of interest, and that contract is binding; but if there is no contract, the law allows 6 per cent. for the charge.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not applying any new principle whatever. This section has been in force for a long time. It was adopted, after full consideration of the subject, as a proper limitation which ought to be put upon the rate of interest chargeable by the bank, and so far from the circumstances having changed since in favor of increasing the rate, the value of money has fallen, and the rate of interest is far lower to-day than it was when that legislation was passed. We propose to adhere to the provisions in the present law on that subject.

Mr. CASEY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there has been a similar provision in the Banking Act for some time past?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. It has been violated then, as I know from experience, for I have had to pay 8 per cent. to the banks. Whether this restriction be a new principle or not in our banking, it is utterly unsound and utterly false in political economy. It has been ineffective in the past, because the banks, like any other lender of money, will secure, when they make a loan, exactly what interest that loan is worth. They will simply refuse to lend unless they get the current rate of interest. I do not see why antiquated usury laws, which were found many years ago to be useless and ineffective, should now be re-enacted by a clause in the general Banking Act. I have not heard from the other side any argument why this law should be re-enacted. The hon. the Minister of Justice says that the rate of money has fallen since the rate of 7 per cent. was fixed by the present Banking Act. But the hon. gentleman must be aware that the rate of interest may go up again. Should some new wave of prosperity strike the country, and the opportunities for investing become more productive, the rate will again go up. The hon. gentleman cannot tell when the rise will occur. A wave of prosperity may strike Canada notwithstanding the circumstances which at present militate against any such probability. I hope it will be distinctly understood by the country that the Minister of Justice has committed himself to the proposition that the Government should dictate what rate of interest should be chargable, that they should interfere with the freedom of contract between the banks and their customers, and say what capital shall be worth for the purposes of investment. The hon. the Minister of Justice told us that capital is not worth more than 7 per cent. invested in Canada. That is one of the most damaging things said about the country for a long time, and the hon. gentleman must take the responsibility for it.

Amendment negatived.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 2nd May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a statement to the House. My attention has been called to a statement in the Toronto *Globe*, in reference to the proceedings of Parliament the other evening, which is so much at variance with the truth that I feel it my duty to refer to it. I will not read the whole statement, but in it occurs the following :—

"It happens that Mr. Wood is the chief owner of the Albert and Cape Tormentine Railway, which was built for private purposes almost entirely out of the public chest to the tune of $118,000 by the Dominion and a further sum by the Province. One of the main objects for constructing this line was to reach some mills owned partly by Mr. Wood. Not only this, but last year the Government granted $50,000 and this year $110,000 for a pier at Cape Tormentine not required in the public interest, in fact quite useless to anyone but Mr. Wood and his railway and his mills."

I desire to say, in reference to the statement regarding Mr. Wood's mills, that I own no mill, nor have I any interest in any mill anywhere along this line of railway. I may further say that I have no private property along that line, and I have no private or personal interest to be served in any way by the construction of that line. With regard to the statement that it was built almost entirely out of moneys received from the public chest, I may say that any one who knows anything of the construction of the road, knows that the subsidies granted were entirely inadequate to meet the cost of its construction—that, in addition to the subsidies, a large amount of private capital has been invested in it. I would further say that from the construction of the line I have received no personal

or private profit whatever. On the contrary, besides the money I have put into the railway, I have devoted, for some years, a considerable portion of my time to attending to the construction and operation of this railway, and for these services I have never asked nor received, nor do I expect ever to receive, a single dollar. With regard to the statement that the pier at Cape Tormentine is not required in the public interest, and is, in fact, quite useless to any one but Mr. Wood and his railway and his mills, as I have stated in the House before, these grants were made, not at my instance, but at the instance of the members representing Prince Edward Island, and after a committee of this House had made a report in favor of those appropriations. I might add that this is not a new enterprise, but that the company which constructed the railway was incorporated in 1874; and long before I was a member of Parliament the subject was discussed here, and my predecessor in the representation of Westmoreland County advocated the construction of this line and this pier, and promised that the Government of which he was a member would provide for their construction. I desire to say that I have nothing whatever to regret in regard to my connection with this road, and that I feel that I should have neglected my duty as a citizen, and should have been very remiss in my duty as a public man, if I had not done everything in my power to secure its construction.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide by law that a bounty of two dollars per ton be paid on all pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore between the first day of July, 1892, and the thirtieth day of June, 1897, inclusive.

He said: This is simply an extension of the policy adopted by the House in 1883, and which prevails at present in Canada. In 1883, a bounty of $1.50 per ton was granted for three years from that date, and it was provided that the bounty should be $1 from 1886 to 1889, at which time it should cease. In 1886 the bounty was made $1.50, until 1889, and $1 from 1889 to 1892. It is now proposed to make this bounty $2 per ton from 1892 to 1897. During the last ten years Canada has imported an average of 200,000 tons of iron yearly, and the demand is constantly increasing. There are great natural facilities for manufacturing iron in this country. The ore is found in large quantities, well distributed over the various sections of the country, and in many instances in close proximity to the flux, and the fuel necessary for its reduction and manufacture. It may be asked, why it is necessary to stimulate the production by artificial assistance if we have such natural facilities? A glance at the history of iron production the world over will answer this question, and show that it has been found impossible to induce in any country a large development in the iron industry without such assistance. From 1760 to 1830 large inducements were given for the production of iron in England, and these were not withdrawn until the process of development was well advanced, and England had become the iron producing country of the world. This had also been found necessary in Belgium, Germany and other continental countries. In the United States so large has been the development of the iron industry through the means of high tariff rates, that the output has grown to be second greatest in the world, and their manufacturers there are now in some measure entering into competition with England. Canada must learn the lesson taught by all other countries and profit by it. At present there is in Canada a duty of $4 per ton upon pig iron, and the additional bounty proposed would make the inducement $6 per ton. Under this encouragement, I believe, it will be found possible to interest additional capital, and cause a large increase in the production of iron from our rich ores. If this can done the secondary benefits will be very important. The production of iron gives a large amount of employment to labor, more than is given by any other great industry. The mining of the ore, the transport to the furnaces, and all the operations necessary to a reduction of the ores; the mining and preparation of limestone for flux purposes, and the raising or production of the immense quantities of coal necessary for the work, call for labor at every turn, as well skilled as unskilled. No less than 80 per cent. of the cost of pig iron is paid in wages, and at least 90 per cent. of the cost of malleable iron. Although the proposed increased bounty will not take effect until 1892, it will encourage the production quite as effectually as if it took effect to-morrow, as it will require eighteen months or two years to provide the requisite furnaces. The advantage of the bounty system over the tariff is that the amount given will not have to be paid upon the whole consumption of iron in the country, but only upon that which is manufactured. Since 1883 bounty has been paid on 160,000 to 170,000 tons, but the number of furnaces has not been sufficient to produce what is needed for the demands of the country, nor has it as yet given us the greater advantage of inducing competition by the multiplication of other industries. A very large capital is necessary in the construction and operation of the necessary furnaces, and the competition with such iron producing countries as Great Britain and the United States, is very strong. There they have the advantages of years of experience and of consequent skill, they have wide markets and immense production which reduces the cost of the manufactured article, and if we wish to induce capital to take hold of our rich iron resources and develop them in the face of such competition, we must be prepared to offer an adequate inducement. I believe the proposed bounty, in addition to the duty, will prove an adequate inducement, and that with its aid we may look for a distinct advance in the development of what should be one of the most important industries of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt exceedingly whether, among the many injurious duties which the policy of the present Government has heaped on the producers of this country, there is one which is calculated to do more harm on a larger and wider scale than the enormous duties which have been placed upon iron. Iron is an article which is, in the highest degree, the raw material of an immense number of our manufactures. It is becoming, from day to day, more largely used

by the agricultural portion of this Dominion, it is one of the particular class of articles to which, more than others, the attention of the Government is called by the accredited representatives of the agricultural industry, with the view of reducing the duties; and it is that particular article of all others, by adding to the cost of which the hon. gentleman will increase the cost of an enormous variety of articles, that he selected to-day for an added bounty, and for a bounty which will stretch over a number of years and thereby tie the hands of the successors of this Parliament. When we recollect that, on the average of years, pig iron can be produced at ten or eleven dollars per ton—I do not know what the exact price is at the moment, as it has gone up considerably, and is subject to a good many fluctuations—no human being can pretend there ought to be such encouragement granted to its manufacture outside the enormous duty of $4 per ton now imposed; yet, notwithstanding that, we have the hon. gentleman proposing here to add to that duty a bounty of $2 per ton to all who may produce iron in this country. There is just this advantage in the proposition, that, to a certain extent, it enables the people to see more clearly than in other cases how much the exchequer has been plundered, because plundered it is, and how much the people are being impoverished by this policy. The hon. gentleman did not state what is supposed to be the average production per man per year, or what number of tons are usually produced per year, in countries where this manufacture is carried on with proper capital and appliances and on a proper scale. Perhaps he does not know. Has he obtained that information, or tried to obtain it?

Mr. FOSTER. Go on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I should be very glad to have him state it to the House. He ought to have obtained the information, as it is an essential element in discussing the question. I would like to have a reply.

Mr. FOSTER. Go on with the discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not choose to give the House a statement of the amounts, and I shall reserve my remarks in that connection until some one better informed or more candid than himself chooses to give the statement. The only possible merit of this bounty is that to a certain extent we can see the cost; and in this connection I will take the opportunity, which I intended to take at another time, of calling the attention of the House, as I have done more than once before, to the excessive danger in the practice now pursued by the Government of substituting specific duties for *ad valorem* duties, particularly on the article of iron. I have here handed to me a statement in detail of the effects of a certain recent change in the tariff, by which the duty on an article very largely used in this country and of immense importance as well in a sanitary point of view,—the article of wrought iron tubing—has been dealt with by the Government; and I give that as an illustration of the exorbitant taxation, which, under the hon. gentleman's system, is now being levied on articles of iron. As everybody knows, there is no one thing which it is more desirable, in a general way, should be cheaper in this country than iron tubing. The House will recollect that recently the hon. gentleman proposed——

An hon. MEMBER. That is left as it was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am told the hon. gentleman has left that as it was. I was not in the House when he made the alteration, but I will use, as an illustration, the duties as they now are, in order to show the enormous weight of the duties which the hon. gentleman is levying on iron. I find that the duty on iron tubing, even as it now stands, ranges from 61¾ to 62½ per cent. In some few cases, it fell to 58, owing to the fact that it is still, in some degree, a specific duty, and is affected by the rise or fall in the value of the goods. But the fact that at this present moment, an immense number of articles of iron are taxed 60, 70, 80 and 90 per cent. in some cases, under the hon. gentleman's tariff, is of itself the best reply in the opinion of everybody who regards the real welfare of the mass of the people, to this proposition, that a further bounty be added to the tax which already exists. Now, it is possible that the hon. gentleman may succeed, by this unhealthy stimulus, in developing a considerable production of pig iron; and if he does, we may be saddled, for all we can tell, with an annual charge of $200,000 or $300,000 for the whole period from 1892 to 1897 during which he proposes to impose this duty. Were the manufactures to assume any proportion worth while, any proportions that could be regarded as conferring an important benefit upon this country, a production of 400,000 or 500,000 tons would be nothing very remarkable, and then we will find ourselves taxed, by this mischievous policy, with a bounty of from $800,000 to $900,000 a year, for which we would receive no benefits commensurate with one-tenth of the expenditure. Now, our market for iron is a limited market, as the hon. gentleman well knows. He does not dare to pretend there is the remotest chance of our exporting iron. We must be confined, at present at any rate, to one limited market; and if the hon. gentleman has chosen to study the subject carefully, he will know it is scarcely possible for us, even if our advantages were greater than they are, with that limited market, to manufacture in such a way that we can produce as cheaply as the great country of the United States, with its continually increasing market, now amounting to sixty-five millions, and probably soon amounting to seventy-five millions, or eighty millions, or as Great Britain, which has not only its own market, but that of the whole world. The resolution, as stated, provides for the bounty of $2 per ton on pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore between 1st July, 1892, and 30th June, 1897, inclusive. This is not the initiation of a new policy, but the extension of the policy which was adopted in 1883, and which obtains in this country now. In 1883, a bounty of $1.50 per ton was granted on pig iron for three years from that date, and it was provided that the bounty should be $1 per ton for three years, after the expiration of the first three years. In 1886, when the first term expired, a Bill was introduced and became law which kept the bounty up to $1.50 for the three years from 1886 to 1889, and then graduated it at $1 per ton for the three years following, which would expire in 1892. It is now proposed to extend the principle and to make the

amount of the bounty 50 cents a ton greater from the 1st July, 1892, at which time the duty payable under the present law will have lapsed. I suppose no one doubts that there are two elements in the country which are peculiarly favorable to the manufacture of iron. One is the very large consumption which takes place in this country, and which is increasing year by year. I am speaking roughly, but I think, during the last ten or twelve years, we have imported about 1,200,000 tons of the rougher kinds of iron and steel per year, and this consumption is constantly increasing, and will naturally increase with the increase of population and the widening of the enterprise and the business of the country. The other element is this, which I think is apparent to all: that in Canada we have large and varied deposits of the raw material, the iron ore, scattered all over the country, in almost every section of it, and that in connection with it we have the fuel and the flux in close proximity to the ore itself, so that, in certain portions of the country there are many advantages for the development of the iron industry, and probably in all parts of the country there are as good average facilities as can be found in any other great country in the world. It may be asked why, if we have a large and increasing demand, and if we have the raw material of varied and good quality and in large quantities, it is necessary to stimulate the production of iron by adding to the duty at present imposed on the importation of pig iron a bounty for the special encouragement of the manufacture of wrought iron from the ore? I think a glance at the history of the development of iron industries in the world will show that it was found impossible in the past in any great country to induce a large growth of the manufacture of iron without giving an artificial and a lengthened stimulus to it. In Great Britain, from 1760 to 1830, there were in this way large inducements held out for the manufacture of iron, and that was when the competition was not so varied or so strong as it is now to an almost infinite degree—if I may be allowed to use that term. The same is true as to the development of the iron industry in the continental countries of Europe, and we have close at hand a pertinent example in the United States of America, which commenced its iron industry with artificial inducements and has followed up that policy with such success that it is now the second country in the world in the production of iron, and its total output is creeping up close to the total output in Great Britain, where the capital is so large and the experience has been so long and so varied. Therefore, though we have already a duty of $4 a ton upon pig iron, we propose to give a bounty of $2 a ton, which will amount to an inducement of $6 per ton to the manufacturers here; and that, if I am not mistaken, is about the equivalent of the American duty. Besides the general advantage of producing what is necessary for the consumption of the country, there is a large incidental advantage derived in producing iron from the ore in this country, inasmuch as it is a very wide and constant employer of labor—skilled labor, labor partially skilled, and labor not skilled—in the mining of the ores, in the production of the coal necessary and of the flux which is necessary, and in all the laborious processes by which the raw material is transformed into the manufactured article. It is stated that at least 80 per cent. of the cost of production of pig iron goes for wages, and that at least 90 per cent. of the cost of malleable iron goes for wages. That shows the large proportion of the expenditure which goes into the employment of labor in the country. This bounty is to take effect in 1892, and will consequently have the effect of aiding as effectually as if its payment commenced to-morrow, in the starting and developing of new industries. In consequence of the immense amount of capital required, it takes a year or eighteen months or two years to make the necessary preparations for the starting of furnaces and getting into a position for the manufacture of iron. I do not think it is necessary to make any lengthened explanation, especially in view of the fact that this is not a new policy, and has been discussed in the House on two or three other occasions. One beneficial effect of a bounty is that, in this case, if we pay $6 a ton duty upon pig iron, it will have to be paid upon the whole product, whether produced in the country or not, while in the case of a bounty there is no payment until the production of the iron, and then only upon the iron actually produced in the country. The bounty has been paid since 1883. From that time we have had produced in pig 160,000 or 170,000 tons upon which the bounty has been paid. If the hon. gentleman merely desires to encourage trade, if he really desires to promote the manufacture of iron in this country, the way to do that is to open our markets, at any rate, to the people of this continent. Were that done, I have no doubt that important iron manufactures would spring up in Canada which would be self-sustaining, which would need no bounty, which would inflict no penalty whatever on the consuming population of this country. The only way to foster any important production of iron in Canada, is to follow the policy of my hon. friend on this side, obtain access to large markets, and you will find that at once capital will flow in, that the millions which the hon. gentleman's leader promised us would have some chance of entering Canada, and he would have some chance of seeing iron manufactories created in Canada of which the country might be proud, which would contribute towards its wealth, and which would not be made the means of pillaging the resources of the people. This is one mode, and another mode of cheapening the production of iron would be to cheapen the cost of living in this country, to enable our artisans to live more cheaply than they do now, to make it a more valuable factor in economy than it is now, and in that way we would have a fair chance of holding our own in competition with the iron which we are at present obliged to import from elsewhere. Sir, I must, for my part, protest on every ground against this proposition. I protest against it because at this present moment iron is exorbitantly taxed, because iron in being a raw material absolutely essential in many manufactures and treble essential, I may say, to the great agricultural class. We have already placed upon it heavier taxes than exist in any other country I know of, except, possibly, in the United States, where the advantage of the large market does operate to some extent to produce that wholesome competition which we might produce to a reasonable degree, but which competition, I tell the hon. gentleman, we have no sort of hope of producing here. This is merely a

concession to certain favored individuals, or certain favored corporations, to be paid for, in all human probability, by contributions to election funds, just as we know that other combines are in the habit of earning the gratitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. For these reasons, and because I object in the highest degree to tying up the hands of succeeding Parliaments and to inflicting upon the people of this country liabilities which may possibly amount to many hundreds of thousands of dollars before the period arrives which is fixed by this resolution—for those reasons I object to the proposition of the hon. gentleman, and will feel it my duty to offer all the opposition in my power to its becoming law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to add my protest to that which has been so ably and forcibly made by my hon. friend, against the new tax which the hon. gentleman seeks to impose upon the people of this country. The history of this duty on pig iron is rather a curious one, and when I listened to the speech of the Finance Minister, I thought I could recall similar predictions which were made when this system was first introduced. Sir, this country has had the advantage of a ten years' experience of the payment of these bounties, and we ought to be able, at least, after that experience, to form some fair judgment as to whether they are beneficial or not. When these bounties were first imposed upon the people, when the Finance Minister first induced the Parliament of this country to consent to the imposition of these duties and to grant these large bounties for the establishment of these petty industries, he did it on the ground that the granting of this bounty would be productive of an enormous increase in the production of pig iron. He told us we had one or two struggling industries already in Canada, notably that of Londonderry, Nova Scotia, and that if his proposition was accepted by the House—and the proposition made, be it remembered, was limited in its amount, and limited in the period of time during which it was to remain in operation—he had no doubt, that at the end of that time iron industries would be so well established that they would need no further aid. The first statement made by the then Finance Minister was, that whereas the production of pig iron up to that time had been about 20,000 tons per year, the granting of a bounty of $1.50 or $2 a ton, as the scale was provided in the resolution, would have the effect of doubling that increase in one year, that an enormous number of men would be employed, that capital was already waiting to flow into the country for the development of those iron industries, and that prosperity would follow on the introduction of this capital. Sir, I hold in my hand the speech made by Sir Leonard Tilley, then Finance Minister, when he introduced that resolution, so far back as the year 1883, in which he said :

"During the last year we imported altogether about 63,431 tons, and it is expected that during the next year, from July, 1883, to July, 1884, there will probably be 40,000 manufactured."

And he went on to show that under the fostering influence of this bounty the result would be, with the natural advantages which we possess—and the hon. gentleman himself has redescribed them to-day in almost the same terms—that before the ten years expired we would be able to produce in this country nearly all the pig iron that was required to be used in the country. Now, Sir, it is interesting to note how far these predictions have been verified. How do we stand to-day? Have the results justified the imposition of the tax? Have any of the predictions made by the hon. member been fulfilled? Has the country been benefited in any way by the enormous sums we have paid out from year to year in the shape of bounties to these pig iron industries? I say we have not. I say the figures show exactly the opposite; I say that although you have been paying out year after year tens of thousand of dollars in the shape of bounty to these industries, to-day the production is not greater than it was ten years ago. I say, in face of these facts it behooves Parliament to pause, not only in continuing the existing system, but in doing what the hon. gentleman asks us to do, in largely increasing the bounties which he proposes to pay, and in largely increasing the taxes which the people will have to pay. Now, Sir, in 1887, when the Finance Minister revised his Budget, he told us there was one great fault in the then system of taxation; he told us there was one article which, in some way or another, had been omitted, and that if we put a heavy duty upon that article the result would be largely to benefit the people of this country. I read his speech the other day, and it was most amusing to remember the proposition which he made, and by which he induced this House to consent to the enormous increase which we then made to the duties upon iron. He told us, in the first place, that the result would be if we increased the duties to the extent that he asked us to increase them upon iron, to sweep away the balance of trade which had been for many years against this country. Well, that was a great thing, if we could only do that. I will quote the hon. gentleman's words :

"There is also one table——"

Referring to a series of tables which he placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen in this House.—

"There is also one table showing the balance of trade, and how much is accounted for by the importation of iron and steel and the manufacture thereof. You have only to look at this in order to see that the balance of trade against Canada is largely and at once accounted for. If you subtract the amount of imports paid by Canada for iron to sustain the iron industries of other countries, you will find that it is nearly equal to the amount by which our imports have exceeded our exports, and, if you want to balance the trade of the country, if you want to have no outgoing beyond the incoming of the country, cut the Gordian knot, put this iron industry upon the same footing and foundation that you have put all the other industries of Canada, and you will sweep away, to a large extent, the balance of trade which stands recorded against Canada up to the present time."

This was the promise, that was the prediction made by the Finance Minister, that was one of the strongest reasons he used to urge this country to double, and treble, and quadruple the duties which were then placed upon the importation of iron to this country; and the House, in a weak moment, unfortunately yielded to the persuasive voice of the then Finance Minister, and what has been the result? Let me ask the Finance Minister to-day how does the balance of trade stand so far as Canada is concerned? Has the increase of taxes upon iron swept away that balance of trade? The hon. gentleman knows that the prediction stands to-day unfulfilled, that there has not been that result which the hon. gentleman was satisfied would take place, and the balance of trade against Canada to-day is larger than it was before the period when we had cheap iron, resulting from the imposition

small duties. Well, Sir, what else? Why, there was no section of this country that was not going to become rich and prosperous. The hon. gentleman told us that the iron industry of Londonderry was to be developed to an extent unparalleled in the world's history, because, he said, we possessed in this country all the materials necessary for the manufacture of iron, and if we had a national spirit we would not go abroad and import iron. He continued:

"If that be the case, what is to prevent the policy of the ship that carries the ore from Weller's Bay, Kingston and Cobourg, across to the United States ports, bringing back a cargo of the anthracite coal which is within one hundred miles from the point of shipment? There is nothing to prevent it but one thing, and that is the duty upon the anthracite coal; and what I propose to ask this House to do, in adopting the policy of vitalising this great industry for Canada, is to take the duty off anthracite coal and make it free."

He was not going to wait one, two or three years for capital to flow in, because he told us capital was at that moment waiting to come in, and would come in the moment the tariff was passed. He further said:

"The moment that is done we shall have blast furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, at all events, served by anthracite coal, making that description of anthracite iron which is so highly valued by gentlemen connected with foundries. The distance between Weller's Bay and Charlotte, in the United States, is about sixty miles, and from Rochester to the anthracite mines is 150 miles; and, I think, when I give those distances and give what is accomplished every day in the United States, where coal and iron are 1,000 miles apart, I shall have settled the problem that nothing will be easier than to establish blast furnaces in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, by which you can not only manufacture unlimited quantities of charcoal iron but manufacture the ore by the use of anthracite coal."

We were not only going to have the balance of trade rectified, but we were to have blast furnaces established; we were not only to have blast furnaces developed in Londonderry, where they had been established, but we were to have furnaces established at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston. In a weak moment this House yielded to the hon. gentleman who addressed such an argument. I now ask, where are the blast furnaces which the Finance Minister promised? Echo answers: They have not been established. The hon. gentleman who predicted that blast furnaces would be established at these three or four places in Ontario and Quebec has failed to fulfil his prediction, as he failed with respect to the balance of trade. But the hon. gentleman did not stop there. Having captivated the members from Nova Scotia with respect to the development of the Londonderry mines, and having captivated the members from Ontario and Quebec, the hon. gentleman turned round and said:

"Now, Sir, you may ask me what about the great North-West. Well, Sir, it is well known that you have in the North-West the most boundless supply of coal that is to be found in any part of this Dominion. One of the great advantages we have over the prairie country to the south of us, is the unlimited supply of fuel furnished by nature in the form of lignite coal. And you have not only 50,000 square miles of this lignite coal in the great North-West, to furnish enormous quantities of fuel for generations to come, but you have in Big Island, in Lake Winnipeg, a valuable deposit of iron ore, and any quantity of timber to make charcoal to convert it into iron. All it requires is the adoption of this policy in order to establish at an early day industries for the manufacture of iron in the North-West as well as in the other portions of the country."

Where are the industries that were to be established in the North-West? The policy was adopted, and, as I shall show presently, millions of money—I use the words advisedly—have been taken out of the pockets of the people to carry out that policy, in the shape of additional taxation on iron. But the hon. gentleman was too big a man to confine his vision to the Provinces of Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and the North-West Territories. How about the great Province of British Columbia, he said. The Rocky Mountains even would not stop him. Said the hon. gentleman:

"And what more? Across the Rocky Mountains, need I tell you that in British Columbia you have one of the most magnificent deposits of iron ore—on Taxada Island, 30 miles long and 5 miles wide—that is to be found in any place in the world, rich in the highest degree in iron; and that you have the Nanaimo coal fields to furnish fuel to put blast furnaces in operation at an early day, lying within thirty miles of Taxada Island. I say, that with the prospect of opening up trade with Australia, with China and Japan, although I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, I believe that at no distant day you will have in the Province of British Columbia an iron industry built up which will compare favorably with that of any other industry in this country."

I ask the hon. members from British Columbia, how many blast furnaces they have in that Province? Where are the iron industries that were to be built up in that country? The hon. gentleman's predictions and prophecies with respect to British Columbia, as with respect to every other matter, have not been fulfilled. Every promise he made with respect to the future prosperity of the iron industry has failed to be fulfilled, as I will show by statistics. But the hon. gentleman said: What are we going to do? We have placed a bounty on pig iron, and we now propose to raise the duty to $4 per ton on imported iron; and when that is done we will produce in this country all the pig iron we require. The hon. gentleman then went into a *per capita* calculation to show how much pig iron was used in this country, that no similar number of people in any country in the world used so much iron as do the people of Canada; and he asked us, what would be the results if all these brilliant prophesies were fulfilled, if we had an increased number of blast furnaces at Londonderry, if we had new blast furnaces established at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, and if we had iron industries opened in the North-West and wonderful iron industries in British Columbia? We would then make all the iron we require in the Dominion, and an era of prosperity would follow the like of which was never seen. The hon. gentleman said:

"Now, Sir, the result is that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men, numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity. I say, Sir, that if there is anything in the National Policy, if we have not been all wrong from the very start, if the history of Canada shows that this National Policy has achieved for Canada what we said it would achieve—and I have given the most abundant and irrefragible evidence on that point—if there is any question on which there ought not to be any doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman, it is that the application of the same sound policy which we have found so admirable and successful in relation to all other industries, will have the same result in regard to the great iron industry of this country."

Let me ask the hon. gentleman where are the twenty thousand artisans, workers in iron, representing a population of 100,000, who were to come into this country? I bring the hon. gentleman face to face with his statements, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to tell the House one single par-

ticular in which any of the predictions and promises of the Finance Minister have been fulfilled, promises and predictions which induced this House to vote the imposition of taxation upon the people of this country which reaches no less than a million dollars per annum. There never was a case in the history of Canada where the representatives of the people were so deceived and so deluded, as they were in regard to raising the duties upon imported iron, which duties the hon. gentleman imposed and carried in 1887. Let us look at the facts. The quantity of pig iron produced in 1887 was 39,728 tons, on which a bounty was paid of $59,576. In 1888, when this industry was going to be developed so rapidly the quantity produced was 22,310 tons, on which a bounty was paid of $33,314. In 1889, the last year for which I have the figures, the quantity produced was 24,822 tons. This is the magnificent result which has followed the granting of these enormous bounties to this special industry. I ask any hon. gentleman whose mind is open to argument, if he can, in the face of these figures, testify an adhesion to this system. Why, Sir, we were told some years ago that we were not going to import any more pig iron, and that we were going to manufacture it all in this country. We were told that pig iron was, more than any other article, a product of labor, and that 20,000 horny-handed sons of toil were to come with their families here, to add to the wealth of the country. We were told, as I have said, that we were not to import any more pig iron ; but what are the facts ? We imported, in 1887, 45,295 tons of pig iron, and instead of reducing the importation we imported, in 1889, 73,844 tons. So that with the imposition of an increased duty we have imported more pig iron from abroad, and we have manufactured less pig iron in this country from 39,728 tons in 1887 to 24,822 tons in 1889. This is the result of the policy of the Government. Now, Sir, what do we pay in the shape of increased duty ? I find that in 1886, the year before the hon. gentleman made his statement, we imported $8,000,400 worth of iron, on which we paid a duty of $1,720,656, or 21½ per cent. increase. The new system came into operation in the year 1887. Of course it had not full play that year and the increased duty was very little. However, we imported to the value of $9,746,667, on which we paid a duty of $2,168,392, or an increased duty in that year of only $121,591, consequent, as I have said, on account of the new tariff not coming into operation until late in that year. When we come to the years 1888 and 1889, when the new tariff was in full operation, and when it bore full fruition, we find that in 1888, we imported $8,757,204 worth, on which we paid a duty of $2,632,151, or an increase over the duties which were in force before the new tariff was brought into operation, of $836,925 in one year. The total, that the people of this country paid out of their pockets in increased duty, which went directly into the treasury, was $836,925 in that year, while the offsets on the other side of the account were nil. In 1889, we imported $9,680,967 worth, on which we paid a duty of $2,950,890, or an increased duty under the tariff, of 1887, of $966,293. So, Sir, we find that, under the increased duties, the duty which was paid on iron for these three years amounted to $7,751,433, and the increased duties we paid as a result of the hon. gentleman's policy, directly into the treasury, amounted to $1,924,809, or in round figures, $2,000,000. These are the results of the Government's policy with regard to pig iron, and the hon. the Finance Minister, with these results staring him in the face, and at the end of ten years from the time Sir Leonard Tilley stated that we would not require to continue this bounty at all, repeats the same old story which Sir Leonard Tilley repeated in 1883, and asks the House not to base their conclusions on the actual facts as we find them in the records of the country, but upon haphazard predictions which the hon. Finance Minister now makes, as to what is to take place in the future. This policy is, in my opinion, a hateful policy, a troublesome policy, and a bad policy from beginning to end. I join my protest against it, to the able and forcible protest which the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made just now. If I have misstated or overstated in any sense or way the professions or predictions which the hon. the Finance Ministers of 1883 and 1887 made, I think it would be in order for the present Finance Minister to rise and state in what regard I have misstated or overstated. Let him state whether any of these predictions have been fulfilled. Let him tell us where are the new blast furnaces that were to be established in the country ? Where are the millions of capital which we were told were ready to pour into this country, if the House would only consent to an increase of this duty ? Where are the blast furnaces which were to be established not only in Nova Scotia, but in Quebec, the North-West Territories and British Columbia ? Where are the 20,000 people with their families which were to come here to increase the population of the country and to enrich its material wealth ? I repeat, Sir, that everyone of these predictions has been falsified, and to-day the House is asked to stultify itself again, to ignore the facts as they are to be found in the records, and to vote blindly for the continuance of a policy which has been productive of nothing but evil in the past.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have a little information collected by the Mining Commission of Ontario, which was charged among other duties, with that of making an investigation as to the cost of producing iron, which may have some bearing on the question, and be of some service in this discussion. The conclusion that I arrived at, with regard to the production of iron in Canada, was, that it was not owing to a lack of a favorable opportunity for making good dividends, nor to our incapacity to produce iron under the existing state of things, that we were not large producers of that metal in this country, but that it was rather owing to a lack of enterprise on the part of our business men, that the present state of things existed. From data procured by the Commission, some of which have been furnished by metallurgists and others by ironmasters, or the managers of furnaces, it appears that the cost of producing charcoal iron in Ontario would be $13.60 per long ton, the figures of ten estimates ranging from $9.08 for a hot-blast furnace of sixty tons daily capacity, to $18.50 for one of five tons capacity. The highest price given as to the cost of producing charcoal iron in Ontario, was $18.50. While this was the case, we imported charcoal iron for the manufacture

of malleable castings at a cost ranging from $26 to $38 per long ton, according to quality, including duty, freight and so forth. Now, Sir, some of the information in detail, which the Ontario Mining Commission acquired, might perhaps with propriety be given to the House. I will give some of these estimates, with the details of production, to show that it is not a wild calculation, not a mere guess, but that they are conclusions arrived at from actual data, furnished by experts and persons skilled in the business. Surely, with the wide margin for profit, which is shown in the figures I have given, it was not a lack of the advantages offered, to induce people to go into the business which did not secure their taking hold of this business, but rather a lack of enterprise on the part of owners of iron mines and the possessors of capital. The items of cost at the Marmora furnace, given by Mr. Bentley, the manager, to Mr. Macfarlane, are based on the daily run of five tons: two tons of ore at $2 per ton, and 160 bushels of charcoal at 6 cents pe. bushel, to produce one ton of pig iron, labor $2.10, and other expenses $2.80 per ton—making the aggregate cost $18.50. The items of cost given at the Madoc furnace were as follows:—

Ore	$3 00
Fuel	3 00
Flux	0 30
Labor	3 10
Wear and tear	1 00
General expenses	1 60
Total cost per ton	$12 00

In July, 1883, Mr. William H. Merritt, of Toronto, mining engineer, made an estimate of the cost of producing iron at Kinmount for Messrs. Parry & Mills, after a careful survey of the region and an examination of their works at that time in course of erection. The furnace was fifty feet high, nine and a-half feet diameter at the bosh, and it was computed that its daily output of pig iron would range from twenty to thirty tons. Without going into the details of the calculation made by Mr. Merritt, I may say that the cost is summarised as follows:—

2½ tons of ore at $3.06¼	$6 89
120 bushels charcoal at 6c.	7 20
Labor and repairs	3 00
Wear and tear	0 50
Limestone	0 50
Total cost per ton	$18 09

A report on certain iron ores in Lanark county, made in November, 1883, by Mr. John Birkinbine, of Philadelphia, secretary of the United States Association of Charcoal Iron Workers, and editor of their journal, was put in evidence by Mr. W. H. Wylie, of Carleton Place. Mr. Birkinbine is recognised as one of the highest authorities in the United States connected with the business of manufacturing iron, especially charcoal iron. This report was made to Messrs. Wylie and Hall after an examination of properties in the Townships of Darling and Lavant, with a view to the suitability of the locality for the establishment of a charcoal smelting furnace, and it embraced estimates of the cost of making pig iron from the ore. The ores examined were of the class of rich magnetites, those analysed showing about 66 per cent. of metallic iron; but in making his estimates Mr. Birkinbine calculated on an average of 55 per cent. ores, and the cost of mining at $1.60 per ton. As wood is abundant and cheap, he stated:

"You need have no fear as to fuel supply, and the character of the timber growth will make charcoal of the best quality. In many parts of the United States, where wood is by no means as plentiful nor of as good quality as in Lanark and adjacent counties, charcoal is made in meilers in the woods and delivered to iron works at 6 cents per bushel. When kilns are used, a lower price still is often obtained; and if retorts are employed, a further reduction in cost is possible, even if the gaseous products are not utilised. To illustrate: Our iron works have a battery of kilns located in woods very similar to that adjacent to locations examined, and a responsible party contracted to cut the wood, haul it to kilns, carbonise it, and deliver the charcoal in cars at 4 cents per bushel."

In making his estimate, however, Mr. Birkinbine put the cost at 5 cents per bushel of 20 lbs., which he considered would be ample for a number of years; and allowing for a possible refractory character of ore and contingencies of operation, an average consumption of 110 bushels for each ton of pig iron, which is about 15 bushels per ton greater than what is required by the charcoal furnaces of Michigan. To produce one ton of iron, with a modern plant and appliances, it was estimated would cost as follows:—

1·8 tons of 55 per cent. ore at furnace	$ 3 60
0·3 tons of flux	0 45
110 bushels charcoal	5 50
Labor making iron	2 00
Repairs and supplies	0 50
Interest and superintendence	0 80
Total cost per ton	$12 85

Mr. Birkinbine then proceeded to estimate that the cost of an establishment sufficient for an output of 60 tons per day would be $200,000, and that to pay a dividend of 10 per cent. on the capital invested, it would be necessary to have a margin of $2.25 per ton, in addition to the $12.85 of cost, which would make the sum to be realised from the iron produced in these furnances, to yield a dividend, $15.10 per long ton. If it costs at the lowest rate $26 per ton to import that class of iron, surely there is sufficient inducement to attract people to the industry with a margin of $10 more, and a profit of 10 per cent. Mr. Ledyard stated in his evidence that he had received an estimate from Mr. J. B. Withrow, a furnace builder of Pittsburg, Pa., for the manufacture of charcoal pig iron at the old Belmont mine at an actual cost of less than $10 per ton. It will be borne in mind that all these estimates are per long ton of 2,240 lbs. He estimated the necessary capital at $150,000, the plant of which would include a Clapp-Griffiths converter capable of producing steel at $14 per ton, charcoal being reckoned at 6 cents per bushel.

"We would deliver the ore at Toronto," Mr. Ledyard said, "supposing the company to own the mines, at $2.25 per ton—$1.50 to mine it, and 75 cents for freight. If the furnace proprietors did not own the mines, then 50 cents per ton would be a fair royalty. In Chicago good Bessemer ore is $5.25 to $5.75; they use Connelsville coke, and I think it could be delivered here a little cheaper if there were no duty. With the fuel as cheap and the ore at half price, we should stand a good chance if we had the same market."

The several estimates of cost of production are presented in the evidence of Mr. J. C. Pusey, himself a practical ironmaker—the proposed furnace to be located in the township of Snowdon, in Haliburton, and to use ores taken from mines owned by Mr. Pusey's company. The first of

these estimates was made in 1881 by Messrs. Taws & Hartman, of Philadelphia, for a cold blast furnace of 100 tons capacity per week, in which it was proposed to use ores of the Howland, Imperial and New York mines, equal parts of each, giving a mixture of 59 per cent. iron. Their estimate of the cost of a ton of iron is as follows :—

4,000 lbs. ore at $1 per ton	$1 80
2,520 lbs. (140 bush.) charcoal at 6c. per bushel	8 40
177 lbs. limestone	0 10
Labor, office expenses and supt. salary.	2 50
Repairs and taxes	1 00
Cost of one ton of iron	$13 80

Their estimate of the cost of the furnace, 40 feet high and 8 feet bosh, with hoist, tackle, casthouse, blowing engine and pipes complete, was $36,000, and of 20 charcoal kilns $10,000, each cord of wood to cost $1.30 at the kilns and to produce 45 bushels of charcoal. The second estimate was prepared by Mr. J. B. Withrow of Pittsburg, in 1884, and agrees with the one given by that gentleman to Mr. Ledyard. It was for a hot-blast furnace of 60 tons daily capacity, and was based on prices of material and analyses of ores of the Howland and Imperial mines furnished by Mr. Pusey. Following are the details :—

2 tons ore (⅔ Howland and ⅓ Imperial)	$2 23
80 bushels charcoal, at 5c.	4 00
¼ ton limestone	0 25
Labor	2 00
Salaries and incidental expenses	0 50
Cost of one ton of iron	$9 08

The third estimate was prepared by Mr. Pusey himself for a hot blast furnace of thirty tons daily capacity, to be erected at the Imperial Mine, and to use equal quantities of Howland and Imperial ores. The ore of the latter mine, Mr. Pusey stated, is too poor to ship, and he, therefore, proposes to utilise it on the ground. The figures are :

5,600 lbs. ore	$ 2 31
200 lbs. limestone	0 15
1,800 lbs. (100 bushels) charcoal, at 5½ cents per bushel	5 50
Labor	2 50
Repairs, taxes, &c.	1 00
Cost of one ton of iron	$11 46

The evidence of Mr. Shortiss, of Toronto, supplies an estimate of the cost of producing iron at Snowdown, given in 1885 by Mr. McCorquodale, superintendent of the Jackson Iron Company's furnace in Delta County, Michigan. It is based on the use of 55 per cent. ore and hardwood charcoal, and is as follows :—

2 tons of ore at $2.50	$ 5 00
100 bushels of charcoal, at 5 cents	5 00
Limestone	0 25
Labor and expenses	1 67
Cost of one ton of iron	$11 92

William Rattle, of Cleveland, Ohio, a mining engineer and analytical chemist, gave evidence before the commission at Kingston, and stated that he had been intimately connected with the smelting of iron since 1872. In his opinion, the ores of the Kingston district are as easy to smelt as those of the Lake Superior district ; he favors Connellsville coke for fuel, which could be laid down at Kingston at $5.50 per ton. I ask the Minister's particular attention to this estimate, for it is an estimate of the production of iron by the use of coke, not of charcoal. Mr. Rattle's estimate of the cost of producing a ton of pig iron, as extracted from his evidence, is as follows :—

Ore	$4 00
Coke	5 50
Flux	0 25
Labor	1 00
Wear and tear, and interest	0 50
Cost of a ton of iron	$11 25

Now, Sir, iron will cost at present in Glasgow $12 per long ton. The duty amounts to $4 per short ton or $4.40 for long ton, and the freight is $1, making the cost $17.40 per long ton, laid down at Kingston ; and against this we have the estimate I have just read, which gives the cost of iron produced by the use of coke at that same point $11.25 per long ton, or over $5 per ton profit to the parties who will embark in that business at Kingston, if my hon. friend would only give them free coke. Mr. E. C. Garlick, of Cleveland, mining engineer and metallurgist, whose report on the Henderson steel process is given in the appendix, has furnished the writer with an estimate on the making of charcoal iron, based on five years' experience in Ohio, which places the cost at $14.30 per ton. Following are his figures :—

2 tons 50 p. c. ore at $1.50	$3 00
Roasting ore at 37½	0 75
130 bushels of charcoal at 6 cents.	7 80
Limestone	0 50
Labor	1 50
Repairs and incidentals	0 50
Management	0 25
Cost of a ton of pig iron	$14 30

The following estimate is extracted from the statement of Mr. Gerhauser, secretary and treasurer of the Detroit Union Iron Company, which appears at the end of the section, and is for the long ton of pig iron :

⅔ ton specular ore at $5.28	$3 52
¾ ton hematite ore at $4.48	3 00
¼ ton magnetic ore at $4.96	1 65
87 bush. charcoal at 7½ cents	6 52
Limestone	0 06
Labor	1 37
Cost of a ton of iron	$16 12

A record of the Iron Mountain Furnace at Ironton, Wisconsin, as given by the manager to the *Journal of Charcoal Iron Workers Association* of the United States in 1883, gives these details of a run of sixty-nine and one quarter days. The total make in that period was 739¼ (2,268 lbs.), the ore yielding 53·6 per cent. The following are the items of cost per ton :

1·86 tons at $2.00	$3 72
87·6 bush. charcoal at 6½ cents	5 70
694 lbs. limestone	0 25
Labor	2 25
Oil and shop	0 08
Cost of iron per ton	$12 00

There can be no doubt that the advantages for producing charcoal iron in Ontario are at least equal to the advantages of producing the article at Ironton, Wisconsin. I will not trouble the House further with these calculations than to recapitulate and summarise the evidence given by these various parties, which makes the average cost of producing charcoal iron $13.60 per long ton, the

highest cost being $18.50 in a furnace producing but five tons per day, and the lowest cost being $9.08 per ton. The president and secretary of the Mining Commission visited various points in the United States, among others Birmingham, Alabama; and we find that in Birmingham, Alabama, all that was claimed as being the cost of producing a long ton of pig iron at furnaces there was from $8.50 to $9 per ton; and from the information which we procured from parties familiar with the situation of the mines in Nova Scotia and the natural advantages offered there, we arrived at the conclusion that, with the same enterprise, with the same skill, with the same investment of capital in Nova Scotia, iron could be produced as cheaply there as at any other point in the world—Birmingham, Pennsylvania, or any place else; and I have no doubt that with equal skill and enterprise to that used in the production of iron in the United States, iron can be produced in Nova Scotia for an actual cost of $9 to $10 per ton. If that be the case, if the highest cost of producing charcoal iron in Ontario is $18.50 per ton; if iron can be produced at Kingston, with coke imported from Connellsville, Pennsylvania, at less than $12 per ton; if it costs $17 to $18 per ton to lay pig iron down in Ontario, and $36 to $38 to import into Ontario, charcoal iron for malleable castings, it strikes me that what we want is, not more protection or iron bounty, but enterprising men who will avail themselves of the opportunities offered by the existing state of things to go into an industry, which, we are told, will yield a profit of 10 per cent. on the capital invested, by placing the iron on the market at $5 and $6 per ton under the market price. I am convinced that bounties are not necessary; that the margins for profit are already large enough; that we can produce charcoal iron in Ontario, as cheap as it can be produced anywhere else, and, that being the case, we ought to supply ourselves with the entire amount of charcoal iron required. If it were not for our lack of enterprise, we could sell a large amount of iron from Ontario, in the American market at a handsome profit under free trade relations. There is no question but that the facilities for producing coal and iron in Nova Scotia, where the ore, coal and flux are all in juxtaposition to each other, are such, that it is one of the cheapest points on the globe for producing iron. Even Birmingham, Alabama, with all its celebrated advantages, is not as favorably situated, because there the ore has to be brought from one side of the valley, a distance, in some some cases, of fifteen or twenty miles, the coal from the other side an equal distance, and the flux has also to be brought a considerable distance to the furnaces; yet, notwithstanding these disadvantages, the actual cost of production does not exceed $9 per ton. I think the hon. Finance Minister, in place of asking the passage of a resolution to give an extra bounty of $2 per short ton, had better take measures to lay before the people the actual advantages we possess, and our capabilities, to show them that it is merely lack of enterprise which prevents us from producing iron, at least to the extent of supplying our own requirements.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I am not surprised at the opposition of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to this resolution, because he has invariably opposed every measure for the development of Canadian industries by protective methods, as also does the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has just spoken, has offered the strongest argument to prove that iron can be successfully manufactured in the Dominion, while the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has argued from the opposite point of view. I leave these gentlemen to settle their differences among themselves. If we follow closely the argument of the hon. member for North Norfolk, we find it is an argument to prove that there is scarcely any country under the sun better adapted for the manufacture of iron than the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do you not manufacture it?

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). If that be the case, and it is largely the case, no evil results can accrue from the protection now proposed, as the competition on the part of those engaged in that industry will, in the course of time, settle the question of low prices, as it has done in other countries where the same system has been pursued. The resolution before the House involves no new policy on the part of the Administration. This system of granting a bounty for the manufacture of iron in Canada was first introduced in 1883, and was afterwards renewed in 1886. And the measure of protection now sought for that industry is very little greater than the protection afforded in 1887 after the duties now in force were imposed by the Government of the day. The object of this protection is to stimulate the manufacture of crude and finished iron from Canadian ores for the supply of the home market. That object might be attainable in two ways, either by protective duties on imports, or by a bounty being granted on domestic production to supplement the duty. The bounty is a species of protection in another form and is equivalent in its effect to a Customs duty of the same amount on the manufactured article, but it is designed to promote manufacture without increasing the price of the product to the consumer, at all events during the early stages of development. It is not necessary now to discuss the abstract question of protection. It is the policy of the Government accepted and ratified by the people, and should be applied to the iron industry as to others, because the manufacture of iron should be one of our great national industries, seeing that we possess in our land all the natural elements for the successful manufacture of iron, grouped together in various portions of our Dominion. While this is the indisputable fact, we are actually importing into this country iron and steel and manufactures thereof to the value of over $12,000,000 annually, being last year over 11 per cent. of the total imports of all kinds of goods. This while all the raw materials for manufacture lie literally beneath our feet. Of all industrial employments none afford greater sources of wealth than the iron and steel industry in all the various branches. Labor is the prime source of national wealth, and it is our true policy as a people, and necessary for our industrial independence, to promote means whereby Canadian labor may be employed on diversified industries, native to our soil, within our own borders. There is no national industry in iron possible without

production from the ore. The foundations must be well and truly laid on this basis, or the superstructure will not be enduring. There are many reasons why the iron industry is not developed. It is because the iron industry has not been given the degree of protection found necessary in other lands in our times. The United States, our great neighbors, have protected this industry for a generation, and their iron manufacture is now outstripping that of Great Britain in many branches. At one time the duty that they imposed was $9 per ton, and the statistics of 1887 of the American Iron and Steel Association will show the development made in that industry:

"For many years this country has been second only to Great Britain in the production of pig iron. In 1886 we surpassed that country, for the first time, in the production of steel of all kinds, producing 197,832 gross tons more than our great rival. In 1887 this leadership was maintained.

"The production of steel by all processes in Great Britain and in the United States in 1887 was as follows, in gross tons:—

Ingots.	Great Britain	United States
	Gross Tons.	Gross Tons.
Bessemer steel (Clapp-Griffiths' included)	2,089,403	2,936,033
Open-hearth steel	981,104	322,069
Crucible steel	About 100,000	75,376
Other steel	Nomi'l, if any	5,593
Total	3,170,507	3,339,071
Pig iron	7,441,927	6,417,148

While the iron industry to which we are pointed by our friends on the other side has made such strides in the United States, what is the condition there as to that industry needing a continued measure of protection? The Ways and Means Committee of Congress this year makes this statement:

"These duties, it is believed, cannot be lowered without detriment to existing industries. Of pig iron it may be said that it is in no sense a raw material. It is a product of the highest skill, requiring in its manufacture large and expensive plants, the capital invested in which (in the United States) to-day more than equals that which is invested in any other branch of the iron or steel industries.

"To reduce materially the duty on pig iron and on scrap iron and scrap steel which are substitutes for pig iron would annually bring into our ports many ship loads of these products to take the place of pig iron which could be produced at home, and it would correspondingly reduce the demand for coal and iron ore. This is a result which is surely not to be desired. * * *

"Pig iron is to-day the leading manufacturing industry south of the Potomac and Ohio rivers. It has been the most potent of all influences in the industrial rehabilitation of the south."

This is the official delaration of the position to-day, and, if it is found that the duty of $6 per ton in the United States cannot be lowered or dispensed with safely, how do hon. gentlemen opposite expect that any great iron industry will be established in this country without similar protection, especially in the initial stages? While we have great facilities for obtaining the raw material in certain localities, we have to pay the same wages, and the amount of capital necessary is not so easily obtained as it is in the United States. In 1887 the United States produced more than twice as many tons of Bessemer steel rails as Great Britain, the production of the former country having been 2,044,819 gross tons from ingots made in its own works, and that of the latter country having been 1,021,847 gross tons. It has been stated that little or no development has resulted from the protection which has already been afforded the iron industries, and I am rather surprised—diverting for a moment from the main question—that this article of iron should be singled out by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) more than any other article, because during his administration as Finance Minister we know that he maintained a higher rate of duty on the petroleum produced in Ontario than this duty upon iron. It is said that iron is an article of general consumption. If so, the duties paid upon it will be evenly distributed over the country, much more so than the duties on petroleum, which the hon. gentleman maintained when he was Minister of Finance. As an index to the development of the manufacture of iron in Canada, the statistics compiled by the Geological Survey show that the production of iron last year, in those branches, amounted to $2,210,062. In 1885–86 we imported from Great Britain, of bar iron, rolled or hammered, including rounds and squares, 28,759 tons; while last year, of these same articles, we imported 15,552 tons, or a decrease of 13,207 tons, indicating an increased manufacture in those articles to that extent. Now, in examining the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that, last year, we imported of crude iron, steel and scrap for the making of finished iron and steel, and manufactures thereof, 118,446 tons, as against 77,254 tons in 1885–86, being an increase of 41,192 tons, or 53 per cent., showing that 41,000 tons of these crude materials had been imported and converted into finished articles last year, more than in 1885–86, before these additional duties were put on. The advantage in extending the bounty until 1897 is to give capitalists confidence in the stability of the protection offered. The large amount of capital required to start works on a successful scale, involving ore mining, limestone quarrying, railways, smelting, furnaces, &c., makes it indispensable to secure capital for new works, that confidence exists as to the maintenance of a needful measure of protection. Of all branches of manufacture, pig iron making is that which requires the heaviest investment of capital in proportion to the value of the product, and the greatest hazard to the investor, as if unsuccessful his money is absolutely lost, the plant being useless for any other purpose. The object of the bounty is to neutralise these deterring influences, which exist strongly in a new country, and to encourage capitalists to risk their money, by giving an adequate protection, extended over a sufficient period, to inspire confidence and ensure stability. The importance of the industry—the large investment of capital in the country resulting from it—and the fact that it employs a larger population than any other—ore, fuel and all the other articles used being home products—are such well established facts that it is not necessary to occupy time now in adverting to these points. It has been said that this industry is not indigenous to Nova Scotia, or to Canada. I think that statement cannot be maintained. The influences that

have prevented a greater development than now exists do not arise from that cause. The non-development arises largely from the difficulty encountered in securing capital to commence these undertakings. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) adopted a different line of argument to-day from that which he adopted some days ago, in dealing with this question. On a former occasion, he expressed the opinion that iron manufactures would not be successful in this country, and that our policy should be to ship our iron and our coal to the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I said it was desirable to ship our ores to the United States, but I did not say that we should encourage iron manufacture here.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was our policy to ship our ores and our coal to the United States for the true development of these industries. I may say that, so far as coal is concerned, it is the opinion of those gentlemen engaged in that industry in the county I have the honor to represent, both Americans and Canadians, who thoroughly understand the business, that no advantage whatever would result to them, but the contrary would result, by the free admission of their coal to the United States in exchange for the free admission of coal into Canada, and they would not accept that arrangement without opposition. I wish now to refer to a statement made the other day by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). In discussing the pig iron duty the other day he stated that the manufacturers were drawing more bounty than they should, because he was informed that they used about three-fourths pig iron and one-fourth scrap iron, so they could get a bounty for using old scrap. I think if the hon. gentleman had been better acquainted with the facts, he would not have made that assertion. I made an enquiry of the managing director of the Londonderry works, and I received this reply:

"The statement you mention as made in the House by Mr. Watson is absolutely untrue, in so far as this company (which, being by far the largest producer of pig iron in Canada, may be presumed to be aimed at) is concerned, and you are authorised to contradict it. I am quite satisfied that it is equally untrue in regard to other makers, but, of course, I cannot assume to speak positively on that point."

Now, in relation to a statement made by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), I do not suppose he intended to mislead the House, but his statement is inaccurate as to the production of iron in 1887. He stated that the production that year was 39,000 tons. I have been unable to obtain statistics to verify that statement; the statistics I have show that the production was something like 25,000 tons. There is a payment made in some previous year which probably would lend color to his statement; but the production for that year was only 25,000. The largest production was in 1883–84, when it was 29,000 tons. He says that the production of iron to-day is less than it was ten years ago, but he should not forget that in that interval production had ceased to be profitable, the Londonderry works had to suspend operations, and the company went into liquidation. If this measure of protection now proposed is adopted, I am certain that within two or three years we will see the existing production more than doubled. These works at Londonderry are running at a fair way, and with the prospect of an additional furnace being started; and in my own county a large work which represents now about half a million dollars, is being formed into a joint stock company for the smelting of iron, and the enterprising parties connected with that work are throwing all their present investment into a new concern which will extend its operations to the production of pig iron. Under all the circumstances, and in view of the importance of this industry to the people of Canada, I shall support the resolution now before the House as being in the direction of giving employment to Canadian labor to develop the iron industry on Canadian soil.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman has mentioned my name in connection with a statement I made the other night while discussing the tariff resolution. I did make that statement, and I believe that my informant is as good an authority as his informant. I do not suppose for a moment that the men who are engaged in using scrap iron and drawing a bounty for pig iron, would inform the hon. gentleman that such was the case. I am entirely opposed to the resolution now before the House. I think it is one of the most unjust and unfair taxes that could be placed on the people, and I believe, if the members of this House truly represented the people they are supposed to represent, they would reject this proposition to increase the bounty on iron. We are told by gentlemen in the Lower Provinces who live in the vicinity of those iron works, that they have all the natural advantages possible for manufacturing iron ore. If that is the case why should we give them an additional bounty beyond the $4 a ton protection? The protection they have is equal to about 41 per cent. I find that the price of pig iron in Glasgow is $12.10 per long ton of 2,240 lbs., or $10.80 for a ton of 2,000 lbs., and it is upon the latter ton that the bounty or duty is paid. Now, $4 a ton of 2,000 lbs. is equal to 41½ per cent., and I submit that that is quite a sufficient protection for an industry enjoying the natural advantage which it enjoys in Nova Scotia. The Finance Minister has felt bound to admit there were many disadvantages to offset the advantages, and the principal advantage, he considered, was, that this amount was paid directly to the people as a sort of guarantee to them on going into the business. The people of the North-West are entirely opposed to contributing this bounty towards the establishment of one industry in Canada. It is well known that at present nearly all agricultural implements are made entirely of iron, and while you place a duty of 41½ per cent. on the raw material of the manufacturer, you give him a protection of 35 per cent. on the manufactured goods. I consider that the manufacturers of implements are much more to be considered than the producers of pig iron. I should like to know the value of the labor employed in producing a ton of pig iron. It is not only $4.48 per ton of 2,000 lbs. we are paying on iron, but we are about to pay $2 additional bounty. We are even doing more than this. We are carrying the coal and the iron at a loss over Government railways, the loss under these heads on the Intercolonial being placed at $2 per ton. We

are, in fact, paying too much to maintain one or two industries in the Lower Provinces, the advantage of which only accrues to those engaged in them. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) has said there is a falling off in wrought iron duties on account of the iron not being imported. That being the case, the country suffers a loss, while the people who benefit by the loss of public revenue are those directly interested in the industry. This is a system we should not encourage, for it is one of taxing the whole people for the sake of two or three manufacturers in the Lower Provinces. The hon. gentleman has also told us that competition after a time will lower the prices. We have heard that statement ever since 1878, but the prediction has never been realised. If you compare the prices of Nova Scotia and Glasgow iron you find that the prices for the same quality are about the same, the Nova Scotia manufacturers obtaining every cent they can for their iron in competition with the imported iron which pays duties. When industries do grow up under protection, in our limited market here, half a dozen large establishments are erected while there is only business for two or three. The result is they form a "combine" and put up the prices, and the people have to pay interest on the total investment, including the whole plant lying idle. Coming from the west, I am the only member who opposes the present tariff arrangements of the Government, but I think it is my duty to say to this House that, while I am the only representative from Manitoba out of five, who opposes the Government on their high tariff, the present members do not represent the Conservative party in that Province. I will read an editorial from a Conservative newspaper, published in Brandon, which refers to a speech delivered by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) in answer to remarks made by me. This paper is edited by a Conservative and has always been Conservative. I affirm that 90 per cent. of the people of Manitoba are opposed to the present system of high tariff, as they feel that in every instance they have to pay the total amount of duty on agricultural implements. What did the manufacturers ask in 1883? Not increased protection on manufactured goods, but a reduction of the duties on raw material. The Government would not, however, reduce the duty on raw materials, but they gave an additional 10 per cent. on the manufactured articles, making 35 per cent. The Brandon *Times*, in commenting on the speech delivered in this House by the hon. gentleman, who lives in Brandon, who was supported by this paper, which, no doubt, considerably assisted in his election, says as follows, and I think it expresses the honest sentiments of the great majority of the people of Manitoba:

"MR. DALY AND THE TARIFF.

"Mr. Daly, in speaking on the Budget at Ottawa last week, is reported to have said:

"That the 35 per cent. duty on agricultural implements enabled the different manufacturers in the country to put more money in their business and thereby enable them to give a cheaper and better article. He took issue with Mr. Watson that 90 per cent. of the people of Manitoba were in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and held that his own election, where this cry was urged against him, was proof of it. He admitted that some of the tariff changes might pinch the people of Manitoba, yet they ought not to forget that they were only a component part of the Dominion and the tariff changes were for the best interest of the country as a whole. For himself he never forgot he was a Canadian.

"We have on former occasions dissented entirely from the views advocated by Mr. Daly upon public questions affecting Manitoba, and this is another case in which we are bound to oppose the position he takes. He does not, we believe, express the sentiments of his constituents and the fact that he was elected at the last general election is no proof that he does. Mr. Daly can't go to the country to-day in this constituency upon the platform above laid down and be returned. The contention that our farmers should lie quietly under a 35 per cent. tariff upon agricultural implements, in order that the manufacturers in the East may be allowed to amass fortunes which will enable them to turn out better and cheaper machines, is simply all bosh, and the farmers of Manitoba, who are to-day paying 12 per cent. interest on overdue notes because they had short crops last year, and were unable to meet their engagements when they fell due, know that what we say is true. They have paid 35 per cent. duty on their machinery in the past in order that the infant industries of the East might get a footing and be in a position to compete with American manufacturers and they have paid the assessment with a good grace, but they did not and do not expect that that heavy tax shall continue for ever. In this Province, the great necessary of successful farming is machinery. The farmers must have agricultural implements or they can't succeed. And still Mr. Daly pretends to voice the sentiment of these farmers, when he advocates from his place in Parliament a 35 per cent. duty on the implements they must buy. If we know anything of the sentiment in Manitaba, the farmers are tired of the high tariff and they want at least a measure of relief."

That is sufficient evidence to show that in my remarks, and in the view I take of the tariff question, I represent not only the views of my constituents, but the views of Conservatives as well as Liberals, and I am perfectly satisfied, that 90 per cent. of the people are in favor of doing away with the high protective tariff; and for that reason I strongly oppose the proposal of the hon. gentleman to increase the bounties on iron, which is simply another system of protection. If manufacturers cannot get raw material at low rates of duty, they have to add the duty on the raw material to the cost of the manufactured goods, and the consumers have to pay it. I maintain that it is simply a system of class legislation, and that it is taxing the masses for the sake of the classes. I, for one, feeling that I am representing the sentiments of a large portion of the people, not only of Manitoba, but of the North-West Territories, will oppose this high duty.

Mr. DALY. It was not my intention to take any part in the discussion of this afternoon, as I do not pretend to be an expert, the same as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Watson) pretends to be, on every subject which comes under discussion in this House. To apply a well known quotation, the hon. gentleman "rushes in where angels fear to tread." He gives his opinions to this House in opposition to opinions of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) who speaks of what he knows, when he deals with the question of the iron industry. I simply rise to reply in a very few words, to the reference which the hon. member for Marquette has made as to the sentiments of the Conservative electors of Manitoba, on the protective tariff.

Mr. WATSON. I read your own paper.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman has not read my own paper. He has read a paper which is just as "gritty" as the hon. gentleman is, and I want the hon. gentleman to understand, that I utterly repudiate that the Brandon *Times* is Conservative, or ever was Conservative. The editor and the proprietor of the Brandon *Times* is like a great many other people who would be Conservatives for reve-

nue purposes only, and just so long as he could get whatever he could obtain, he was a Conservative. He is no longer a Conservative, he does not represent the views of the electorate of the district which I represent, nor does he represent the public opinion of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. He was a Conservative.

Mr. DALY. He called himself such, but I do not know whether he was or not. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the position which I take upon this tariff, I have the courage of my convictions. I do not care whether there are Conservatives in the Province of Manitoba who differ from me. They have a right to differ from me, if they so wish, but I say now, as I said on previous occasions to this House : that we must look to the fact, and the people of Manitoba must look to the fact, that they are but a component part of this great Confederation. This tariff which is building up this great country—no matter what hon. gentlemen on the other side say to the contrary—may work a little harshly against one particular Province, or against one particular portion of a Province, but we have the resulting benefits of it. If by this tariff, we can build up manufacturing industries in the Province of Ontario, which will give employment to hundreds of men, who will consume the products of our western country, we are by that means benefiting Manitoba and the North-West Territories. If, on the other hand, by building up these industries in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, we can give to our people machinery just as good and as well made as can be got on the other side of the line and at as cheap or a cheaper price, we are pursuing the policy which we ought to pursue, namely, the policy of building up a great country for ourselves, with mutual advantages to all classes of the people. The hon. gentleman for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has referred to the question of farm machinery. I am tired of quoting to the House, as I have done for the last three or four Sessions, figures to show, that so far as agricultural implements are concerned, they can be purchased in the Province of Manitoba to-day, cheaper than they could be purchased before the 35 per cent. duty was imposed.

Mr. WATSON. You are wrong.

Mr. DALY. I am not wrong.

Mr. WATSON. What are the prices across the line ?

Mr. DALY. The fact of the matter further is, that we can buy, even American machinery, cheaper in Manitoba to-day, than we could before the tariff was imposed.

Mr. WATSON. What is the comparison between the prices in Manitoba and the prices across the line ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. I do not think I interrupted the hon. gentleman when he was speaking. If I am hitting him very hard, he should take his medicine like a good little boy.

Mr. WATSON. You are not hitting me hard at all.

Mr. DALY. Then keep your mouth shut. I was about to say——

Mr. WATSON. I rise to a point of order. I do not think any hon. gentleman has a right to address to me language in this House which he dare not address to me outside of the House.

Mr. CASEY. He addressed it to the Speaker. Before you decide on this point, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to discuss this matter, Mr. Speaker, before you decide this point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will, I know, withdraw the expression.

Mr. DALY. If I have said anything unparliamentary, I withdraw the words, but I want the hon. gentleman to understand distinctly that I am not going to be interrupted by him or by anybody else. I think I conducted myself as a gentleman when he was speaking ; but the hon. gentleman is continually in the habit of interrupting members on this side of the House, when they are speaking, and when he says that I would not dare to say anything to him inside of the House which I would not say outside of the House, I want him to understand that I fear him neither inside nor outside of the House. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, in relation to agricultural implements in the Province of Manitoba, that our farmers are able to get in Canada just as good implements as they can buy in the United States and at as cheap a price. I stated to the House, in the speech which I made on the Budget, that the Massey Manufacturing Company had sent up a number of agricultural implements to the North-West Territories, and that the Massey Company's binder, which was equal, if not better, than any binder manufactured in the United States of America, is sold for $180 on time payments, and $160 cash. I did not state upon that occasion, as I will state now, that the Massey binder took the first prize and the gold medal at the Paris Exhibition last year. It did not take the medal in competition with other Canadian machines only, but it took the medal in competition with machines manufactured in the United States, France, Great Britain and Canada, and that too after an actual field contest. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by referring to what took place at that field contest, but I may say that among the machines in competition were the McCormick binder of Chicago, the Wood binder, the Osborn binder and the Johnston binder, which were manufactured in New York State, as well as with another binder which is made in France. In all the tests which were made, the Massey binder came ahead and received the gold medal. It is a proud thing, Sir, as a Canadian, to stand on the floor of Parliament and to be able to say : This Canadian farming implement took the first prize at the World's Fair, at Paris. I may say that the people of Manitoba are satisfied with the machinery which is being made in Canada, and the proof of that is that they are purchasing it in large quantities. There may be men who prefer the American implements and if they do they can purchase them cheaper than before the 35 per cent. duty was imposed. I will not take up the time of the House further than to say that when the hon.

gentleman rises to remark that the Brandon *Times* voices the sentiments of the Conservative electors of Manitoba, I utterly repudiate any such statement. I want the Brandon *Times* and its editor to know that, so far as I am concerned, I do not care a straw what his opinions are upon the position which I take here in reference to the question of the tariff, or upon any other question.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has been rather severe on my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson). He has said that the hon. member for Marquette rushed in where angels feared to tread. He meant to be very severe on the member for Marquette, but of course we are all familiar with the proverb criticising those who pursue that line of conduct. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody who has been rushing in where angels do not care to take their daily walks, it is the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), because it so happens that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has been speaking in the interests of his constituents. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) on the other hand, has been speaking against the interests of his constituents, and I think the member of this House who defends a policy which takes money out of the pockets of his constituents, without doing them any good in return, is certainly one of that class who rush in where angels fear to tread. I am sure the hon. gentleman's memory is sufficiently good to supply the word which designates that class of persons, but I do not suppose it would be parliamentary for me to quote it here. In all probability the constituents of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) will let him know how they appreciate that proverb, and how they can apply it, at his next election. A friend on my right suggests that probably the angels will meet him on the cross-roads when he goes home, and will explain to him how foolish he was to go where even they dare not take a walk. The hon. gentleman is very much exercised about the Brandon *Times*. He says that it is not now a Conservative organ—that it has ceased to make money out of the Conservative party, and has been disowned by the party. A little bird has whispered to me that the Brandon *Times* has disowned the hon. gentleman, and that may be the reason why he has disowned the Brandon *Times*. However, it appears from the hon. gentleman's statement that the Brandon *Times* was supporting the party for revenue only, and the revenue failing, it has gone back on its party. It may be as Conservative now as it was before, although it is not supporting the hon. gentleman; according to his explanation, it would remain Conservative as long as it was paid to do so. It will now be proper for the Brandon *Times* to resent and explain this statement of the facts, if it be not an absolutely correct and unprejudiced statement. The hon. member says that agricultural implements are cheaper in Manitoba to-day than they were under the late Administration, when the tariff was lower. Of course they are, and the hon. gentleman has told us the reason. He admitted that they are cheaper in the United States than they were ten years ago; they are cheaper all over the world than they were ten years ago; for the reason that invention and the processes of manufacture have improved, and they are now produced on such a large scale that they are produced a great deal more cheaply. But the hon. gentleman says that all this is the result of the protection on iron and on agricultural machines. Now, Sir, I do not think that even a man who will go where angels do not care to go, is sufficiently of that character to expect the House to believe such an assertion as that—that these agricultural implements are cheaper to his constituents, because we tax the machines 35 per cent., and the raw material that goes into them to the extent of $4 per ton, or altogether about 41 per cent. The hon. gentleman says that the Massey binder achieved a great triumph at the late Paris Exhibition, and that he is proud of it. Well, of course we are all proud of the success of Canadian manufactures anywhere; but he says that the people of Manitoba are satisfied with the quality and the price of this Massey binder, and have shown their satisfaction by purchasing it largely. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is an agent for the Massey Manufacturing Company or not; I do not suppose he is; but he has given that company a certain amount of cheap advertising by this remark, which probably they will appreciate. Still, I do not agree with his conclusion that the people of Manitoba prefer the Massey binder to any other they could buy because they buy it so largely. There is another reason, one which, I think, is usually decisive with the farmers, that is, that there is a duty of 35 per cent. against American machines brought into Manitoba, which is a practical prohibition of the importation of those machines; and, therefore, the farmers of Manitoba are obliged to buy some Canadian machine. But whether they prefer the Massey machine or any other is a question for themselves to decide, and not a question that need be discussed in this House. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) objected strongly to the interruptions of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), but he failed to answer one pertinent question put to him by my hon. friend. He was asked: How do the prices of agricultural implements in Manitoba compare with their prices in the United States? He forbore to answer that question, I think, wisely. He was not quite such a replacer of angels as to answer it, for the reason that he knows very well, as every member of this House does, that if the tariff were now what it was during the régime of the revenue tariff, before protection came into force, the farmers of Manitoba could import equally good if not better machines from the United States at a much lower rate than they are now paying for them. If it were parliamentary—but I know it is not, and I do not use the term—I would say that it is a fraudulent statement to compare the prices of agricultural implements to-day with the prices ten years ago, without telling the House at what rate they could be imported if the same tariff were in force to-day that was in force ten years ago. But, after all this argument to show that the farmers of Manitoba are paying nothing for the privilege of fostering the Canadian home manufacturer, the hon. gentleman admits that they are losing something by it. He says that this policy may bear hardly on one Province or on another, but that we have a resulting benefit. What is the resulting benefit? It is that it builds up a large industry in Ontario, and thereby creates a market for Manitoba products; in other words, if the farmers of Manitoba have to pay too much for binders, the men who make those binders consume a great deal of Manitoba flour. If the

House will think for a moment of the additional demand for Manitoba wheat caused by the additional number of men employed in the manufacture of Massey reapers, they will see the absurdity of this contention. There are no more people in Canada to consume Manitoba wheat for all the people employed on the Massey machines. I do not say this out of any disrespect to the people so employed ; but the price of Manitoba wheat is regulated by the market that regulates the price of all other wheat throughout the world, namely, the Liverpool market ; and the number of men employed by the Massey Company has no influence on the price of the wheat the Manitoba farmers have to sell. When a manufacture springs up, it does not bring any more men into the country ; it simply diverts a number of men from one occupation to another. It may be a more appropriate occupation, but it does not as a rule, in this country, increase the number of mouths which have to be filled with Manitoba flour, and that seems to be the point my hon. friend was trying to make. With regard to the question really before the House, as to the proposed increase in the bonus on pig iron, I want to say a few words. There is one respect in which a bonus is perhaps preferable to a protective tax. We know just what we are paying, whereas in the case of a protective tax we do not. In the latter we are probably paying a good deal more than the nominal amount of duty, and in the former we know what we are paying ; but it does not follow that it is sound financial economy to give a bonus. Why should we give a bonus to one industry rather than another ? For a long time this bonus system has prevailed. Let us compare the results of these bonused and protected industries with the results of other industries which have received neither bonuses nor protection. The amount of profit derived by the country from any manufacturing industry is best gauged by the amount of exports in that particular line, and the same test will apply to other industries as well as to manufactures. The amount we make out of our agricultural operations, as a country, is gauged by the amount of agricultural produce which we send abroad. Of course there may be profit to the individual manufacturer, as well as to the individual farmer, from the sale of their products in the country, but the amount the country makes by their industry is gauged by the export ; and it is the exports we have to consider. We have no right to say that a certain industry should be protected or bonused for the sake of putting money in the pockets of certain individuals. All that we should do in the way of a protective tax, if we admit the principle of protection, is to make such arrangements that the country as a whole shall derive benefit from the outcome of that system. Let us compare the exports of the iron industry with the exports of farm products. We find by the current Trade and Navigation Returns that the export last year of pig iron amounted to $151. That is the magnificent result of the protection we have given to that industry for many years, and of the bonuses we have given it for a shorter number of years. It must make the heart of every Canadian swell within him ; it must make the heart of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) swell within him, to think that his country exported pig iron to the value of $151 during the past year. In another direction, perhaps, the tax and the bonus have been more successful. We have exported iron ore to a very considerable extent, not, of course, as largely as we might have done if we had free trade with our neighbors, but to an extent in glaring contrast with the export of the manufactured product. After giving an encouragement of $5.50 a ton—$1.50 bonus and $4 duty—to the manufactured iron, we have only reached this magnificent result, that we export $150 worth a year ; but when we come to iron ore—the raw product as taken from the bowels of the earth—we find we have exported $60,289 worth. It does not look as if the past encouragement given to the manufacturer of pig iron has led to magnificent results, since we export of iron ore more than three hundred times the value of the manufactured product, after twelve years of protection. This does not show that protection has done much for the iron industry. Of all the products of iron, including machinery not otherwise specified, of which a part may be in wood, for all I know, we only exported $300,518 worth. This is the result of the high protection we have given to the iron industry—in the first place by the duty and bonus to encourage the production of pig iron, and in the second place by the heavy duties levied on iron manufactured in various stages. After all this, we find that, in 1886, we imported over $8,000,000 worth of iron ; in 1887, we imported $9,760,000 ; in 1889, $8,800,000 worth ; while we exported the enormous amount of $300,000 worth of iron and its products. Even looking at the iron trade itself, it is clear that the protective system has not created an iron-producing industry in this country.

Mr. AMYOT. It was not sufficient.

Mr. CASEY. If a protective tax of $4 a ton, which amounts to about 40 per cent., and a bonus besides of $1.50 per ton on the raw material, has not been sufficient to create this iron industry, I do not think the increase of 50 cents a ton now proposed is going to convert this industry from an insignificant portion of the wealth of the country to an enormous resource. Take, by the way of contrast, the industry which has practically defied protection in all its respects, the results of which, at all events in the way of exports, may be considered without reference to protection at all, because we have to sell, in common with our neighbors, in a free trade country, where there are no circumstances in our favor. The products of the farm, other than animals and their products, exported last year, amounted to $17,193,000, while animals and their products exported amounted to $24,693,000. On the whole, we exported $41,886,000 worth of farm products, as against an export of $300,000 worth of iron. Which of these industries is doing most to add to the wealth of the country. The agricultural industry is the mainstay of the country, the main source from which the greater part of the wealth of the country is derived, and yet that industry, so far from having any protection or encouragement, so far from being bonused, is taxed to the extent of 35 per cent. for the benefit of the manufacturer of the implements used in producing this wealth, and to the extent of over 40 per cent. on all the raw iron material which enters into the manufacture of agricultural implements. I do not intend now to mention the other taxes, but we all know that they all fall ultimately

on the farming community. Every man who has to pay a tax in any other line of business adds it on to the price charged to the farmer. The wholesaler adds it on to the retailer, the retailer to the purchaser, and so on ; and as nearly all the wealth of the country, at least of Manitoba and the part of the country I live in, at all events, comes from the farmer, the farmer is the man who finally pays these duties. And he, while he is taxed to benefit the other producers, has added to the wealth of the country, $41,750,000, as compared with $300,518 contributed by the highly protected producer of iron, out of which the producers of pig iron contribute the sum of $151. Yet the farmer is refused the right to import free the raw material for his industry ; he is refused the right to import corn free with which to feed his cattle. I contend that, if it is proper to bonus the iron industry, it is also proper to give the farmer a bonus of so much a bushel on his grain, of so much a head on his cattle, and a proportionate allowance on every kind of produce that he exports. The whole system is rotten, but, if you begin to adopt this rotten system in favor of the iron manufacture, you are bound in logic, you are bound in fairness, you are bound in honesty to extend that system to all the other industries of the country. If you bonus the production of iron, you should bonus the production of cattle for the English market, the production of wheat and barley, and also the production of lumber for export to the United States market. Knowing that the House has already made up its mind on this subject, I will content myself with this protest.

Mr. KENNY. Considering the very eloquent and successful protection speech which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) addressed to the House the other day during the discussion of the tariff item referring to the duties on pork, I was surprised that he should be opposed to granting any protection to the iron industry of Canada. I suppose the hon. gentleman confines his sympathies entirely to the little pigs in Prince Edward Island, and has no sympathy for the big pigs of iron at Londonderry. If we have in Canada in a crude state all the ingredients essential for establishing a great iron industry, I think it is decidedly in the interest of the country generally that that industry should be protected, for the reason that in no other country in the world, as the history of the iron industry shows us, has the iron industry prospered in its early stages unless it was protected. I have stated, on a former occasion, that in my opinion the iron industry is eminently indigenous to the Province of Nova Scotia, because we have there the ore, and the fluxes, and the coal, so situated that we must ultimately attain great eminence in the development of that industry ; but, in order to satisfy the House that this is not a matter of mere assertion on my part, I desire to strengthen the statement I made as to the opinion of the Local Government in Nova Scotia on the subject by reading to the House an extract from a letter written on the 19th December last by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, the Premier of Nova Scotia. The letter was addressed to the editor of the Boston *Herald*. Mr. Fielding says :

"I send you herewith a letter from Mr. Edwin Gilpin, jr., Inspector of Mines for Nova Scotia, which, I think, will satisfy those interested in the iron industries of New England that the iron and coal deposits of Nova Scotia are very extensive and of great value. It is the firm belief of most Nova Scotians that these valuable deposits will, at an early date, be more extensively worked and will become a source of great wealth to our country."

I know that the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia does not, from what I have heard in this House, represent the opinion of all Nova Scotians, or of all the representatives of Nova Scotia in this Parliament, but such was the opinion of the hon. the Provincial Secretary, who has necessarily given this matter special study. In the same paper, I find a letter addressed by Mr. Gilpin, Inspector of Mines in Nova Scotia, which confirms entirely the statement of the hon. the Provincial Secretary. I will not detain the House by reading the whole letter, but I will read one or two extracts. He says :

"The Londonderry company have only two stacks. Necessarily it is frequently the case that one is idle for repairs, and they have had both running together. The Londonderry ore has yielded an average per cent. of metallic iron running from 42 to 45 parts in the hundred. Its quality is good as respects sulphur and phosphorus."

Again :

"The amount of available ore in Nova Scotia alone may be gathered from the fact that large bodies of Bessemer ore are known in Pictou County, besides numerous beds from 4 to 50 feet thick of red hematites, running from 40 to 50 per cent. of metallic iron, and large deposits of limonite ore."

That is the opinion of the officers of our own Province in regard to the iron ore of Nova Scotia, and confirmatory of that opinion I wish to read to the House an English opinion, the very best opinion that can be given on this point by any journal in England. I will read an extract from the *Iron and Steel Trades Journal*, which is considered in England the highest authority on all matters appertaining to the iron trade :

"A good deal of attention is being given to the question of native production of pig iron in Canada. An abundance of all the necessary materials for iron making exists in several of the Eastern Provinces ; but the attempt to utilise them has hitherto been only partially successful. This is the natural order of things, for rarely is an industry transplanted to foreign soil without unforeseen obstacles preventing it from budding forth at once into a prosperous undertaking ; and we see no reason why pig iron production on a large and profitable scale should not soon be an important feature of Canadian industry. It is only a question of time, and we believe that movements now on foot are likely to accelerate the event.

"The enormous production of pig iron in the United States has now rendered the great Republic practically independent of external supplies of crude iron ; and we must be content to accept the inevitable and see Canada also become self-supporting in the matter of pig iron. The demand for our iron and steel in Canada is not what it once was.

"In the early part of this year, travelling in Canada, we found that a strong prejudice existed against importing any material that could possibly be manufactured in the Dominion.

"Canadian customers now rely, as far as possible, on their own resources. It, therefore, seems probable that in the near future iron smelting will be an established industry on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of British North America."

I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is not an ordinary expression of opinion by an ordinary newspaper. This is the result of the impressions produced on the editor of this paper when he visited Canada, and I think it is an infinitely better authority than the wild statements of gentlemen who, actuated solely by a desire to make a point against the Government and against the policy of the Government, attempt to traduce the country and say that the condition of things in the Province from which I come and from which they come are such that the iron industry is not indigenous to

that Province on the question of protection, as applied to the iron industry. Hon. members of this House are perfectly familiar with the fiscal policy of the neighboring Republic. But let us revert for a few moments to the policy which the British Government have applied in the past to the great iron industry in that country. We find that formerly the iron industry was largely protected, and the British duty on foreign iron during the early years of this century, was as follows :—

From 1798 to 1802	$18 35	per ton.
1803	20 52	"
1804	21 19	"
1805	24 57	"
" 1806 to 1808	26 15	"
" 1809 to 1812	26 72	"
" 1813 to 1818	31 59	"
" 1819 to 1825 if imported in British ships,	31 63	"
If imported in foreign ships,	38 56	"

Now, what are we to infer from this statement? That England's supremacy in the manufacture of iron, a supremacy which she still holds, was only attained under a protective policy, and that it was in that manner that that great trade was fostered in the mother country. Now, let us, for a moment, glance at the manner in which the iron industry, and its importance, have been recognised by the Congress of the United States of America, for I contend that the statistics which we gather from that country are infinitely more interesting to us, and the condition of things there is more analogous to ours, than the condition of things which prevail to-day in the mother country. The development of that industry is shown by the following table :—

PRODUCTION OF LEADING ARTICLES OF IRON AND STEEL IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1865 TO 1885.

YEARS.	Net tons of 2,000 pounds.						
	Pig iron.	Rolled iron, including nail plates, but excluding iron rails.	Iron rails.	Steel rails.	Rails of all kinds,	Steel ingots and other steel.	Blooms from pig and scrap iron and iron ore.
1865	931,582	500,048	356,292	.....	356,292	15,262	63,977
1866	1,350,343	595,311	430,778	.....	430,778	18,973	73,555
1867	1,461,626	579,838	459,558	2,550	462,108	22,000	73,072
1868	1,603,000	598,286	499,489	7,225	506,714	30,000	75,200
1869	1,916,641	642,420	583,936	9,650	593,586	35,000	69,500
1870	1,865,000	705,000	586,000	34,000	620,000	75,000	62,259
1871	1,911,608	710,000	737,483	38,250	775,733	82,000	63,000
1872	2,854,558	941,992	905,930	94,070	1,000,000	160,108	58,000
1873	2,868,278	1,076,368	761,062	129,015	890,077	222,652	62,564
1874	2,689,413	1,110,147	584,469	144,944	729,413	241,614	61,670
1875	2,266,581	1,097,867	501,649	290,863	792,512	436,575	49,243
1876	2,093,236	1,042,101	467,168	412,461	879,629	597,174	44,628
1877	2,314,585	1,144,219	332,540	432,169	764,709	637,972	47,300
1878	2,577,361	1,232,686	322,890	559,795	882,685	819,814	50,045
1879	3,070,875	1,627,324	420,160	693,113	1,113,273	1,047,506	62,363
1880	4,295,414	1,838,906	493,762	968,075	1,461,837	1,397,015	74,589
1881	4,641,564	2,155,346	488,581	1,355,519	1,844,100	1,778,912	84,606
1882	5,178,122	2,265,957	227,874	1,460,920	1,688,794	1,945,095	91,293
1883	5,146,972	2,283,920	64,954	1,295,740	1,360,694	1,874,359	74,758
1884	4,589,613	1,931,747	25,560	1,119,291	1,144,851	1,736,985	57,005
1885	4,529,869	1,789,711	14,815	1,079,400	1,094,215	1,917,350	41,700

It will be within the recollection of the hon. members of this House who are at all familiar with the trade of the United States, that in years gone by nearly every steel rail used in the United States was imported from Great Britain. At present, however, it is a remarkable fact that steel rails—and I would point this out, in reply to hon. gentlemen opposite who stated that domestic competition would not lower prices—in the United States of America to-day, under a protective tariff, are as cheap as they are in free trade England. I desire to point out the effect of the protective policy, as applied to the United States, in the production of pig iron, the same policy as applied to Germany, and the effect of the free trade policy of England, during certain contemporaneous periods. I find that in 1865 there were 4,819,254 tons of pig iron produced in Great Britain ; in the United States during the same year there were 831,770 tons ; in 1867, Germany's production of pig iron was 1,113,606 tons.

Now, not to weary the House with too many statistics, I will give the production of pig iron in Great Britain in 1883, it was 7,250,657 tons ; in the United States during the same year, it was 4,044,526 ; and in Germany 3,751,775 ; or during the period from 1865 to 1885, in free trade England, the production of pig iron had only increased 76 per cent, whereas in the United States, under the policy of protection, it has increased 456 per cent., and in Germany, where it is also protected, it had increased 237 per cent. Now, we have in Canada to-day, as I contend, the same natural conditions as exist in the United States, and if we have the ores, and the fluxes, and the coal in close proximity, I do say that, considering that Canada uses *per capita* more iron than most nations of the world—I think it ranks third—I contend that, under these conditions, we can develop an immense iron industry, and, for my part, I think there is no motion which has been made by the Government

this Session which has received more hearty support from me than the motion now before the House will receive ; and I only regret, as it is now nearly six o'clock, that I have not time to point out to the House many interesting statistics which should confirm us in our desire and our determination to protect the great iron industry of this country.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

RESIGNATION OF THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. RYKERT. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to speak to a question of privilege, and to make some observations in respect to what has been transpiring in this House during the last seven or eight weeks. It is within the recollection of hon. members that upwards of twelve weeks ago certain correspondence appeared in the *Globe* newspaper purporting to have been written by myself, which correspondence was subsequently brought under the notice of this House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). At that time there were no charges made against me of a formulated character, but the correspondence was simply referred to in this House, and I was called upon to make an explanation of it. I then stated to this House that that correspondence had been published broadcast throughout the County of Lincoln previous to the last general election, that a large portion of that correspondence had become public property, and had become known throughout my county prior to the election in 1882. I felt that that correspondence having been so widely promulgated among my electors, it having been thoroughly discussed in the presence of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the County of Lincoln, I had the right to claim at the hands of this House and of the Committee, protection under the law. I thought that correspondence of a private and confidential character had no right to be investigated by this House, no matter what it might be found to contain. I felt also that two Parliaments having elapsed, and I having been returned with the endorsement of my electors, who had had full knowledge of all the facts contained in that correspondence, I was free from any investigation at the hands of a committee of this House. Nevertheless, when that correspondence was produced, and I was called on for an explanation, I asked this House to refer the matter to a committee for the purpose of investigation. I felt at that time that I had the right to demand that charges of a specific character should be made against me. I felt that in a matter of that great importance, one affecting my seat as a member of this House, which I had occupied for nearly thirty years, I had a right to demand that specific charges should be made before I was called on for my defence. This Committee, instead of formulating charges, as they were asked to do by me, called on me to enter on my defence, and not one single letter was singled out by any person on the Committee as being objectionable.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I understand, Mr. Speaker, it is contrary to the Orders of this House to discuss proceedings of a Committee which has not yet reported.

Mr. KENNY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman not to discuss the proceedings of the Committee, but only to refer to the fact that the matter had been referred to the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman proceeded to discuss the conduct of the Committe.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not go to that extent.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not wish to infringe upon the Rules of the House. I did feel, and I do still feel, that I have not had fair play, at all events, at the hands of this House or at the hands of the Committee. I had hoped that when these charges had been investigated, and these charges had been finally disposed of, and the Committee had taken the matter into their consideration, that the question would not be opened again. However, it has been opened, and I understand, to-day the proceedings of the Committee have been again opened up. I have felt that in a charge of such a serious character, reflecting on myself as a member of Parliament, and to a large extent reflecting back on the constituency returning me, it is my duty, if the trust reposed in me has not been properly discharged, to place that trust back in the hands of my constituents. I do not feel I have been fairly dealt with by this House or by the Committee, and the rules of Parliament appear to prevent me from going into the matter in detail, which, however, I may have another opportunity of doing. At the same time, as I say, having been charged by a member of this House with having committed a breach of trust, and having been elected by my constituents when they had a full knowledge of all these facts, which it was alleged in this House was the case, and having been charged, also, with having violated that trust and betrayed it, I feel I can no longer occupy a seat in this House. I feel it to be my duty, in the interests of those I have represented so long, and whose confidence I have enjoyed so long and uninterruptedly, if a reflection is cast on them, to place myself entirely in their hands, and I feel it to be my duty to tender my resignation as the representative of the County of Lincoln and Niagara and to return that trust to those who sent me here, and give them the opportunity of doing what they desire, of electing whoever they please, and I hope they will elect some person who will discharge the duties as faithfully as I have done for thirty years. I, therefore, beg to tender my resignation as a member of this House.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

House again resolved itself into Committee on resolution (p. 4321).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAWSON. I had intended making a few remarks on this subject before the Speaker left the Chair, and I shall not detain the House very long now. In my estimation, this is one of the most important resolutions which has come before the House this Session, and in the effect it is likely to have on the country, it must be considered of the very greatest moment. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in his remarks on this matter, gave us some very valuable information in regard to the iron mines generally throughout

Canada, and more especially in regard to the cost of producing pig iron in the different Provinces of the Dominion. He argued that the facilities for the manufacture of pig iron were such, that it could be produced at a larger profit here than in the United States, but that it was from the want of enterprise on the part of the people of this country that its production had not progressed as it should. Now, Mr Speaker, if that be the case, it requires some stimulus to push on the industry, and, in my opinion, the proposed bonus of $2 per ton is very likely to have a good effect in stimulating the production of pig iron in Canada. When we consider our vast extent of country from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, in many portions of which iron ore of the very finest quality is to be found in abundance, we must see that if it can be brought about, that an industry will be developed in the production of pig iron, it is difficult for us to conceive the extent of the good effect it will have. It will open up vast tracts which are now a mere wilderness; it will give trade to our canals, freight to our steamers on our navigable waters, and it will lead to prosperity in sections of the country which are now unsettled and barren. It has been clearly shown by the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. McDougald) that this bounty would be productive of great advantage to Nova Scotia. I have no doubt that it would be equally so in British Columbia, and in the Province of Quebec; but there is an intermediate country—the Province of Ontario—to which, I believe it would be productive of the greatest good. In the district which I have the honor to represent, as well as south of Lake Superior, iron ore of a quality which is not to be found in any other part of the world, is very abundant. On the south side of Lake Superior, near Ontonagon and at Marquette, iron ore of the very finest quality for making Bessemer steel is found, and the quantity exported from the former locality, last summer, reached nearly 2,000,000 tons. On the north side of Lake Superior we have a great deal of iron ore quite equal to that on the south. The ore found in the celebrated Vermillion range, just west of the boundary line, is quite as good as the ore on the south shore of Lake Superior, and probably hon. members are not aware that, within the last few years, an immense traffic has arisen in the exportation of that ore in its crude state. Last year, according to the official returns, there were exported from the Vermillion range, 840,000 tons of iron ore, to the port of Two Harbors, a place about twenty or twenty-five miles east of Duluth, and thence shipped to Cleveland and other ports in the United States. When you consider the enormous traffic this has given rise to, and when we remember that on our own side of the boundary, we have iron ore of an equally good quality, extending across the boundary line to the west and running to the eastward for immense distances within our own territory, you can conceive what opportunities we have for developing this iron industry. The quality of our ore has been tested and found to be just as good as that on the other side of the line. Last year, American capitalists purchased from the Ontario Government, 20,000 acres of land to the westward of Port Arthur, with a view of mining and exporting iron ore. There are other sections in the same district in which extensive purchases have been made, and we look to the Americans coming over and carrying on a large trade in mining and exporting iron ore. How much better would it be if, by means of this bonus, or by means of any encouragement which the Government can give, our people could be led to smelt the ore in our own country? It was mentioned that charcoal could be obtained in abundance in Canada. The whole country north of Lake Superior, and far to the eastward, is one vast forest, and there can be no doubt that charcoal might be easily produced. It is well known that the iron manufactured from charcoal is much more valuable than the iron made from coal, or even from coke. We had in this country, many years ago, iron produced from charcoal. I allude to the iron works which, under the French régime, were carried on north of Three Rivers. At one time the St. Maurice district produced pig iron for making into stoves and also wrought iron. The Kings of France had a royalty upon those mines, and so successful were they that several large fortunes were made by the manufacture of stoves and other articles at the forges of the St. Maurice. Lately they have been manufacturing railway car wheels from the St. Maurice and Radnor ores. Now, Sir, when you consider the vast areas over which those iron deposits are spread in this country, and when you consider, moreover, that we have not only charcoal at hand, but that we have, also, coal in our own country within 150 miles of Lake Superior, it must be seen what facilities there are for carrying on this industry in Canada. The coal on the Moose river north of Lake Superior is, I think, equal to the lignites of the North-West. At all events it is not inferior to Souris coal. Whether it is fit for smelting iron ore or not is more than I can say; the probability is that it may be largely used for that purpose. If we go still further north than a distance of 150 miles from Lake Superior, we have the true coal at the north end of Hudson's Bay; coal like the English coal, coal of the carboniferous period, and to bring that by water and land to Lake Superior would be quite possible when a railway is built to James' Bay. There is no doubt that between the charcoal, which there is every facility for making, and the coal, which is not very far off, iron works might be erected at Lake Superior and carried on with large profits; and this bounty of $2 per ton on pig iron will be a powerful stimulus towards establishing such works. It will give a stimulus to the development of mines in general in that district, It is well known that the nickel of Sudbury is becoming quite celebrated all over the world; there are copper mines not far from the same place; and near Sault Ste. Marie, as well as north of Port Arthur, there have been recent discoveries of very large deposits of iron ore. These are quite accessible to coal, which can be imported from the United States and delivered at those points at very moderate rates; and the establishment of smelting works there would be productive of a great deal of good to the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) gave us much valuable information this afternoon in the extracts he read from the report of the Ontario Mining Commission; and the statistics were put in very good form. It is very much to be regretted that that hon. gentleman, instead of fighting imaginary enemies, such as the Pope and the Jesuits, and indulging in wild fancies

about the equal rights of man and free trade, does not more frequently make such speeches as the one he delivered to-day ; they would be a great deal more useful. He shows that the inducements for the smelting of iron ore at present are very great, that the average cost at which pig iron can be produced in Canada is $13 per ton, whereas on the other side of the line it costs $17 per ton, leaving a very large margin in favor of operations on this side. That advantage, with the bonus of $2 per ton, will in all probability lead to the establishment of smelting works in this country. In view of all the circumstances, and in view of the fact that it will stimulate the settlement of those wild regions to have iron works established in them, I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the resolution. I think it one of the most important, in the interests of the country, that have come before the House this Session.

Resolution reported.

THE SEAMEN'S ACT.

Mr. COLBY moved second reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend the Seamen's Act. He said : The object of this short Bill is simply to give the power of removing the convictions of seamen by *certiorari* to a superior court. The law has been found to work very hardly in certain instances, and it seems unreasonable that any class of citizens should be liable to severe fines or imprisonment at the hands of a single justice of the peace without any opportunity for revision under any circumstances whatever. It is not proposed to give an appeal from the decision of a justice of the peace ; it is simply proposed that in the case of manifestly illegal or irregular proceedings, the case may be taken by *certiorari* to a higher court for revision. The law as it stands would seem to be harsh and quite out of harmony with the spirit of our entire legislation, and the object of the Bill is to remove the extreme stringency of the law, which is not found to be necessary or desirable.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill is certainly in the right direction, but the only fault I have to find with it is that it does not go far enough. The legislation which the Bill is intended to remedy is quite exceptional in its heartlessness. The party convicted under it is absolutely without any remedy, except that usually allowed to all parties convicted by an inferior court, of taking the case before a superior court, when the inferior court has exceeded its jurisdiction. It is now proposed simply to allow the exercise of the right of *certiorari* to break an illegal conviction. So far, so good ; but the hon. gentleman must admit that this is a very inadequate remedy. All other cases of summary conviction can be tried again before a superior court. Not simply to have the case reviewed, but, in reality, to have a new trial. Why not extend the privilege of having this trial apply to this class as well as to other classes of offenders ? For my part, though I quite approve the principle of the Bill, in my opinion it does not go far enough ; and in Committee I shall move in that direction.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the observations of my hon. friend. A number of years ago, I think in 1882, this class of persons was subjected to extremely stringent legislation at the hands of this Parliament ; and the legislation was framed with special reference to a difficulty which existed in the port of Quebec. It was then provided that a stipendiary magistrate might convict without appeal, and without any method being given for reconsideration, in cases in which penalties of from two to five years' imprisonment in penitentiary could be inflicted. Upon that occasion I was unsuccessful in endeavoring to secure a trial by jury to persons who were subjected to so grave a penalty. It was upon the 15th of May, 1882, that the Bill to amend the Seamen's Act of 1873 was moved by the right hon. the First Minister, seconded by Sir Leonard Tilley ; and upon the second reading I moved, seconded by the hon. member for Bothwell, to recommit the Bill to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same, so as to provide for a trial by jury of any person liable to be sentenced, under the said Bill, to from two to five years' imprisonment in the penitentiary. My motion was defeated upon that occasion, as, I presume, any like effort will be upon this, the ground given for the exceptional rigor of the procedure, which deprives the parties accused of those securities that exist in ordinary cases, being the transitory nature of the occupation of the parties who would be the principal witnesses, and the fact that the offence having generally to be proved by captains and crews of ships, an appeal would mean a defeat of justice. I cannot reconcile to myself the view that the circumstance that there is a difficulty in prosecuting an appeal successfully, should leave the party accused without some protection against the possible injustice of the primary and sole tribunal analogous to that which exists in other cases. It may require some special legislation as to expedition of the trial, some special legislation as to the facility of taking and recording evidence ; but I hold that that protection which the subject at large has against injustice inflicted by primary magistrates, should, in some shape or other, be given to the class of subjects treated in this Bill as well as to the others ; and I maintain that the simple alleviation which the Minister rightly proposes in this Bill, and which restores to the subject in this case the right to a *certiorari*, is but an imperfect and inadequate alleviation ; that while other classes of subjects, convicted before magistrates, of the same class of offences, of the same description and gravity, to punishment of the same kind, have other means of redress, we ought not to limit this particular class to the inadequate, partial, incomplete, and oftentimes wholly abortive remedy of a *certiorari*.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest for the consideration of the Minister of Justice, that there is no reason why there should not be an appeal granted as well as a *certiorari* from this conviction as well as any other summary convictions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not present during the whole of this discussion, but heard sufficient of it to understand its general trend. This provision is not the only one which imposes severe restrictions in regard to certain classes of offences. We have, under the Canada Temperance Act and various other enactments which do not occur to me at the moment, a like provision,

namely, that the convictions shall be final and shall not be the subject either of appeal or removal by *certiorari*. Such provision is made, sometimes, in consequence of the peremptory manner in which it is desired the offence should be punished ; sometimes, as in this case, on account of the transitory occupation of the witnesses and persons concerned in the case. We have considered fully the subject of removing the restrictions which exist in these cases. In the Seamen's Act, it was principally on account of the difficulty of the witnesses for the prosecution remaining, that this procedure was made so restrictive. There is no doubt, however, that other reasons, as, for instance, the desire to punish with great rigor, severity, and promptitude, persons who may be convicted of certain offences, was present in the mind of Parliament when this procedure was adopted ; and both reasons remain to a great extent. The two classes of persons who are likely to be charged under this particular provision are, in the first place, the class referred to by the hon. member for West Durham, who are said to ply a very nefarious occupation in the port of Quebec, and some other maritime cities as well—an occupation known as " crimping, " which was exceedingly prevalent, and which it was considered necessary to put down with a very strong hand. In that view, not only severe penalties were imposed, but the procedure was made restrictive. The second class are the seamen themselves, who are liable to be charged in this manner by their masters or other officers, and against whom the witnesses are almost always persons engaged on board ship. The insertion of an appeal under these circumstances, requiring, as it may, a trial *de novo* will practically destroy conviction and the effect of any prosecution ; because in nearly all these cases, the witnesses are persons who cannot remain in port long enough for another trial, even if that trial took place immediately. In the case of crimping, seizing and imprisoning seamen and conveying them on board ship for the purpose of obtaining the advance wages which the seamen are entitled to draw on their advance notes, the charge is one that must be instantaneously made and instantaneously tried. And to assert an appeal from that conviction, as it always would be asserted for the purpose of tiding over the time when the vessel must leave the port, would practically be to render the prosecution nugatory. These views, however, I have thought do not extend to the remedy by *certiorari*. In the case of that remedy, it is not necessary that the witnesses should remain, and, if we give that remedy, it simply entitles the complainant to have his case removed to a superior court to review the legality of the judgment arrived at. Inasmuch as that writ does not ordinarily or necessarily require the presence of the witnesses, and inasmuch as the investigation as to the correctness and legality of the decision can as well take place after the witnesses have left the court as before, I have always thought the objection to an appeal did not apply to a writ of *certiorari*. Therefore, we propose to remove the restriction as regards that writ, but I think the objections still remain in regard to the appeal, and I think it would be a mistake to make any change in that respect for the two reasons I have given, both as regards the necessity for rigorous punishment and as regards the absence of witnesses on the appeal.

Bill reported.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Colby for second reading of Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

Mr. LAURIER. I had hoped that, when this Bill came again before the House, the hon. gentleman would be disposed to modify it in the sense indicated in the former discussion.

Mr. COLBY. The matter has had some consideration, and I am not inclined to make the modification which the hon. gentleman suggested.

Motion agreed to on a division, and Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a very objectionable clause. It provides that an applicant for a certificate shall be a British subject, and a resident of the country for three years. He may be perfectly qualified when he comes here. This may have been his occupation during his whole life, but he cannot obtain a certificate. If a man were to come from Norway or Sweden to settle in this country, would the Minister deny him the right to engage in agriculture ; or if he were a carpenter, or a bricklayer, would he deny him the right to pursue his avocation, until he had been three years in the country ? It seems to me that this is a monstrous regulation, and that persons who come here as residents should be allowed to engage in whatever business they have been engaged in before. There is no reason why the business of agriculture or any mechanical pursuit should be open to any one from any part of the universe, while one who has been engaged in engineering should be denied a similar privilege. We ought not to engage in class legislation of this sort. The persons now engaged in this business are no more entitled to special protection by Parliament than any other class of the community, and, in a country which is endeavoring to get people to occupy its waste lands, and engage in agricultural pursuits, it is very unwise to prevent any class from engaging in any pursuit for which they are best qualified.

Mr. COLBY. This simply makes the law regulating these matters uniform and consistent. This provision exists in the Masters and Mates Act, and there is no reason why it should not exist in regard to this analogous case. We have abundant material in this country from which to provide serviceable and useful men of this class. The business is found to be already overcrowded. Representations have come from British Columbia, from Toronto, from Montreal, and, I think, from the Maritime Provinces, to the effect that it is felt to be a serious grievance by this body of men in Canada, that, while they are not permitted to obtain employment on the other side of the line——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, they are.

Mr. COLBY. There it is necessary not only that they should have resided but that they should be naturalised.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is retaliation.

Mr. COLBY. It is not retaliation. The hon. gentleman does not call reciprocity retaliation, I hope. Reciprocity cannot be considered, surely, in the light of retaliation. It is not with a view to retaliation, but it is to guard the rights of our own citizens, who are clamoring and calling upon the Department to protect their interests in this particular. They say the business is quite sufficiently supplied already. In many instances they have gone abroad to seek employment, and have been compelled either to be naturalised and become citizens of a foreign country, in order to prosecute their avocations there, or to return to this country. It was stated in the other branch of the Legislature by an hon. gentleman, when this matter was under discussion, that circumstances had come to his knowledge of persons who had been obliged to throw up their situations when this law was in force, and to return to Canada. It was felt to be a hardship, and a hardship which, in the interests of these people, it has been thought proper to endeavor to redress and to rectify. As I stated before, it is not initiating any new legislation whatever. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Masters and Mates Act, section 2, chapter 73, of the Revised Statutes, he will find this :

"Examinations shall be instituted in the several Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years, who intend to become masters or mates or second mates of sea-going ships registered in Canada, or who wish to procure certificates of competency for sea-going ships hereinafter mentioned ; and persons serving in ships registered in Canada shall be deemed to be domiciled in Canada while so serving."

This has been the law for some years. It is assimilating the law, it is making the same provision in the case of engineers that has existed for some years in the case of masters and mates, without any objection, so far as I know, or complaint whatever.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the argument of the hon. gentleman is by any means conclusive. I think this section is utterly indefensible. The hon. gentleman will see, if he turns to the Act, that before anybody can get a certificate as an engineer he must produce, in support of his application, certificates of character, habits of life and knowledge and experience of the duties of an engineer.

Mr. COLBY. To what is the hon. gentleman referring now ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To the statute that you are seeking to amend. You are going, therefore, to add on to all that, although a man may be qualified in every respect by his character, his habits, and his experience and knowledge of the business, he shall be disqualified unless he is a born British subject, or has resided here three years.

Mr. COLBY. We have the very same requirements in the Masters and Mates Act with regard to sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even so, the argument is not by any means conclusive. If you have done wrong in one instance, there is no reason why you should do it in another. Engineers are a special class. Those who purchase steamships in England very often, when the ships come out here, have engineers of their own on board. Why exclude that class of people ? They are educated men ; they are the very class of men we want to encourage to come here, the more the better. But you want to insist that if a man purchases a steamship in England. and finds on board a German, a French or a Norwegian engineer, he must immediately discharge this man ; he must say to him : You cannot enter here, or if you enter, you must take some other employment, or you must live in this country three years before you will be allowed to go as engineer on board a steamship. I deny and oppose the principle underlying the hon. gentleman's Bill. He talks about reciprocity. Where is the reciprocity in his Bill ? What does the hon. gentleman mean, by asking whether we are in favor of reciprocity ? You may have some object in keeping out the American engineers on the lakes, but how is that going to apply to the Maritime Provinces ? How to the steamships purchased abroad ? You know, nowadays nearly all our steamships are purchased abroad, and when they are brought here they are registered as Canadian ships, and you have got to discharge the engineer who comes with them, if he happens to be a foreigner. The thing is utterly indefensible. My hon. friend behind me remarks that there is another difficulty in the way. The custom is, in buying steamships, that the vendor guarantees them for twelve months,and, as a matter of course, takes care that a most necessary officer for the guidance of the ship, which is the engineer, shall remain here for twelve months. Now, you are going to tell the vendor : We are very sorry, but in this civilised country of Canada, you must not send anybody as an engineer, unless he is a born British subject, or a Canadian. The fact that the hon. gentleman finds a clause somewhat analogous in the Seamen's Act, is no justification for the introduction of this clause.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that iron vessels built in Europe are now upon the lakes, and that the builders of those ships insist, as part of their contract, that an engineer of their appointing shall be in occupation of the ship for twelve months. The hon. gentleman has said that the law in the United States is similar. Well, it is a very extraordinary arrangement that we must legislate according to the legislation of the United States.

Mr. COLBY. We are making our own legislation harmonious ; that is what I said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not all he said. The hon. gentleman said they had legislation of this sort on the other side, and because they had it there, we must have it here. I say to the hon. gentleman, they have not legislation of this sort. According to their legislation a man must declare his intention of becoming an American citizen. He may make that declaration the next day after he has gone into the country, and the moment he makes it he is entitled to engage in that particular pursuit. But the hon. gentleman, by this Bill, insists that a party who may not be qualified to engage in any other pursuit, shall reside here three years before he can engage in the one business in which he can earn anything like a livelihood. It seems to me this is a monstrous proposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a fault in the analogy which the hon. gentleman drew between

the legislation of the United States and this country. In the United States they have not the privilege of buying British ships and bringing them into the United States and transferring the flag and sailing them under the American flag. Therefore, the difficulty which arises here does not arise there. If they buy an English ship they cannot transfer it to the American flag. They must continue to sail it under the British flag. Therefore, the difficulty you are imposing here between the purchaser and the vendor of British steamships, does not exist in that country. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he is going to do if he goes to Glasgow, or London, or Germany, and buys a ship with a German engineer on board, and the vendor insists on having his engineer on board that ship for 12 months—what are you going to do in that case? Are you going to compel him to change his engineer?

Mr. WALLACE. Not many weeks have elapsed since we heard hon. gentlemen opposite advocate that a British subject from England, Ireland or Scotland coming to Canada should not be employed by the Government unless he had resided here for five years. These same hon. gentlemen consider it an outrageous act for an American citizen to be compelled to reside here three years before he can secure a certificate under this Act, and it must be remembered that we do not ask him to become a Canadian citizen, but simply require a residence for three years. But we are told that the American law is much less stringent than ours, and that a man does not require to become a citizen in order to obtain employment; but it does require a declaration that he intends to become an American citizen. That is much more serious and stringent on British subjects than the clause which requires a three years' residence. This Bill is drawn on the line of legislation we should pursue to keep Canada for the Canadians, to keep our profitable employment for our own people, more especially so as to-day we have an abundant supply of such engineers, possessing certificates of qualification, to fill all the positions in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I ask the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) whether he is prepared to apply that rule as to three years' residence to all people coming into this country, and to say that a man shall not come here and purchase a farm and cultivate it unless he has resided here three years prior to the purchase. The hon. gentleman says he wants Canada for the Canadians. If he wishes to apply that rule, let him keep out everybody. Why did the hon. gentleman vote, a few days ago, sums of money for immigration purposes? The hon. gentleman says: If you come here you must remain three years without doing anything. What position does he take with regard to the farmer? Is he prepared to keep the agricultural lands for the Canadians, and deny to persons coming from abroad the privilege of purchasing farms and cultivating them? What reason has he for undertaking to apply special restrictions to one class of laborers which he does not apply to another? It would be infinitely wiser, not to pay any one to come to this country, but to say that whoever does come here, if he is an industrious and honest man, may engage in that industry, whatever it may be, he is capable of doing best, and the Government should keep its hands off and let him alone, free to decide what his employment shall be.

Mr. WALLACE. I am afraid the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has not read the Bill, or he would have noticed that British subjects, no matter from what part of the Empire they may come, have certificates granted to them and pursue their occupation. Therefore, this Bill does not apply to British subjects. Again, as to giving employment to men who come here: we do not refuse them employment, but this a question of granting a certificate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Can he be employed without a certificate?

Mr. WALLACE. This is a question of giving a man special privileges, and, in order that he may procure them, it is proposed to require a residence in Canada for three years. What would be the position if we allowed all engineers to come here and take the positions when there are plenty of engineers in Canada to fill them, and not require a residence in Canada? What is the conduct of Americans towards Canadians? The factory operative, who gets employment in the United States, is driven out unless he takes up his residence on the other side; and even sewing girls, who cross the river to get employment in the United States, are deprived of their employment unless they reside on the other side. I hold that we should protect our own people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a child-like simplicity about the hon. gentleman which is quite refreshing. He says that by the principle which he supports, Canada will be reserved for the Canadians. How has the hon. gentleman carried out his principle? I remember that not a week ago an hon. member on this side of the House moved that the Civil Service of this country should be reserved for Canadians, and that Englishmen coming here should not be employed unless they have resided here three years. How did the hon. gentleman act on that occasion? He was one of the first to shout his approval of the First Minister, who denounced the measure as ridiculous in the extreme. He was one of the first to laugh the measure out of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. How did you vote?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had not the privilege of voting, but I will tell you how I would have voted. I would have voted on the line of freedom. I want every respectable, educated and well-to-do man who makes Canada his home to take his chance here without fear or favor. I want him to stand on an equal footing with the rest of us. We are to-day voting tens of thousands of dollars to promote immigration, and the hon. gentleman supports a Government that has issued a pamphlet inviting people of this class, skilled artisans and mechanics, to come here. That pamphlet sets forth that such classes should come to Canada, where there are abundant openings and employment for them; and now, by a single clause of this Bill, it is declared that so far as engineers are concerned, they can come; but they must starve, for they cannot obtain employment for three years. What are such people to do? A steamboat is not capable of turning his hand readily to any other kind of employment, for he is really a specialist. We have no trouble

in the Maritime Provinces with respect to this question when Americans come in from the States and obtain employment as engineers on our steamboats. Foreign engineers also come from France, Germany and other countries on vessels purchased abroad. There is no ground on which hon. gentlemen opposite can uphold this proposition.

Mr. WALDIE. I am not objecting to it except from a business standpoint. The Hamilton Steamboat Company has purchased two steamboats in Glasgow, and they are now running on Lake Ontario, and one of the conditions on which the agent guaranteed the boats for a certain time was that they should have their own engineers on the boats. One of their own engineers is still employed on the boats.

Mr. COLBY. What countryman is he?

Mr. WALDIE. I do not know. Engineers belonging to any country, when employed in England, should be able to accept employment here, and our legislation should be copied from that of England. One of the effects of this kind of legislation is, that vessels will not be registered as Canadian vessels until the term of the guarantee has expired, and as the experience of the United States shows when restrictions are imposed on vessels built in foreign countries, their marine declined and what is the condition of the United States Navy to-day? If there is obstruction offered to the registration of foreign iron ships it will be against the interests of this country.

Mr. COLBY. Does the hon. gentleman happen to know if any French or German engineers are employed on British ships built in Glasgow?

Mr. WALDIE. I am not acquainted personally with the men.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I must say at the outset that I cannot feel any sympathy with much that has been said by my friends on this side of the House. Unless it can be shown to the people of the country and to the members of this House, that there is a deficiency in the number of our engineers, it is, I think, our duty to consider first the rights of our Canadian engineers. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said: Would you exclude an American farmer, who came to Canada, from buying a farm and working it, or would you exclude a carpenter or any other tradesman from coming into Canada? I certainly would not exclude them, but in the case of a man coming to Canada, and requiring a certificate for competency for the discharge of responsible duties, it is entirely a different matter. I would ask my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) whether they are not two living examples of a profession which refuses to allow Americans and others coming to Canada to practice that profession? My hon. friends know very well, that if an American comes to Canada, however skilled he may be in law, he is refused leave to plead before the courts of this country. The profession to which I belong excludes Americans from coming here and practising their profession, unless they are domiciled here for a certain time and go through a form of study. While I am enjoying the advantages arising from a position of that kind, it would be unfair for me, and dishonest on my part, to refuse to the Canadian engineer the same protection, the same rights, and the same privileges which I am myself enjoying. If these hon. gentlemen will consider the matter, they will see that there is no wrong being done to any individual, but, that on the contrary, we are protecting the rights of our Canadian citizens. I believe this law is in the right direction.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister of Public Works, who has purchased vessels and tugs in the United States, if it is not a fact that the Americans who furnished these tugs, asked to send an engineer with them until they are in service for a certain time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember that my Department has purchased any such tug.

Mr. WATSON. Did not you buy the tug on Lake Winnipeg, from an American firm?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have several tugs, but I am not aware that any of them were purchased in the United States.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the *Sir Hector* a true Canadian?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that tug was brought in in parts, and built here.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman's memory is not fresh on the matter, but I think that there are tugs which have been bought or hired from the United States. I can easily understand the arguments of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Waldie) that where a company furnishes a steamboat, they ask to have the engineer to operate that steamboat, as far as the machinery is concerned. You deprive a person buying a vessel in any country abroad if you do not allow the engineers to come into this country to work them for a certain time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There has been no argument yet given from the Government side of the House to justify this Bill, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned. This legislation seems to have been aimed entirely to suit a state of affairs which exists on the great lakes, and I am sorry to see that the Marine Department seems to be controlled so as to suit the exigencies of fresh water business. Let me congratulate the Imperial Federationists on the other side of the House on the strides they are making towards the accomplishment of their purpose. Here they are endeavoring to engineer a Bill through this House, declaring that it will not do for a man who has been ten or twelve or twenty years engineer of a British steamer, sailing under the British flag, to follow his business under the Canadian flag, but that he must be under the Canadian flag, as distinct from the British flag. A man may have been twenty years engineer of a British steamboat—and there are thousands so placed—but when he comes to Canada he will find that we do not recognise the Imperial Federation fad in this matter. It does very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about on the platform, but when they come down to business they are going to draw a broad distinction between the British and Canadian flag. The hon. gentlemen opposite propose here, that although a man may serve twenty years under the British flag, it will all count for naught when he comes to this great country of Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think my hon. friend is a little wrong in the construction he puts upon the

Act. The objection is not against a man being an engineer of a British steamer, but it says distinctly: "that such person, if not a British subject," and so on. It is a question of his being a British subject and not a question of his being an engineer on a British steamer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I want to call my hon. friend's attention to is, that if a Frenchman, German or Norwegian, or other foreigner has been from his boyhood on board a British ship, and has sailed under the British flag for twenty years, it will not avail him anything for service in Canada, and he cannot get a certificate to be an engineer on a Canadian ship, although he has sailed under the British flag.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that, but I merely took exception to the last speech of my hon. friend, in which I understood him to refer to the engineer of a British steamboat. My hon. friend has correctly stated, as I understood the Act, the position of affairs. He states that if a Frenchman, German or Norwegian, happens to be the engineer of a British steamboat which comes to sail in our waters, he is excluded from being an engineer on that vessel, while she is in Canadian waters, until he is domiciled three years in Canada. I have no hesitation in saying that, to my mind, that is all wrong. In the administration of affairs in this Parliament of Canada, we thought it necessary for the protection of life and property to adopt certain rules for the examination of captains and officers of vessels with a view to ascertaining their qualifications, and to prevent them from occupying these important and responsible positions unless they receive certificates after due examination by the Department. The same thing applies to engineers, and in addition to that they were graded into classes. This is about the first time I have seen any legislation coming from the Marine and Fisheries Department, which makes a distinction as to the nationality of an individual. To my mind, it is clearly wrong to discriminate against the nationality of an individual in a free and young country like this. I admit that the position of marine engineers is very responsible; the lives and property of individuals are under their charge, and their capacity and efficiency should be properly ascertained. That, I think, could be done by the examiners who are under the control and direction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We have hitherto had every security and protection taken in the administration of our marine affairs, and I think affairs have been conducted with as much security to life and property in Canada as in any other country in the world. But when it comes to excluding a certain class of people who come into Canada to look for employment because they happen to be born in a foreign country, I think our legislation goes too far. There are as competent engineers who are not British subjects as those who are, and we certainly ought not to discriminate against that class of people. I have no doubt that this legislation is inspired by some difficulties on the other side of the great lakes which separate Canada from the United States owing to American engineers obtaining employment on vessels sailing under the Canadian flag; but that is no reason for an exclusive law like this, discriminating against all engineers in the world who are not British subjects. To my mind, such legislation is entirely in a wrong direction. I feel that it not only places people of that kind in a false position, but it interferes seriously with the operations of trade and commerce in the country by limiting shipowners to the employment of British subjects as engineers. I do not mean to say that a man coming from the United States, or France or Germany, should be allowed to act as an engineer because he held a certificate in the United States or France or Germany. We have examinations to test the efficiency of engineers, and if these men are not efficient or are discreditable as to character, the examiners will refuse to give them the certificate which is necessary to their employment. Our examiners have always proved themselves efficient men, and no instance has come under my notice in which an incompetent man has been able to get a certificate from them. On two grounds, therefore, I oppose to this provision: First, because it is wrong in principle, in limiting the sources from which people engaged in maritime pursuits shall get their employés; and in the second place, because it tends to prevent efficient engineers from coming into the country and making Canada their home.

Mr. COLBY. In this clause the Minister of Justice recommends a verbal amendment. In the 17th line, are the words "and service as engineer of any class on any Canadian steamboat." We have no classes in Canada, and I would suggest that "Canada" be struck out and the following substituted: "on any steamboat registered in Great Britain or in Canada, and plying in Canadian waters."

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing a Canadian vessel so registered should visit a foreign port, and her engineer should become disabled, how is that vessel to engage a new engineer? If it cannot find a British engineer in the foreign port, is the vessel to remain there until she can send to Great Britain for one?

Mr. BOWELL. The law does not provide that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why does the hon. gentleman wish to confine it to steamboats plying in Canadian waters? The hon. gentleman has his mind fixed entirely on the lakes; what about steamboats plying between the Maritime Provinces and the United States.

Mr. COLBY. Do you want the restriction applied to them?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; I do not. The mere fact that one of the termini to which the boat runs is in a foreign country surely is not going to disqualify its engineer from receiving a certificate.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not if it is a British boat.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The Steamboat Inspection Act does not apply to a boat of that kind at all. Section 3 of that Act says:

"This Act shall not apply to steamboats belonging to Her Majesty the Queen, or to steamboats registered in Great Britain and Ireland or in any foreign country, and plying between any port or place in Canada and any port and place out of Canada."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That Act does not apply to steamboats registered in Great Britain, but how about steamboats purchased in Great Britain and registered here?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They are all registered under the Imperial Shipping Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No ; if you buy a ship in England, the register is transferred to this country.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not necessarily. We have vessels plying on the inland waters and registered in Glasgow and London.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will get his eyes away from the inland waters, we will understand this better. I know of vessels which have been purchased in Great Britain and registered in Canada, and which are plying some of them between Canada and the United States, and others between Boston and the West Indies, and between New York and the West Indies, carrying fruit, and those steamboats, owned and registered in Canada, have engineers on board who are put outside of this Act even though they may have served twenty years on board those vessels. The limitation to vessels plying in Canadian waters is most unjust. Suppose a ship sails from Halifax to Boston, and one of the engineers gets ill, what is going to be done ? The vessel may lose its whole insurance if it takes another engineer on board. Is the owner going to tie up his steamboat ? She may be under heavy demurrage, and the owner may be greatly injured unless he sends to Canada and gets a Canadian-born engineer. The hon. gentleman must consider the circumstances of the whole marine fleet, and not those of the fleet on the inland waters alone. If he confines this Bill to the inland waters, I have nothing more to say, because I do not know their circumstances.

Mr. MITCHELL. In conversation, the acting Minister has called my attention to a Bill respecting masters and mates of ships which was passed in 1870, when I had the honor to be myself Minister of Marine. I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that with regard to masters and mates, it is more a question of experience than anything else, but with regard to engineers, scientific knowledge and skill is required, as well as character and experience ; and, therefore, the law which would apply to masters and mates does not necessarily apply to engineers. I, therefore, think, after what the Minister of Justice has said, that the matter should be reconsidered in Council in relation to this particular point, and that the words "domiciled in Canada for at least three years" should be struck out. If the object is to provide for some evils or grievances existing in the inland waters, a Bill may be framed to suit those ; but I am sure this measure will not suit the people in the Maritime Provinces as it now stands.

Mr. COLBY. To meet the views of the hon. member for Queens, it would be better to strike out the words "plying in Canadian waters." I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland with regard to the difference between engineers and masters and mates. Engineers certainly require more technical knowledge and higher qualifications, in a certain sense, than the other class, and another qualification is more especially required in their case. Engineers in charge of vessels, being responsible for the safety and the lives of those on board, require other qualifications even than scientific attainments and experience. They require certain moral qualifications. They must be men of sobriety, of character and standing, men of some morale as well as experience, and in this view the limitation in the Bill is one worthy of support. A man may come to us from any country, from Norway, France and Germany, and the United States, whose antecedents we cannot possibly know ; yet, under the law as it stands, on passing the examination he can get his certificate, although he may be a scuttler, or a wrecker, or a man who has been dismissed from some other country for still grosser misconduct. This restriction is not altogether without its advantages in this respect. As the hon. gentleman suggests, this is not a matter upon which there is any great fixity of opinion, and it may be further considered ; but I think we have sufficiently discussed the Bill on this occasion, and would ask that it might pass this stage, and be further considered before the third reading.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am astonished at the observations of the President of the Council. He says that a party might pass this examination and yet be thoroughly unfit to be trusted with the care of property. The proprietors of the vessels are the proper judges of that. This House cannot undertake to regulate the business of every party in the country. This House will have discharged its duty in seeing that people have the necessary qualifications, and it is then the business of the owners of property to say whom they will and whom they will not employ. I would ask the Minister of Justice how far has this House the right to go in this kind of legislation ? The hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, has clearly indicated that he not only desires to provide for the necessary qualifications, but he desires to adopt a particular policy under which persons must, though they may be qualified, be excluded from this particular employment. Would it not be an abuse of the authority of this Legislature if this House were to say that no colored men should be entitled to a certificate, that no one born in a particular Province should be entitled to a certificate ? The hon. gentleman must see that all we have to do in this matter is to provide the necessary legislation pertinent to shipping ; and that to say that a man must be a resident of this country for three years before he can obtain a certificate, is going a long way afield from the subject of legislation on shipping. The question of the civil rights of any party who is a resident of a Province is wholly within the province. The Government might ask Parliament to go further and legislate so as to exclude a particular class, who may be Canadians and may be residents of a Province, on obtaining certificates. I submit that it is really an abuse of authority to undertake to put into the Act any other qualification than that which absolutely pertains to the particular business the party is about to engage in, and when we require any other qualifications than that, we are legislating outside of the subject altogether. I think that the hon. gentleman does not, by the amendment he has suggested, satisfactorily meet the objection raised by the hon. member for Queen's. My hon. friend has pointed out that the only parties to be excluded from this legislation would be the proprietors registered in the United Kingdom or some foreign country, and that every vessel registered in Canada, whether it be for the inland waters or for sailing upon the high seas,

would be brought within the purview of the disabling provisions provided for by this section.

Mr. COLBY. I wish hon. members, especially those from the Maritime Provinces, and particularly the ex-Minister of this Department, to understand that their opinions have, as they are entitled to have, great weight in this matter. We desire to make what progress we can, and I would be glad to have the clauses pass this stage, with the understanding that we will leave the Bill still in Committee, if they so desire.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is reasonable, and I am satisfied that, when the Council reconsider the arguments *pro* and *con*, they will make the change desired.

Mr. COLBY. We want to make it right.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The examination on which a certificate is granted is not simply in regard to technical knowledge, but also as to habits of life and character.

Mr. DAVIN. As a supporter of the Government, I am very glad to hear that the hon. gentleman intends to have this reconsidered, because I was trying to find some reason for defending the clause as it stood, but it seems to me contrary to true business principles.

Progress reported.

FIRST READING.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved first reading of Bill (No. 146) to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories (from the Senate).

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting banks and banking.

(In the Committee.)

On section 86,

Mr. FOSTER. The only change in this clause is that "fifteen" is put in place of "twenty" in the fourth line.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would suggest that the number of days for the banks to make their returns should be left twenty as it was before. The law has worked satisfactorily and there is no reason for changing it. If anything caused a delay of a day or two, the bank would be subject to a heavy penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. The only reason for making it twenty days was in regard to British Columbia before the railway was opened, and that has ceased to be a reason. Practically the banks can put in their returns within ten days from the furthest parts of the country, and fifteen days are quite sufficient.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Must the return be in the Finance Minister's Department before the expiration of the fifteen days?

Mr. FOSTER. It must be sent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There might be some difficulty in getting the returns in from Prince Edward Island, when the steamboat is unable to run on account of the ice. Sometimes it takes eight or ten days to get a letter. If it is simply that the returns are to be dispatched within that time, it is another thing.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The clause says that the returns are to be made and sent in within that time. That must mean, that they are to be received by the Finance Minister.

Mr. TISDALE. If a bank has twenty or thirty agencies, it practically evades the law, because it is given to commence the returns sooner than it ought in order to send the report in promptly. If banks are established, as I hope they will be, in the mining regions in the North-West Territories, where they will not be able to send returns with the promptness they do now, there will be considerable difficulty, and very heavy penalties are imposed for a violation of the statute.

On section 89,

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this clause and the sub-sections contained in it, I have a word to say which will, to some extent, modify what I stated upon the introduction of the Bill, and upon its second reading. There were two things included in section 89. The first part of the section, and a vital part, was that which provided for publicity being given to unclaimed dividends and balances in the bank. The second part was to provide that these unclaimed dividends and balances, or deposits, should, after a certain time, revert to the Government and be held by them for the public uses of the country. It will be remembered that I stated that we proposed to hold by this clause in its essence, but I foreshadowed at the time that certain amendments might be made. The change which I propose to ask the Committee to make in that is this: That we shall hold by the principle embodied in the first part of this section, and that we shall give up to a very large degree the principle that we contended for in the second part. With regard to the unclaimed dividends and balances in the hands of the bank after a certain period returns shall be made of them to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General; but these balances shall remain in the hands of the banks with the publicity given by the return enabling those who have a right to claim them to know that they are there, and to proceed to claim them and make what disposition they please with regard to them, saving that, with reference to banks which become insolvent, I shall have a clause to submit to the Committee which will provide that unclaimed dividends and balances in these respects shall revert to the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. Revert to the Government for what purposes?

Mr. FOSTER. For the very same purposes as we proposed that the whole of them should so revert, always subject, of course, to the claims of individuals who may have a right to them. What I propose in the place of the 89th section, is this:

1. The banks shall, within twenty days after the close of each calendar year, transmit or deliver to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to be laid by him before Parliament, a return of all dividends which have remained unpaid for more than five years, and also of all amonnts or balances in respect of which no transactions have taken place, or upon which no interest has been paid during the five years prior to the date of such statement; provided always, that in cases of moneys deposited for a fixed period, the period of five years, above referred to, shall be reckoned from the date of the termination of such fixed period.

2. Such return shall be signed in the manner required of the monthly returns, under section of this Act, and shall set forth the names of each shareholder or creditor, his last known address, the amount due, the agency of the bank at which the last transcription took place, and the date thereof; and if such shareholder or creditor is known to the bank to be dead, such returns shall show the names and addresses of his legal representatives, so far as known to the bank.

3. Each bank which neglects to transmit or deliver to the Minister of Finance or Receiver General the return above referred to, within the time hereinbefore limited, shall incur a penalty of fifty dollars for each and every day during which neglect continues.

It will be seen by this provision that the main object the Government had in view, which was to make sure that parties who had any claim to moneys which were lying in the banks as unclaimed dividends, or balances, or deposits, should have the best possible means of knowing of their existence will be attained by virtue of the return made to the Finance Minister and Receiver General, so that the public may know that these are lying there and that they may be claimed by the parties who have a right to claim them, and that the money should go to its rightful owners. With reference to the other part, as I have stated, that was a minor matter. As the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) intimated, it was never intended by the Government that this should be taken as a mere matter of revenue. It was not supposed that the revenue from this money was so great as to make it a matter of consequence to the Government to desire to get possession of it; and at the present time the Government is not so in need as to require to take charge of these moneys, even in trust, for the sake of adding to its revenue.

Mr. BLAKE. I had intended, when we reached this clause, to refer it to the Select Committee on the North-West furs; but in view of the change which the Minister proposes, I shall abandon that intention.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice where he thinks these unclaimed balances would go under this provision?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The unclaimed balances which are paid into the treasury?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; the unclaimed balances of the bank.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would remain as it stands.

Mr. TISDALE. In view of the great changes made in this section I would ask the Minister of Finance to allow it to stand. There are some other matters which I would like to see delayed, and we cannot discuss this section to-night, without fully understanding the purport of this new clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked how these balances would stand. Irrespective of the effect of that return they will be subject to the operation of the statute of limitations, under the decisions on that subject. I understand the sub-section which my hon. colleague will propose, with respect to the payment of those sums into the Treasury in case of the insolvency of a bank, will likewise deal to some extent with the question of banks availing themselves of any defence of prescription or statute of limitations. If those are the points to which my friend the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) refers, perhaps he will discuss them on the sub-section.

Mr. TISDALE. There is an objection in regard to the form in which it is attempted to carry out the principle, in regard to the shortness of the time. It will also compel those who do not wish the fact to be known that they have funds in banks to disclose it to Parliament, and to any one who examines the returns. While I am perfectly willing, and think it proper in the public interest, that these returns should be made so that people can ascertain whether there are any moneys in the hands of the banks that belong to other parties, it is necessary we should carefully guard the privacy of those who have funds deposited. If every year all deposits on which no transactions have taken place shall be made public, I know, from my personal knowledge, that it will prove a serious annoyance to parties who do not want their private affairs known. So that, while we should make the banks disclose somewhere the facts so that parties having just claims can find out whether moneys are deposited in the banks, it is equally important that we should protect the secrecy of banking transactions. I have a letter here from my town written by a man who, I thought, would be about the last man to have a deposit in a bank. He writes asking me to oppose this provision, because he has money deposited in the bank for each of his children, and he is leaving it there to accumulate. The first amount will be drawn twelve years hence, and the other in fifteen years, and he does not wish the fact of the deposit to be known. According to this Bill, the fact will be announced at the end of five years. If we compel this disclosure to be made in every case, the people will discover some other place in which to make private deposits, and allow them to accumulate outside of the banks. I understand the Minister does not want the secrecy of transactions to be exposed, and in that he is quite right, while at the same time he is determined that the bank shall make such returns as will enable the people who have moneys there to obtain them. In the second place, I do not agree with the proposal that the amount should be stated in the return. The names and addresses will be sufficient, and information as to the amount can afterwards be obtained from the bank. I desire further time to consider the clause.

Mr. FOSTER. I sympathise entirely with what the hon. gentleman has said with respect to the class of transactions about which there is any implied contract or agreement, and this clause has been especially carefully drawn in order to avoid that danger. The only idea in view was to cover that class of dividends and balances with respect to which no transaction had taken place and no contract or agreement involving secrecy, which for various purposes is often a condition in the deposit of these moneys. Only those that had none of those conditions are to be made public, so that the persons who could legally or rightfully claim moneys might know of their existence and consequently be able to claim deposits of that kind, which such depositors would have a perfect right to do. To show that this is the case the clause is guarded in three ways. It is provided that the banks shall make return of all dividends which have remained unpaid for more than five years, and

also of amounts or balances in respect of which no transactions have taken place within five years, or upon which no interest has been paid during the five years prior to the date of the statement; and a proviso is added that in the case of money deposited for a fixed period, the period of five years above referred to shall be reckoned from the date of the termination of such fixed period. So it entirely covers the case which the hon. gentleman has stated of a person who wished to deposit money for his children or for his wife or for a friend, and does not wish the fact to be made public. If the money has to be paid only when the child comes of age, that makes it a fixed period, and this provision I think covers all that class of cases. Then when you take the other two classes in which interest has been paid, or in respect to which transactions have taken place, they cover all possible dividends or balances about which there can be any desired secrecy, any agreement or any contract. It is quite right that all those three points should be carefully guarded in the interests of those who deposit in that way. So there is nothing substantially new, and I would like very well, unless there is very decided objection offered, that we should discuss this provision and pass it, and that would not prevent any hon. gentleman here after coming back to the clause.

Mr. MULOCK. The only thing which causes me to have any doubt on the matter is, that a very high financial authority in this country, on two occasions at least in my presence, declared that the language of the provision could not be improved. I refer to the proposition contained in this Bill when it was first introduced into this House, and in regard to which, the Finance Minister, after a month's consideration, declared that while there might be some other defects in this measure, it was simply perfection in regard to this question of claimed balances, and he stood on that principle with both feet.

Mr. TISDALE. The Minister of Finance did not understand me on the point I raised, or else I did not make myself plain. Most of the cases I referred to will not be for fixed periods. They do not deposit them for fixed periods, because they always want to take them out when they please, or in case of their being dissatisfied with the strength or arrangements of the bank. For instance, take the case of a wife who has an improvident husband, and who is putting by a fund to provide for a rainy day. She does not fix the period, but at the end of five years the fact of her having that fund would be disclosed, What I endeavored to make plain, as one of my objections, was, that a large number of these cases would not be for fixed periods.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand the hon. Minister of Justice to say that he was clearly of opinion that when money had been deposited with a bank, and no interest had been paid, although instead of accumulating it it had been entered to credit in the bank's books during a period of six years, that the statute of limitations would apply?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would not say that if the entry were entered to credit in the account, the statute of limitations would apply. I am assuming that there is simply a deposit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What you might call a deposit on current account without interest?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In such a case the statute of limitation would apply.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the majority of cases, even where there is a fixed deposit, as on a deposit receipt, the interest is not carried to credit, unless the receipt is produced and the interest drawn and recredited on the receipt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The custom of banks differs materially in that respect. No doubt, in many cases it is so, but in some cases it is not. Although no doubt the law is as the Minister of Justice stated, I think that the general custom of banking nearly all over the world, deters banks from ever making use of the statute of limitations against their customers. It is, I believe, both the custom and in the interest of banks, not to put the statute of limitations in force against any party establishing a claim to a sum of money deposited with them. That being the case, the question arises whether the term of five years which the hon. gentleman has fixed—and which I presume from some of the statements made, had some reference to the statute of limitations—is not unduly short. I should be disposed to think, taking all things into consideration, that that might be very considerably extended without any detriment to the object sought by the Government, and without any risk of injury or inconvenience to the public. If that reasonable extension were made, it would, I think, remove pretty much all the objections to the clause as now proposed to be amended.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think there is a great deal in the point raised by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and as he has asked that this clause be allowed to stand until he has an opportunity of considering it, I think it would be desirable that his request should be acceded to. There ought, in my opinion, to be a special clause in this Act, stating that the statute of limitations should not be used by a bank against persons who claim the unpaid balances such as we referred to in the Bill. I think there is also objection, as my hon. friend stated, to the manner of making these returns. There should be a return made somewhere, and there should be a source through which people who may imagine themselves interested in a balance or balances at a bank or banks, should be able to get that information. The objection taken by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), is that a publicity is given to the general public who have no interest whatever in the individual accounts, in so far as this concerns that secrecy which ought to surround transactions in banks. No doubt a great many people have a great aversion to have other people know their business. The instances the hon. gentleman has given are such as to convince this Committee, I think, that a great deal of care should be used to guard against any undue publicity being given to the public, with reference to these unpaid balances. I think the request of my hon. friend, to have a little time to consider this matter, is reasonable and should be granted.

Mr. GUILLET. After listening to the objections made by the hon. member for South Norfolk

(Mr. Tisdale) it occurred to me that there were several reasons why depositors would object to depositing for a fixed period. They might wish to reserve the right to draw the deposit in case of urgent need, or in case that the bank became weakened, and they considered their deposits were not safe there, and wished to place them in another institution. These are reasons why a depositor would not desire to make a deposit for an indefinite period. I know of the case of a friend of mine who left for foreign parts, and deposited his money, expecting to return soon; but he was not heard from for ten years, when he sent for and obtained his deposit. The case of another gentleman occurs to me, who deposited a considerable sum, expecting to return to Canada the following year, but he was required to leave for India on business, and did not return to this country for nine years. It appears to me that no return should be made in these cases. The fact that there are respectable and strong private banks in the country, which have the confidence of the people, will, it seems to me, cause this clause to operate in favor of these institutions and unfavorable to the chartered banks, inasmuch as the private banks are not required under the Act to make this return. There is a valuable institution of this kind called the Midland Banking Company, in the county adjoining mine, and it has obtained a large measure of confidence from the people, and receives a large amount of deposits. I am quite sure that it would be unfair to the chartered banks to impose upon them these restrictions, especially for the limited period which is named, when the unchartered banks not being subject to the provision will thereby receive perhaps great benefit and advantage. It seems to me that this provision will operate in favor of other institutions—for instance, trust and loan societies—which receive large deposits. There is no provision requiring them to report their unclaimed deposits. For these reasons, I think there should be, at least, an extension of the period.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now that the Minister of Finance is put upon the track of other moneys that may be got, I have no doubt that we will follow up this Bill with one to amend the Loan Companies' Act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) with regard to the objection made by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). If I understood him aright, the principal objection he made was to the exposé of a private transaction between a bank and an individual. He instances the case of money being deposited to be drawn by certain beneficiaries at a certain time. I submit that the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance makes abundant provision for that case. If the money is deposited for a fixed period, the return is not to be made until five years after that fixed period expires. If it is not deposited for a fixed period, all that the depositor needs to do is, a little while before the five years expire, to go to the bank and pay in a dollar or two, or draw a dollar or two out, and the deposit is not subject to a return. I think the amendment exactly meets the case; I fully approve of it; I do not think the hon. Finance Minister could have done anything better; and I intend to support it just as it stands.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the period of five years is too short. I think it might be well to extend it to ten years, which would go a long way to meet the objections of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). Then, I do not think it is absolutely necessary that the return should be laid before Parliament every year. I think it would be sufficient to have the return presented to the Finance Minister or the Receiver General. Then it would always be subject to the order of Parliament, and could be brought down when wanted, by a resolution of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the section might be amended by providing that all unclaimed balances or dividends remaining unpaid for a term of five years or ten years, whatever the limit may be, should be returned provided the owner is unknown to the bank. As to the proviso with regard to moneys deposited for a fixed period, I am not aware whether there is such a thing as a fixed period in the depositing of moneys in banks. I think money is deposited either on current account or by deposit receipt, or on the savings bank plan; but I am not acquainted with any arrangement for fixed periods, and I would like hon. gentlemen who are interested in banks to say whether there is any or not. Then, what is meant by the phrase, "where no transaction has taken place?" If the money is in the bank and the interest is added to it every six months, is that a transaction? If these points are made clear, perhaps the clause as it stands will answer the purpose; but I should think that unless the owner of the money is out of the country or is unknown to the bank, the bank should not be called upon to disclose his account.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I understand that it is not usual to deposit money for a fixed period. Money is sometimes deposited on the condition that unless it is left on deposit for a certain period, it may be for one or two or three months, a certain rate of interest will not be allowed; that is the only fixed period that I know of. As regards the statute of limitations, it has certainly not been understood by the banks to apply to any moneys or deposits left with them; in fact they have acted entirely in the contrary sense. In the case of one bank which has been in existence for a long time, deposited moneys have been paid out, not merely after five or six years, but after fifteen, twenty or thirty years. I do think myself that the period spoken of is far too short, and I should like to see it extended, not to ten years, but if we are to have that clause at all, to twenty years.

Mr. FOSTER. Say a hundred.

Sir DONALD SMITH. We might not be able to keep track of it for a hundred years; many might be able to do so for twenty years, and I trust that the hon. gentleman is among that number, although I cannot, perhaps, look forward so far. But we are speaking at this moment of things which are practicable. It may be proper that there should be some means providing for the banks communicating with those who are interested. I believe that the banks themselves take such means as may be in their power, when application has not

been made to them within a certain number of years, to find out if the people who have deposits with them are in existence or not; and it might be very well that there should be some provision requiring the banks, when they cannot find an owner for moneys on deposit, after having made proper enquiry through the post in the usual way, to make a return of the names of those who have money on deposit and who cannot be found. And it should be so made that it will be sufficiently explicit for those who have an interest in it. For myself, I should much prefer to see the clause struck out altogether. The present law has worked well, without any injury to anybody, and it would be found that there would not be any great hurt done to anybody for the next ten years by leaving it as it is. I trust the hon. the Minister will see his way either to leave it as it is, or to extend the time very materially, and also to eliminate that portion which calls for amounts which may be due.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not rise to add anything in a lengthened way to the discussion, but I want to ask the Committee not to consider only one class of illustrations. There is another class. Suppose a laboring man comes out from England to this country, leaving his wife and family behind. He works upon a railway here for several years and amasses, over and above what he has sent to his wife and family and what he required for personal expenses, say $1,000, which he has deposited in bank. He meets with an accident, is drowned for instance, and his bank book disappears with him and is never recovered. There is a case in which his wife and children would be deprived of this money. Whose money is it? It certainly does not belong to the bank. The man's family have no knowledge of it, and no way of finding out, unless the fact be published. I think that woman and her family would consider five years long enough for the bank to keep this money which belongs to her. I shall not consent to strike out this clause. The Bill may go, but the clause shall not, as far as I am concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It occurs to me that such a person as the hon. gentleman describes would be more likely to deposit his money in a savings bank, and, perhaps, by preference, the Government savings bank. Has the Government given orders that such lists should be published with reference to the savings banks under their control? If they have not they should do so forthwith?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is hardly worth while to do that until we test the policy of this House on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Your sense of justice should move you to do it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Private institutions should have no right to keep other people's money as their own, or, at least, they should be made to disclose what balances they have. I should have been exceedingly surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) if he had not explained, at the close of his observations, that he was opposed to the clause entirely. Any person opposed to such a provision of the Bill can suggest means by which it can be made practically useless. The hon. gentleman suggests that the clause should only apply to balances lying unclaimed for twenty years. I think such a provision would be quite as useful, and not more useful, than a provision applying to balances lying unclaimed for 100 years. It might also be rendered perfectly useless by saying that it can only apply to names and not amounts. It may be of some importance to prevent absolute publicity as to the amount, but there cannot be a doubt in the mind of any one who is in favor of this return being made, of the necessity of having the return made to the Finance Minister of the amounts as well as the names. The great object of the return is to indicate to those persons, who are rightfully entitled to the money, not only the bare fact that the person himself, or those who represent him, has a sum of money in a bank, but the amount which they are entitled to claim from the bank. Let us suppose that a deposit to which this section shall apply is only returned under the name of A. B., without any indication of the amount. What means would there be of rendering that practically useful for the purpose of recovering the amount from the bank. The bank would say: "We have made all the return the law requires; we admit that A. B. had money in this bank; prove how much or how little;" and the representative would be forced, in order to recover the balance, to commence an action, the costs of which may be $300, while the balance may turn out to be $5. You can likewise succeed in defeating all the usefulness of the clause if you surround it with the other guards which the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) mentioned, as, for instance, making it apply only to cases where the bank has endeavored but failed to find out the whereabouts of the depositor. That endeavor might be made in a perfunctory manner; there is no check on the fidelity with which it is made. We ought to have a return of all the balances, irrespective of any efforts that may or may not be made to discover the whereabouts of the depositor. With regard to the period, it seems to me that five years is a very convenient and proper time. It is the period of limitations in Quebec, and it is desirable to have the period uniform all through Canada. It might have been made six years, to suit the statute of limitations in other Provinces, but we thought it better to have it uniform; and, therefore, made the period that fixed by the law of the Province of Quebec, not because the statute of limitations will apply to these deposits, because we intend to prevent that, but because for a very long period that has been considered, and wisely considered everywhere, as about the time when a debt should be collected, if it is to be collected at all. The policy on which the statute of limitations was founded is the policy which indicates that that is a fair period to fix in this regard. Upon that ground it would be well not to enlarge to any great extent this period; and on the whole, I am strongly inclined to think the period is a fair one, and the most convenient one to work, being the one generally followed.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I doubt very much, and I do claim to know something of the matter, if there would be found one case on the list of unclaimed balances, such as that conjured up by the hon. the Finance Minister in favor of the

orphan and widow. I doubt if any one case can be found such as that. Some such balances of small amounts there may be, but when you speak of anything like $1,000, or even $100, it will be found that there are none such on those lists.

Mr. FOSTER. The same principle would apply if only $25.

Sir DONALD SMITH. The principle would apply certainly, but, it is a very different thing from saying that to propose to extend the time to twenty years, we are not to have any list at all. But if twenty years is too long, although I cannot think myself it is, then it should be made ten years, which will bring us to the next period for dealing with bank charters. I do trust, that even now the hon. Minister will see his way to modify what he proposes, and to extend the time, and not to require the publication of the exact amount.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked what the practice was among the banks in regard to these balances which would be affected by this clause. Speaking only from a knowlege of the manner in which the banks in the Maritime Provinces are conducted, I may say that these balances arise either on current accounts or on deposit receipts. The deposit receipt, bearing interest, is usually a demand obligation, the bank claiming at the same time that it shall not be compelled to pay without a certain notice. As regards the unclaimed balances on current accounts, the Minister of Justice has said that the information which the banks endeavor to obtain is obtained in a perfunctory manner. The hon. gentleman must permit me to say, that that is hardly an accurate description of the manner in which the banks discharge their duty in regard to current account balances. Hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with the management of banks will recognise that it is absolutely impossible for a correct inspection of a bank to be made unless each current account is certified to. It is within the knowledge of everyone who keeps an account in a bank that at least once a year the bank sends to each of its creditors a certificate for him to sign as to the accuracy of the balance which he has at his credit on current account. When an inspection takes place at any bank agency, it is one of the most imperative duties of the inspector to ascertain that the balance at the credit of each current account is so certified. So I think hon. gentlemen will recognise that it is essential in the interests of the banks that they shall ascertain positively and beyond peradventure that the current account balances shall be certified to every time when an inspection takes place at an agency, and at least once a year at the head office. Everyone who has a bank account must know that this is done, and that, if the certificate is not given, he is importuned by the bank until he certifies to the correctness of the balance account. That is one manner in which the banks have adopted for their own protection, that they endeavor to satisfy themselves as to the accuracy of current accounts. As to the deposit receipts it is not so easy for the bank to ascertain the whereabouts of each depositor, and a deposit receipt, like a bill of exchange, may be negotiable anywhere, and the bank may be called upon, ten, fifteen or twenty years after issuing a deposit receipt, to pay the amount. As to the question of the unclaimed balances, I do not think you will find in the history of the oldest bank in Canada any amount which appeared either at the credit of a current account or the amount of an old deposit receipt, ever carried to the profit and loss account. It stands as one of the liabilities of the bank, and has invariably been so recognised by every bank in Canada. Reference has been made to the statute of limitations, and the possibility of a bank pleading that statute in regard to a balance due either on current account or on a deposit receipt. I think this House should so legislate that it should not be possible for any bank to plead the statute of limitations. The Minister of Finance stated that his proposal contained nothing substantially new. As I understand the bank charters of Canada, they have been twice renewed since Confederation, and this is the first time when it has been considered necessary to insert such a clause as we are now considering. Therefore, the hon. gentleman must recognise that it is very substantially new, and he must not be surprised if the chartered banks of Canada seek for some very satisfactory explanation before they are prepared to accept an innovation like this upon the charters under which they have been working for very many years. I think it is hardly fair to say that the banks desire to pocket other people's money, when we see that they make every effort—in the matter of current accounts and deposit receipts—to ascertain the whereabouts of their depositors. It would seem to me that, as far as the public interest is concerned, if it was thought wise, where the address of a depositor is not known, or after the lapse of 10, 15 or 20 years his whereabouts cannot be ascertained, it might be well that a return should be made of his name, of the fact that he is a depositor in a certain bank, that on a certain day he made a deposit in a certain agency of that bank, and the return might state the last known address of the depositor, or, if that is not known, the last known address of his heirs or of those known to be interested in his estate. If that was given, I think all the protection necessary would be accorded to the public. That such must be the feeling of the Government is evident from the fact that they have never thought it necessary to advertise or to notify the public in any way as to the amounts lying to the credit of depositors in the Government savings banks. If this matter is so important, I should think it would be the first duty of the Government to advertise the names of those persons to whose credit stand the unclaimed balances which have accrued in their own savings banks. With all due deference to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, he must permit me to say that five years seems to be an unconscionably short time. He says that in the Province of Quebec it might be possible for the banks to plead the statute of limitations. I do not think that statute has ever been pleaded by any bank in Canada, and I do think we should legislate that it should be impossible for any bank in Canada to plead the statute of limitations. I should think it would be possible to incorporate a clause in the Bill to prevent any bank pleading the statute of limitations. I think the time should be very much extended even if the Government insists upon this provision.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. KENNY. Especially as regards deposit receipts. That is a contract made with an individual where the bank binds itself to pay that individual or his representative a certain sum of money whenever he calls for it. Now, the bank stands in a little different position relative to a current account, because in a current account balance a man has money immediately available at his credit, but he holds no voucher from the bank. But the deposit receipt is very often put away; the money is put in by individuals who do not desire to touch it for a lengthened period. Now you compel these persons to go to the bank at the end of some fixed period, and I say that for that reason, and for many others, the period of five years is decidedly too short.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I congratulate the Minister of Finance in making one modification of this clause as he originally proposed it, and I think he has gone in the right direction. I am sure the House could not have approved of the original proposition which was practically confiscation of the money, But the changes he has made, while they are in the right direction, I think, do not go far enough. He has limited the time for making a return of these unclaimed dividends and balances, to five years. Now, why is that period taken? I suppose it is taken for the reason given by the Minister of Justice, that it is the period at which the statute of limitations in the Province of Quebec bars actions, and he says it is desirable to make the same limitation of time throughout the Dominion. But I think this will not be a good reason. We can change the statute of limitations, so far as regards the setting up of the statute against such balances, and we can provide in this Act—and I understand it is the intention of the Government to provide—that the bank accepting a charter under this Act shall not be allowed to plead the statute of limitations to any action brought to recover unclaimed dividends and unclaimed balances; and if a clause of that kind is inserted, then the reason of this term of five years disappears. I think the term of five years is too short. The reason we are asked to give this return at all is to give publicity to the names of persons who are dead, or have disappeared, or who have lost sight of the money to their credit, and five years is too short for that. People may have left it there willingly for five years, they want to let the interest accumulate; they may have died a year after, and if they have, there is no reason why their heirs should not wait. But I think a sufficiently short time would be the duration of the charter which we are giving the bank. We are giving these banks a charter for ten years, let that be the period. Let any bank hold a balance for ten years, and then let a return be made. I think that is quite short enough time to require them to make a return, especially if the people are not known to them. If the people are known to them, the bank will find them out; in order to make a return the bank will hunt them up, and it is reasonable that they should have, at least, ten years before disclosing the names of their depositors. Now, a very practical question comes in here with regard to one class of these deposits, it is the case of deposits for which a deposit receipt is given. Now, a deposit receipt is a negotiable instrument, it is payable to the depositor or his order. He endorses that over. John Brown makes a deposit of $1,000 in the bank and he takes a deposit receipt, and six months afterwards he disposes of that deposit receipt to Richard Doe, and Richard Doe puts it in his strong box, and perhaps it happens to him, as in the case the Minister of Finance has depicted with such vividness, that he is lost in a ship, or he is burnt up, and he disappears, and then the return is published that this money is at the credit of John Brown, whereas John Brown is not entitled to it, nor is John Brown's representatives. John Brown has got value for it, John Brown has sold the deposit receipt, and Richard Doe or his representatives are entitled to it. How are you going to meet that case?

Mr. BOWELL. The bank will let him keep it, I suppose.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Then, what is the use of the return here? I submit that the publishing of these returns will not meet the case of deposit receipts. Suppose George Foster is a party to the transaction. I say if John Brown deposits money and transfers a receipt to George Foster, it is George Foster who is entitled to the money, and not John Brown, and there is no use in publishing that name. Again, this principle that you are bringing in here for the first time is a new principle, and any new principle of legislation ought to be adopted only to redress some grievance, and there is no practical inconvenience here, no grievance has ever been suggested to exist, in fact we find here in the statutes of the Dominion the very contrary provision, we find that with regard to Post Office savings banks the postmasters and their officers shall not disclose the name of any depositor. There is a statute passed in 1886 by this Government in which the principle of secrecy is recognised, by which the names of depositors in the Government savings banks shall not be disclosed. And why should the names of men who deposit money in one of the chartered banks of the Dominion have their names disclosed to the public, and the amounts standing to their credit? I say that even if the names are published, there is no reason why the amount should be given, and I hope the Minister of Finance will strike out that clause regarding the amounts to be given, and that the names and addresses only should be published after a period of ten years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose it would answer the purposes of the banks as well not only to strike out the amounts, but to strike out the names, too. My hon. friend calls attention to this fact, that deposit receipts are negotiable instruments, and because deposits are sometimes transferred, the publication of the name, he says, would not be useful. It is not difficult to suggest cases in which the publication of this return would not be useful. There may be cases in which the person having a deposit has left no living relative, and the publication would serve no useful purpose in his case. We are using a return, and we are proposing legislation for the great class of cases in which it may be useful, although it is quite possible to conceive that in some cases it may be of no use at all. With regard to the proposal that it shall be for the life of the charter of the bank, it amounts to this: the Government having conceded all that the banks professed to wish,

namely, that the money should not be taken from them, and at the same time the banks having proclaimed in the loudest tones their anxiety that there should be a publication of the names of depositors, that there might be the fullest publicity and frankness with the whole public—the banks now say this: Oh, don't put that into force until this Act expires, then we will use some force and pressure again to prevent it being put in the new charters. There would be no return and no publication, except as to past balances, until a Banking Act should be brought down at the end of the next decade, and there would be the same fight on the floor of Parliament to defeat that to which the bankers have agreed every time they have opened their mouths on this subject. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) said I had asserted that the way in which the banks made their enquiries as regards the whereabouts of depositors was purely perfunctory. I did not say so. But from the manner in which this clause is objected to, obstructed and its operation endeavored to be defeated, I would not wonder if it should be so. All I said in that regard was this: that if you say that returns need not be made, if the banks have ascertained the whereabouts or taken reliable measures to ascertain the whereabouts of the depositors, you will have no supervision over the operation of your section, and no check whatever. The most perfunctory method may be adopted. I have not said that all this business is done perfunctorily now. I am pointing out now that, if Parliament should require no restriction, the whole operation of the section would be defeated. The banks themselves would be the only judges as to whether they had proper information as to the whereabouts of their depositors or not, and it would be equivalent to saying that the returns should be made as the banks please, and that if the banks did not please there should be no returns at all. My hon. friend has almost intimated that the pleading of the statute of limitations is unknown in the history of banking. Perhaps it has not been pleaded in Canada. I have no doubt that banking in this country, as regards unclaimed deposits to which the statute of limitations applies, is fair. I do not dispute that the banks have not set up the statute of limitations, and no respectable bank in Canada would do so. But the point has been raised, it has been raised by a wicked bank somewhere else, and it has been made the established law of England; and being so, shall we reverse that principle or not, and shall we give the relatives of depositors, before they are grey-haired old men and do not want the money, or have passed out of existence, the information that there is money in the name of their deceased ancestors, or shall we simply say that John Doe or Richard Roe had some money there, and that it is none of your business what it was or what is the amount. Inasmuch as this is an entirely new question, I admit authority does not count for very much; but if we can get a little light from authority on such a question, it is useful, because it brings to our notice the reasons which may exist with respect to the usefulness of such a provision. Among legal practitioners the *Law Journal*, I need not say, is one of very great value and of high authority. In its number of 22nd March, 1890, it calls attention to the fact that a recent edition of "Chitty on Contracts," emphasises the rule laid down in the case of Pott *vs.* Clegg, 16 M. and W. 321; 16 Law J. Rep. Excheq. 201, 11 Jur. 289, to the effect:

"That moneys left with a banker if not drawn upon for six years becomes at the end of that time the absolute property of the banker by virtue of the statute of limitations. The suggestion has been made that some legislation is desirable to avoid or mitigate the occasion of great hardships which this rule might cause as where a person should die leaving a large balance at this bank unknown to his executors, and this suggestion seems reasonable enough."

As regards the period of time this authority says:

"We do not think, however, it would be desirable to extend the period of limitation. A fair and just reform would be to provide that during the last two of the six years bankers should be compelled to advertise particulars of such unclaimed balances, and at the end of six years they should become the property of the bankers, indeed as at present, but subject to a very substantial claim for special duty on the part of the transfer of the exchequer."

The provision that unclaimed balances should be divided between the banks and the Government, would not be considered a fair proposition in this country. But the Committee will observe that those who make such a proposition to readjust the law with respect to the operation of the statute of limitations, as regards bank deposits, contend that particulars of all deposits should be published at the end of four years. Such legislation exists in New Zealand, but there, not only is the list with all the amounts of deposits and the names published *in extenso* in the official organ of the Government, but the list is sent to the office of the High Commissioner or Agent for New Zealand, in London, and an advertisement is there inserted calling the attention of the British public to the fact that the list is in that office for their inspection, in order that relatives of persons who have gone to the colony shall have ready access to full particulars as to moneys that lie unclaimed in the New Zealand banks. Let me refer to a book familiar to all of us. I admit, with respect to the whole of this matter, I am not using these references for authority properly so-called, but for the little light they give and for the illustrations afforded. I refer to Whittacker's almanac, which, referring to this subject, says:

"By the East India Unclaimed Stocks Act, 1885, provision is made for the transfer to the Government of India of all unclaimed Indian stocks till claimants appear, and, judging by discussion at the recent colonial conference, legislation may shortly be looked for with reference to unclaimed dividends on all colonial stocks."

As to unclaimed dividends of companies, and dividends generally, the author goes on to say:

"That the public would largely gain by the proposal of publicity may easily be judged of by the perusal of the balance sheets of the leading railway, banking and insurance companies. The amount invested in railways exceeds £800,000,000, and the item, unclaimed dividends, amounts in most cases to several thousand pounds. A very remarkable claim against the Royal Exchange Assurance Company may be noted; the representative of an original one hundred pound stockholder recovering no less than £3,600, and after 163 years non claimed."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The statute of limitations was not pleaded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Evidently not. Whether that poor man would have fared as well in Canada, in view of the attitude taken by certain hon. members in this House who take the banker's view is not so clear.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a reflection on some of us which is unjust. I advocated that the statute of limitations should not be pleaded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understood so. The hon. gentleman took the view of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale).

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. gentleman cannot refer to my position. I understood the hon. gentleman was going to introduce a clause stating that the statute of limitations could not be pleaded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I did not refer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Then the hon. gentleman must refer to me. I made the same remark, that I thought a clause would be introduced providing that the statute of limitations could not be pleaded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not mean to refer to the hon. gentleman as a poor man. On the contrary, by the attitude he has taken on this question, I supposed he had largely invested in bank stocks.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Well, I have not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. It must have been the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), the hon. gentleman referred to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let us proceed a minute until we see some of the instances which my hon. friend from Montreal (Sir Donald Smith), might say, if we suggested them, here were cases that we had conjured up.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I hope the hon. Minister will not direct any remark to me.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think I can possibly make any more exceptions.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I do not think there were any such instances in Canada 160 years ago.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let us see further what this says about unclaimed bank deposits:

"Unclaimed bank deposits.—Strange as it may seem, it is nevertheless a fact that many deposits made with bankers years ago for safe custody, are still lying musty, dusty, and, in some cases, rotting away. If particulars of these deposits were published, many interesting and valuable 'finds' in the shape of family title deeds, plate, jewellery, &c., would be the result. For instance, in the case of the winding-up of a Dublin bank the following (among other) items were advertised in the newspapers:

"Box, containing diamonds and articles of jewellery, lodged by Doctor Andrew Blake and George Jennings on 22nd December, 1795.

"Box, containing thirty-nine articles of plate, some of them bearing a coronet.

"A perusal of the foregoing facts and figures would seem to show the desirability of the Government introducing some comprehensive scheme, dealing with all unclaimed funds. The result would be a great public benefit. Newspapers would no doubt give publicity to the Government returns, while sums unclaimed for a certain number of years, might then, without injustice, fall into the national exchequer, and be utilised as many other unclaimed funds have been, towards the reduction of the national debt."

These are illustrations which indicate that in a growing country like Canada, with its growing commerce, and I hope, its growing wealth, there will be cases in which the provisions of a Bill like this will be found eminently useful.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I put a question to the hon. Minister of Justice some time ago, and I saw from his answer that the question was not rightly apprehended. I suppose I did not put it with sufficient clearness. I do not exactly know upon what ground the Government are proposing legislation, in the direction they have intimated it is their intention to legislate. Of course, if the Government chooses to declare banks the trustees of all these unclaimed balances, then the statute of limitations would not apply, because the statute does not apply against trustees, and by publication it would be known for all time to come to whom this property belonged, if there was any rightful claim upon the property. My enquiry some time ago arose from the fact that I thought the legislation that the Government proposed in the Bill as it now stands, that the alteration which the Minister of Finance had proposed, proceeded upon the assumption that the Government of Canada was the rightful claimant of all these balances, when no heir could be found to the persons who deposited the money in the bank. I do not know whether that is the position taken by the Government or not, but it seemed to me that both what was contained in the Bill previously, and that which is now proposed to be substituted for it, are based upon this assumption. I cannot see that property in bank stock, or in bank deposits, would in any way differ from any other kind of personal property. It belongs to the person, and is under the protection of the law of the Province in which he resides, so far as it is his property. It seems to me, that where there is a depositor residing in the Province of Ontario, and if he dies without heirs, his property deposited in the bank would pass to the Attorney General of the Province, as representing the Crown in that Province, and so in other Provinces, and if his home was in England, it would pass, not to the Government of Canada, or to any one of the Provinces, but to the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom. The Government, it is true, in making provisions for banking may provide that it shall become the trustee for persons who die holding either bank stock or deposits in banks; but it would be equally proper and serve an equally efficient purpose, if the Government were to make the bank the trustee. It could be as well provided that the bank should be the trustee, as that the Government should be the trustee, or the personal representative of the parties. I can see a very great deal to be said in the favor of notice of unclaimed balances being given, at least as often as once in five years. There may be creditors of the parties who have money deposited who may have an interest in knowing whether there are such deposits or not, and in making distribution among the creditors of the deceased person, the amount which they receive may often depend upon the fact of the deposits in the bank being known. It is, therefore, important that this information should be given. There might be serious objections to publishing the exact amount, because if that were done it might invite spurious claims from persons who thought there was an opportunity of successfully imposing upon the estate of the depositor. I am at a loss to know upon what ground the Government are proceeding, or whether they are really making a claim to the property where the person dies without heirs.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I fully agree with the remarks of some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that in dealing with this matter we have to thoroughly guard the interests of the public, and

at the same time to do what we think is just to the monetary institutions of the country. It is conceded by the Committee that the law should be that banks shall not be able to plead the statute of limitations in regard to any unclaimed dividends, or unclaimed balances of deposits. As I understand it, that, at present, is the practice of the banks of this country, and I think it would be a very sorry day, indeed, for any bank which would introduce the practice of pleading the statute of limitations against such claims. I fancy their deposits would diminish in proportion as their conduct deserves. This section provides for a return in two classes of cases, that is to say, a deposit in respect of which no transaction has taken place, or in which no interest has been paid during the five years prior to the date of such statement. It has been stated that the difficulty might be easily overcome by the deposit or withdrawal of a dollar during the period. That is a formality which would practically be a farce; and it would seem to be too much to require that formality to be gone through in order to protect the deposit from publication. I have a suggestion to make to the Finance Minister which I think will meet the case. The meaning of it is that an account which is not a live account at the end of five years, or in which no dealings have taken place during the five years, should be published. It is said that in many cases the publication would be of great value to the public, and I agree that it would. At the same time, there is another class of cases in which the publication would not be desirable. Take the case of a man who has a deposit which has existed for four years or a little longer, and who is about going away on a trip to Europe. He does not think anything about the account, and he does not want it made public; but his absence is the cause of the bank publishing to the world his whole business with them. I would suggest, therefore, that you should provide for another class of cases in which the bank should not be required to make the publication, by adding, "or in respect of which the bank has been requested in writing in the year next previous to the expiration of the five years, not to publish any particular in respect of such deposit or such money." Then, a person being absent, would simply require to write to the bank prior to the expiration of the time, saying: "I do not require you to make any publication of my deposit." I am very glad that the Minister of Finance has adopted what I believe is the general view of the Committee in respect to taking over the unclaimed dividends, and we have now only to settle this one question of the publication. When the period is decided upon, I think some such addition as I have submitted might, with very great service to depositors, be added.

Mr. TISDALE. The great objection I have to the short time, is based on the very principle which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) mentions; and if you can draw a distinction in words between a live account and a dead account, I do not see that the extent of the period makes any difference. I have not the slightest objection to five years, if that distinction can be made; in fact, in that case, I think the sooner we know about the dead accounts the better. But if the provision applies simply to an account existing for a certain number of years, live and dead accounts must go in together. I have the strongest repugnance to making any changes in the bank charters unless for good reason. The Finance Minister has acted very fairly in regard to this matter. He has changed this clause, expunging the portion which I consider the most objectionable, and introducing a new principle, of which I heartily approve; and the only thing to be done now is to qualify that, so that it will not do more harm than good. I have looked up some statistics, and I find that in the State of Massachusetts, where there is $294,000,000 on deposit, there is less than one-eighth of one per cent. of unclaimed balances or dead accounts. If the distinction between live and dead accounts could be clearly drawn, I am satisfied that the unanimous feeling of the Committee would be met on that point. I see a difficulty in wording the clause, but I thought there was a good deal in the suggestion of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that the banks should publish only the names of people whom they did not know to be alive.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the desire which the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) evinces, of having only dead accounts dealt with, I really think the accounts the Government propose to deal with are dead enough, because it is only in the cases of balances, in respect of which no transactions have taken place and no interest has been paid during the five years, that this provision is made. Whether the people are alive or not, the account is practically dead.

Mr. TISDALE. A credit of interest would not keep it alive, as that would not be a transaction.

Mr. EDGAR. Most people in the legal profession who have had to do with the administration of the estates of intestates have had experience of many cases where justice would have been served by a publication of balances of this kind. I have, in my own practice, seen many instances in which it was only by the merest accident that balances were found to exist in the banks, though, I admit, chiefly savings banks. There is another class of cases in which I have seen the same practical difficulty arise—the administration of lunatics' estates. It will be a great advantage, when lunatics have been confined in the asylums for years and are unable to give information as to the condition of affairs, to have these returns published. I cannot really see why there should be any objection to having the name and amounts stated. There is no objection in the case of bank shares.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is not claimed that the legislation on the subject of the statute of limitations would be based on any claim of the Crown to succeed to personal property by analogy to escheats. I do not say that it might not be based upon that, but the law upon that subject is too unsettled to justify its being based upon that principle. I think it comes within the principle of the Banking Act. We say that no institutions, except those authorised by Parliament, shall carry on the business of banking. We have the right to limit the extent to which they shall do business, and decide what kind of business they shall do. We have the right to authorise their receiving money on deposit or to prohibit their so doing; and we have the right to say on what terms they shall receive the deposits, what interest they shall pay, and how long they

shall keep them without availing themselves of any period of prescription. We might provide a form of return of unpaid dividends and balances, which should itself contain an admission that would take the case out of the statute of limitations. I would rather not discuss the way it should be dealt with until we propose the clause itself. There are several ways it can be done, and it will be inconvenient at this stage to discuss the propriety of any particular method.

Mr. HESSON. I cannot understand the argument of the hon. member for South Norfolk. He speaks strongly against the existence of this clause as an injury and injustice to depositors through the fact being made known that there are moneys lying to their credit, and then he tells us that there are no such funds worth speaking of—that ⅛ of 1 per cent. would cover the amount. I do not see how it can injure anybody to have it made public that he has a balance at the bank. It is not a question of breach of faith or trust between the depositors and the banks, when the banks are only carrying out the law which requires that this thing should be done. If any depositor objects to having his balance made known, all he has to do is to have a change made in his account, which he can do very easily by drawing some money, or making a deposit, or having the interest entered up; and if five years have been allowed to elapse without any change having been made in the account, that is good ground for believing that something is wrong and that those entitled to the money should be made known of its existence. If it is not offensive to shareholders of banks to have the stock list published, I do not see why it should be offensive to depositors to have their deposits made known after the five years' period.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I think we are unnecessarily drawing suspicion on the good faith of the banks by suggesting that they would discharge in a perfunctory way the duty of finding out to whom balances belong. As the hon. member for Halifax has mentioned, the banks not only give the balances every year, but, further than that, they remind all their customers of anything they may have in the bank's keeping, in the shape of bonds, debentures or other securities; and these depositors are asked to sign a certain form to show if the statement is correct, and if there is no response the bank takes it for granted that it is. The following six months there is a similar intimation made. The hon. the Minister of Justice pointed to certain things that were found to have been left with the Dublin Bank, but these were of an entirely different character. A bank does not assume a responsibility for diamonds, plate, or other similar articles, left with it merely for safe keeping, and consequently does not consider it necessary to make a return. But all I wish, in rising now, to say is that I consider that the banks take the best possible means within their power of informing all who have balances that those balances are there for them at any time that they may desire to call for them.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had a pretty long discussion on this clause, and I think, or at least I hope, that I will be voicing the sense of the House when I state that I do not think the period of five years can be increased. I would rather make it much less, if I had my own way about it. In reference to what several gentlemen have spoken about very strongly, I have to reiterate what I said before, that there is no intention to make the banks, against their own interests, or the interests of the depositors, divulge any agreement entered into in secrecy, and we believe that these clauses most effectually guard against that. I think it would be well if the Committee can see its way to pass this clause now. Afterwards I will go over it very carefully with the Minister of Justice in order to see if it is necessary to guard it in any additional way. Several suggestions have been made, and they will not be lost sight of.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think it would be fair to ascertain the feeling of the Committee in regard to the time. I, therefore, move that five years be changed to ten years.

Mr. KENNY. I would ask the Minister of Justice if it is correct that before this time would elapse—the bank charters having expired—it would really have any legal effect?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would have no effect at all. It is simply during the life of this Act.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Then would it not have any effect in reference to the balances which had accrued during the currency of the last charters?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will apply to the past balances, but not in regard to transactions where the ten years have already accrued. It will apply where the time is unexpired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Suppose that, to-morrow, the several banks who have had these accruing balances for the last 10, 20, 50, and 100 years should transfer them to profit and loss. Would the passage of this Act have a retroactive effect against a transaction of the kind? It has just struck me that it is possible that all the past balances might be provided for in that way, and that would be a way of defeating the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the Bill could be defeated in that way by any transaction of that kind, but I can only say that, if such a thing were possible, we would prosecute to the last resort the fraudulent bank that would attempt such a vile proceeding.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. As I read the Act, after it comes into force, the very first year and every year thereafter, the banks will have to make a return of the balances that have been lying with them for five years or more. So, if the word "ten" were substituted for the word "five," it would not be nugatory.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not entirely so.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Minister of Justice says he would prosecute banks which acted as I have suggested with the utmost rigor of the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I meant to say was that we would certainly test the validity of their action.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the banks now can plead the statute of limitations, as I understand, if they appropriated all unpaid balances that accrued during the period before the last six years, that would be no violation of the law. It is quite possible, though I do not say the banks would do it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We would take away the charter of any bank that did it. It would be conspiracy.

Mr. McMULLEN. When these lapsed balances are published the first year, would the Provincial Government have the power of imposing a tax upon those unclaimed balances?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think they would.

Mr. McMULLEN. If they did, could they call upon the bank to pay the taxes?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Provincial Legislatures have the right to tax banks as they have the right to tax any person doing business in the Province.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I think it is very likely that the Provincial Government of Quebec, who have exercised great ingenuity in their financial methods, will be likely to follow the example of the Minister of Finance and to secure plunder in that way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose the Provincial Government has power to impose that tax, then would the payment of that tax on the part of the bank be a transaction in connection with that money?

Amendment of Mr. Kirkpatrick substituting the word "ten" for "five" negatived.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do I understand from the Minister of Finance that in arranging this clause the Government will take suggestions?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then I have one to make. I voted against a motion made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), not because I agree with the object and spirit of this section at all, but because I believe that a preferable modification can be made. Now, I understand that the Government desires to get at the case of depositors of the bank who have died, leaving heirs possibly, possibly leaving no heirs, but whose heirs, if there are any, are unaware of the fact that those deposits remain in the bank to their credit. It was the intention at first to appropriate this money to the benefit of the Treasury, but the Government has thought better of that determination, and has dropped the clause altogether. Now, it seems to me that there is a broad distinction between the case of a dead account and a live account, a distinction pressed by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) with a great deal of force this evening. What the Government are aiming at in this clause is to make this distinction manifest in the wording of it, and I would suggest that it should read something like this:

The banks shall deliver to the Finance Minister and Receiver General, to be laid by him before Parliament, a statement of all amounts or balances in respect of which no transactions have taken place, or upon which no interest had been paid during the five years prior to the date of such statement, and in respect of which the whereabouts of the principal is unknown.

And also to provide that when the whereabouts of the principal is known to the bank, the bank shall notify him at the end of every five years that certain balances remain to his credit. Now, the consequences of such a change would be this: that where a depositor died leaving heirs, the name at the end of five years, would be returned to the Government and laid before Parliament and published to the world, so that the heirs might become aware of the fact; and that where, in the case of a live account, the principal depositor was known to the bank, he should be notified at the end of every five years, by the bank, of the fact that he had this money remaining to his credit. In that way it seems to me the distinction between a live and a dead account would be observed, and that justice would be done to the banks and to the depositors. I do not move this as an amendment, but I merely offer it as a suggestion.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Primary amendment of Mr. Foster agreed to.

Progress reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 5th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that John Charles Rykert, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Lincoln and Town of Niagara, having in his place in the House resigned his seat, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DAVIN presented third report of the Committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the Debates of the House.

HEREFORD RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. IVES moved:

That all rules and orders of the House be suspended as regards the Bill respecting the Hereford Railway Company and Maine Central Railway Company, and that leave be given to bring in the said Bill.

He said: I do this under the authority of Rule 69, which provides, that in Acts of urgent and pressing necessity, the rules may be suspended. I presume the House would like to have some little explanation. The original Act of incorporation of the Hereford Railway Company, passed in the Session of 1887, gave power to that company to make arrangements, by lease or sale, with the Boston and Montreal Railway Company, and also the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company, but at that time it was not contemplated that the Maine Central Railway Company would be in a position to connect with the Hereford Company, and power was not taken in the Act of incorporation to make a lease with the Maine Central. Since that time, the Maine Central has become a very active and enterprising corporation and has been extending itself in the direction of the Canadian frontier; and on the 1st of May last, a preliminary arrangement was made for the

leasing of the Hereford Railway by the directors of that company, to the Maine Central. Of course the matter has arisen suddenly, and there has been no time to give notice, and at this stage of the Session there is no time for pursuing the ordinary formalities of referring to the Committee of Standing Orders the petition, &c. It seems to me, however, that it would be a mere matter of form, and the matter is one of very considerable importance to that section of the country. It is of great necessity that connection should be made with the Maine Central, giving access to Portland, Boston, and all the southern seaports. There has been no time to give notice, and I propose, not that we should pass the Bill, as has been done in some other cases, on record in our Journals, but to take, with the permission of the House, the first and second reading to-day, and refer the Bill to the Railway Committee. That Committee will have time on Wednesday to consider this Bill, and if there is no objection to it and it is reported back to the House, we should have a chance of examining it in the Committee of the Whole, and it seems to me there will be no difficulty about it. There are only two clauses in the Bill. The first clause authorises the Hereford Railway Company to make a lease of their railway to the Maine Central, upon the usual conditions contained in the model Bill, namely, the approval of the shareholders and the sanction of the Governor General in Council. The second clause provides that, in case the lease be made before the passing of the Act, it shall be legal and binding, provided the approval of the shareholders and the sanction of the Governor General in Council be obtained.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course I take it for granted that everything stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives), is correct, and the proposed reference to the Committee on Railways, will give an opportunity of the Bill being sifted, so that we can weigh its provisions before deciding on its merits.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the best course.

Motion agreed to, and Bill introduced.

Bill (No. 147) respecting the Hereford Railway Company was read the first and second times.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—EX-MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. GIROUARD presented the first report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask my hon. friend the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, on what day he proposes to ask the House to proceed to the consideration of this report ?

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not know, because every day now is a Government day.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend the First Minister gave an understanding to the House that an opportunity should be afforded to consider this report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before that is done, I think the evidence should be printed in the Votes and Proceedings. At all events, I will make a statement on the subject to-morrow.

THE BREMNER FURS.

Mr. LAURIER. I would remind the hon. gentleman at the same time, that the evidence taken by the reporters in connection with the committee on Bremner's claim, has not yet been brought down.

LABOR STATISTICS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) to provide for the collection and publishing of Labor Statistics. He said : The character of the Bill is already known. It has often been mentioned in the public press, that a necessity existed of publishing special statistics concerning the relations between capital and labor. Without entering into the question itself, I may say that it has often been stated as one of the grievances of the laboring classes that the different statistics obtained by Governments and published by them were not such as would put their claims, their wants, their just demands before the public and before Parliament. The necessity for the establishment of a Bureau of Statistics has been often admitted, and it has been brought under the consideration of the Government and of Parliament, by the trades unions and the other labor organisations of the country. Promises were made that the attention of Parliament would be called to this matter, and that a measure would be introduced with that effect. This is the measure. In this we are following the example given to us by the neighboring country, where a Labor Bureau is established. This Bill consists in provisions for the organisation of such a bureau. It is proposed to establish a new branch under the Minister of Agriculture, as a branch to attend to labor statistics. The Minister presiding over that Department will be the Commissioner of Labor Statistics. He will have the right to appoint an assistant, whose duty it will be to collect these statistics. I may say here that, if this measure has not been presented by the Minister of Agriculture, it is because I was charged at the beginning of the Session with matters of legislation affecting the relations between capital and labor. I have prepared this Bill, which is a very inoffensive, if not ineffectual, one, and there should be no need to say, as some of the press of the country have said, that it was a slur upon one of my colleagues because this Bill was prepared by the Secretary of State, and not by the Minister of Agriculture. It is provided that it shall be the duty of the commissioner to collect from Dominion, provincial and municipal officers, and of all officers of any public institutions in the nature of boards of trade, harbor commissioners, and of all trades unions, mutual benefit associations, and other workingmen's associations, all the information in their power necessary to assist in carrying out the objects of this Act. The amount of $10,000 is to be appropriated to provide for the working of the new Department, including the publishing of the report of the Commissioner of Labor. The objects of investigation will be agriculture, mining, mechanical and manufacturing industries, transportation, clerical and all other skilled and unskilled labor, that amount of capital invested in lands, buildings and machinery respectively, and the means of production and distribution generally ; the number, age, sex and condition of persons employed, the nature of their employment, the extent to which the apprenticeship system prevails in the various industries

requiring skilled labor, the number of hours of labor per day, the average time of employment per annum, and the net wages received in each of the industries and employments in Canada; the number and condition of the unemployed, and their age, sex and nationality, together with the cause of their idleness; the sanitary condition of lands, workshops and dwellings, the number and size of rooms occupied by workers, &c.; the number and condition of the Chinese in Canada; the number, condition and nature of the employment of the inmates of prisons, and so on, and all such other information as the Commissioner deems essential to further the objects of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GRAIN TESTER.

Mr. HESSON (for Mr. MARSHALL) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, this present Session, to make any changes in the grain tester now in use and which has been so strongly objected to by the farmers and others throughout the country? If so, what are the probable changes?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On Friday last I gave an answer to a question on this subject, and I have no need to repeat it to-day.

FISHING FOR SALMON WITH NETS.

Mr. KIRK asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to enforce the laws this year, prohibiting fishing for salmon with nets above tidal waters? Have instructions been issued to fishery officers to enforce the law?

Mr. COLBY. It is the intention of the Government to enforce the law. Instructions have been issued to fishery inspectors in some rivers to enforce the law. In others, on which there is a doubt as to the tidal boundaries which have not yet been defined, instructions have not yet been issued.

PURCHASE OF LAND IN ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. BÉCHARD asked, Whether the Government employed an advocate in connection with the purchase of a lot of land whereon to erect a public building at St. Hyacinthe? If so, what is his name, what amount of fees did he claim, and how much has been paid to him?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government did employ advocates in connection with the purchase of a lot of land. The names are Messrs. Beauchemin & Mallette. The claim for their services was $220; amount paid, $100.

CALVIE, ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. BÉCHARD asked, Whether the Government employed advocates to take charge of the case of one Calvie, before the Criminal Court sitting in November last at St. Hyacinthe? If so, what are their names, what did they do in connection with the case, and how much did they receive for the said case?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government employed an advocate to take charge of the case; Mr. Hall was the advocate. Calvie was prosecuted and sentenced to one month's imprisonment and $100 fine. Mr. Hall has not yet rendered his account, nor has he been paid.

THE SEAMEN'S ACT.

Mr. COLBY moved third reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend the Seamen's Act, chap. 74 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I beg to move, in amendment, that said Bill be now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by providing:

The right of appeal granted by the general law against summary convictions shall also apply to summary convictions pronounced under the Seamen's Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say a word with reference to this proposed amendment in renewal of the discussion which took place the other day. As I understand the Act which the present Bill is proposed to amend, it has reference only to the inland waters and does not apply to ocean voyages; at any rate it does apply to the inland waters. The great bulk of vessels engaged on inland voyages are engaged on a regular course, in sailing from point to point, and the extreme voyage is, I think, two or three weeks in length, from Lake Superior downward to the port of Kingston, and return. There is, therefore, with reference to the bulk of the cases, an opportunity of reaching once again a point at which the difficulty arises within a very short time, and if I am rightly informed, the bulk of cases which come under the provisions of this Act, arise in the Welland Canal, about midway in the voyage. I make this statement because it seems to me to be not unimportant to consider whether there is, in any point of view, an absolute necessity for what I must call a denial of justice. I think there is in no case such an absolute necessity as that you should wholly deny justice, but I say that here the inconvenience which is suggested as a cause for the denial of justice, is a minor degree of inconvenience altogether, and that, by the adoption of the right of appeal with reference to the inland voyage, possibly with some further precautions, possibly with some precautions as to the facilities for taking and recording evidence for use on the appeal, and with some other provisions suitable to the case, we could overcome any of those difficulties and prevent the risk of gross injustice resulting. We have found it necessary to establish appeals from courts composed of judges of great experience, of great dignity, of much learning, who discharge their business in the light of day, with the assistance of trained advocates, and with all the advantages, and also with all the checks and precautions, which the ordinary course of a public court provides. How much more important it is that we should, with respect to magistrates such as those who are called upon to deal with the cases, give some better opportunity than a *certiorari* gives—we all know how very poor and narrow that remedy is—against the injustice which such a magistrate may commit. A case which has been laid before me, and, I think, it is a case which has been laid before the Minister of Justice also, I bring before the notice of the House as the kind of thing which may happen, because it is a kind of thing which has happened under the law, and is not remedied under the law as it will be altered by

this Bill. At a certain time the person of whom I am speaking was summoned to appear before the police magistrate at Port Colborne, charged with the offence of persuading, or trying to persuade, the crew of a schooner to leave or quit their work. He appeared, and asked that the case might be adjourned till the next day in order to secure the services of a lawyer; but that was refused, and the magistrate declared that the case must proceed at once. The captain, who swore out the warrant, could give no direct evidence that he had seen the person either on board the vessel or talking to the men. The men were necessarily sent for, and when they were summoned, they were asked whether they were under articles, and they proved that they were not under articles, in which case the Act had really no application whatever. The individual charged then demanded to be acquitted, but the magistrate determined that he must be convicted, and he sentenced him to gaol for one month at hard labor. He said to the magistrate that he would appeal, but the magistrate told him there was no appeal for him. He telegraphed for the assistance of a lawyer, and the lawyer came down the next day. He saw him. The lawyer told him there was no appeal under the law. An effort was made to get a copy of the evidence, but there was great difficulty in procuring it, and a threat had to be made to proceed against the magistrate before even a copy of the evidence could be procured and sent to the Law Clerk at Welland, and then it was made clear that there was no appeal or redress. That is the state of things, I am informed, which has happened under the Act, and that state of things may happen under the Act notwithstanding this amendment. It seems to be a blot upon the administration of justice that such a condition of things should continue, and, so thinking, I propose to vote for the amendment, in the hope that, with certain precautions, it may be effectual.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should like to ask if the hon. member is sure that the Act only applies to inland waters? I was so informed, but that is a mistake.

Mr. BLAKE. The law to which I referred was confined to the waters about Quebec, and it was so stated at the commencement of the statute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is an Act relating to the shipping of seamen.

Mr. BLAKE. I was told that there was a statute that did so confine it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I, also, was so informed, but I was informed incorrectly.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a statute which contains these provisions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not that which contains the provisions we are amending. This is an Act in regard to the shipping of seamen, and it refers to sea-going ships as well.

Mr. BLAKE. If that be so, all the observations I made as to the inland voyage would apply to this proposed amendment, and the change might be left to the inland voyage, the outgoing voyage being left as it is.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not able to favor that proposition. The Act is one which is of the greatest importance in carrying on the shipping business of the country. It relates to all sea-going ships, as well as to vessels on the inland waters. It is the statute which relates not only to offences committed by seamen, but also to offences committed against seamen, as, for instance, the crimping business, which was put down by this Act, it provides also penalties for desertion and other offences committed by seamen themselves. The particular character of the offences against seamen or by seamen, I pointed out the other evening. They are offences which must be speedily tried or not tried at all, and to establish a different rule with respect to vessels on the inland waters from that which prevails with respect to sea-going ships would be very unwise and rather unphilosophical. The offence of crimping is, perhaps, not well known outside seaport towns, and even to the people of some of the seaport towns outside of Quebec. We know it was very prevalent, and that it required to be put down with a strong hand in Quebec city. It has existed to some extent also in the Maritime Provinces, in St. John and Halifax. It is the offence of taking charge of seamen, keeping them, as is often done, in a state of intoxication, and carrying them on board ship forcibly for the purpose of procuring their advance wages. This is a very serious offence. It is an offence that should be put down by immediate prosecution, and if we are to permit an appeal to be had and the ship kept in port and witnesses summoned, every crimp will take an appeal for the purpose of defeating justice. It is in the interests of the seamen themselves that such cases should be promptly decided. If we allow an appeal to be taken in every case, the witnesses must be held or the prosecution be abandoned, and it would be, in my opinion, a retrograde step in regard to offences of this kind, to have the remedies in one Province different from those prevailing in another. There has been a very strong remonstrance from the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec, against the passage, even, of this Bill, on the ground that it is one liable to lead to a revival of the crimping business. I do not think that is a fair judgment on the Bill. I think it is reasonable and fair, that after the offence has been committed and conviction has taken place, and even after the ship has sailed, there may be an enquiry as to the regularity by the Superior Court. But to permit an appeal and a new trial, is to afford doubtful justice to ship owners and ship captains.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the only objection the hon. Minister seems to think arises with respect to the right of appeal, is, that as it will virtually involve a new trial, the witnesses would all have left the country when the trial came on. The difficulty might, however, be obviated in the same manner as it was obviated in a Bill proposed by the hon. gentleman himself during this Session, in which it was provided that in certain cases when an appeal was heard, and the witnesses cannot be secured, the depositions given by those witnesses before a magistrate were accepted. If we adopted that principle some three or four weeks ago, I see no reason why it should not apply in this instance. We all desire to protect the navigation interests of the country, but there are certain rights belonging to the individual which we are bound to guard, and cases of gross injustice, under the present Act, have been brought to our attention.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was not in the House when the hon. Minister of Justice explained the Bill on a former occasion, but I am glad to observe the strong ground he has taken on this measure. Connected, as I long have been, with the shipping interests of the country, I have found it of the greatest advantage to be able to deal with these questions promptly. When sailors engage to ship on board a vessel, and which they have always done some days before the vessel is about to proceed to sea, and when, as it very frequently happens, they refuse to go on board, we can deal promptly with them by bringing them before a magistrate, and if they still refuse to go on board a vessel, he has the power to send them to gaol for a certain time. If the Act requires longer delay, and that the captain and the witnesses also remain, together with the ship, until an appeal is heard, it will cause very great hardship and loss to the shipowner. If the Act contemplates that, it is one that will be strongly opposed by the shipping interests.

Amendment of Mr. Wilson (Elgin) negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. FOSTER moved that resolution respecting bounty to be paid on all pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore, reported from Committee, be read a second time and concurred in.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,
Audet,
Boisvert,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bryson,
Burns,
Cargill,
Carling,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cochrane,
Colby,
Corby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dickinson,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Gigault,
Gordon,
Guillet,
Hall,
Hesson,
Hudspeth,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McNeill,
Madill,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Patterson (Essex),
Porter,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Small,
Sproule,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon (Albert),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright.—69.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Béchard,
Bernier,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Campbell,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Couture,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Doyon,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Innes,
Jones (Halifax),
Landerkin,
Laurier,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
Mackenzie,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mulock,
Neveu,
Paterson (Brant),
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John),
Welsh,
Wilson (Elgin),—45.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. FISET. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not voted.

Mr. GIROUARD. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint), otherwise I would have voted for the resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) has not voted.

Mr. TROW. I paired with the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) up to three o'clock. I see he is not here, and I continue my pair.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) has not voted.

Mr. KIRK. I am paired with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron). I would have voted against the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149), to provide for the payment of a bounty on pig iron made from Canadian ore.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved further consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 6) relating to Bills of Exchange, cheques and Promissory Notes.

On the third amendment,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is an amendment to section 19 which refers to a qualified acceptance, that is to say, acceptance payable at a particular place. The object of the amendment made by the Senate is to provide that a bill payable at a particular place is not thereby a qualified acceptance. They leave out sub-section 3 of the Bill, and, later on, it is provided that the bill shall be presented at the place indicated, and the effect of non-presentment is, as to the acceptor, simply a question of costs in the discretion of the court, in any suit which may arise. The amendment gets rid of the words: "payable only there and not elsewhere." It establishes the principle that an acceptance payable at a particular place is not a qualified acceptance within the meaning of this Act, and that, therefore, an acceptance in that form, does not discharge the other parties to the instrument. It goes on to provide that there must be a presentment at that place.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to ascertain from the hon. Minister, whether there can be a qualified acceptance, as to place ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, there can be; but the result of that qualification is not the discharge of any previous party to the bill. The result is simply that it must be there presented, under the penalty of costs in regard to the acceptor.

On the fourth amendment,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This amendment is subsidiary to the last. It merely leaves out subsection c of section 19, regarding a local acceptance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that, suppose a bill is made payable at a particular place and not elsewhere, it is not a qualified acceptance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; there is no qualified acceptance, within the original meaning of the term, as the Bill left this House except as to the endorser.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E. I.) Then, the Senate have deviated from the English statute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. If a man accepts a bill payable at the Bank of Montreal and not elsewhere, he is still liable at any place, provided the bill is presented at the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How about the endorser?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is in the same position as before. Presentment is necessary as to him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that by the common law, which this Bill leaves when not expressly altered, if an acceptor accepts payment at a particular place and not elsewhere, you must, to hold the endorser liable, present the bill on the day it falls due at that place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand that there is any express stipulation in this Bill altering that common law by making the endorser continue liable, whether the presentation be made according to the expressed contract or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think, if we find that the Senate amendments have not worked out that properly, we should amend the amendments, so far as the endorsers are concerned, but I think I found the other day that that was worked out.

On the fifth amendment,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This embodies an amendment to the law with regard to forgery. The House will remember that, the other afternoon, when the Bill was before the House, I urged that a section should be adopted to relieve the bank from the consequences of paying on a forged endorsement. The Senate has gone to some extent in that direction. They provide the following amendment:—

"Page 8, line 8.—After 'forgery' insert 'And provided also, that if a cheque, payable to order, is paid by the drawee upon a forged endorsement out of the funds of the drawer, or is so paid and charged to his account, the drawer shall have no right of action against the drawee for the recovery back of the amount so paid, or no defence to any claim to the drawee for the amount so paid, as the case may be, unless he gives notice in writing of such forgery to the drawee within one year from the date at which he has received notice of such payment, by the delivery to him of such cheque, of any book or statement containing an entry of such payment, or otherwise; and in case of failure by the drawer to give such notice within the said period, such cheque shall be held to have been paid in due course, as respects every other party thereto or named therein, who has not previously instituted proceedings for the protection of his rights."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think that is reasonable enough, with the exception of the provision that notice must be given in writing. If that were struck out, the banks would still have to be notified, but not necessarily in writing. In these days, business is done to a considerable extent through the telephones or verbally, and when a merchant finds out that a forged check has been charged to his bank account, he may, not being acquainted with the law, simply notify the bank through the telephone. If the bank clerk to whom the notification was given omitted to attend to the matter, the merchant, thinking no more about it, might at the end of the year be held responsible through having given insufficient notification.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman would get rid of a very small amount of present trouble at the expense of a great deal of future litigation. There is nothing more calculated to bring about trouble than telephone communications in matters of this kind, and nothing concerning which there would be so much contradictory testimony. It is a very easy matter for the merchant to send a notice in writing, and no practical inconvenience would arise from this clause.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the case mentioned by the hon. member for Brant of a telephone message, an investigation would follow, as a matter of course, but to allow the notification being made verbally would only create confusion. There is no evidence so conflicting as that with regard to verbal statements.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The practice has always been heretofore that if the bank pays a cheque bearing a forged signature, it is held liable. A great many people do business with banks, who have very little knowledge of the forms of law, and would not be likely to know what is required under this law; and as soon as the bank got notice, whether by telephone or in any other way, that the signature was a forged one, that ought to be sufficient. If you insist on notice being given in writing, you will create a great deal of confusion among those who are not conversant with the requirements of the law. When you provide that the bank shall have notice, I do not think it matters much whether the notice be by telephone or otherwise.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When the cheque is charged against the account, the merchant will soon see that proper notice be given.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But as soon as the notice is given through the telephone, the cheque would be struck off his account, and there would be no charge for it against him; but at the end of the year, simply because he did not give written notice, the cheque might be charged again.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There are so many circumstances surrounding a forgery, that an investigation would be sure to be held, and a verbal notification would give rise to a good deal of contradictory evidence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In 99 cases out of 100 the information comes to a person who is charged with a cheque within a month or two after the forgery can have been effectual or after the money has been paid, and, if we allow a year, I think we are giving a very liberal time. If we allow the notice to be given verbally, there may be some misunderstanding in the conferences that

will ensue, and the result may be doubtful as to whether the bank understood that the cheque would be repudiated or not. I think it is better that this should be clearly stated.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This amendment provides that the notice may be given by the delivery of the cheque, or any book or statement containing the cheque, or otherwise. I think the delivery of the cheque should be sufficient. The delivery of the pass-book containing an entry of the cheque would not be sufficient, because most people receive their pass-books at the end of the month and see a cheque they have given charged to them, and do not enquire further.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If any man received his pass-book he would certainly check over the cheques which were entered against him and see whether they were forgeries or not.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This is a question of a forged endorsement.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I can see the difficulty. The delivery of the pass-book would hardly be giving notice of a forged endorsement.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The cheque may have been properly issued, but, if the cheque itself is not shown to the drawer, he cannot tell whether the endorsement has been forged or not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It must be remembered that this is a concession to the banks in comparison with the old law. It might be impossible for a person, even after he had the cheque in his hands, to tell whether it was a forgery or not. It has been customary amongst business men, that when a person who has an account sends them a cheque payable to their order, they are careless whether they get a receipt or not, because they take it for granted that the cheque is properly made. Here you require that notice must be given in writing. A great deal of this business is done over the telephone. A conversation might take place over the telephone with the bank, and that would not be sufficient. The Minister of Justice and some of my hon. friends on this side of the House say that it would lead to litigation afterwards ; but it seems to me, that two or three verbal communications of that kind with the bank would prove beyond a doubt that they had the notice, because the bank clerks could not forget that they had received the notice in regard to that particular note. A person not conversant with the law might allow the note to remain in abeyance, thinking it was perfectly understood in the bank, and would not give the notice in writing.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I can understand the difficulty suggested in reference to the pass-book. But a man finds a cheque charged against him payable to John Smith. He has given a cheque to John Smith, and he thinks it is all right ; but, if he gets the cheque returned to him, I think, in nine times out of ten, he will know the handwriting of the endorser.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Not at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that if you sent a cheque to a man and did not get it back within a year, you would enquire in regard to it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there is something in what my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) says, but I think the return of the cheque should be sufficient, because the drawer is the person primarily responsible for having made it, and it is for his convenience that it was made, and if he gets an endorsement he ought to be responsible for it. That does not deprive the endorser of any rights against the drawer of the cheque. I would propose an amendment to amend the amendment.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Before that is moved, I would say that my hon. friend (Mr. Weldon, St. John) is quite wrong in stating that it would be known whether many of these endorsements were forged or not. Many cheques are made payable to order, and you do not know the signature of the party to whose order the cheque is made payable. This is a concession to the bank. The cheque is given from Ottawa payable at Montreal, where it is cashed. The diligence of ascertaining that this is not forged should rest upon the bank in Montreal, who have better means of knowing it than the person here. It requires caution on the part of the bank. By adopting this provision you relax the vigilance required on the part of the bank.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is not the case, as my hon. friend puts it, that the bank can wait 48 hours before making enquiries. It would be unfair to the bank that a man should wait five years and eleven months and then come in and say that the check was forged. If the cheque is given to the individual himself and he loses it, the drawer is charged, but if he sends the cheque through by letter and it never reaches the drawee and falls into the hands of other parties, then of course the drawer is not relieved. If my hon. friend, in the course of business, sent a cheque to a firm in Montreal and did not get an early acknowledgment, he would feel disquieted.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There is no doubt, that in the many hundreds of thousands of cases where these cheques have gone through banks, we have very seldom heard any cases of payment of forged cheques or forged endorsements. The reason of that is, that the banks have been heretofore liable for it, they have exercised great vigilance in seeing that the person to whom they pay the cheque is known to them. If the cheque is sent from here to Montreal, it is paid through an agent to the bank there, and the man who goes to get that cheque cashed must be known to the bank. They could refuse to pay it at Montreal, unless they were satisfied of the identity of the applicant. It is only done there as a matter of courtesy. He has not got his account there. It is paid to whom it is sent, and the party generally deposits it in his bank. Any amendment to this law which will relax the vigilance of the banks, I think, is to be deprecated. I think we would be better without any amendment at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then my hon. friend would say that a man could lie by until the expiration of six years and then come in and say the endorsement is forged. What position would that bank be in then ? In England, where they understand these things, they have chosen to alter the law, and I think we have a right to do it also. According to the hon. member for Frontenac, the bank has got to run the risk of refusing the cheque, and be responsible to the drawer of the check for damages.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No ; the account is here. They do not promise to pay that cheque in Montreal. If the agency of the bank pays it in Montreal, they must have the person identified who comes for the money. They ought to be vigilant in seeing that the person to whom it is paid, is the person for whom it is intended.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, cheques are paid at the bank in the place where they are drawn.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that the Minister of Justice accepts the amendment of the member for Renfrew (Mr. White). I think that removes any grievance that can exist.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we can appreciate the full weight of the objection to the change by testing the illustration of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson). He puts the case of a merchant, say in Ottawa, sending a cheque to his creditor in Montreal. He admits that there is no hardship at all, provided the drawer knows the endorsement of the person to whom he makes the cheque payable. There, surely, can be no hardship in that case. He receives back his cheque. He either knows, or does not know, that the endorsement is a forgery ; he ought to know it, because he has required his bank to pay on the endorsement of that person. Surely he cannot say the loss by any forgery should fall on the bank for not knowing the signature of the person to whom he has made the cheque payable, and whose signature he does not know himself, and if he does not know it, he has twelve months to find it out, and there is hardly one business transaction in a thousand in which he would not find it out by having information from his creditor that he had not received his remittance. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the bank in Montreal would not be obliged to pay and could demand identification. But the bank in Ottawa on whom, perhaps, the cheque is drawn, would not be bound by the identification in Montreal either, nor would that be any information to the bank in Ottawa. The bank in Ottawa must pay on its judgment of whether the signature is forged. The true test of the genuineness of the signature, I think, is to give the man back his cheque, and give him twelve months to ascertain whether that is a correct signature or not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister must not lose sight of the fact that we are speaking about what has been the law and the custom. If this clause is struck out altogether and the law stands as it has been for years, I do not see what hardship it could be to the bank. The established custom for years among business men has been to draw a cheque payable to the order of one of their creditors, and when that has been done they have been very careless as to whether the receipt was given or not, because the very fact of drawing their cheque payable to order and getting that cheque back, paid by the bank, having it in their possession, they have considered it equivalent to a statute. It would be quite natural if, not having heard from the creditor, not having received a receipt from him, they should be careless and say : Well, according to our custom we have made it payable to order, and the cheque is either not charged against us, or if it is charged against us, it stands as a receipt.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not see why any change in the law, which has always worked well and in respect of which no complaints have been made by the banks, should be made. It is one that is now thoroughly understood and to which the people have become accustomed. If I draw a cheque on the bank of Ottawa to the order of John Smith payable in Montreal, and John Smith takes that cheque to the Bank of Montreal in Montreal, the bank need not pay the cheque unless they please to do so. But before they do pay it, they use due diligence to see that the cheque is properly endorsed by John Smith, and if they do not know him, they ask that he be identified. If payment is made by the Bank of Montreal, the onus rests on that bank. A long period may elapse before a forgery is discovered, as you may have a running account with a business man and no settlement be arrived at, and you do not take the trouble to notice whether you receive an acknowledgment of every cheque or not. Unless there can be some reason shown why the law should be changed, and unless the banks have suffered some hardship, we should not readily change the law to which the people have become accustomed, and which has given general satisfaction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This matter is, in a large degree, one of convenience. In the vast majority of cases there is no loss sustained, either by the banks or by the makers of the cheques. Under the present law, and with the responsibility resting on the banks, they are called upon to ascertain whether the party who presents the cheque is the party entitled. If it be presented by a stranger, the bank usually asks him to come with some one known to the bank. Do away with that responsibility, and that precaution taken by the banks is not adopted. A dishonest man very seldom likes to face the bank, and a refusal to present a person to identify him at once places the bank on its guard.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The argument of the hon. member for Bothwell would have been a very good one in favor of the original clause of the Bill, which would have relieved the banks of all responsibility. If this amendment is adopted, the banks will not relax their vigilance in regard to the payment of cheques ; but, if the maker of a cheque has ascertained that a forgery has been committed, he is bound to give notice to the bank at an early day. At the present time that notice may be delayed five years and eleven months, until it is impossible to find out the guilty party.

Mr. TISDALE. I have a very strong objection to any change being made in the law. The clause was thoroughly threshed out before in this House, and no cause for any change has been adduced. The people have become accustomed to the practice, and the bankers are not put to any unnecessary trouble and meet no losses. I am opposed to any provision that will tend to relaxation of diligence on the part of the banks.

Mr. CHARLTON. I thoroughly agree with what has fallen from the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). I am unable to see why the Government should not with as great propriety legislate for the repayment of money which one party has handed to another party, but has been lost by him. Under the old law when a man drew a cheque payable to order, the bank was responsible if they paid that cheque to the wrong party. That was

an equitable arrangement, because the bank had the benefit of the deposit, and the cheque was paid out of funds left in the hands of the bank for such purpose. The law has worked well as it is, and as no cause of complaint has been made out, it should be allowed to remain, and this amendment should not be agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. I would not object to a provision that if we limit the time to a very short time after the drawing of the cheque within which to ascertain whether it was a forgery, a notice should be given to the bank.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Justice previously yielded the point in deference to the wishes of a large number of members of the House, and I ask the hon. gentleman to maintain his position and strike out this clause.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will try the sense of the House first on the motion which I now move to strike out the following words in page 8, line 8, "on any book or statement containing an entry of such payment or otherwise." Subsequently, I will take the sense of the House on the clause as amended.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move concurrence in the amendment as amended.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the expression of opinion given on both sides of this House, by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), should meet with the general approval of this House. The business transactions of the country in the use of cheques, have been carried on in the past without any serious complaints from the banks, and I do not think this innovation should be made. If a man makes a cheque payable to a person at a distant point, it facilitates his business, and it is the duty of the bank to take precaution to see that the endorsement of the party to whom the cheque is made payable is properly made. The best evidence that the old system has been sucessfully operated in the past is that few, if any, difficulties have arisen under it. When this law has worked so admirably in the past, it would be imprudent on the part of this House to alter the principles on which business has been transacted in this country for many years. If this amendment is accepted you will find that banks will overlook the precautions they have taken in the past and the drawers of cheques will be put to considerable inconvenience and loss. I think we should continue in force a law which has given such general satisfaction, and not make an alteration in it which will place the trading public in an awkward position. In my opinion it is the duty of the bank to see that a cheque is properly endorsed.

Mr. BLAKE. I move "that the amendment be further amended by leaving out all the words after "one" down to "payment" and inserting the words, "a month after he has acquired notice of such forgery."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the question is taken I would like to say that, for my part, I would be quite willing to adopt that amendment. Instead of going to the trouble of taking a vote, I would like to have some expression of opinion from hon. gentlemen on the matter.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think that amendment seems to meet the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would prefer to have the amendment dropped out altogether, and leave the law as it formerly stood.

General LAURIE. I should prefer to see the clause dropped out altogether.

Mr. TISDALE. So should I.

General LAURIE. The system at present prevailing has worked exceedingly well in the past, especially for those who live at long distances from banks. Our only means of paying accounts has been by sending cheques, and we have had to trust to parties receiving them endorsing the cheque as a receipt. I have very much to regret that any other plan should be adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will see that the proposed amendment is not open to this objection. The amendment is: that if you have acquired notice of the fact that the cheque is forged, you ought, within a month, to give notice to the bank. You are not to hold it in your pocket for five years and eleven months.

Mr. TISDALE. This amendment is sure to lead to a great deal of trouble and confusion as to what notice is. I think the safer way is to leave the law as it stands at present.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My opinion is, that if the drawer of a cheque gets notice of a forged endorsement, he is not likely to keep it in his possession for five years and eleven months. He is more than likely to give the bank notice just as soon as it comes to his knowledge that the cheque is forged. But the law as it has stood heretofore seems to have worked without any considerable friction, and, for my part, I would prefer leaving it as it is, and striking out the Senate amendment altogether.

Mr. BOYLE. I prefer the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham to the proposition of the hon. Minister of Justice, but I prefer the old law to either of them. But I am in this difficulty, that by voting for the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham, I would commit myself to the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice. Under these circumstances, I feel that the only safe course for me to take will be to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham and also against the proposition of the hon. Minister of Justice. The law has worked so well that I think no change should be made, unless some improvement on this amendment is proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe that by voting for my amendment, which he prefers, he may carry it; and after carrying it, he is quite at liberty to vote against the amendment as amended; whereas, if he votes against my amendment, he may have the worse proposition carried, instead of the better.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A cheque payable to order is really an innovation. The effect of the amendment will be that the bankers, to protect themselves, will revert to the old system.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see how anyone can object to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Durham. That a man who has drawn a cheque and receives notice that its endorsement has been forged, should give the bank

notice within a month, is not an unreasonable proposition. There can be no possible injustice to any one in such an arrangement.

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to the assertion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), that cheques are generally made payable to bearer, my experience has been quite the reverse. For my part, I never make a cheque payable to bearer, in order to guard the interests of the person who receives the cheque. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Durham is a very great improvement, which I am willing to accept, if afterwards I shall be free to vote to leave the law as it was before. I would ask whether we can do that ?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly. If my amendment were carried, the clause as amended would be before the House, and the hon. gentleman could vote yea or nay on the clause.

Amendment of Mr. Blake agreed to.

House divided on amendment as amended-

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Innes,
Béchard,	Jones (Digby),
Bernier,	Jones (Halifax),
Blake,	Kenny,
Boisvert,	Kirk,
Borden,	Landerkin,
Bourassa,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bowell,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Lovitt,
Brown,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Cameron,	McCulla,
Carling,	McDougald (Pictou),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McMullen,
Casgrain,	Mills (Annapolis),
Chapleau,	Mills (Bothwell),
Colby,	Moncrieff,
Costigan,	Neveu,
Daly,	O'Brien,
Davies,	Putnam,
Davin,	Riopel,
Dickinson,	Robillard,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Eisenhauer,	Ste. Marie,
Ferguson (Renfrew)	Small,
Foster,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Temple,
Gillmor,	Thompson (Sir John),
Godbout,	Tyrwhitt,
Grandbois,	Weldon (St. John).—58.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	McDonald (Victoria),
Audet,	McMillan (Huron),
Bain (Wentworth),	Madill,
Boyle,	Masson,
Brien,	Montague,
Burns,	Mulock,
Campbell,	Paterson (Brant),
Charlton,	Porter,
Cochrane,	Purcell,
Coughlin,	Scriver,
Davis,	Semple,
Doyon,	Sproule,
Dupont,	Tisdale,
Ellis,	Wallace,
Ferguson (Welland),	Watson,
Gigault,	White (Cardwell),
Gordon,	White (Renfrew),
Guillet,	Wilmot,
Hesson,	Wilson (Elgin),
Hudspeth,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—43.
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),	

Mr. SMALL. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not voted.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint); otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

On amendment 30,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This it to omit section 96 altogether.

Amendment concurred in.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 140), to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting Interest."

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me it is desirable to repeal those special sections regarding New Brunswick, namely, from 18 to 23 inclusive, as they are not necessary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not see why they should not be repealed. There are special provisions all through this Act relating to the different Provinces, the policy being apparently to keep in force parts of the old usury laws of the Provinces while there was a possibility of contracts made under those parts of old usury laws having force, and preserving likewise the penalties so far as they relate to such contracts. We have, however, run through a period of twenty-three years, and I think that the effect of these provisions has ceased. It is on that principle, apparently, that the Senate has adopted the second clause of the Bill which repeals certain provisions relating to Ontario and Quebec. I have no objections to the hon. gentleman's proposal to repeal the special provisions relating to New Brunswick.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My view is to make the whole thing uniform throughout the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The last three sections, which relate to Prince Edward Island, are quite unnecessary. The interest is controlled by subsection 2 of section 1. It merely enacts that where there is no special contract 6 per cent. shall be exacted. That is provided for by subsection 2 of section 1. These three sections, 28, 29 and 30, might well be repealed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for St. John wants sections 18 to 23 repealed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would it not be better that the Committee should now rise in order that the subject may be further considered ?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). At the time the Provinces went into Confederation there were various statutes in force regulating the rates of interest, which were different in the respective Provinces. In 1875 a general Act was passed, of which this is a consolidation. I think it would be better to repeal all the sections after section 8 and make the law uniform throughout the Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We had better pass the clause we have in the Bill.

Progress reported.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

(In the Committee.)

On section 91,

Mr. FOSTER. There is a slight change in this section. The old Act provided that the suspension of payment by a bank for ninety days constituted a bank's insolvency. The words "consecutively or at intervals within twelve consecutive months" are added.

On section 96,

Mr. FOSTER. After the word "or," in line 39 of this section, I wish to substitute the following :—

Or persons whose subscriptions to the stock of the bank have been cancelled in manner hereinbefore provided, within a period of three months before the commencement of the suspension of payment by the bank, shall be liable to all calls on such shares held by them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see the period is changed from thirty days to three months. It seems to me that unless there is some very good reasons for this, the change would be very undesirable.

Mr. FOSTER. The change is to afford greater security against the transference of shares, and of responsibility, on the bank becoming suspected of being weak. This section makes the different classes of shareholders, namely, those who transfer their shares, those who have had their shares cancelled in accordance with the powers given under section 30, and those who have had their shares forfeited on account of non-payment or otherwise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is very hard to defend the fixing of any arbitrary period, and we must just take such period as in the good sense of the Committee it thinks would be a fair time to cover fraudulent transferences. It does seem to me that the thirty days limit was reasonable, and that the extending of it for three months would make the time so long that it would impair contracts which are made *bonâ fide* in the open markets by those who could not have knowledge or even suspicion of the possible failure of the bank. If a man buys or sells stock in the month of May or June, the presumption is rather against his having any knowledge that the bank might fail in September. I think a *bonâ fide* contract of sale, made three months before the bank becomes insolvent, ought be protected. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell me, if the thirty days arrange ment, in the old Act, was found to be inconvenient. Instances may have arisen out of the Exchange Bank, which may have suggested this change. With regard to the bank I had a personal knowledge of and whose failure took place one or two years ago, we found this period of thirty days to act very well. It does seem that three months is rather an abnormal extension of the time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the thirty days period has been found in practice to be too short. It is very easy for a bank whose condition is hopeless to be kept running for thirty days, and in that thirty days the directors themselves and their friends could get out of the liability. The old provision has been found in practice to work so that the extension of the period is thought necessary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Perhaps that provision could be directed so far as the directors are concerned, but it seems to me very hard that it should apply in relation to *bonâ fide* transactions. I know that in nearly every instance in the Maritime Bank case, that the sales were all *bonâ fide* up to a very short period of the bank's suspension. If this could be directed against the directors or persons connected with the bank, it would be a different thing, for the very instant they attempt to sell or put their stock in the market, it creates a suspicion. In the case of the Maritime Bank there were some cases of very great hardship, both parties believing the stock good, and they had not the least suspicion of the bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that opening up all sales for three months before the suspension of the bank would be rather dangerous.

Mr. FOSTER. The period of one month will be admitted by the Committee to be too short. Suppose we make it sixty days ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is satisfactory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you throw the onus on the party, if the transaction was a *bonâ fide* one, or do you cancel the sale altogether ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The sale is not good. The transferee is practically liable for the double liability.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The man who accepted the stock is also liable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He has recourse against the vendee unless he sold to a man of straw.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose the holder of the shares at the time the bank fails, does not pay, and you go back to the original vendor who sold the shares three months previously ; what recourse would he have unless you give him special recourse by statute ? I cannot see where the implied contract would come in under the common law ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The vendee has purchased the shares, and the contract implies that he will take them with the liability that attaches to them. It is not worth while to discuss what the vendor's remedy will be, because the liquidator of the bank will find out that the vendee is worthless before he calls on the vendor.

On section 99,

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister whether this section will apply to private banks doing business throughout the country. Some years ago, a provision was adopted in this House requiring private banks to put on their signs the words, "not incorporated." There are still a number of these banks doing business, and some of them think this clause as it stands, may interfere with their operations.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only the names that are expressly mentioned here would be prohibited.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If they use the words, "not incorporated," could they then use any of the titles mentioned in this section ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

On section 102,

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to change this, to make it read as follows :—

The bank shall not charge any discount or commission for cashing any official cheque of the Government of Canada, or of any Department thereof, whether drawn on itself or on another bank.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This change, as I understand, merely removes the compulsion, and requires that the banks, if they cash Government cheques, shall not charge any discount.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

On schedule D,

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest a change in schedule D. I would suggest that, in the column of liabilities, after the figure 8, the word "balance" be struck out and "deposit" substituted, and the same after figure 9; and that in the column of assets, after figure 7, the word "balance" be struck out and the word "sums" be substituted, and the same after figure 8. At present you will see, by looking at the list of liabilities, that it reads: balance due to agencies of the bank or to other banks or agencies in foreign countries. Under that provision, the bank is only obliged to publish a return of the net balance of its assets over liabilities, or *vice versa*, so that the official return to the Government does not give a full statement of the liabilities of the bank or of its assets. To illustrate that, I have just made a rough comparison between the return made in December last by a certain bank, under the general Act, and its return to its own shareholders. I find, according to the London *Economist* of 8th March, 1890, a return showing the assets and liabilities of a certain bank. I will only take the column of liabilities as a matter of comparison. Under that column it appears this bank had liabilities amounting to £5,555,989 13s. 11d. Deducting from that column certain liabilities to certain shareholders, it leaves a balance of liabilities due to the public of £3,257,506, or, in currency, $15,831,479. That was this bank's admitted liability to the public according to its return to its own shareholders, which, I presume, is a return according to the requirements of the English Act. Turn to the return made under the Banking Act here, and you find that its liabilities to the public at large amount to $8,827,014; so that, according to the return under our Banking Act, the bank only owes to the general public $8,827,000, whereas, under its return to its shareholders, it owed to the general public $15,000,000. The reason of the difference of the result is that, according to our Act, the banks are not obliged to give the full extent of their liabilities in foreign countries, but are allowed to deduct their assets in foreign countries, for example, money deposited with them in foreign countries, and only declare their net balances, whatever it be. If the form is to be complete, this other information should be given as well. I do not think it would be wise to prevent Canadian banks, to a limited extent, from being able to carry on business outside of the Dominion. We know there are times—it may be at all times—when it might be well that a bank might have a considerable amount of assets invested in a foreign country, say in New York, where its assets could be immediately convertible, and therefore, available in our own country in a few hours. I am not making this suggestion with any view to hamper the banks, but simply to have a full return made.

Mr. KENNY. I do not think the Committee thoroughly appreciates the object of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I understand that he advises the change of the word "balances" into the word "sums." The hon. gentleman will see that No. 8 shows the liabilities of the Canadian banks to their foreign correspondents and amongst the assets is also shown the indebtedness of their foreign correspondents to them. Taking the return of the 31st March, I find that the Canadian banks show indebtedness to their foreign correspondents amounting to $193,921, and the same statement shows that they had at their credit in the hands of their foreign correspondents $10,393,027. I contend that that shows the exact business relations at that date of the Canadian banks with their foreign correspondents.

Mr. MULOCK. That is all of them grouped together.

Mr. KENNY. It gives the accurate condition of those accounts with our banks.

Mr. MULOCK. I say, that at present there is no obligation upon any bank to show how much it owes to a foreign agency as gross liabilities, or what are its gross assets in that foreign agency. It is only obliged to show the balance. A bank may, at its foreign agency, owe $15,000,000 to the general public, and yet, according to our present law, it is only obliged to show a net balance or liability, which might be $8,000,000.

Mr. KENNY. Does the bank to which the hon. gentleman refers enjoy any special privileges? Is it a bank working under an English charter?

Mr. MULOCK. Every bank in Canada has to work under the same provisions. The schedules are sent out by the Government. The Government have no right to demand further returns than the law requires. Any bank in Canada which has an agency in New York may have a deposit there of $15,000,000. It owes that amount beyond all question. It may have discounted American paper there for $20,000,000. What is the state of the bank? There is no doubt about the $15,000,000 which it has to pay. Then it reckons $20,000,000 owing to it by the Americans. If that is all paid, there is a net balance of $5,000,000, but there may be a loss. Still, that $5,000,000 is the net balance shown under the present law, whereas I contend that they should show that they have liabilities of $15,000,000 to that agency and that $20,000,000 is due by that agency. It is for the public then to say what inference they draw from the operations of the bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that my hon. friend Mr. Mulock is right, and as a matter of fact that state of things may and probably does exist. If we want an accurate statement of the banks' affairs, the liabilities and the assets ought to be both put in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. While that matter is being considered, I will ask the Committee to revert to clause 37, in which I propose to insert after the words "null and void:"

"Saving, however, as to a purchaser not having knowledge of the defect, his rights and remedies under the contract of sale."

Another amendment is required in line 20 of the same section. Just before we come to that are

these words "unless he shall be at the time thereof the registered owner in the books of the bank of the share or shares so sold or transferred, or intended or purported so to be." I want to add the words: "or shall have the assent of the registered owner to the sale, or acting with the assent of the registered owner."

Mr. TISDALE. There is no provision for the recording of proxies in section 18, and I propose to put in after the word "hold," in line 5 of subsection 1, the following:—"A record to be made of proxies and the time prior to the meeting when proxies must be produced and recorded in order to entitle the holder to act thereon."

Progress reported.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on resolution (p. 4261) respecting the proposed contract of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain what he proposes to do, and give his reasons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This resolution is for the purpose of giving similar pecuniary aid, and in a similar way, to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Prince Albert Railway. The House will remember that last Session there was an agreement, or contract, made with the railway giving it $50,000 a year as a loan, or an annual payment for ten years of $5,000 a year, as soon as the railway was completed to Battleford, which was increased to $80,000 when completed to Prince Albert. The railway company had up to 1892 to finish the work. As the House knows, there has been series of charters granted with land subsidies attached, but, with one or two exceptions, these land grants have not been sufficient to induce investors to undertake the task of constructing those roads. In order, therefore, to make a connection between the railway line across the continent and our great line of water communication, also across the continent, the Saskatchewan, the Government asked Parliament to make an arrangement, and Parliament did so, by which, in addition to the grant of 6,400 acres of land, they should receive an annual grant of money, and for such grants the road was obliged to do all the transport work, carry the mails, officers and other passengers on Government business, transport all goods and Indian supplies and supplies for the Mounted Police, and so on, and that an annual account should be kept of all the work done, fair prices to be agreed upon between the Government and the railway, and the earnings for the year should be credited against the advance of $80,000 a year. One-third of the land grant was to be held as security for the annual deficiency, if any. The proposition worked like magic, and a contract was made at once. Capitalists were found to build the road, and I am glad to be able to inform the House that, although the time allowed for building the road will not expire until 1892, the railway will be finished by 1st July to Saskatoon, and by 1st January next year to Prince Albert. So there will be a connection of 240 miles made between our great means of transport across the continent by water and land. The other great line which the Government, and I hope Parliament, will see to be equally important is the line connecting Calgary with Edmonton. The House knows that is the great ranching country. It is at present one of the most favored localities in the great North-West for immigration, and for the investment of capital in cattle-raising and other industries. The necessity of a railway in that region has long been admitted by Parliament, but that district has been singularly unfortunate in regard to securing railway accommodation. A charter was granted with the usual land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, some years ago, to a number of gentlemen, some Americans and some Canadians, to build that road. They failed altogether. Two years ago negotiations took place with some English capitalists, including two leading members of two banking establishments in London. Both of those houses are exceedingly respectable, and the individual members of the two houses, who became promoters of the undertaking, are gentlemen of very good standing, and they made every *bonâ fide* exertion to raise sufficient capital to build that railway. As the Government and Parliament thought it was of great importance that the road should be built as speedily as possible, and as an inducement to construct the road within three years, the land grant was increased to 10,000 acres a mile, instead of 6,400 acres. The syndicate did all they could to obtain sufficient capital for the purpose of completing the work, but they failed and acknowledged that they had to give up the task. When that country was almost in despair, the same parties who raised the money to build the Qu'Appelle and the Prince Albert roads, and the same contractors, agreed to build a road from Calgary to a point near Edmonton, and also to build from Calgary to the frontier. The $80,000 a year subsidy which we propose to give, is applicable only to the line between Calgary and Edmonton; that is the purely Canadian portion of it, and the company is to earn for doing Government work, in the same way as the other roads. They propose to commence the road next year and to complete it in 1893. While they stipulate this period for commencement and completion, they intend to finish it much before that period, as they have done in the case of the Qu'Appelle road. For fear of accident, however, they want to have the time I have mentioned specified, and the House will admit that is to be a very speedy construction of a road upwards of 200 miles long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the distance from Calgary to Edmonton?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 200 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to give 10,000 acres?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. As they are to get this annual payment, they are only to get, as in the case of the Qu'Appelle Railway, 6,400 acres; but they will receive no money contribution for the road south of Calgary running to the boundary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But they would get the land.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They would get 6,400 acres. These were the terms, as far as the land grant is concerned, that were given to the other railway companies. The additional assist-

ance, without which I think there would be no chance of the road being built, is the $80,000 a year, and we retain a-third of the land, in addition to any earnings of the company, as security for the ultimate payment of the whole advance. Whether we will do so or not, one cannot say, as that depends on the amount of the earnings, I fancy. They have made arrangements, also, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, similar to these made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Qu'Appelle Railway, that is, the Canadian Pacific Railway undertakes to run the line, furnishing the rolling stock, and doing all the work of the railway, in fact, for six years from the time of the completion of the road, when it is handed over to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Canadian Pacific Railway, as I understand you, are virtually going to lease this road ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They lease it in fact for six years, furnishing the rolling stock, as is done in the case of the Qu'Appelle road. I hope, and indeed I am almost satisfied, that the expectation that the road will be completed as expeditiously as the other road was, will be fully realised. As I said already, the parties who furnish the money, undertake to negotiate the loans in England, the same as in the case of the Qu'Appelle road, and the contractor, Mr. James Ross, whom perhaps the hon. gentleman opposite knows, has undertaken to build the road and to push it forward to completion, with the same energy that he displayed in the construction of the Qu'Appelle road. He expects to finish one hundred miles this year, and to complete the line to Edmonton by 1891, although, in the terms of the contract, the time is extended one or two years longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, no doubt in the present position of affairs in the North-West Territories, any proposition to open up that country, and to increase settlement there, deserves our best consideration. But there are two or three things in connection with this, to which I would like to call the attention of the House, and as well, the attention of the First Minister, who is especially charged with this matter. I dare say the right hon. gentleman recollects that last year, in reply to a question put by myself to the Minister of the Interior, it appeared that he had almost entirely parted with the control of the arable land between the Red River and the Rocky Mountains ; that is to say, that we had pledged ourselves to grants, which, if we continue our present practice of giving acre for acre to the settler there, would practically exhaust the land at our disposal. I think the First Minister was in the House at the time the discussion took place ; but if not, he can refresh his memory by looking at *Hansard*. My impression was then, that very great care would need to be exercised against making indiscriminate grants in the future, if we desired to realise anything at all—as the hon. First Minister in former times hoped to do—towards recouping the people of the older Provinces for the enormous sums of money which have been expended in our western country. However that is, perhaps, a minor consideration. There is another point connected with these grants to railroads, to which I would like to call the hon. gentleman's special attention. A good many years ago when we were induced—at the earnest request of the railway companies themselves, and also at the request of the Government—to give up to them, without any payment, the lands which had been granted heretofore to certain railroads similarly circumstanced, on which the Government had reserved a dollar an acre ; I called the right hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there was great danger that these lands would to a large extent go into mortmain : unless some precautions were taken by the Government, when making these grants, to see that they would be put on the market at a reasonable rate, so that settlers, if they choose, might get possession of them. I am alluding more particularly to the case of the land which we granted in Southern Manitoba to the Manitoba and South-Western Railway, and which afterwards passed into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have had innumerable communications from settlers in that country on this matter, and I am personally acquainted with the fact, that after these roads were handed over by the Government, free of charge, and after we had abandoned our prior lien, of a dollar an acre on these lands, the company, for reasons best known to themselves, put these lands in the market at a practically prohibitory price, and the settlement and progress of Southern Manitoba has been in consequence enormously retarded ever since. I doubt whether even at the present moment, these lands are offered at a reasonable rate, but my information is that they are not. By some arrangement, which I am not exactly conversant with, the company are able to hold the land without paying taxation, and one of the worst evils that was apprehended, has resulted from the neglect of the Government to take the course which I then advised. Now, if we are going to give to these roads bonuses to the extent proposed, which I think amount to something like $1,000,000 in cash—that is converting the $80,000 for twenty years into its present cash equivalent—together with 1,280,000 acres of land, I think we ought in all conscience, in our interest and in the interest of the public, to insist that these lands should be offered to the public, at least for a term of years, at a reasonable rate. Of course, I would not object to reasonable reservations for stations and other purposes of that kind. I do not object to this rate being placed fairly high, but it ought to be reasonable, and based on reasonable terms of payment. If we put out of our hands huge tracts of land like this, the settler, who is the person we desire to encourage, and for whose benefit alone we are justified in using the money of the people to this extent and parting with any portion of the public domain, should not be, as he has been elsewhere, excluded on one pretence or another from a large part of the land. Nothing has retarded the settlement of portions of that region more than the introduction of what is called the checker-board system, whereby each alternate mile has been handed over to the companies, and in many cases practically taken out of the market. I do not know whether the Government have altered their policy in this respect, as the late Mr. White stated they intended to do, and purpose granting the land in alternate townships. I think, however, that it would be in the general interest, if it appears good to the House to make these grants, that some precaution in the line I have indicated should be taken to ensure actual settlers being

able to get lands at a reasonable rate. At present I shall not make any suggestion, but I hope the Government will consider the advisability of fixing some rate. I can assure the hon. First Minister that the evil I speak of has resulted in great injury to the southern part of the Province of Manitoba, where, if I am not misinformed, it has cost us many thousand settlers, besides greatly retarding the progress of the country for the settlers already there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the danger of the land being held in mortmain, I do not think there is any real danger of the land being held by the railway companies from purchasers. The hon. gentleman knows that they look for traffic as their chief source of income; they cannot have traffic unless they have population; it is to their interest; and so far as I hear, they are aware of that, and have offered their lands at reasonable rates. The hon. gentleman says one thing that is true to a certain extent, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by their charter, are not obliged to pay taxes on their land until it is sold.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, in the case to which I referred the charter did not apply. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company held the lands as the assignees of the Manitoba South-Western Railway Company, who had no such privilege; and it was their arrangement, not with this Government, but with the Local Government, by which they succeeded in having their lands exempted from taxation in Southern Manitoba. The point to which I called his attention was this: When I took this objection with respect to the lands in Southern Manitoba, the hon. First Minister stated then, not unreasonably, precisely what he says now, that the interest of the companies would prevent their doing this thing. More than five years have elapsed, and they have continued to do it during the whole time, and I can assure him that if he enquires, he will find that settlement has been enormously retarded in consequence. I think myself that the company has been injured also. But it has occurred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot see how that could have occurred to any great extent, because the even-numbered sections are free homesteads, and I scarcely think they have all been taken up. We grant lands to the railway companies in the expectation that they will make money out of them. The chances the shareholders of the different companies have of ultimate profit are rather doubtful. I have not lately enquired at what prices the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are offering their lands; but I know that they have been offering a great portion of them at $2.50 an acre. In more favored positions they have sold them at $4 or $5 an acre, while for village or town lots they may have charged and got more. But unless they make money out of the lands, they are really of no value to them. With respect to the block system, I may state that in this instance the land is to be granted in alternate townships instead of alternate sections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can assure the hon. gentleman, speaking from my personal knowledge, and with the list of prices furnished me by the Canadian Pacific Railway land agent at Winnipeg, that in the section to which I refer, where the company got us to throw off a dollar an acre on the ground that we were asking too much, their minimum price was $5 an acre, and the price ranged from that up to $10 an acre. The result was that after the free homesteads were pretty well occupied, settlement was wholly checked by the action of the railway company in Southern Manitoba, and many thousand settlers who were desirous of going there, were driven out by the high prices, and many of them fled to Dakota and became settlers there. A grave injury has been done there, which I think might have been easily averted by taking the precaution of compelling the company to sell at reasonable rates, which would have amply indemnified them for the construction of the road. By the present proposition the hon. gentleman proposes to give 6,400 acres a mile for 200 miles, and a cash bonus of about $1,000,000, in instalments of $80,000 over 20 years. The 1,280,000 acres which he proposes to give would, at $2 per acre, realise about $2,500,000, which, with the cash subsidy of $1,000,000, makes a bonus equivalent to $3,500,000, or $17,500 a mile for the construction of this road, which I think is a prairie road chiefly. Unless it is exceptionally difficult of construction, the gentlemen who take up the enterprise do not risk much, provided any population at all goes in. Of course there may be circumstances that would modify that, but having seen and known what I have seen and known as to the conduct of these companies in holding public lands, in the case I have named more particularly, I think it would be well to consider whether we ought not to put some limitation on their power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to this region, it is not prairie country, every acre of which, with the exception of some arid sections, is fitted for agricultural purposes. It is a cattle-raising country, and this road will be exceptionally expensive in comparison with a prairie road, because it is in that rolling country as it approaches the Rocky Mountains, and will have to cross all those streams which flow between Calgary and Edmonton from the Rocky Mountain boundary. Again, the company will have to get their land in places not in the immediate vicinity of their road, as the reserve north of Calgary, including the regions north of the Saskatchewan, belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway, approximates 18,000,000 to 19,000,000 acres, and the odd-numbered sections in that reserve are kept as homesteads for homesteaders. Therefore this company will be obliged to look for land perhaps to the north of that reserve, and it will be some time before that land will be sought after by settlers, though eventually it will be an exceedingly valuable portion of the North-West. There are good indications of petroleum there, over a large area, which will make this country eventually of very considerable value.

Mr. LAURIER. Do not promise too much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the Director of the Geological Survey, he will find a very satisfactory statement as to the existence of that material north of the Saskatchewan. It is of great importance that the flow of capital and the immigration of gentlemen from England, who have taken a fancy to that country and are spending large sums

of money in ranches, raising cattle and horses, should not be checked, as it will be pretty soon if means of transport are not furnished for the cattle; and I am therefore extremely anxious that this road should be built as soon as possible.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot approve of the policy indicated by the Government in the proposition now before the House. I think it has been unfortunate for the country that railways were extended or projected all over the North-West Territories, when we have so very small a population there. It would have been a great deal better for the settlers and the country if an attempt had been made to confine the population within narrower limits; and it does seem to me that with so large as extent of fertile territory lying within the Province of Manitoba still unsettled, it is not in the public interest to undertake to spread the very small number of settlers we are likely to receive for many years to come, over such an extent of territory. The right hon. the First Minister says it is of great consequence that no check should be given to those engaged in ranching. If there is any employment in the world in which a railway can be dispensed with, in the immediate vicinity of those who reside in the country, it is the business of ranching, for there is no difficulty in driving cattle one or two hundred miles to a railway station for shipment. It has also been unfortunate in the railway projects all through the North-West Territories, that they should have been taken up, in many cases, by parties without any capital, merely for the purpose of speculation, merely for the purpose of being hawked about New York or London in order to secure a certain amount of money for the charter from those disposed to invest in railway enterprises. It seems to me it would have been of very great value if the Government had secured a topical survey of the country in advance of those railway enterprises, in order that some attention should be given to the location of the roads before the charters were given, if the system of incorporation by charter granted by Parliament is to be continued. I do not see what the particular object is in building a railway in this section. The hon. gentleman proposes a road that is to be but 200 miles in length. That will carry the produce of the ranches but a very short distance. Almost 200 miles, in the business of ranching, is in the vicinity of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the number of persons who are likely to go into the country for the purpose of sustaining railway traffic is very little indeed. If there was likely to be a settlement of the country at all, it seems to me that the interests of the population would be much more likely to be promoted by the road which has been projected in the direction of Battleford and the Saskatchewan River, and from the districts the hon. gentleman has mentioned the navigable waters could be employed, because the railway which will run to Battleford, which road is now under construction, will take parties, who wish to go to the country, very nearly to the district to which the hon. gentleman refers; and the road running from Edmonton near the base of the Rocky Mountains southwards, would be a road running one side almost of a right angle triangle. It is not running in the direction in which the produce is carried, and is simply lengthening the distance every day that produce must be carried. I do think all our expenditures in this way have been, to a very considerable extent, a waste of the public resources. Because, in a very short time, if the progress of settlement were to go on and extend westward, the necessities of the country would secure the construction of the road with hardly any cost to the public treasury. With the immense territories we have, with the millions of acres which are unoccupied in Manitoba and in the immediate vicinity of Manitoba, I do not think it is in the public interest to assist railway construction further west, with the result of scattering a population which ought to be converged within more narrow limits.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite and this House will not suppose that that country is only a ranching country. When I spoke of ranching in that country, I spoke of it as being the industry which seems to attract a great many immigrants there at the present time. There are several who have gone there with considerable sums of money, and have had large ranches and large flocks and herds; but that country is admirably adapted for farming. It is beautifully watered, and all the banks of the rivers are bordered by most fertile lands. I have no doubt that by degrees the horse, and the cow, and the ox will be supplanted by the agricultural settler.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the rivers will furnish ingress and egress.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think very few of those rivers are navigable. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the people in the districts of Edmonton and Prince Albert went in there in the expectation that they would soon have railway accommodation. The railway, as first projected, went considerably north of the present line, and many settlers have gone north of the North Saskatchewan. That is a fine river, but a very unsatisfactory river for navigation. It is only a question as to what amount of snow will come down from the mountains whether that river is navigable for three or four months. It is very shallow, and is, unlike the St. Lawrence or any of our large rivers in the east, not a satisfactory mode of transport. The company which is constructing, or I may say has constructed, the line to Prince Albert, has asked for a vote for the line to Battleford. There has been no advance for that. The money advanced is only to Prince Albert, and this is only for the line to Battleford.

Mr. CHARLTON. We seem to have a very comprehensive railway system blocked out in the North-West, and I see but one defect in relation to the scheme, and that is the want of population. If we were receiving 200,000 or 300,000 immigrants a year into that country, if we had two or three million people there, then the railway schemes we have on foot would be comprehensible; but, with a population of not more than 300,000 souls between Lake Superior and the Pacific Ocean, this policy of railway construction seems to be one of a very extravagant character, and the policy of the Government seems to be one of a scattering nature. If, in marking out a Canadian Pacific Railway policy, we had extended that road westward as the settlement of the country required, we would not have built it so rapidly, but we would have concentrated the population, we would have saved

money, and the condition of the country would have been much better. Now we have a number of railway schemes proposed. There are 200 miles to be built along the foot hills of the Rocky Mountains. Then we have the Canadian Pacific Railway running through that country with very little population along the line, and one result of embarking upon those railway enterprises is that we are obliged to give charters to companies and lock up the lands, or to offer undue inducements to companies to build railways through the wilderness. If the country were being settled, if the mixed farming to which the First Minister refers were being prosecuted extensively, there would be very little difficulty in obtaining the capital required and in finding the people to embark upon these enterprises; but at present the Government feels bound to offer as much in money and land at a moderate price as this line will cost. The line will be built at the cost of the country, and, if we are to embark in this business, we ought to adopt some safeguard to protect the interests of the settlers who are to go into the North-West. We ought to realise the fact that the land there is now being placed in the hands of corporations and monopolies, and that there will be very little land left for settlers, but that they will have to look to land companies and railway companies for the land they desire. It is very well to say that the interests of these companies will dictate to them that they should sell the land at a reasonable price, but it is quite possible that they may not know what their own interests are. They may take the Government subsidy, issue bonds and raise money, and it may be to their advantage to hold these lands for many years in order to sell them at a price they think they may ultimately obtain. I, therefore, think there should be a reasonable limit fixed as to the price at which these lands shall be sold, so as to guard the people from the extortion of the companies. That is a common sense provision which the Government should make, but, in locking up the public domain in the hands of corporations, the Government is not adopting proper safeguards in the interests of the great mass of the people. Undoubtedly the provision for the construction of this road is premature. The settlement is not in the country, and the inducements offered to secure the construction of the road are too great. If the hon. gentleman would wait for a while, the outlay would be much less, and the road would be constructed as soon as the country requires it. If the First Minister would look at this matter in the right light and would place a limit beyond which the company could not go, he would confer a benefit on the country at large.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no desire on this side of the House to prevent the hon. gentleman from taking the stage he desires on these resolutions this evening, but, before we come to another stage, we expect he will give more information than he has given us this evening. Of course, we are all pretty well informed as to the general character of the country. As to that we may differ with him, but it is only fair to the House that the hon. gentleman should give us all the information he has concerning this company, and the reasons which have induced him to give them this aid. This is not the first time this company has come to this Parliament for aid; we have already given them, as explained this evening, a subsidy of 10,000 acres per mile, but it appears this is not sufficient, and I presume the company have asked him for more. I think he ought to inform us what are the grounds of their expectations, and we ought also to have the correspondence which he has on the subject, before we finally consent to this grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend quite apprehends the position of matters. This is a new company; the charter was only granted this Session, and it received the royal assent the first time that His Excellency came down. The first charter was granted some years ago to a company composed partially of Canadians and partially of Americans living south of the line. That company failed altogether. It was, I am afraid, a good deal of a speculative enterprise, and was not formed so much for the sake of constructing a railway as for the prospective profits that might be made out of it. Then, two other gentlemen, Mr. Praed and Mr. Wiguelin, belonging to respectable banking houses in England, took it up with a *bonâ fide* desire to raise the money and construct the road. They are gentlemen of high standing, and their banking houses, as no doubt the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is aware, are most respectable moneyed institutions. But they were not fortunate enough to be able to raise the money, so they candidly wrote out that they could not raise it, and they abandoned the enterprise. And so instead of going by the circuitous route of getting them to assign over their interest in the old charter, I thought it better to advise the present promoters, who I believe will build the road, to apply for a new charter, which was granted here the other day, so they have no connection with the two companies that failed. They start now as if there had been no previous charter to anybody. I do not know that I can give the hon. gentleman any further information than I have already done. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, as every Canadian has done, has informed himself about that beautiful country; I do not know whether he has visited it himself, but if he has, I have no doubt the charm of the country will induce him to desire very much to see a railway built there, so that he might visit other portions of that magnificent region.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a very pertinent argument.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I forgot to say that the company are going to build simultaneously to the south, that is from Calgary to the boundary, 130 miles. They expect that the Canadian Pacific Railway in running it will generate a very large business almost immediately; we are only giving, however, as I have already stated, 6,400 acres for the railway running to the south. The whole road will then be 330 miles long, and I am satisfied from the character of the parties who have taken it up, and from the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway have taken hold of it and agreed to run it for six years, that it will be a very valuable road. I will not trouble the House by going into a discussion as to the propriety of originally putting a limitation on the price of the land; but I can say, with respect to this road, that that would be an exceptional restriction, and being an exceptional restriction on this road, would destroy all chances of getting money. There was no such restriction on the Canadian Pacific Railway nor on

the other railways that have got grants; especially there was no restriction put upon the Qu'Appelle and Prince Albert Railway; therefore, if this road had less favorable terms than the other one, it would just completely throw over all chances of its being built. We have discussed in years gone by, when we had the Canadian Pacific Railway question up, the policy of spreading railways all over the country, and of endeavoring to restrict settlement within comparatively small limits. I ventured to differ with some of my hon. friends opposite on that question. I believe that the experience of the United States has shown us that there is no means of limiting settlement, or the area of settlement. People will go where their fancy takes them, they will scatter all over, as they scattered all over the western counties of the United States, and they are still doing so. It would be one means of keeping immigration out altogether to say to them that they must settle there and nowhere else. I am satisfied that policy has been a failure. Whether, my hon. friends opposite were right or whether we were right, the policy has now gone on so far that we cannot go back to any mode of limiting the settlement of that country. I would again press my hon. friend and this House to agree to this measure; I feel that it would be a great mistake to lose this chance of building this road, and I think on very favorable terms.

Mr. LAURIER. Am I to understand there is no application on the part of this company for this subsidy?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; there is an application. I have the letter in my hands, and I will send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. TROW. I was going to remark that it is commendable, in my estimation, on the part of the Government to endeavor to develop that portion of the North-West. If there is any portion of that North-West country that we ought to develop by railway entreprises, it is that portion from Calgary to Edmonton. I think, however, it was a mistake, on the part of the Government, to divert the Canadian Pacific Railway through a territory that is not adapted for successful settlement for three or four hundred miles. Had this line followed the old original Mackenzie survey, it would have passed Prince Albert and gone through Edmonton, through a portion of the country that is well timbered and well watered. The present line of the Canadian Pacific Railway for hundreds of miles passes through a section denuded of its timber, if it ever had any, and is not adapted for successful settlement. But this portion of the country, which the Government are now going to develop, I think, is nearly the best portion of the North-West, and I predict that in a very few years after that road is constructed there will be thousands of settlers in that section as soon as people become aware that they will have good facilities of getting out their surplus produce. I hope the Government will place sufficient safeguards so that settlers will be protected from any monopoly in being charged extra prices for their lands. Settlers require all the leniency you can possibly give them on account of the great hardships they have to undergo, and, I repeat, that I hope the Government will place sufficient safeguards to protect the honest settler and that the company will be compelled to sell their lands at moderate prices.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to offer a few remarks, as I have some knowledge of the working of land grants in the North-West. Some suggestions thrown out by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are well worthy of the consideration of the Government, and one is in regard to giving the land grant in alternate townships instead of in alternate sections.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is going to be done in this case.

Mr. WATSON. I am very glad to hear it. I also think the Government should place a limit on the price of the land. This policy has long been advocated by this side of the House, and any one living in Manitoba knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway lands there are held entirely for speculative purposes and are held at extravagant prices. A settler cannot buy an acre of their lands in Manitoba for less than $4 to $10 an acre. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), who is well acquainted with Southern Manitoba, knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway land there is held at those prices, which are speculative prices. In the interests of the settler there should be an upset price placed on the lands of this railway company, and a settler looking for land should know that he can take up vacant land at a certain fixed upset price. It has been argued that $2.50 should be that upset price, but even if it were $5 it would be better than no upset price being fixed. It is, moreover, I argue in the interests of the company as well as in the interests of the country and the settler. In regard to the railway lands being exempted from taxation, I suppose they will be exempt for a certain time, so long as the company holds them, probably 20 years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no such a stipulation. That applies only to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and this is not the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WATSON. Will their lands not be exempt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So long as they are Crown lands they are exempt from taxation, but when they are conveyed from the Crown to the company they are no longer exempt.

Mr. WATSON. Certainly; that is the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Canadian Pacific Railway have only got a very small portion of their land grant transferred, and the balance stands as Crown lands and is non-taxable. The right hon. gentleman says that every squatter would be protected. Do I understand that if a squatter settles on an odd section, he will be protected in his holding?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not state that. If he has taken a homestead and walks over and squats on the next lot, he, of course, has no claim. He has his homestead, and that should be sufficient.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose his homestead is on an odd section. I am not going to oppose the Bill, for it is a desirable road and a good country to settle. It is not a country that is only fit for ranching, for outside of the 24-mile belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway you immediately strike a good country for mixed farming. I do not anticipate that any portion of the land grant will lie in the ranching country, because the Canadian Pacific

Railway monopolises most of that to the North. In regard to the company seeking to place settlers on their land, I may say that the only company pretending to do so is the only road independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba, and that is the Manitoba and North-Western. I consider that this road now under the consideration of the House will be built, for I look upon it as nothing more than a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is true the charter is granted to other gentlemen, but the Canadian Pacific Railway will no doubt acquire it, and it will be another means of procuring for them a large tract of land and a handsome subsidy. The right hon. gentleman is doing a good deal for that country, and I was a little surprised that he should have shut off, as he did the other day, in the Railway Committee, another road that would have been built, within 100 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which would have struck more settlements than many other roads to which he has granted charters. It was proposed to build it through a tract of country well occupied, but the hon. gentleman refused to grant it a charter; and yet he goes 800 or 900 miles further west and comes here and tells this House that that section of country should be covered with railways, leaving portions well settled inside of Manitoba still without railway communication.

Mr. DALY. In regard to the remarks that have been made as to the value of Canadian Pacific Railway lands in Southern Manitoba, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is perfectly correct that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are selling them at from $4 to $10 an acre. That is the true value of those lands, and the farmers there will not sell their lands, the even sections for which they have patents, for one cent less. Three or four years ago that price was a very high one, but during the last three or four years lands have doubled in price in Southern Manitoba which is one of the most thickly settled portions of the Province, and you cannot buy lands from private individuals in that section for less than from $5 to $10 per acre, that is for unimproved lands. As to placing restrictions on the lands to be given to this particular railway company, it is not very likely, from the knowledge I have of the Canadian Pacific Railway land subsidy, there will be any land available for this railway company along its own route between Calgary and Edmonton. Most of that land will be covered by the Canadian Pacific Railway 24-mile belt. No doubt land will be taken further to the north and it would be unfair, under such circumstances, to place a fixed value on that land. Such a restriction has not been made to any chartered railway to which a land subsidy has been given. When the Canadian Pacific Railway built the road in Southern Manitoba, I took exception in a communication to the land commissioner to the high prices at which the company held their lands. That was some years ago. To-day it is a moral impossibility to buy land there for less than the Canadian Pacific Railway are asking for their lands. In Souris County, the most western and south-western in Manitoba, since the Souris branch was proposed, land has risen in value 50 per cent., and the state of affairs that existed in Southern Manitoba will not exist in the country through which this line will run. I must take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that there is no settlement in that country, and that what the country wants is people, and we should not build railways until we have people. I have heard the hon. gentleman speak of the wonderful development of the Western States. Did the people who built railways across the western prairies of the United States wait for settlement before they built the railways? The whole Reform party in our western country will take issue with the hon. gentleman on this statement. We all agree, no matter what politics we may profess, that what we need are railways, and the true policy of filling up the western country is shown to be by railways, by the wonderful development of the Western States. Railways are our best immigration agents, and when you get a company with a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, that company is as much interested in populating the district as is the Government or any one else. Nearly all the companies that have land subsidies are now interesting the people in England with a view to settling immigrants on those lands. You will find in to-day's despatches that the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company have sold their lands to a land corporation at $2 per acre. The people who bought those lands do not only expect to make money out of them by selling them at so much per acre, but they intend to bring people here to settle on these lands. I am satisfied, so far as this line of railway is concerned, that it is going to open up a magnificent tract of country. I had the pleasure, in company with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), to listen recently in this city, to a lecture delivered by the Rev. Leonard Gaetz, and any one who listened to that reverend gentleman could not but come to the conclusion that he was located in one of the most magnificent portions of that grand country of ours. Mr. Gaetz is settled at Red Deer River, which this line of railway will cross, and the statements he made in the course of his lecture were such as to justify me, as well as any person who listened to him, in coming to the conclusion that this was one of the choicest portions of that whole western country. There has been a large settlement at Edmonton for years past, and as the right hon. gentleman has stated, there are petroleum wells, and valuable mineral deposits to the north of that. I am satisfied, that as soon as this line of railway is built, the settlers will come into the country, and that they will not come if there is not a railway. I maintain that every acre of land granted by the Canadian Parliament, for lines of railway, both in Manitoba and the North-West, will bear tenfold fruit to the whole of Canada. As to the policy of scattering the settlers, which hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to, I can only say, from my knowledge of the early settlement of that country, that it would be a moral impossibility, to keep settlers within any particular bounds. I remember very well, in the spring of 1882, when the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway was at Oak Lake, some 150 miles west of Winnipeg, that the settlers passed through thousands of acres of the choicest lands of the Province of Manitoba, and rushed to the Qu'Appelle Valley, where there was not a line of railway, and where there is not a railway to-day. You cannot confine people in a western country like that, within any particular bonds.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, you can.

Mr. DALY. I beg your pardon, sir, if you can confine the settlers of that or any other western country within certain limits, you will do something that the people of the United States have not been able to do, and something that our people in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories have not been able to do either. The people will go where they think the choicest land is, and no matter from what part of our country a man comes, he will tell you that he lives in the choicest portion of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, as the case may be. I am satisfied that, if the House assents to the proposition now made by the right hon. the Premier, not one hon. gentleman opposite, nor one member of this House, nor will the country either, have any reason to regret giving this aid to that railway. I believe that the prophesy made by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), who has been through that country, will be fulfilled, and that this railway will open up to settlement, and will develop, one of the choicest portions of the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will not detain the Committee but for a few moments, on the subject of this resolution. I do not agree with the observations which have been addressed to the House by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) to the effect that you cannot confine the settlers of the North-West to a particular district. Now, Mr. Speaker, our experience in our Territories—and it does not differ from the experience of our neighbors in the United States—is, that settlers go where they expect facilities will be furnished them for entering the country, and for sending their products out of the country. When the settlers went in the direction of the Little Saskatchewan and Battleford, and up the Saskatchewan River, they went there because the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway had been surveyed through that country, and because they expected the road would be constructed there in a very short time after they had settled. The hon. gentleman says: we require to construct these roads to furnish facilities for settling up that country. Why, we have hundreds of miles of roads there, where there are very few settlers. The whole population of the North-West Territories is far less than the population settled along some railways in Ontario, which are less than 100 miles in length. It is no facility for the settlement of the country if we construct an immense mileage of railway in advance of settlement. It is true that in a prairie country your railway ought to be in advance of settlement, or at all events along with settlement, but you have done that already. You have now roads built far in advance of settlement. These sections of territory have yet to be developed, and you have every possible motive for securing immigration with the present railway facilities, which you will have if this proposed road were built. I suppose, Sir, that the right hon. gentleman has determined upon the construction of the road, if possible, and that the amount will be voted, and the lands granted, and the enterprise pushed forward if possible. We might, therefore, consider some matters in connection with that, upon the assumption that that road will be built. The hon. gentleman says that the question as to whether you will scatter the population over the entire country, or seek to confine it within narrow limits, has already been settled. I know that the attempt had been determined upon, but I thought that the actual settlement had fallen so far short of the right hon. gentleman's expectations, he would have found by this time, that it was still an open question. It is an open question at all events, so far as the actual population is concerned, and the hon. gentleman must be satisfied that his ten years' experiment of the course which he believed best in the public interest, has not been successful; that in fact it has been a failure, and that if the other experiment had been tried and had not been more successful, it would have been a failure likewise. So, the hon. gentleman has not at the present time an open question before him, because the experiment has been tried for a long period. There are thousands of miles of railway constructed and the people are not there, and as the idea of populating the country was the chief object for undertaking these works, the experiment cannot be said to be a success, notwithstanding the confident expression of opinion made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). There are some other considerations connected with this matter. We know, if that country is settled, Provinces will be established, and revenues for the maintenance of the Governments of these Provinces will be required. Where is that revenue to come from? Some of the older Provinces have not shown a very great anxiety to give up indirect taxation and to rely upon direct taxation for the purposes of revenue. They relied very largely upon the timber products of these Provinces, as a means of revenue, for the purpose of supplementing the grant which is received from the treasury of the Dominion. Now, there are in the North-West Territories considerable sources of revenue in the mines, if a proper policy is adopted in regard to them. I never could understand why we should part with the fee in the mines as well as in the soil in that country, or why a man engaged in agriculture should receive with his patent the mines in his land, which are of no use to him except for speculative purposes. I do not see why all the mines should not be put upon the same footing as those containing the precious metals. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the large petroleum springs in the very portion of the country where he is granting these lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; north of them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why should the Crown not reserve these mineral beds as a source of revenue to the Provinces which are to be established there in the future, instead of allowing them to be squandered? The hon. gentleman has said that it is desirable not to set a fixed price on those lands, because that might hinder the enterprise. The Government could go this far: they could say that after a certain sum was realised from the sale of these lands, the interest of the company in them should cease, and revenues thereafter derived from them should belong to the Crown. Then the company would have an interest in not asking an excessive price from the settlers, because they would

know that when they approached the utmost limit fixed, they would be obliged to hand over the revenues remaining to the Crown. I think a maximum sum could be fixed which would be no impediment whatever to the settlement of the country or to the company undertaking the enterprise; and in fixing it, the Government would prevent abuses such as those described by my hon. friend. I remember myself a case which was brought to my notice of a young Englishman who entered on a lot which he had got from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company expecting to pay $2.50 an acre for it. He told me that after he had spent $1,600 on improvements, the company had added $10 an acre to the price, equal to the whole cost of his improvements, leaving him free to pay for his own improvements or to leave his land, like the landlords in Ireland. I have no doubt there are other cases of the same sort.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that my expectations as to the settlement of the country have failed. It is my great disappointment that settlement did not go on as fast as I predicted; but when I did so I underrated the influence of hon. gentlemen opposite, not only on this continent, but on the other. I bow to the superior power of hon. gentlemen opposite, and confess that I really did underrate the influence of their arguments. I will say one thing about the price of the land. The hon. member from Selkirk says that the price of the land in that section has increased very much—that the price of land in the hands of private individuals ranges from $5 to $10 an acre. I dare say some hon. gentlemen opposite do not know that; perhaps the hon. member for South Oxford, who has been very enterprising in that part of the country, has found out that land has increased considerably in value, and has found —I am very glad it is so—the advantage of that increase. The only consequence of putting a limit upon the price of the land in the hands of the railway company would be this: We might require the railway to sell it at $2.50 an acre, and enterprising gentlemen like the hon. member for South Oxford would buy it and afterwards sell it at $9; unless we adopted this other provision, which has been tried both in Canada and the United States, and has always resulted in failure, of saying to the settler: "You shall not get your deed unless you have made certain improvements." The settlers will not go on the land under such a condition. Suppose these lands are given to the railway companies to be sold by them so as to recoup them to a certain extent. It is to be hoped, unless my expectations are again disappointed, that settlers will settle along this line, and that traffic will spring up. But in the meantime it is the case of "Live, horse, and you will get oats." We know that some of the railways in the United States, as was the case of the Northern Pacific, were originally utterly insolvent; although they had large quantities of land they could not sell it. Therefore, these railway companies must sell their lands at once in order to pay their interest on their bonds; and if we limited them in price, we should really be giving them little or nothing. If the grant were altogether in money, instead of in land and money, you might as well say to the company: "Now, you must keep an account of what the cost of the railway is, and what a fair profit to be realised from the road is, and you shall hand back all the money you make over what will be a reasonable compensation to you." That would be an absurd bargain if applied to the money, and equally absurd, I think, if applied to the land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has indulged in some chaff, which has not been infrequent on his part, as to the influence of this side of the House. If our word goes for a great deal more than his with the people of this country and the people of other countries, there are good reasons, I have no doubt, why that should be the case. However, that is not, as he very well knows, the reason. The reason is that his railway policy, and his land policy, and his tariff policy, have been singularly ill-adapted to develop the North-West. We have expended over a $100,000,000 in trying to settle up the North-West; and had that money resulted in bringing us a million settlers, as it might have done, I would have said that the money was well spent. But when I remember the records of the census, it appears that all we got for about one hundred millions of money spent in the North-West was the bringing in probably of 12,000 families. I cannot but feel, and the country cannot but feel, that the very grossest mismanagement alone could have produced such pitiable results in a country naturally so well adapted for settlement as a great deal of that is. However, that is a point we have over and over again discussed in this House, and concerning which I shall not alter my opinion, and I am afraid the hon. gentleman is too old to alter his, at any rate, until the public at large force my views upon him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hope told a flattering tale.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; when the hon. gentleman promised us $55,000,000 by the first of January, 1891, as the net proceeds of the sales of land in the North-West, almost as flattering as his colleague's prediction that we should have 640,000,000 bushels of wheat as the annual product from that territory. I wish to point out one or two matters. First, as regards the disposition of the lands at reasonable fixed rates and condition of settlement. That is precisely what has been done, and pretty successfully done, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as their land commissioner informed me. That company fixed its condition of settlement, and succeeded in carrying them out in many cases. I only state this to show the thing can be done. There is another consideration, but I do not know that it applies to this case, because I suppose these lands will not be exempt from taxation. The difference between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the private holders was this, that the private holders were taxed to the full selling value of their lands and the Canadian Pacific Railway were not; consequently no benefit whatever accrued to the people there from holding, and there was no inducement for the company to sell unless they thought they would get more by selling at once than by holding, which is by no means always the case. This road is not before us for the first time; this charter was granted four or five years ago. I think in cases like this at any rate, it was a duty of the Government, before making propositions to the House involving a grant of a million of money, or the equivalent, and 12,000,000 acres of land, to have obtained information from these parties as to the character of

the road and the cost of building it; and I wish to know whether any surveys have been submitted to the hon. gentleman's Department. I do not mean elaborate surveys, but any rough location surveys, from which a fair idea can be formed of what this road will actually cost and how much?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot state that to the hon. gentleman just now, but Mr. Ross, who is the contractor of the QuAppelle road, and who, I hope, will be the contractor to build this road, had his men go over the country and look at the general lie of the land, the quantity of bridges and all that kind of thing. It was simply a rough examination rather than a survey. I have not the particulars of that, but no doubt Mr. Ross who is in town will give them to me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman supply us with them before the next stage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Bill goes through I will do it. The Minister of the Interior informs me that the calculation of the last company, which was in the first place promoted by a Mr. Lloyd, a well known railway man in England, and subsequently examined for Mr. Ross, is from $24,000 to $26,000 a mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated that the Qu'Appelle were to lease this for some six years, with, in all probability, a right to purchase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I guess so. I understood something of that kind was in contemplation. It appears to me we had better deal directly with the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves. What are these gentleman going to do? Are they going to put in the difference of money or to get the Canadian Pacific Railway to finance for them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will finance themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And then lease the road?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; for six years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A curious arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the same arrangement which has been successful with the Qu'Appelle company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the Canadian Pacific Railway agree to lease that also?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; for six years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On terms submitted for approval by the Railway Department?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the terms and the contract.

Mr. DALY. On the line of the railway there is the Bow River, the Red Deer River and the Saskatchewan, which are all large streams to bridge, and there are, besides, ten or fifteen small streams running from the mountain. The expense of building that road will exceed that of building an ordinary prairie road.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In reply to what the First Minister said with reference to fixing the price of land sold to railways, I would inform him that the Minnesota Railway have fixed the price for their lands at $2.50 per acre. The lands were sold, and they remitted one-half to the settler on every acre brought under cultivation. That was found to be a profitable arrangement, because they made a larger sum from the produce of the lands thus brought under cultivation than they did by adding $1.25 extra per acre.

Mr. DALY. That same policy was adopted by the Canadian Pacific Railway. All the lands they sold in the counties of Brandon and Denis and south of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line were sold in 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884, at the same price as to-day, $2.50 per acre, with a rebate of $1.25. But they have ceased to give the rebate, because it imposed conditions which the parties could not carry out. For instance if a party purchased 320 acres, he found breaking 160 acres was too much for him. I would not like the House to run away with the idea that, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, they have not sold lands at $2.50. Nearly all the lands sold in Turtle Mountain, Brandon and Souris River, with the exception of the last two years when there has been a rise in the value of the land, was sold at $2.50, and until four years ago on the principle of $1.25 rebate.

Mr. WATSON. The conditions were such that the settlers could not carry them out. The settler got 160 acres, and he had to bring half of that under cultivation, and could not comply with that condition. Not one-tenth of the settlers are able to comply with the terms at all. The First Minister has stated that, if these lands were held at a low price, hon. gentlemen would have no opportunity of speculating. It is not in connection with speculation that I speak. I do not ask the Government to provide a lower price for speculators, but I do say that, when an actual settler is willing to go in and perform his homestead duties, he should get the land at an upset price. I do not care if the railway company charges speculators $10 an acre. If all the lands in Southern Manitoba to-day were held at an upset price of, say, $4 an acre, which I think would be ample to pay a company to build a road through a prairie country, I think all the settlers would be satisfied and the people would settle on those lands instead of going to the far west. There has been too much of a rush to the far west for speculative purposes and not for settlement. The speculators have thought they could get town sites and other advantages, and so they have gone far west. For some years it was impossible to get homesteads in Manitoba at the very time when we were getting people to come to that Province to settle. Unfortunately they went south, but I am glad to say that many of them are coming back now, because they find that Manitoba is better than the land to the south.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. WATSON. There is no doubt about it. If the hon. gentleman had pursued a better policy we would have had these people in Manitoba to-day, settled, instead of their migrating back and forwards as they have been doing. There should be an upset price on those lands in Southern Manitoba of $4 or $5 per acre. I know some of the lands

that would be occupied at once if they could be got for $5 or $6 an acre, but they are held for what they are worth, $10 or $12 an acre, just as a private individual would hold them for speculative purposes. I think we, as guardians of the public domain, should make arrangements in the interest of the Dominion as a whole.

Resolution reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Within what limit do you propose to allow the company to take this land?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As they earn it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the limit of time. I mean within what distance from the line of their railroad are they to be allowed to select their land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Order in Council states that they may take it within twelve miles on each side of their line, and any balance of the land from contiguous lands at the disposal of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you give them the right to choose anywhere?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It must be as contiguous as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But if there is no available land contiguous, how far can they roam?

Mr. WATSON. As I understand, the Canadian Pacific Railway have reserved for them all the land north of latitude 52. Does the Government intend to keep that immense reserve now that they have taken back a portion of their land? That is an immense blanket of land reserved from any other company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, we must take back our lands.

Mr. WATSON. Where are you going to take them from?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We hope to have all that settled during 1890. I have no doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will make their selection during this year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is very little doubt that the 17,000,000 acres, or whatever it may be, which the Canadian Pacific Railway still claim, are equal to all the lands which have been reserved for them, and that the Government lands which have been bought back from them are nowhere.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government lands have to be equal in average value to the land retained by the company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But, as I understand, the area the company are still entitled to may be taken within the belt, or from the reserved district, and these very lands lying alongside this road may be claimed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and this company may have to go elsewhere.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The land will run twelve miles on each side of this road from the northern extremity of the original grant of land, known as the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, until it strikes the 52nd degree of north latitude, which is, the southern boundary of the reserve. This road cannot go into that reserve until the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government make an arrangement as to where the balance of the land is to be taken within that reserve.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far is the 52nd degree north of Calgary? I think it must be about 40 miles.

Mr. DEWDNEY. More than that; but I have had a map prepared which I will bring down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is 120 miles from the boundary line to Calgary. That is two degrees. If Calgary is two degrees north of the 49th parallel, you have only one degree between that and the southern boundary of the reserve. Then you have to deduct 24 miles for the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, so that you would have only about 35 miles before you struck the belt from which the lands for this road could be selected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have to get the rest of the land where they can get it.

Mr. WATSON. I thought they would be able to get their land within the railway reserve north of line 52.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not unless the Canadian Pacific Railway Company consents, but, as the Canadian Pacific Railway is to run the road, there will probably be less difficulty than under other circumstances in arranging this matter, if the Government conveys to them the land lying along their line.

Mr. WATSON. That is the great trouble I see—that a great tract of country is reserved for the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no disguising the fact that this road is practically a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That being the case, we are now allowing another million and a quarter acres of land to be reserved in some other locality outside that tract of country, and the whole North-West country will be tied up under that company, and no other railway company can get a land grant in that reserve unless they make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be well if the Government would profit by the experience of the United States in the matter of railway grants. They have been very liberal with railway land grants in that country, and their experience shows that the policy pursued in that respect is a very unwise one. Roads, when required, have been built without land grants, and the Government of this country are actually squandering the heritage of the people in the lands of the North-West by granting to these corporations land to induce them to build roads in advance of the wants of the country. It is a most lamentable policy, and we shall see the evil effects of it soon enough, no doubt.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SAFETY OF FISHERMEN.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 96) for the better securing the safety of certain fishermen. He said: This bill passed the Sen-

ate after a very full discussion. It is a Bill that has been considered necessary in the public interest, to provide some means of greater security for the fishermen engaged, notably, in the bank fisheries of the Maritime Provinces. This question has been discussed at considerable length in the United States, and I notice that a proposal has been made there to introduce similar provisions into their laws. This Act has also engaged the attention of our people at various times, and has been suggested here, as the hon. Minister is aware, on a previous occasion. It is intended to provide by the first section that no boat shall be launched or set out from any vessel engaged in the deep or bank fishery for the purpose of fishing without having on board an accurate and serviceable mariner's compass, and unless there is placed in such boat at least two quarts of drinking water and two pounds of solid food for each man of the crew of said boat. That is intended to remedy an evil which is found to exist in the prosecution of the fisheries. Sometimes the boats are set off from the vessel in a hurry, and unfortunately they have sometimes been lost in the fog, and the people have suffered great hardship before they could reach their vessel again; and in some cases these boats have never regained the ship which they left. The Act provides that when these dories, as they are called, leave the vessel for fishing purposes, they shall carry enough water and provisions to last them at least 48 hours. The expense will be very small; in that respect it is a very small matter indeed; perhaps the compass would cost a couple of dollars, not more, and the food and water can easily be placed in one end of the boat in a place which will be provided when the boat is originally constructed. Those interested in the bank fishery in our Province, notably the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), have long seen the necessity of some provision of this kind. In many instances the fishermen have voluntarily provided what this Bill calls for, and at other times these precautions have been neglected; therefore it has been thought advisable to make it compulsory on owners of vessels to provide these safeguards for the preservation of the crew engaged in the bank fisheries, and to impose a moderate penalty for their failing to do so. I have not heard of any opposition to this Bill from people in our own Province who are largely interested in this fishery; I think there can be no solid argument against a measure of this kind which is intended to benefit a class of people who require the protection of Parliament.

Mr. COLBY. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman has been animated by philanthropic and humanitarian motives in introducing this Bill. But so far as I am able to ascertain from the officers of the Department, and so far as the Department has been able to ascertain from practical men who are consulted by the Department under such circumstances, the Bill is not considered a necessary one. It is considered to be a useless Bill, to be inconvenient, expensive, and burdensome upon the class of people whom it proposes to protect. If I understand correctly the fishing on the banks—and I understood the hon. member to say it was mostly to protect that class of fishermen—fishing on the banks is mostly done by the fishermen who are themselves interested in the catch, who charter their own vessels, who select their own captains, and who benefit in the result of the voyage. Now, I think that is not always the case. I think the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) is an exception, and I think there are some other fishermen like him; but I have the authority of a gentleman from the Maritime Provinces whose opinion is entitled to weight, that the statement I have just made is correct. The hon. gentleman himself, of course, knows whether I am correct or not in this statement. Now, if that be the case, it is simply saying to these fishermen who charter the vessels, the interested parties, that they shall be compelled to adopt precautions for their own safety, which they are privileged to adopt now or not, as they choose. It is their affair altogether, if the rules which regulate the safety of vessels and of passengers are not enforced and observed in case of these fishing vessels—this is a matter which concerns the fishermen themselves. Now, I am very confident that no representations have come from the fishermen asking for this legislation. I have taken particular pains to ascertain this fact. The Department has not been applied to by the fishermen whom the hon. gentleman's Bill is designed to protect, for any such legislation. There is one feature of the hon. member's Bill, which, I think, certainly ought not to be adopted, and that is the clause which imposes a penalty upon a master of a vessel who permits, under any circumstances whatever, a dory to leave the vessel without carrying on each occasion a compass and provisions. If I understand the matter rightly, 8 or 10 dories start from the vessel in the early morning, and if, by any neglect in any instance a dory should be permitted to leave without this equipment, the master of the vessel would be liable to a very severe fine, $100, or imprisonment. I think that is a very hard imposition, and a very severe restriction. If it was a matter affecting the safety of passengers whose lives where dependent on the regulations to be observed, it would be a different matter altogether, but it affects fishermen, who, if they chose, could for a very small expense outfit themselves, if they thought this a necessary and proper protection. I am told that this compass would be of no earthly use so far as regards returning to the vessel in case of fog, or in case of drifting away unless the bearings of the vessel were first taken. I am told also that in very many instances these fishermen would be incapable of using the compass. I am told further that in the construction of the dory there are no places to which the compass could be attached and provisions stored, and that the equipment would have to be attached to the person and not to the boat. That kind of compass would be rather a toy compass, I fancy. While the motive was evidently a good one which caused this Bill to be introduced, yet, inasmuch as it was not asked by the only class of people who could be affected by it, the fishermen themselves, men of mature years who are accustomed to the perils of the sea and inured to a seafaring life, I do not think it should be proceeded with. I understand they are not a wealthy class, and not a class that can bear very heavy burdens, and this class should be permitted to judge for themselves as to whether they desire to take on themselves the expense of this outfit. If they do think so, it is optional for them to do it now.

If not, I think it would be burdensome if we compelled them to do it. I am informed no such legislation exists in any other country. With the long experience of Great Britain, United States and Newfoundland with regard to these fishing vessels, those countries have not thought it necessary in any instance to impose similar legislation and similar requirements upon their fishermen. If the fishermen came to Parliament and said that their calling was made more hazardous in consequence of this provision not being made by the owners of the vessels, that would be another question altogether. I would say at once that such a request should be acceded to, and perhaps a charge should be levied on the owners of the vessels; but it is not asked by them in a single instance, and, on the other hand, it would prove a positive burden on them, and inasmuch as there is no analogy for it in any country, I do not think at this time that we should initiate this legislation. This is not the first time this Bill has been before the House; I think it was before the House last Session, and it did not receive favor at that time. I have voluminous reports here on the subject. The Department, of which I am the unworthy representative, had no prejudice against the Bill, and if it was a useful Bill they were prepared to accept it; but the result of enquiries which had been made from persons in whom the Department have great confidence, has led the Department to believe that it is not desired by the fishermen, that it would not be wise legislation, and the information which the Department has collected is not favorable to the passage of the Bill. I therefore feel it my duty to move:

That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following inserted instead thereof:—"the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill this day six months."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is evident the hon. gentleman has been misinformed in several particulars, judging by the observations he has addressed to the House. He said this Bill would be expensive and burdensome to the fishermen. The hon. gentleman is perhaps not aware that when a vessel fits out for the bank fishing, whether owned by several parties or by one individual, the outfit forms part of the expenditure of the voyage, and under the circumstances there would be no additional expense whatever in taking those provisions on board of the dories when they leave the vessel to go to their trawls. The provisions and the compass are there. The hon. gentleman is aware that the compass is a very small instrument, and can be placed in any part of the boat, and all that would be required would be a small cover for it. The owners of the vessel find the provisions and outfit for the voyage, and the fishermen do not pay one cent towards that expense. They go on the vessel for the trip or for the season, and when the vessel returns the owners receive one-half the catch as belonging to the vessel, while the other half is divided between the captain and the crew, and in that way they receive compensation for their summer's work. The hon. gentleman says that the compass would be of no value to them. That statement occurred no doubt from the hon. gentleman not having been informed by those who made representations to him that the trawls are set in a certain position from the fishing vessel, and when the men leave the vessel they take the bearings of the trawls, and consequently when they reach the trawl and have taken their observations before leaving, if the weather is foggy, all they have to do is to go back again by the compass to reach the ship. The hon. gentleman has been informed on this point by a person who is not familar with the modes in which this very important industry is conducted; he has evidently been informed by some person in the Department, I presume in Halifax, because this Bill did not originate in the Department, and he thought fit to make objection. But there is not any objection raised by the hon. Minister that cannot be met by any practical man at all familiar with our mode of conducting our fishing. It is only in the deep sea fishing where people leaving vessels may be exposed to the danger of being left in the fog not only for hours but for days, away from their vessel unless the fog clears up, and if they have no provisions or water to sustain them, they may be unable to reach their vessel again. The hon. gentleman says he is not aware of this law having been required or in force in any other country. I am not aware that there is, but within the United States that has been the subject of discussion for some years, and I have no doubt it will become law before long. In Newfoundland, they have almost entirely a shore fishery, and therefore they do not require the same protection which our Nova Scotia vessels do, in the deep sea fisheries. Under these circumstances no comparison can be made. The hon. gentleman says there has been no application from the fishermen requiring this Act. Well, we pass a great many Acts in this House which have never been asked for by parties interested. The Government has adopted measures year after year, for the preservation and safety of people on railroads, steamboats and otherwise, which have not been asked for, but simply because it was considered that it would be wise and prudent to make such provisions. In the present case accidents have occurred with us and dories have been lost, because of neglect to take the precautions which the Bill proposes shall be taken. In my opinion the hon. the President of the Council has not given any argument against this Bill. I am aware he is not familiar with it himself, and acting as the head of the Department, in the absence of the Minister of Marine, he has taken the information which has been given probably by some person in Halifax, who, I repeat, cannot be as familiar with the question as my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) who has been engaged very largely in that branch of commerce, and who recognises the importance and necessity of this Bill. I think the Government would have done well to have accepted this Bill, because it is in the interest of the fishermen. The fishermen are a peculiar class of people. They would go on from year to year, and would probably not ask for any of these precautions. They are naturally a careless class of people. They are careless about danger, they hardly know the risks they run themselves, and they are so accustomed to the dangers of the sea from their boyhood, that they look with indifference upon them, and accidents do occur frequently, because of the neglect of precaution which we are endeavoring to remedy by this Bill. It is the duty of the Government to see that the dangers incident to the hazardous calling of the fishermen

should be minimized. This Bill was not of my own introduction, it was proposed by an hon. member of the Senate and brought down to this House, but when it was explained to me, and when I had a conference with the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) and other hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, and from my own experience, and the discussions which have taken place from last year to the present time, I was persuaded that the Government would do a great injustice to the fishermen if they did not allow this Bill to become law. I hope the hon. Minister will even now reconsider his statement, and allow the Bill to pass.

Mr. EISENHAUR. I think that with the exception of the heavy penalty provided, this Bill is a good one. It would not, however, affect our fishermen, for we have already complied with the provisions of the Bill, and the necessary water, and food, and compasses are carried in their boats. I know to my personal knowledge, that since they have taken these precautions, the loss of fishermen has been far less, and there has been less hardship and loss of life experienced in cases where they strayed away from their fishing vessels. As my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) has stated, the expense will not devolve upon the fishermen at all, as the articles specified are found by the owners of the vessels. In the county which I have the honor to represent, the fishermen, I believe, have found their own compasses, which are small brass instruments, three or four inches in diameter and which cost only about 75 or 80 cents. The men are quite willing to procure these compasses at their own expense, but as it is well known the provisions are supplied by the owners of the vessels. The hon. the President of the Council is altogether mistaken in stating that these vessels are chartered. As my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) has stated the men get half the proceeds and everything is found for them. I think the $100 penalty mentioned in the Bill is altogether too high, for in many cases, if the Bill became law, it would be violated unintentionally. Sometimes these crews are called upon to jump into their boats in a great hurry, and probably they might forget the necessary supplies. This might be the case also when the fish are plenty. There is great rivalry as to who will bring in the most fish, and sometimes they leave the vessel without taking time to provide for supplies in the boat. If this Bill is adopted, I would suggest that a penalty not exceeding $50 would be ample, instead of the $100 fine now proposed.

General LAURIE. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) has given the very strongest reasons why the Bill should not pass. The Bill provides what is required to be placed in the dory, and the penalty is to be inflicted on the captain or owner of the vessel, if the regulations therein set forth are not carried out. As my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. Eisenhauer) says the food is provided by the owners of the vessels, and if the men do not take it in their boats, it is their own fault. Why should a penalty be imposed on a captain or owner, if the fishermen being provided with these things, do not see fit to take them for their own safety. It is quite true as the hon. gentleman states that the vessels are, in the main, worked by the crews on shares, and there is great rivalry among them as to who will take the most fish. They get away in their dorys as quickly as they can in the early morning, and it would be practically impossible for the captain to keep the whole of the crew around his vessel, with the boats bumping against the sides, if a heavy sea was running, while he examined the dories to see if food, water and compasses were carried in every case. It is out of the question that the captain of a vessel should be held responsible in a fine of $100 or imprisonment because the men may so far neglect their own comfort or safety, as not to take the necessary articles in their boats. Then, again, to insist on finding the owner or captain of the vessel in case the men go out without a fog-horn in their dory, seems to me unreasonable. The object is that the dory shall get back to the vessel, and not that the vessel shall go to the dory. The vessel is provided with a fog-horn, or bell, or guns; and when the dory is absent, and a fog comes on, the fog-horn is sounded on the vessel, and the dory in that way is brought back. Even if the men had fog-horns with them, the vessel could not go to them; she would be at anchor, and she would not lift her anchor every time the dory was away. It seems to me that the men's self-interest in their own safety, is the best precaution we can have; and it would be most unreasonable to inflict a heavy penalty on the captain or owner of the vessel because they neglected their own safety. The fishermen are often reckless and daring; their desire is to bring back a full take to their vessel, and, if possible, to make her high line in the fleet when they come back to port, and in their desire to excel they often neglect their own safety; and I think it would be hard to inflict the penalty of their neglect upon the owner or captain of the vessel.

Mr. KIRK. If the penalty alone is the only objection the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has to the Bill, that is a matter which could easily be remedied in Committee. For my part, I think the principle of the Bill is a very good one. There does seem to be a necessity for something of this kind being done to protect the lives of the fishermen. Scarcely a year passes without our hearing of fishermen getting astray in consequence of fogs, and enduring great suffering. A few years ago two or three men went away in their boat, and lost their vessel in a fog, they were away so long that one or two of them actually died, and the survivors were actually obliged to drink the blood of their comrades, and I am not sure but they had to eat their flesh also to keep themselves alive. It seems to me that if anything could be done to prevent such suffering, it ought to be done. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Fisheries Department, and who has objected to the Bill, is not at all acquainted with the business. His statement that the fishermen would incur great expense in fitting out their vessels if this Bill passed, has already been shown to be incorrect by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer). The fishermen do not share in the expense of fitting out the vessel; that is done by the owner of the vessel, and I am sure that the expense would not be very heavy if they were required to furnish a com-

pass for every boat. I do not think it would be a hardship on the owners of the vessels if this Bill were enacted, and I am sure it would not be a hardship on the fishermen themselves, but a great relief to them.

Mr. KENNY. I am sure that the House will recognise that it is a duty incumbent upon us to do all we can to protect the lives of the fishermen engaged in the prosecution of their very precarious calling. I have listened carefully to this discussion and the arguments advanced in favor of the Bill now before the House. I do not pretend to have that intimate acquaintance with the fishing industry which the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) possesses. I am aware that during the past few years many of our fishermen have lost their lives while engaged in dory fishing; but I cannot see that in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries, who has, I believe, paid special attention to this matter, any great harm could result in letting the Bill stand until next year. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) has pointed out a fact with which we are painfully familiar, that during the past year or two some of these dory fishermen have died of starvation; but we must recognise that two quarts of water and two pounds of bread in each dory would hardly have saved the lives of these men. My hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has pointed out that the penalty, which is really the most important part of the Bill, would be very oppressive on the owners and captains of the vessels. It has also been mentioned in the course of the debate that these vessels are now amply provided with provisions and with compasses, and that, consequently, it must be the fault of the fishermen themselves if they do not take the necessary provisions and the compass with them. The hon. member for Lunenberg says that the fishermen sometimes forget to take them, or intentionally violate this precaution. Well, does my hon. friend contend that if the fishermen forget to take the provisions or compass, or intentionally violate the regulations of the vessel, the captain, who is really to some extent a co-partner with them in the enterprise, should be subjected to the whole penalty? While I am very anxious that we should adopt such legislation as would protect the dory fishermen, I do not see what great harm could result from allowing this Bill to stand over for one year; and I would respectfully suggest to the Department of Fisheries that they might, during the coming season, institute enquiries along the fishing coasts of our Province, as to the manner in which the dory fishing is prosecuted. The fact has been elicited that in no other country in the world has similar legislation to that proposed in this Bill been enacted; and if it is not demanded by the fishermen who are the most immediately concerned, I think no great harm can result in letting it stand over for another year.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) does not pretend to call in question the statement which has been made that loss of life has resulted from failure to comply with the precautions which this Bill provides shall be complied with; but he deems this matter to be one of small importance, evidently, as compared with the inconvenience of dealing with it during the absence of the Minister. Now, if the statement made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) is correct, that instances have occurred of boat crews starving in consequence of their failure to provide themselves with food, and if these occurrences are liable to happen again, surely there is reason for the passage of this Bill. The expense to be incurred is a very slight one—a small compass which can be procured for $1.50 or $1, and a small quantity of provisions. It may be true that the fishermen should make provision themselves to secure themselves against distress; but let it be incumbent on the owners, and loss of life and much suffering would be prevented. If the facts are as presented there is pressing necessity for the passing of this Bill. It is not sufficient reason to assign that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is absent from his post, and therefore the condition of things which we deplore should continue for another year.

Mr. ELLIS. The argument with which the Government endeavor to head off this proposed legislation is entirely inconsistent with the argument they advanced last year in the case of protecting seamen on the upper lakes. It was then contended that it was a matter of free will to these seamen, to engage on board of the old vessels complained of, but nevertheless the Department supported its legislation entirely on the ground that it was in the interest of the seamen and necessary for their safety. Now the argument is entirely opposite. It is that the men can protect themselves. Everybody who knows anything of the fisheries in the fishing season knows that cases are constantly occurring of boats getting lost during foggy weather. Sometimes for three or four days the whole fishing population, indeed the whole population of the Provinces, are excited over the fact that three or four boats have gone astray and have not been picked up. The men no doubt have neglected to make any arrangements for themselves, and the owners make no arrangements for them, and the consequence is that the men suffer great privation and often die. This may be a matter of no great concern to the Legislature, but the Legislature does deal with questions of this kind, and in this case it ought to take hold of this matter and make some provision for the fishermen who are largely at the mercy of the captains of vessels and the men who employ them. With regard to the penalty, it seems to me a heavy penalty, but a provision could be made requiring these dories to be provided in the way prescribed by the Bill.

Amendment of Mr. Colby (six months' hoist) agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 6th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OTTAWA ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of

the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Charles Herbert Mackintosh, Esq., to represent the electoral district of the city of Ottawa.

THE BREMNER FURS.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would ask the Government whether we will soon receive the printed evidence in the Middleton and Bremner case. I understood it was to be printed as soon as possible.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think it has been printed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It has not been distributed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My neighbor here shows me a copy he has received.

Mr. LAURIER. We have none.

Mr. DAVIN. It cannot have been distributed, for I did not get one.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will see that it is distributed.

Mr. BLAKE. I have understood that the hon. gentleman got many things in advance. A statement was made yesterday, that to-day we would be informed when the consideration of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections would take place.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Prime Minister is not here now, and the hon. gentleman might repeat his question when he is here.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When I receive anything in advance, I do not desire to keep it to myself.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 146) to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories. He said: The principal provisions in this Act are the following:—It is deemed advisable to define the Territories more particularly than they are at present defined, and to change their name to the Western Territories of Canada. This is proposed to be done by section 3 of the Bill. Sections 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 contain the provisions which are to govern the composition of the Legislative Assembly, the periods at which sittings thereof are to be held, and the mode of proceedings for electing a new Assembly, or for filling a vacancy. Section 10 defines the classes of subjects respecting which the Legislative Assembly may make ordinances. By section 13 of the Bill the powers of a single judge are to be extended and defined. By the same section the confirmation, reversal, or modification, by the Court of Appeal, of the decision of a single judge is to be provided for. By section 14 provision is to be made for the performance of the duties of a sheriff or a clerk in the event of a vacancy through death or otherwise. By section 18 provision is to be made to empower each judge of the Supreme Court of the Territories to be *ex-officio* a district magistrate for the Territories, and also to sit as a criminal court to try and determine charges preferred against any persons for the offences which are specified in that section. By section 22 of the Bill provision is to be made as to the manner of indicting persons so charged. By section 23 provision is to be made for the transmission, by a justice of the peace or magistrate holding a preliminary investigation into any criminal offence, which may not be tried under "The Summary Convictions Act," of the records of such investigation; and for the notification of a judge, with the object of affording the person charged with the crime, a speedy trial. By section 24 those persons convicted of a breach of a municipal by-law and sentenced to imprisonment on account of such breach, are to be excepted from the provisions of section 79 of chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes, unless the municipality shall arrange with the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police for the maintenance of the person so convicted during the period of his sentence. By section 30 the wording of section 108 of the said chapter 50 is to be slightly changed, and two sub-sections are to be added thereto. The first of these sub-sections fixes the width of public highways, roads or trails which existed in the Territories prior to survey, and also provides for the improvement of the location thereof by the surveyor, if necessary. The second retains the title to the highways in the town for the public uses of the Territories, and provides that such roads cannot be altered and that the land cannot be sold except by consent of the Governor in Council. The amendment proposed by section 31 to section 110 of the said chapter 50 will give the Legislative Assembly which will be elected to succeed the present one the right to regulate and to decide the manner of recording and publishing its proceedings. By section 32 of the Bill it is to be provided that no change shall be made in the existing law of the Territories concerning intoxicating liquor until the dissolution of the present Assembly has afforded the inhabitants an opportunity of expressing their opinion with regard to the nature of such change. The other sections of the Bill contain no material alterations of the present law.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has only given us a synopsis of what the Bill contains, but no explanations as to the reasons of the alterations made in the Act. I think no more important subject could be brought before this House at the present time than a Bill legislating in regard to the North-West Territories, and the House, I am sure, will be disappointed at the more than dry manner in which the hon. gentleman has introduced this subject, but I cannot blame him very much for that, because the Bill itself is a very dry one, and the changes made in the present law are mostly technical, with the exception of section 13, which is clothing the Legislature of the North-West Territories with powers similar to those now enjoyed by the Provinces. In fact, section 13, as amended by this Bill, is largely borrowed from section 92 of the Confederation Act, which gives the powers now enjoyed by the Provinces. I do not find fault with the Administration for enlarging, to that extent, the powers now enjoyed by the Legislature, but it seems to me that while the Government was making that concession, it would have been opportune to supplement it with another concession by giving responsible government to the Territories. The Territories are not progressing very fast, but still the population which goes there is an advanced population, well educated, and already showing great powers of self-government. There are some subjects of a nature which had better be entrusted to them than kept in this House. They are the best judges of what is best

for them in their present condition. It is felt that the powers which they have already received are inadequate, and I question very much whether this small measure of reform, though it may be accepted for what it is worth, will meet the condition of the people of the Territories. If the Government had seen fit to give them a responsible government, or at least a larger measure of self-government, than they have at the present time, many of the difficulties which may come before this House at some time or another, and many of the difficulties which may arise in the Territories themselves, under the present system, would in all probability be avoided. All the difficulties that have arisen between the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislature—and they have had some difficulties during the last Session—arose from the fact that the Governor had not a responsible body of advisers who were answerable to the House, and this fact shows the necessity for some larger measure of responsible government. Under the circumstances, I do not venture at this moment any further criticism of this Bill than to say that, in my judgment, it falls short of what should be the proper remedy for the difficulties which may arise, not only in this House but in the Territories themselves.

Mr. DAVIN. I sympathise, to some extent, with the remarks that have fallen from the leader of the Opposition. Those remarks are not couched in a spirit of hostility to the Government or to this Act. In fact, this Act is travelling along the road that the hon. and learned gentleman wishes it to go, but he would have it go further. I think that so long as the Act remained as it was there was a very large section of the people in the North-West who were well content. I may tell the hon. gentleman that though there was some difficulty in the Assembly last year, I believe as a fact that the weight of opinion in the North-West was with the minority of that Assembly. By the 11th sub-clause of section 10, that is to say, section 13 of the Revised Statutes, which has been put in by the Senate, all the powers that call for responsibility are given, as we find by these words:

"The expenditure of such portion of any moneys appropriated by Parliament for the Territories as the Governor in Council may instruct the Lieutenant Governor to expend by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly."

I am afraid that unless some form of responsible government is given, that money will be worse than wasted; that money will be expended—how? It will be expended by the Lieutenant Governor by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly. Why, Sir, what will happen? You will have that money log-rolled, as we know has often happened in the history of such Governments. Suppose moneys were voted here in Committee of Supply; if you allowed those moneys to be expended by the advice of this Parliament without any Government to be responsible therefor to the people, the result would be that vast sums that are now carefully expended, would be worse than wasted. With regard to the local fund which they raise now, amounting, I think, to some $16,000 or $17,000, that sum is log-rolled. The manner in which that sum is expended is this: It is divided by 22, and the quotient given to each member, and whether he needs it or not, he naturally takes it, although sometimes he may have to fall back upon his inventive faculties for ways of expending it. Yet, of course, he does expend it. One case happened where an hon. gentleman spent the money on purposes that never could have been contemplated when it was voted; and, therefore, I think, as we have gone thus far, probably it would be as well to go still further and to give them a little government. I think there are some parts of the Bill that will be found an improvement; but, when we come to the clause dealing with the appointment of deputy sheriffs, I will ask the Committee to accept an amendment. It seems to me that is indefensible; it is vicious in principle, to have the Assembly provide for the appointment of deputy sheriffs; it would be much better to have the judges provide for the necessity of the appointment of deputy sheriffs, because if you have this work devolving on the Assembly, every member of the Assembly will be troubled with requests from every little town in his district to have a deputy sheriff appointed, because every little place would think it would obtain a certain importance if it had a deputy sheriff. The subject was discussed elsewhere, if I may refer to it in passing, and all the North-West opinion was in the direction which I now express myself. I will ask the Government to consider that point, because, as I say, you will have such a large number of deputy sheriffs that the receipts will not be enough to give them bread and salt. I think, on the whole, there are very good reforms in the Bill, and the North-West will welcome it.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it impossible to attach too much importance to the point on which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has just enlarged. We are proposing to make a departure from the principles of responsible government, as we understand them, in a most important particular. I admit that it is difficult to deal with the exigency otherwise than it is dealt with by this Bill, without responsible government. The principle, as I understand it, is that, with respect to the expenditure of public moneys, it is the Crown that initiates, not the Assembly. The Assembly is supposed to be a check, a guard, to keep the drag on; that is the function of the popular body. I quite agree that eminent statesmen, not theorising, but dealing with actual results in late years in the mother country, have pointed out how far the English House of Commons has departed from the ancient traditions; how far it has ceased to be a bulwark and support to the Administration in matters of prudence and economy in public expenditure. But, none the less, I hold it to be the most important ingredient in securing economy, and also good direction, in public expenditure, that there shall be an initiative somewhere else than in the popular assembly, and, deeply as I differ from the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) as to his characterisation of the expenditures that have taken place in this House, or rather with the sanction of this House, I say they are, beyond all comparison, better, more prudent, and wiser than they would have been if such a system as we are proposing to give the North-West Territories had existed here. We have had a few instances, I am glad to say only a few, of attempted departure from that system. There have been perhaps three cases, three only occur to my mind at this moment, in which select committees

have substantially, though not nominally, been allowed to deal with old claims in order, I am afraid, that the Executive might escape the responsibility, with the inevitable result that the claims were allowed; but, subject to those trifling exceptions, which only mark the rule, we have observed the rule. We are not without experience in this matter in the old Province. In the early days of the old Legislature of Canada, prior to 1840, when, as you know, we had a system which was not a system of responsible government, although there were Ministers representing the Crown, at that time, as Mr. Bourinot says:

"All applications for pecuniary assistance were addressed directly to the House of Assembly, and every Governor, especially Lord Sydenham, has given his testimony as to the injurious effect of the system. The Union Act of 1840 placed the initiation of many votes in the Crown, and this wise practice was always strictly followed up to 1867, when the new Constitution came into force."

And we know the language of the present Constitution provides expressly:

"It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended by a Message of the Governor General, in the the Session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed."

A similar provision is inserted in the Constitution of each Provincial Legislature. Now, as I have said, I see the difficulty in which hon. gentlemen opposite were plunged when they came to deal with this question, because they have got one or two alternatives to adopt. They have to adopt the language we find here, which says:

"The expenditure of such portion of any moneys appropriated by Parliament for the Territories, as the Governor in Council may instruct the Lieutenant Governor to expend, by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly."

That is to say, the advice of the Assembly is to rule. They had that course open to them. Or the course was open to them of providing that the Lieutenant Governor should send down his Message, and without that Message it should not be competent for the Legislative Assembly to deal with the question at all. There you would at once be face to face with irresponsible rule. The Legislative Assembly cannot condemn the Lieutenant Governor, or dismiss him, or alter his position in any way, his advisory council is not responsible; and you are brought face to face with a difficulty which must subsist for the want of responsible government. But, on the other hand, what are we doing by the proposed plan? We are deliberately initiating that system which was deliberately abandoned in the early history of the old Province, where it was tried with injurious results, which has been deliberately rendered impossible by the constitutional Act, as to this Assembly and as to the Provincial Legislatures, and which is decidedly opposed to the spirit of the British Constitution. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia has told us of the method of the expenditure of the scanty funds, which up to this time the Legislative Assembly has been allowed to expend. It is not an entirely new method of expenditure, because, I happen to know, that in the Province of Nova Scotia there are certain moneys called "road moneys," the disposal of which has been placed under the control of members; but, even there, the question of deciding as to how much shall go to each county is decided according to constitutional principle, while the detailed application has been left, with very injurious results, to the local members. But the hon. gentleman tells us, that in this case the total fund to be disposed of is divided by the number of constituencies, and each member is given his equal share. Of course, it is impossible to suppose, that in a territory like the North-West, in which, with the best possible desire, you cannot have equal areas with equal wants all over, that an equal division of money all over is a just division. Why, it is beyond all possibility that such an arrangement can be just, and it is important that what scanty funds are available should be expended for such objects as may on the advice of responsible Ministers, be submitted to the Assembly and as shall by the Assembly be deemed to be for the general good. It might be that a particular district might be infinitely more benefited in reality by the whole fund being expended outside of it, in an adjoining district; its own immediate local interests might be better served by a large expenditure on a bridge or other means of public communication, than by being frittered away in the district itself. Such a system as this is one which certainly does not encourage us in the scheme of placing more funds in this present fashion under the control of the Assembly. I think, therefore, we are face to face with a very serious question when we are engaged in the work commenced in 1875, that high and noble work for any Legislative Assembly, the task of improving, as we were engaged then in the task of inaugurating, the institutions under which a large territory, to be inhabited at some future day, we hope, by millions, may grow up and prosper.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. In the early part of this Session, a question closely connected with the present legislation which we are now called upon to examine was raised in this House, and it was then stated although the population of the North-West Territories was largely composed of a class of people using the French language, it was astonishing that in the North-West Council, composed of 22 members, not one had been returned who belonged to the French Canadian nationality. This was due to the fact that the electoral divisions were so arranged, that the French population could not muster a sufficient number of electors to elect one of themselves to represent their interests in that Council. I expected that the present Bill would contain such provisions, as would alter the electoral divisions so as to give the French population of the North-West Territories a chance of having representatives upon the floor of their Council. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) made at the time a suggestion, that when amendments should be framed to the North-West Territories Act, they should contain such changes as would help the French population to be properly represented; and if my memory serves me right, the promise was given to him, that when such legislation would be brought before this House, it would contain a provision whereby the desired change would be effected, and whereby the interests of those which are to-day unrepresented in that body, would be protected. I am sorry to see, that when a suggestion was made to the Senate to that effect, it was not

accepted by those who had the Bill in charge ; and the Bill which now comes before this House is, consequently, without such provision. Out of 22 members composing the North-West Council, as I have said, not one belonged either to the French nationality, or even to the Catholic religion, although one-fifth of the North-West is French. The population of the North-West Territories, according to the last census, was 22,000 or 27,000 inhabitants, out of which 4,800 were of French origin, and these people, as I repeat, are without representation in the North-West Assembly. Before this Bill is adopted by the House, I hope that such an amendment as will rectify this state of affairs will be incorporated. When a Constitution was given to the Province of Quebec, at Confederation, the framers were very careful to set apart a certain number of counties which were called the English counties ; and by the Constitution, the Legislature of the Province of Quebec could not interfere with the limits of these counties, so that the Protestant minority of the Province would have their representatives, and would thus be protected against the majority. I say that this was well done. Although there was no danger, still it was right, I believe, that the minority should be protected against the majority. If we had this protection in the Province of Manitoba, we would not have had to regret the legislation recently adopted in that Province. I maintain that it is within our duty, as representatives of the people here, to see that the minority is protected in the North-West Territories, as it is in the Province of Manitoba by the Constitution, and as the Protestant and English minority of the Province of Quebec is also protected by the Constitution. I repeat expressing the hope that, before this Bill is put through all its stages in this House, such provision will be incorporated as shall protect the minority of the North-West Territories, as far as their right to fair representation at least, is concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with a great deal which has been said by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), but I do not think he has quite stated the law ; he has not stated it, at all events, as I understand it. The difficulty with the North-West Territories is, that the Advisory Council is not responsible as a Government would be ; although it is stated that the Lieutenant Governor has to consult the Advisory Council with regard to the expenditure of moneys. It is a hybrid system. It is neither a system of responsible government, such as we are accustomed to understand it, nor is it a system by which the Executive—that is, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories —is responsible, and, I suppose, solely responsible to his official head. But I think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was wrong in this respect. As I understand the effect of the amendment now proposed, it is this : that in addition to the moneys which the people of the North-West vote themselves, and which, according to the present practice, they are supposed to have control over ; they are to have control over such further sums of money, under the 11th sub-section :

"As the Governor in Council may instruct the Lieutenant Governor to expend, by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly."

My hon. friend will see that under another clause of the North-West Territories Amending Act of 1888, these moneys so expended will have to be recommended by the Lieutenant Governor ; so, in point of fact, one of the mischiefs he pointed out, that that would be an expenditure without any responsibility, is, as I conceive, the result of the present scheme ; the Lieutenant Governor is not responsible, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, but no money can be expended by the Council without his recommendation. To my mind, that is a most unfortunate condition of things, and I join with the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition in thinking that, if the day has not come, it is fast approaching, when responsible government might well be given to the North-West Territories, in some degree at all events. I do not mean to say that we should give them control of the public lands, but I believe that responsible government might well be given in a very large degree to the people of the North-West Territories. A Bill of a similar nature to this is now before the British Parliamene with regard to West Australia, and although ths population there is 65,000 only—not so much at the population of the North-West Territories, if my memory serves me right—the Imperial Government have introduced a Bill proposing to confer on West Australia responsible government, though not giving them absolute control over the great public lands of that country. With that exception, I do not know why our North-West Territories, with 100,000 inhabitants, as, I think, they claim themselves to be, should not be entrusted with responsible government, instead of the extraordinary system which is perpetuated to some extent by this measure. Any one who reads the difficulties of the last session of the North-West Assembly will see how important it is in the interests of that country that this question should be settled, and settled promptly. We find that in the early days of the last meeting of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Haultain's Administration resigned, because the Licutenant Governor declined to account for the expenditure which had been voted by the Assembly the preceding session. Then we find, that a new Advisory Board having been selected, the Council promptly voted want of confidence in them, and the Advisory Board having refused to resign on account of that, the Legislative Assembly refused to vote money which had been recommended by the Lieutenant Governor. There is a deadlock ; it is a deadlock that this measure is certainly not going to get rid of in any way ; the same difficulty will arise next session ; and I really think that when the Bill is before us, some more adequate provision should be made for getting rid of a difficulty which is calculated to create uneasiness and disturbance in the North-West, the result of which we must all deplore. I notice, too—though it is perhaps not intentional—that the effect of the Bill is rather to limit the authority of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West. The 9th sub-section of section 13 simply gives power to the North-West Assembly to constitute courts of civil jurisdiction ; but that Assembly has up to this time had power, which it will cease to have if this Bill becomes law, to constitute courts of criminal jurisdiction as well. I do not know the reason for that change. However, these are provisions which will, perhaps, undergo discussion in committee, and I merely refer to them now, without in any sense opposing the second reading. I regret that this Bill has not been

brought down earlier in the Session. Dealing as it does with a territory of such vast extent and with such a large population, I think it is not too much to say, that it is one of the most important, if not the most important measure of the whole Session, and I think it is a pity that it has been left to be considered in the dying hours of the Session. But, when the proper time comes, I will move with regard to one or two clauses—one clause which I see in the Bill, and another which I object to not seeing there, if that is not a Hibernianism. I propose to ask the Committee to reconsider the resolution which is now to be found embodied in the 31st clause of the Bill:

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Legislative Assembly of the Territories and in the proceedings before the courts; and both those languages shall be used in the records and journals of such Assembly; and all ordinances made under this Act shall be printed in both those languages: Provided, however, that after the next general election of the Legislative Assembly, such Assembly may, by ordinance or otherwise, regulate its proceedings, and the manner of recording and publishing the same; and the regulations so made shall be embodied in a proclamation which shall be forthwith made and published by the Lieutenant Governor in conformity with the law, and thereafter shall have full force and effect."

Now, I submit that this clause does not at all dispose of the question of the dual language. I notice that the hon. gentleman who represents the Government in the other House calls it a compromise. If it is a compromise, I do not know who were the parties to that compromise. I do not know why the Upper House should have felt bound or precluded by some arrangement or compromise made with regard to this question. Who were the parties to the compromise? Were the people of the North-West consulted? Had they any notice of it, or did they assent to it?

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

CHARLES H. MACKINTOSH, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the City of Ottawa, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Robillard.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was pointing out that it had been urged in the other branch of the Legislature that this compromise had been agreed to, and that by reason of the compromise it was not in the public interest that this agitation, as it was termed, should be prolonged or renewed. What I want to know is, who were the parties to the compromise, and why should we be bound or precluded by an arrangement when we cannot even tell who were the parties to it. It was not stated on the floor of this House that there had been any arrangement; certainly no arrangement was agreed to on the floor of the House other than that found in the vote that was cast. Then, was the arrangement made outside of the House? If so, who were the parties to it? It was stated, I see, by the hon. gentleman who represents the Government in the other Chamber:

"The reason is precisely the one which my hon. friend from Ottawa stated, and it is the one which actuates probably nearly every man in this Chamber who votes for the proviso, namely, that by the introduction of the proviso it is intended not to prolong or increase or renew the agitation on this subject, but, by accepting it, to seek to put an end to the agitation on this subject, because it represents something in the nature of a compromise which has been impliedly entered into and agreed upon by the leaders of all parties in politics in this country—with the exception of this new and small party which has lately sprung up—as a solution of the difficulty which can reasonably be accepted."

Well, I do not understand, and on endeavoring to recall the discussion, I cannot now derive from it, although I paid pretty close attention to it, how this compromise was agreed to. I do remember, that my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) moved a resolution proposing that the whole subject should be left to the people of the North-West after the general elections; I understood that a large proportion of the House were in favor of that; I heard the right hon. gentleman who leads the House applaud the sentiment, and I think, if I am not mistaken, that he spoke in favor of it. Shortly afterwards, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made a proposition, he not being satisfied either with the Bill or the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. Within twenty-four hours afterwards, this other amendment was suggested, but it was not suggested as the result of a compromise or anything of the kind. Perhaps the leader of the other House knows more about it than I do; all I know of it was what took place on the floor of this House. But what I protest against, is that Parliament should be supposed to be bound by any arrangement come to on that occasion. I ventured to say then, and I repeat now, that that is not going to settle the difficulty. If this dual language discussion is calculated to arouse passions and feelings which had better not be aroused, then the proper thing for Parliament to do is to settle the question once and for all. This is no settlement of it. What does it do? It merely leaves to the Assembly of the Territories the power to say that the Journals shall be printed in the way they think fit; in other words, they shall not be printed in both languages; and further, that but one language, if they please, shall be spoken in the Assembly. I have not the slightest doubt that, without any law at all, any reasonable body of men—and I take it that the members of the North-West Assembly are reasonable men—would permit one of its members to speak in any language which suited him, in which they could follow him. I do not think they require any law for that. I do not think that is the grievance which was complained of. What the people of the North-West complained of, and what they still, if I read their press aright, complain of, is that this is a perpetuation of the system of dual languages, and, therefore, calculated to do a great deal of mischief, unless put an end to at an early day. That system is still maintained in the courts. I do not object, nor need anybody object, to the printing of the laws in as many languages as the Assembly thinks necessary; it is not necessary to impose by this Act imperatively upon the Assembly that the laws shall be printed in French and English, as that is a matter which reasonable men would deal with properly and fairly. What I feel, and what I think most people feel on this subject, is the mischief resulting from the policy of perpetuating the dual system of language. I do not propose to renew the discussion at any length upon that subject; but ask the attention of the House to an omission which is perhaps still more serious in this Bill, and that is with reference to the question of education. By the law, as it now stands, separate schools have

been, since 1875, absolutely imposed upon the people of the North-West Territories. The majority constitutes its school and then the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic, has a separate school. This system differs from the system prevailing in Ontario in this way, that in Ontario we have the public schools, which are the general schools, and then we have the separate schools which are the schools of the Roman Catholic minority. But in the North-West Territories the law is the same as in the Province of Quebec, I believe; at all events, it is that the majority having formed their school, the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic, are then entitled to form theirs. So that there are in most of the districts two schools—the school of the majority, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, and that of the minority. The intention of our Constitution is to give the Local Assemblies absolute and complete control over education. That is the scheme of our Constitution. In the cases of Quebec and Ontario, special restrictions were imposed on both these Provinces; but in all the other Provinces of the Dominion there is no restriction whatever, and the question is left to be settled by the local authorities, who are the most competent to deal with it. I propose to ask the Committee, when this Bill is in committee, to place the law in the North-West Territories exactly in that position. When this law was passed, it was said there were only five hundred people in the North-West Territories. It was passed, so far as the Senate was concerned, in opposition to a very large number of Senators. I have here the debate on the subject, and I find that this clause of the Bill was only carried by a majority of two, it having been opposed on a motion made by Senator Aikins and strongly supported by the Hon. George Brown. The late Mr. Brown opposed it on the ground that it was contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, as the British North America Act gave the matter of education absolutely to the Provinces, and that, as at that time, the North-West Territories were being endowed with certain powers, the power should be given to them of dealing with this question. Mr. Brown spoke, according to the official reports of the Senate, as follows:—

"He held this provision was quite contrary to the British North America Act. Nothing was more clear that each Province should have absolute control over education. He held that was the only principle on which the Union Act could be continued. If the Dominion Government interfered in local matters we would get into inextricable confusion with the Provinces. The safe way for us was to let each Province suit itself in this matter. The country was filled with people of all classes and creeds, and there would be no end to confusion if each class had to have its own peculiar school system. It had been said this clause was put in for the protection of the Protestants against the Catholics, the latter being the most numerous. But he, speaking for the Protestants, was in a position to say that we did not want that protection. In this case, it was proposed that the national machinery should be used for the imposition and collection of taxes upon persons of peculiar denominations for the support of schools of their kind. It was an attempt to enforce upon that country peculiar views with regard to education."

Now, what was the argument against this contention? It was that the system of separate schools and public schools was prevailing in Ontario and Quebec, and that it was the subject of very great regret that there was not in New Brunswick—because at that time the New Brunswick question was up—a similar law. Well, I have learned from members coming from New Brunswick that the school system there has acted satisfactorily, and that there is no substantial grievance complained of by the minority, who do not find that, in attending the ordinary public schools, they are suffering any great wrong. We know that in the Province of Ontario, in many places, all classes of religion attend the public schools. I know of one place in my own riding where the Roman Catholics have always refused to have separate schools, although they are a very large body in that particular township. They are quite content, rather more than content, to send their children to the public schools, confident that by joining with the others they would get a much better education than by dividing the schools into two smaller bodies. The suggestions, therefore, which were made in the Senate in support of this clause of the Bill, experience has shown to be not warranted by the results. It is urged that this and kindred questions should not be dealt with until after the next elections, and I propose to move an amendment in that sense. The Legislative Assembly has unanimously petitioned that the clause to which I refer should be amended in the direction I speak of. I find, upon the 29th of October, on motion of Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Brett, it was resolved:

"That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency, the Governor General in Council, the Senate and the House of Commons, praying that an Act be passed to amend the North-West Territories Act by repealing subsection 1, of section 14, after the word 'education' in the second line."

In other words, simply giving the North-West Assembly power to deal with the subject of education. A special committee was thereupon appointed to draft a petition, and both these motions were carried unanimously; and I find on page 65 of the Journals of the North-West Assembly, that a petition to the same effect was presented and again unanimously adopted. However, if there is any doubt about the propriety of asking the North-West Assembly to deal with this question at present, I am quite willing to yield to that doubt, because a year or two cannot make any great difference. Therefore, I propose to move in Committee that after the next election they shall have power to deal with this subject of education in an unrestricted manner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret I was not able to be present during the previous part of this debate, and that I had not the advantage of hearing all the argument of the hon. member for North Simcoe. This Bill, however, does not pretend in any way to be either a consolidation of the laws respecting the North-West Territories or to make any substantial amendments, except to remove the clause dealing with education and leaving to a future Parliament the discussion of the whole system of governing the North-West. I presume that, in a very few years, the population there will be such as to call for the division of the Territories into Provinces. Then I have no doubt a constitution will be adopted similar in substance to the constitutions that prevail in the various existing Provinces of the Dominion. The Legislature of Canada has proceeded, with reference to the organisation of the North-West, with great care and caution. It will be remembered that at

first that country was governed by a Lieutenant Governor with a council appointed, I think, altogether by the Crown, and afterwards with a council composed of a certain number of Crown nominees and a certain number of elected councillors. The governor was practically without responsibility to the Legislature, and I have no doubt that was designedly so, the Governor being responsible to the central Government, and that central Government or Cabinet being responsible to the Dominion Parliament. The amended measure which was introduced, I think, by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made a further advance and provided that when the population amounted to a certain number——

Mr. BLAKE. That was introduced by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for the error. That provided that, when the number of the elected members amounted to 21, the nominated council should disappear, and it should be changed from a council to an assembly, and the Governor would then sever himself—if I recollect aright—from the council of which before he was merely a member, and would assume a more distinct political existence, in fact, would assume by degrees the position of the representative of the Crown in a Province. Still, there was no responsible government provided for in so many words in that Act. In 1888, the last Act was passed, by which without the Lieutenant Governor having a responsible government as we understand it, without having advisers selected from the assembly and obliged to go back to their constituents for re-election upon being appointed advisers of the Crown, it was provided that further steps should be taken towards the assimilation of the system there to that which prevails in the Provinces, so that the Lieutenant Governor should have an advisory board taken from the Assembly, and so on. The difficulty—if difficulty it may be called—the difference of opinion in the North-West arose from the fact that the Assembly at once assumed that they had a constitution similar to a Provincial constitution. As to the danger that was alluded to by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or rather the practice in the olden days—I am old enough to remember them—the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada did not look after the finances at all except those which were derived from Imperial revenues, such as Customs, for instance.

Mr. BLAKE. And the post office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Also the post office and the Indian revenue *quoad* the Indians. The Lieutenant Governor managed those revenues autocratically, but, I believe, with a praiseworthy desire to meet the views of the people, though he was not obliged to do so. As to the revenues which came within the governance of the Legislature, I am afraid there was a great deal of what the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) calls log-rolling. At all events, there were Acts passed appropriating the revenue at the instance of any member who moved a Bill—something like the system which now prevailsin the American Congress. There were ludicrous instances of Bills being passed for certain purposes when there was no money in the treasury to carry out the purposes for which they were adopted. Year after year statutes were adopted enabling the Province to borrow money when there was really no power to borrow, and when, if there had been the power, they had not sufficient credit to raise the money required by the Bill. You will find a semi-indignant, but somewhat cynical account of these proceedings in the report of Lord Sydenham. This state of affairs was cured in 1863. In this case no such action can be taken except on the initiative of the Governor, who is responsible to the Parliament of Canada as a Dominion officer, but he had always the power in that country to act at first on his own discretion. In 1878, there was an attempt made to provide an embryotic Ministry or Council, to allow the Lieutenant Governor to select four advisers, from those he thought, from their commercial and financial experience, were best fitted to discharge that duty. That was all that was then done in the direction of establishing responsible government. Whether the time has come, or not, when responsible government in its fullest extent should be established in those Territories, I am unable to say, but I can say this, that almost every gentleman from the North-West with whom I have communicated, either personally or by letter, on the subject, has objected very much to the premature introduction of the system which now prevails in the Province of Manitoba. They say that they are warned by the results of Provincial Government in Manitoba ; that, there not being included in the population of that Province men of political experience, men acquainted with constitutional principles ; they say—I am not expressing my opinion on the subject—that the experience of Manitoba, and the enormous expenditure in that Province, has warned them against having that system prematurely extended to the North-West. I shall not enter into the discussion as to the dual language or the separate schools. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has promised to express his views by resolution when we are going into Committee of the Whole. I hope, therefore, that the Bill will pass the second reading, and will be set down for an early day, when we can discuss those questions. I regret that my absence from the House at the time prevented my hearing the speech of the hon. gentleman, and, therefore, no doubt, my remarks are very much short of being an answer to that speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in saying that the measure now under our consideration is one of the most important, perhaps the most important, that has been before the House this Session, and I feel in my own mind that it is quite impossible at this period of the Session to give to a measure of this importance that full and exhaustive consideration which it ought to receive from this House. The principles involved in the measure are of very great importance, and ought to receive very full consideration, and ought to be discussed from every possible standpoint by the members of this House, before any final action is taken. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that it is not proper at the present time that responsible government should be introduced in the North-West Territories. Well, it does seem to me an extremely unsatisfactory condition of things that

you have given to the people of that country a representative Assembly, but that you should withhold from them executive responsibility. The hon. the First Minister has referred to the Lieutenant Governor as a party who is responsible for the executive government in those Territories. Well, he is only responsible in the same way that the Governor appointed by the Imperial Ministry for this country was responsible to Downing Street before responsible government was conceded. The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is responsible to the Administration here ; he is not responsible at all in the sense in which we understand the expression. It is an Administration, or an Executive, that is responsible to the representatives of the people within the Territories for the purposes for which that representative Assembly is constituted. Now, there has been a good deal of discussion in the House, not on this question but on another question that preceded it this Session, which shows that to some extent there is confusion in the minds, I think, of the members of this House, and also perhaps, in public estimation, with regard to the differences that exist between a Territorial Government and a Provincial Government. We recognise this difference in every Bill that we introduce to this House, and we have recognised it in the measure that is now before us. But whether we give to the Territorial Legislature large power, or whether we give to it little power, whatever power is conferred upon it should be exercised, it seems to me, under the control of a responsible Administration. I do not see how it is possible that you can have anything like permanency in public policy in regard to measures which may be brought before that Legislature for consideration, unless you have an Administration controlling the legislation and responsible for its due execution. You may have measures carried through the Territorial Legislature to-day, which will be repealed next Session, because there is no Administration existing which will, in any proper sense, be responsible for the conduct of public affairs. Now, I admit that in a new country people must be content with narrower powers than we have in an older country, which is more densely settled, where the population has grown more wealthy, where their wants are more varied. We recognise this difference in the growth of Provincial establishments under responsible governments. We are not content to-day with the amount of power that was possessed by the old Legislature of the Provinces after responsible government was first introduced. Our population has become more dense, their interests have become more varied, they have external as well as domestic relations, and so they require and ask for a voice in controlling their external as well as their domestic affairs. This may make a difference between the extent of power which we confer upon a Local Legislature under a territorial system, and upon a Local Legislature that is constituted under a Provincial organisation. But all these matters are matters that require very careful consideration. I was astonished at the change of sentiment indicated by the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe here to-day, in discussing the subject of the dual language. The hon. gentleman expressed sentiments to-day with which I, in a great measure, cordially agree ; they were those which I enunciated in discussing this Bill at an earlier period of the Session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

The hon. gentleman has had new light, and I am glad to see that the views which he expressed to-day are more nearly in consonance with those entertained by the majority of this House. Now, I am sure that some of the parties outside of the House will be disappointed. Let me tell the hon. gentleman this : A Frenchman and a countryman of his, in this city, were discussing this question of the dual language yesterday, and his countryman said to his French friend : "Ah, ye may use your French lingo to-day, but wait till the Great McCarthy has done wid ye, and ye will only be able to make signs then." I am sure if the hon. gentleman's countryman had heard his speech here to-day, he would be satisfied that the Frenchman, after all, might be able to do something more than make signs after the hon. gentleman had done with him. The hon. gentleman has recognised to-day the principle that language used for public purposes, like language used for private purposes, is a matter of convenience. The hon. gentleman said that we ought not to force two languages upon a population. Well, I do not think we are doing that. I was opposed to that in the first instance, but I never supposed for one moment that if the members of the Council were Frenchmen and could not speak English, they would be debarred from speaking French. That was their privilege. When that Council was first created the Crown appointed to the Council, upon our advice, a half-breed who could not speak a word of English, and we appointed him because he was a man of immense influence over the half-breed population and one in whom they had the utmost confidence ; and I am perfectly sure that we carried on the government of that country during the remaining period of our administration, with very much smaller police force to maintain peace in that country, than if we had appointed a member to the Council in whom the people of the Territories had not the utmost confidence. I observe that the hon. gentleman has by this Bill, in section 3, provided that the "territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the North-West Territories shall be " so and so. Well, the hon. gentleman will see, from looking at any old work on the subject of Hudson's Bay, or any old map representing that territory, that Rupert's Land embraced the territory east of Hudson's Bay as well as the territories on the west, and that the designation of the North-West Territories applied rather to the territories extending eastward from the Bay, and that Rupert's Land was, on most old maps, marked as the territory laying on the east and south-east of that Bay. The hon. gentleman will remember that the territory is not embraced in any Province at the present time ; it is not embraced in the Territory of Keewatin, and so there ought to be some phraseology used to show what precise territories are intended to be embraced under the provisions of this Bill. I notice there are some provisions providing for the appointment of legal experts, for the appointment of a fixed number of members of the Territories, which is, no doubt, right and proper in the first instance ; but the limits of the territorial districts and the number of members to be elected, ought to be left to the people of the Territories through the Legislature which they have constituted. I would just say one thing more with regard to the general principles embodied in this Bill, and that is with

reference to any appropriation that may be made by this Parliament and placed at the disposal of the Legislature of that Territory. I think that an amount of money ought to be appropriated upon some principle such as was recognised in making an appropriation out of the revenue for the use of a Province, and it ought to be as absolutely under the control of the Legislature and its responsible executive as an appropriation that is made by this Parliament under the constitution is under the control of the Legislature of the Province to which it is made. It is impossible that the government of that country can be fairly carried on with the very small appropriation that is made, nor is it at all adequate when we compare the number of the population with the number of the people in any one of the Provinces. It does seem to me, when we look at the fact that the Territories have no resources whatever except those received by direct taxation or those derived from grants made by this House, that an appropriation ought to be placed at the disposal of the Legislature of the Territories for territorial purposes, and it should be as completely under their control and as free from interference as if it were made to a Province regularly constituted.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. DAWSON. Perhaps the hon. Minister will allow me to direct his attention to a technical matter; it is that, I think, the description might be somewhat improved. It at present reads:

"All that portion of the Dominion of Canada which is bounded as follows, that is to say: Beginning at the point of intersection of the western boundary of the Province of Manitoba and the international boundary line dividing Canada from the United States; thence westerly along the said international boundary line to the line of the watershed dividing the waters flowing into the Pacific Ocean from those flowing into the Arctic Sea or Hudson's Bay."

The international boundary line does not touch the watershed of the Arctic Sea at all, but it crosses the watershed separating the waters flowing into Hudson's Bay from the waters running to the Pacific Ocean. The description would be better in this way:

"Dividing the waters flowing into the Pacific Ocean from those flowing into the Gulf of Mexico and Hudson's Bay."

I believe that in the Rocky Mountains the international boundary line actually touches on the sources of the Mississippi, but certainly it does not touch on any river flowing into the Arctic Ocean. It also touches the head waters of the south branch of the Saskatchewan. The hon. Minister has officers in his Department who could draw up a very good description. As it stands now, it is not a great deal better than the description drawn by the Imperial Privy Council of the boundaries between Manitoba and Ontario, where a very large portion of the United States is given to one of the Provinces. I merely throw out the suggestion.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The officers of the Department have taken much trouble in preparing this description; but if the hon. gentleman will send to me in writing any suggestion he has to offer, it will be considered.

Mr. CHARLTON. I doubt very much whether it is advisable to change the name of the country from the North-West Territories to the Western Territories of Canada. The new name is not as convenient as the old one, because there are more words in it. The country has been for many years known as the North-West Territories, and it will very likely continue to be so known despite this legislation changing its name. I question very much the propriety of making any change, and I move that we retain the old name, North-West Territories.

Mr. BLAKE. It occurred to me that it is a very awkward name that is proposed. If you do not use a name that is easily spoken, it will not be used at all. I felt some difficulty about making a change, but it occurs to me that if a change is to be made it would be a much easier mouthful to say, Western Canadian Territories.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The name might be changed to Western Territories. Objection has been taken to the word "North" as conveying to the general public the idea of an arctic condition, that the country was not very like the American North-West, but was further north, and possessed a more severe climate, a shorter summer and a longer winter, and for these reasons it was suggested to drop the word "North."

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that the old name, after all, was not devoid of truth, and the change proposed will not alter the thermometer in winter or in summer in any way whatever. My impression is that any announcement made to the world at large, and particularly to the immigrating public, with the view of persuading them that they are not going to cold winters in the North-West, will not have any effect on any sensible man.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These Territories have been designated by the present name for half a century, and are known to the geographical world by that name, which we should retain. The name merely expresses its relation to the other portions of Canada. In 1787, the territories between the Ohio, Lake Erie and Mississippi, were called the North-West Territories of the United States, and they were so-called because of the geographical position of the territory to that embraced within the thirteen States of the Union. So I think those territories may very well retain the name of North-West Territories, considering their relation to the rest of Canada. This section would require to be somewhat altered so as to describe the Territory of Keewatin, and the north and west of the Province of Manitoba; otherwise you have not a proper description.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to the name, I do not suppose there will be any serious quarrel about it. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as did my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson), suggested that the description was inaccurate. My hon. friend said that Rupert's Land was understood to be the land that lay to the south and south-east of Hudson Bay. If that is the case, the North-West Territories, which was one time held under license, would be supposed to lie to the south-west of Rupert's Land. I would suggest that the clause should be allowed to

stand until the Minister of the Interior has time to consider the matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Rupert's Land lies east of the Territory of Keewatin. The hon. gentleman does not propose to embrace all that territory under this jurisdiction. All the territories this Bill deals with lie west of the Territory of Keewatin, and, therefore, it should not refer to Rupert's Land at all.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The simplest way would be to leave out "Rupert's Land" altogether.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think it is a great mistake to change the name. There is a sort of historical interest attached to the name of the "North-West," and when you speak of the North-West in Dakota or the Western States, the people know at once that you refer to the North-West Territories of Canada. It is a more euphonious name than the one you now propose, and in all respects a better one in my opinion.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I think we should call it the South-West Territories instead of the North-West, for there are plenty of lands which remain there which you can call the North-West if you so wish.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In that case the hon. gentleman ought to propose to exclude from this Bill all the territories lying north of the Saskatchewan, but this Bill embraces all the territories to the mouth of the Mackenzie River, and the hon. gentleman will hardly call the territories lying around the Mackenzie and Copper Mine Rivers the "South-West."

Mr. CHARLTON. The change proposed by the hon. gentleman would lead to the supposition that we had been acquiring territories in Central America.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are a number of people throughout Canada who have a very strong feeling on this matter. The name of the North-West often leads to a confusion between our country and the United States. I saw, no later than a few days ago, in our local paper here, a statement as to a snowstorm in the North-West Territory, and people looking at the item though it referred to the North-West of Canada, and congratulated themselves that the snow would do good to the fields. I have frequently had letters from the old country, sympathising with us on account of storms and cyclones, which were experienced in the Western States of the Union, but the people thought they had occurred in our North-West. That is one of the principal reasons that we proposed to change the name. I do not think the name should be struck out of the Bill without consideration, and I think it is better to allow the clause to stand for the present.

Mr. AMYOT. I did not raise an objection that this Bill was not translated into French as I did not wish to delay the House at this late period of the Session, but I should like to know from the Minister of the Interior before I vote for this, what is the translation into French of the name he has suggested. If the hon. Minister cannot answer me, perhaps the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) can.

Mr. McCARTHY. I decline.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Nobody knows that better than my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot).

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman the name in French.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is too good a French scholar not to be able to translate that himself, but no doubt he wanted to have a little joke on my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, who is not, perhaps, so fluent in French as he is in English. I suppose the translation would be: "Territoires Occidentaux du Canada." That will be rather a long name, but I believe it will be a good translation.

Mr. AMYOT. I am glad this has drawn some compliments to my humble self from the Minister of Public Works. I am not used to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will let the section stand.

On section 5,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this section is objectionable in this, that it ought to provide for a fixed number of members until the Legislature otherwise determines. The Legislature ought to have an opportunity of altering the boundaries of constituencies, or increasing the number of members. It may be convenient, on account of settlement going on more rapidly in one division than in another, to divide it and give it two representatives. Then, I can see no object in having three legal experts.

Mr. DEWDNEY. With regard to the twenty-two electoral districts, I may state, that that number was agreed to during my term as Lieutenant Governor, and a great deal of trouble was taken in the division of the electoral districts. The members were naturally jealous for their districts, desiring to get as many members for them as possible; but after a good deal of negotiation, the number of twenty-two was agreed to as a compromise. I am not aware whether there will be any objection to giving to the Legislative Assembly power to increase their number; I think they would probably know the position of affairs better than any one else. With regard to the legal experts, during my time they were of very great service in the Council, and I believe they are still felt to be of great service, and I think it would be a pity at present to make any change with regard to them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If it is found necessary that parties with legal knowledge should be in the Assembly to advise, the constituencies ought to do just as is done in regard to this House—they ought to return a certain number of legal gentlemen to the Legislature, who would give them the legal advice they require.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think there is any substantial reason for changing this clause. It is only a temporary arrangement, and at present it works very well. I may say that the members of the North-West Council pretty well fixed on the number of the constituencies before we fixed on it here. I do not think there is any sense of grievance with regard to this clause at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) made

provision for twenty-one elected members whenever the population arrived at a certain point; and there was frequent request from the North-West to alter the constitution to allow of twenty-one elected members. When the Council met together, they found that it would be more convenient, that it would make a better readjustment—a better gerrymander, as the hon. gentleman would call it—if there were twenty-two elected members instead of twenty-one. That was their own deliberate recommendation, and I think we ought to leave the provision as it is until they ask for an alteration; because the House must remember that the expenses of the Legislature are defrayed out of the Dominion treasury. By-and-bye, when the North-West Territories become Provinces, they will, of course, have all the powers which Provinces have.

Mr. LAURIER. There are at present nineteen territorial divisions, two of which, Edmonton and Calgary, I think, elect two members each. I think it would be wise to adopt the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that as the population increases in any division, the Legislature should have power to increase the number of representatives for that division. Not later than yesterday, the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill which he hoped would very much increase the population in a certain section of the country, that is to say, the section which already returns two members, Calgary and Edmonton. Under such circumstances, it seems to me that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell has a good deal to commend it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The difficulty I see about it would be this: that if one district proposed to increase its number, every other district would also insist on an increase.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why should you undertake, once you have created a representative body, to tie it up in this way. There is none of the Provinces tied up by the Constitution in that way. The hon. gentleman is just creating a difficulty similar to the one which was raised here during this Session over the clause relating to the dual language, a clause which was wholly unnecessary to secure the use of both languages. Now, you propose by this restriction to force these people to come here and occupy the time of this House in making a change which they could, if you gave them the power, better make for themselves, as they are better judges in that matter than we can be. Suppose one of these districts in the next few years increases in population while the others scarcely increase at all, that district will require additional representation; and that is a point which the Legislative Assembly is best fitted to pronounce upon. All that it is necessary is to say that the Legislative Assembly shall be composed, until the Assembly otherwise determines, of twenty-two members. There is no danger of the Assembly wasting its resources lightly by undertaking to increase the number of representatives beyond the actual requirements. If any such a thing were attempted, the people would send other men to represent them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The money does not come out of the local revenues, but out of the Dominion treasury.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These people are contributors to the Dominion treasury. You give to every Province a certain revenue per head according to the population. Are you prepared to give them the same revenue to be at their own disposal? I think we should. I think, that as soon as they increase in numbers sufficiently to be entitled to have a competent representative Assembly, they ought to have control of the revenues required to carry on the Government, and those revenues should be voted by this Legislature on some intelligible principles recognised by the British North America Act as applicable to the Provinces.

Mr. DAVIN. I have always contended that we should have a revenue granted on the same principles as those on which revenues are given to the Provinces. But the reason I do not think it necessary that this clause should be changed, is that I have heard no desire expressed on the part of the members for a change, and have seen no evidence of grievance whatever in that connection. The only thing I have noticed in connection with this clause, is that there is a kind of defiance on the part of the members—of three judges who are there. I do not know why they should dislike to have them there, since they cannot vote, and only one of them speaks.

Mr. McCARTHY. He speaks very long.

Mr. DAVIN. No; he does not. He has only spoken once or twice. The experience, patience and labor of Judge Richardson, as the hon. the Minister of the Interior well knows, are invaluable to that Assembly; and Judge McLeod is a man of considerable experience and ability; and I cannot understand why there should be, among quite a number of the members, a certain impatience at having these gentlemen there. So far as I can see, they do nothing but good. They do not vote, and take no part in the discussions. There is only one subject on which the learned judge ever took a prominent part, and that is the subject of the dual language clause. I do not see much necessity of changing this clause; but if, later on, when you come to the clause giving the Assembly power in great part over the revenue, you should make a change so as to give it a little executive, then, on the third reading, you could recommit this Bill, and alter, as you logically should, this clause. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that three or four years hence it may be found necessary to add to the number of the Assembly. Why, Sir, before three or four years pass, we shall require to have another North-West Territories Bill in this House. We shall have a census taken; and I venture to say that we shall find a far larger number in the North-West Territories than hon. gentlemen, who always speak disparagingly of that country, give it credit for; and that being the case, something will have to be done then in order to readjust the representation. If the hon. gentleman had proposed a practical plan, I should see no insuperable difficulty in altering this clause; but, as a matter of fact, there is no grievance. I have never heard a single complaint about the number; I have never heard any of the members declare that they ought to be able to control it; and the only murmur I have heard—in fact they have petitioned—was that they objected, for some inscrutable reason, to having the three legal experts there. At present I think

it is an advantage to have them there. Our experience has shown that the members of the Assembly found it convenient to make use of these gentlemen's experience and legal knowledge.

Mr. BLAKE. As long as we have not decided to alter fundamentally the system which exists, and which it is proposed by this Bill to continue, I do not see, in the absence of any complaint from the Assembly, why we should interfere with the three legal experts who do not vote. The only complaint that can be made is that which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) suggested, that their speeches are rather long.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a petition against them.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not aware of that; I did not find, on looking at the petitions, that there was any complaint against them. My own impression strongly is, that if a small executive council were granted to the Territories, which, I think, ought to be granted, the experts should disappear; and my opinion is that the people of the country themselves would find it necessary to elect to the Assembly a certain limited number of gentlemen experienced in the law, so that their Assembly might not be a *parliamentum indoctum*, as a well-known Parliament was, from which, I believe, the lawyers were altogether excluded. They would thus obtain as much trained assistance as they thought necessary; and if they chose to do without it, nobody but themselves would be the sufferers. With reference to the number of members, I was not in a position, of course, to hear the whispers of the North-West; but I heard what were not whispers here. I heard the hon. member for Saskatchewan, at an early period of the Session, declare that complaints were made with reference to the distribution of districts in the North-West, and particularly with reference to those in the region he represents; and, if necessary, some remedy ought to be applied to that. If there be a subject with which the Territorial Assembly might be supposed to be better competent to deal than any other, it is in what way the country should be divided for local representation. How is it possible for us to form an intelligent appreciation of that subject? We have to take upon trust the statement of the Minister who studies the subject, with his knowledge of the country from the maps, and the statements of the four members from the North-West Territories. We cannot judge how things are. We cannot give an intelligent vote upon the question of the arrangement of districts. They are, in a country of that description, arrangements which require an intelligent acquaintance, not merely with the census, but with the prospects of growth and with the particular regions in which those prospects are brightest. It is an evil to change frequently, and in this country we know that, in older days, when changes were made, we recognised the view that newer sections—as, for example, the County of Bruce and the County of Renfrew—should be, as regarded population, over-represented for a while, because we expected that an influx of population would redress the difference. That is all a matter to be best considered by the Assembly itself, and, therefore, I think that the readjustment of the electoral districts might be well left to the Assembly. The only question is whether we should give them the power to increase the number of districts, and the only difficulty in regard to that is what the First Minister has suggested, that they may unduly increase the number of districts because it is a popular thing to do, because there are many who in small districts might thus obtain positions of prominence, and possibly of emolument, which they otherwise could not. If we think it necessary so far to hamper and restrain the action of the Assembly, that difficulty might be remedied by providing a maximum number which would cover all demands for increased representation for the next few years. We might say the number should be thirty. We might give the new Assembly, elected after the people have had that question before them, the power to readjust the districts, while not giving them the power to increase the number of districts beyond a certain maximum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The advantage of not confining the number of the Assembly to twenty-two is that, if you have a large increase in population you have it met by a division of the districts, but, if you fix the number at twenty-two, it may entail a readjustment of the entire territory.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am entirely in favor of the view expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It seems to me that we are treating the people of the North-West as if they were unfitted for responsible institutions. Most of these people come from the older Provinces, and they are generally well trained in regard to political institutions. From the short visit which I paid to the North-West, it appeared to me that they were particularly well fitted in that respect, though the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) seems to think that they do not occupy the same plane as members of this House.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. That seemed to be the tone of the hon. gentleman's remarks. We ought not always to be tinkering with this question of the North-West. We cannot here be competent to reassign and readjust the boundaries of the districts in the North-West. If the Legislative Assembly there are to have the power to readjust the boundaries, we should give them the power to increase the districts when, in their judgment, it is necessary. It may be said that these 22 men have not the ability to do anything until after the next election. That, at all events, is the theory which has been already adopted by this Parliament. At all events, they might be given the power to do it after the next election. I dare say that, if you take many of the districts since the Act was passed two years ago, you will find the changes in population so great that the present representation is not a fair one. I press upon the Committee that a change should be made in the direction suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to repudiate in the strongest manner the language of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He said that I put the representatives in the Assembly on a lower plane than the members composing this Parliament. On the contrary, I have again and again asserted in this House that we have a representation in that Assembly which would do credit to any Assembly in the world. I congratulate the North-West on

the sudden accession of popularity which it has obtained, because in 1887, 1888 and 1889, when I brought forward the question and moved for a representative government there, I found there was very little interest taken in the subject either by hon. gentlemen on the Reform side, or by hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) must remember that he should not taunt me, who have been a veteran in the service of the North-West, because he is now animated by the warm zeal of a convert. I am glad to welcome him as a convert, but confessedly it is a recent interest on his part, confessedly it is a new love, and it has all the warmth and perhaps some of the imprudence of a new attachment. So he must not taunt me, who have been fighting the battles of this people, and have contended in this House for responsible government for them. If you give them representative government now, I want to be logical, and I think that clause should be changed. I think now, when you are going to give them control over the funds, you should do what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) contends, namely, strike an average as to the population—you can easily find out what the population is, you can go far below what the actual population is, and still give us far more than we get now; you can give us an adequate income, loose our bands and set us free; give us our majority and let us do the best we can for our country; give us our executive, and then we can go back to this clause and change it, if necessary. But the reason why I desire not to change the clause now is that, after the census which is close at hand, is taken, you cannot deny us responsible government. My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) says he has been in that country, and he must know that the people of the North-West are, in intelligence, above the population of any other part of Canada. I mean that there is a greater average intelligence amongst them than there is amongst the people in any other part of the country. In fact we have had an *immigration d'élite.*

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Dual language.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not feel anxious about this clause, but I congratulate the North-West, and I may say, I congratulate myself, on the deep interest which is shown in the North-West this year, because, when I came first in 1887 and in subsequent years to advocate their cause, my words fell on languid ears; but each year this House has taken more interest in the North-West, and I think nothing could be of more happy omen than this fact.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) seems to think that until he came here no one took any interest in the North-West, but the fact is that the North-West owes whatever it possesses of responsible government to the wisdom and prescience of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who, in 1875, proposed a measure which contained the germ of all the representative institutions the North-West has to-day. The hon. gentleman may learn, what he evidently does not know, that for many years gentlemen on this side of the House pressed upon the Government, by speech and by vote, the necessity of extending the representative principle here to the North-West of responsible government; and I am sure that, whatever doubts and fears we may have had before, we may now congratulate ourselves upon the inestimable blessings conferred upon the whole of Canada, upon the North-West, and upon ourselves, in having introduced my hon. friend to this House. He says in the North-West there has been an *immigration d'élite*, and we here have the *élite* of the *élite*, and we may judge what is left there by the sample which they send us. But the hon. gentleman is quite right. So far as the emigration from Ontario is concerned, and I presume it is the same from the other Provinces, there can be no doubt that by a process of natural selection they have got amongst the best and most energetic men that were to be found among us; and I have no doubt whatever that that immigration, taken on the whole, is of a very superior character-just as, upon the same principles, the upper Province was originally settled. I am old enough to remember the character of those settlers, at least of some of them, living at an extreme old age, and I can bear testimony that a great many of the earlier settlers who came to this country at a period when it was very different from what it is to-day, when there was no assisted emigration, no steamships, no cleared lands, when bears and Indians were supposed to be the attractions of that country, were men of the first rank. Those circumstances indicate of themselves that the early settlers were men of superior force of character, men, I am afraid, we must confess with humility, better, upon the average, than many of their sons and grandsons are. So, in degree, though not to the same extent, is the character of the immigration to the North-West; and we must not, of course, keep such people as that in leading strings; we must deal with them as men of capacity, as men of will, as men of resolution and ability; and we must trust them with their own fortunes, confident that if they make mistakes, as it is they who will suffer the consequences, so they will be able to repair their errors. Such is the general principle upon which we ought to deal with them, and in that view I am disposed—not forgetting that we have certain responsibilities towards them and towards Canada until such period as we give them full Provincial rights—I am disposed largely to listen with great respect and attention and deference to the decided and clearly expressed voice of the Territories themselves as to what is for their advantage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps an apology is due by me to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for the insinuation I ventured to make, but really, if I misunderstood him, he is himself to blame. In the observations he made on the second reading of the Bill, he rather intimated that the representatives in the North-West Assembly were in the habit of disposing of public moneys by lot, by some system of log-rolling, to use his own expression, dividing it amongst them and expending the money in some way, being even driven to imagine how they could expend it. Well, I should have not imagined that was the way in which the North-West Legislative Assembly were in the habit of discharging their duties. But if that was a true and correct statement, as no doubt it was according to the hon. gentleman's light, he does not represent them to be a very high class of legislators. That is what I referred to; therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should see that I was

not altogether to blame for the statement I made. Now, Sir, as to the new zeal that I am displaying in regard to the North-West. In admitting it is new, I hope it will be permanent, and I hope it will not be imprudent either, as the hon. gentleman seems to imagine. But I was astonished at the proposition that the people of the North-West were not able to govern themselves; perhaps I had judged the North-West too much by the *élite* of the *élite* they had sent to this House, and not enough by what was left behind. When I visited the North-West, from what I saw of the people up there, I am satisfied that this House would be making a very great mistake indeed if they do not realise that they are quite competent to manage their own affairs, and that we ought to give them the power to do it, instead of keeping them in leading strings, and dealing out authority piece by piece, as if they were children.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend refers to the remarks I made on the second reading. Now, Sir, permit me to explain that what I meant by log-rolling is a thing that any Assembly, that this Assembly, the hon. gentlemen around me, might fall into it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not condemn them for doing so; but let me point out my meaning by facts. What did one gentleman do?—and he is not the least intelligent member of that Assembly, not the least energetic, not the man with the least ambition. When he got his quotient of the sum divided by twenty-two, he had such difficulty in knowing how to spend that money that he took a legal opinion as to whether he could not spend it on sidewalks for his own town, and he spent it on sidewalks. Another gentleman, a member of that Assembly, told me frankly that as the roads and bridges had all been made in his district, he did not know what to do with the money. As the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) pointed out, when you have money administered by an Assembly like that, you will have it expended in one quarter where it is not needed, whereas the money of another man will be expended in another quarter where it is direly needed. As the hon. member pointed out, it would sometime be the proper way to govern the country, and best for the whole of it, that the great portion of the sum should be expended in one district. Suppose in one district there is absolute need of a first-class bridge, the road of which would serve not merely that district, but half a dozen districts; is it not clear that the half a dozen districts would be better served if all the money that is given to the most of them, or the greater portion of that money, were to be spent in the one district where the work that related to the whole of them belongs? Now, I was not ignorant of the fact that the hon. member for West Durham and his colleagues have taken in the past an interest in the North-West. I have listened, from that gallery, to some of his very brief speeches on that subject; I have listened to that compressed and caustic eloquence of which he is master, when dealing with the North-West, and, of course, I have been proportionately struck. But I have noticed this in the speakers on the Opposition side of the House—although the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mackenzie) did inaugurate a certain policy that is even now bearing fruit—I have noticed that there was not the same evidence of insight as to the needs of the North-West, and as to those things that are necessary to give to the North-West progress, that I have seen on the side of the House to which I belong, since the right hon. gentleman and his friends came into power. I do not forget those long and interminable speeches of the hon. member for West Durham, I do not forget all the eloquence that has been lavished upon the North-West; but, Sir, I say this, "nevertheless and notwithstanding," to use a locution of which the hon. gentleman is fond, that when I came forward in 1887 and proposed a motion to give the North-West responsible government, the Opposition benches were dumb—I got no support from them whatever. I got no support from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). At that time he was not enlightened, at that time his eyes were not open, at that time he was in the gall of bitterness, in respect to true views regarding our great western country; but now his eyes are open, and he thoroughly understands the wants of the North-West. I am very glad of it; I do not care whether he assists me or I assist him; I do not care who does the work provided the work is done. For there is much work to be done for the North-West. I am sure that I am expressing the belief of every hon. gentleman who listens to me when I say that there is, to-day, more interest in this House in the North-West than there was in 1887. I do not say it is due to the humble voice——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not say it is due to what my hon. friend from West Durham called the *élite* of the *élite*, or the *crême de la crême*—I do not suppose that, Sir, as the hon. member for West Durham seems to think. And let me congratulate the hon. member for West Durham, and congratulate the North-West, on the genial manner in which he has dealt with this question to-day. The North-West, that vast country, with its great capacities, its inspiring possibilities, has acted on his imagination and on his heart, and I never heard him speak more genially; because, Sir, I sometimes think that that hon. gentleman, so superior, so learned, is not merely the *crême de la crême*, but he is the cream of tartar as well.

Mr. WATSON. We are all gratified to listen to the hon. gentleman. He says the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is cream of tartar; probably it is because he makes a fizz when united with another mixture. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is a kind of mixture, and it is very difficult for the House to understand what he wants and what were the requirements of the North-West from the hon. gentleman's speeches. He delivers himself on every occasion on any matter connected with the North-West that comes up for discussion. Only a short time ago, he told us that he had in 1887 and 1888, advocated a full measure of responsible government for the North-West, but that, after going home and visiting his constituents, he found out he had made a mistake, and he found only one man in his constituency in favor of such a step.

Mr. DAVIN. That is so.

Mr. WATSON. Still the hon. gentleman calls for responsible government for the North-West,

when, on his own admission, the people do not want it. I would not have said anything on this question except for a reflection passed on the Province of Manitoba. The First Minister stated that nearly all the representations he had received from the North-West were to the effect that the people would be in a very much worse position than they occupied to-day if they were governed by the sort of Government they had in Manitoba. I consider that a reflection on the Government of that Province, whoever may be the right hon. gentleman's informants, whether members of this House or persons outside the House; and as a resident of Manitoba, and I know I am speaking the opinion of the great majority of that Province, I say the people are thankful we have a responsible Local Legislature there, and the right hon. gentleman no doubt would much prefer to have a Council similar to that in the North-West, and one subject to his dictation. But we have a Legislature which has protested against the unjust acts of the right hon. gentleman, and we are now reaping the benefits of responsible government. I do not think we should consider the individual acts of any member of the North-West Council to-day, as has been done by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is sufficient for us to know that the Council is composed of an able body of men, as has been admitted by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I am satisfied, although I do not know the individual members of that body, that the representations of the North-West Council should have more weight in this House than the views of an individual member from the North-West; and if the North-West Council recommend to this House the granting of responsible government to that country, it is in the interest of this House to consider the advisability of granting it, and if they object to having legal advisers appointed, who must have certain weight in the Assembly, the gentlemen composing that Council are men who are quite competent to elect men who are able to fulfil the positions of the legal advisers. I have no doubt that if the North-West Council and the people, through their representatives in this House, were listened to by this Parliament, and if it would act on their advice, we would do very nearly what is right for the North-West. They are more interested in its welfare than are people 2,000 miles away. We should endeavor, as nearly as possible, to carry out the wishes of the North-West Council, and I repeat, if they wish to have the legal experts abolished, this should be done. In the North-West, as in Manitoba, we must have minorities, and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) represents a class that think they must have all the rights and privileges which the majority possess in the Province and in the Legislature. We must expect these things to occur, but the rights of the majority under the British North America Act must prevail, and those constituting the minority must submit to such legislation as is carried by the majority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that no doubt I would prefer to have Manitoba governed as the North-West Territories are governed, because it would bring the Province more under the power of the Government. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that the Government of which I was a member gave the constitution to the Province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman might, if he had looked back at *Hansard* of that day, have found that when I proposed there should be two representatives from that Province in this House, the proposal was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, on the ground that the population of the Province did not authorise the returning of such a number, and I was laughed at when I said that I wanted more than one to come, as one would be lonely coming such a long distance. It is quite true, what the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has said, that the credit of giving representative institutions to that Province is to a certain extent due to the Government of which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was the head. But the hon. gentleman must not deprive me of my four lambs from the North-West, the four representatives from the North-West, and the fact that representation was given to the North-West Territories by the Government of which I was a member. But, speaking in regard to this measure now under consideration, the discussion has gone on as if we were settling a new constitution for the North-West, as if we were applying ourselves to the remodelling of that whole system. If that were so, it would require more consideration than can possibly be given to the subject at this period of the Session, and it must be remembered that this Bill was introduced for the purpose of making such amendments as were wanted for the present, and not for the purpose of arranging a new constitution for the North-West, as when we were settling the Quebec resolutions giving a constitution to the Dominion of Canada. It is impossible that we can endeavor in the discussion of this Bill, which is a practical one, to discuss it with any such view. In order to do justice to the measure, we would be kept here for weeks and weeks. And, therefore, the Government must either ask the House to take such provisions as are unobjectionable and adopt them for the nonce, for this Session, or we must ask the House to support the majority, or we must withdraw the Bill. We cannot set to work and settle now a new constitution for the North-West.

Mr. BLAKE. The right hon. gentleman is quite correct in the two statements of fact he has made. It is quite true that the right hon. gentleman gave to Manitoba its present popular Constitution; it is also true that the right hon. gentleman gave the North-West Territories their representation in the House of Commons, and obtained his four lambs, as he called them, but I prefer to call them sheep, and I will not say of what color. *Revenons à nos moutons.* I should like to tell the reason why the right hon. gentleman gave popular institutions to Manitoba, and gave representation in this House to the North-West Territories. That supervened which generally does supervene before a Tory reform. There was a rebellion first. The right hon. gentleman gave the people of Manitoba a paternal Constitution; he sent up there a Lieutenant Governor, who never got into the country; and an alien Council, which could not get in either. The people rose in rebellion against him; and then he came down here and gave them, forsooth, provincial rights. And he now claims credit for having given that which they obtained at the point of the bayonet. So much for Manitoba.

Then as to the Territories. Year after year we in this House, sitting on this side of the House, inveighed against the absence of representation from the Territories. We pointed out their distance, their remoteness, the murmurs of complaint which came from that country, and we said it was absolutely essential there should be a safety-valve, at all events, for them, and guidance for ourselves. We did not indeed know then how extensive, or expansive, or expensive, that safety-valve would be; but we called for a safety-valve for them, for light and information for ourselves. We asked for it, we called for it, we pressed for it, we moved for it. Deaf ears were presented to us on those benches. Another rebellion came, and the year after his second rebellion the hon. gentleman gave representation to the North-West Territories.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to say, that there have been petitions presented from the North-West Territories asking for some changes in the system of Government. I think it is material that the Committee should know what were the views submitted to the Government by the representatives of the North-West Territories.

Mr. McCARTHY. The papers were brought down, and are now before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are they printed?

Mr. McCARTHY. They are printed in the proceedings of the North-West Assembly.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they printed in both languages?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid not. The Bill of the Minister of the Interior of last Session, which was submitted to the Legislative Assembly, was criticised by them, and they say that section 10 of the Bill should be amended, so as to dispense with the sitting of legal experts in the Assembly.

Mr. MULOCK. How does the Minister propose to get over that? I presume it is the expression of opinion of the people of the North-West Territories. I am glad to have the question introduced by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I can congratulate him on his increasing light, for I think it is only a year ago since he professed to be a Tory of the Tories.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am still.

Mr. MULOCK. At any rate, the hon. gentleman is repudiating some of the old Tory principles. I think we ought give effect to this expression of opinion of the people of the North-West.

Progress reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June 1891; and, in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 6th May, 1890.
Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Message of His Excellency and the Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 151) respecting Railways.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I have moved the House into Committee of Ways and Means for the purpose of moving an amendment to item 5 in the Tariff Bill, which now reads as follows:—

"Animals, living, viz.: cattle, sheep and hogs, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*"

I desire to take out the word "hogs," and to make another item, as follows:—

"Live hogs, 2 cents per lb."

The object of this is to equalise the duty on the live hog with the duty of 3 cents or 1½ cents per lb. on the dead product of the hog, so as to prevent the live animal being imported and made up into meat here in competition with our own live hogs, at a lesser rate of duty than that imposed on the dead meat.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume that the hon. Minister makes this change with the view of carrying out the National Policy, and encouraging the Canadian farmer. Now, as there is a certain class of hog that is not raised in this country, I mean the hog that makes the clear and mess pork, does he not think that it would be more in accord with the course decided upon when the duty was reduced from 6 cents to 3 cents per lb. on clear and mess pork, if we were to make a distinction between the hogs that make mess pork and the hogs that make prime and prime mess?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I imagine 2 cents per pound live weight would be an enormous increase in the heavy duty which the hon. gentleman originally proposed. The average value of a hog could hardly exceed $6 or $8, so that this would be a duty of at least 50 or 60 per cent. It appears to me that this is practically a prohibitory duty, and a mischievous duty in every sense, inasmuch as it will probably lead to a suspension of trade, and expose our people to retaliation. Now, as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, the practical result of this tax would be that, as we imported two live swine, our farmers would receive a protection to the extent of $4.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we would not get a large increase of duty in that case.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; but you would inflict serious charges on the lumbermen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You may possibly interfere materially with trade in other quarters. Of all that the hon. gentleman has said

nothing, and I do not know whether he has considered the question at all. It would be worth our while to look into it. So far as Ontario is concerned we imported two live swine and we sold a thousand thereabouts, so that the practical result would be that we would exclude these two swine and would lose the sale of the thousand.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is in keeping with their general policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In British Columbia, which is a small Province, they imported nearly 3,000 ; and no doubt under the new law the hon. gentleman would pretty completely extinguish that traffic. If the British Columbians like that, it is their own affair ; apparently they do. I must again point out to the hon. gentleman, that the more he raises these taxes, the more he invites retaliation, and the more sure he will be of getting it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if the Finance Minister is not disposed to admit for feeding purposes hogs which are not fattened, without imposing that duty? If he did that, the farmers might bring in foreign hogs, and produce the pork here. I sympathise considerably with the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, who seems disposed to pronounce it a hoggish business all through. My impression is, that this is not going to be any advantage to the farming community, and I would suggest to the Finance Minister, if it would not be well to make the change I recommend.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that the argument applies so much to what was brought in in the past, as to what is likely to be brought in in the future, under the change in the tariff. If there was a difference made between the dead meat and the live meat in favor of the live meat, the effect would be to bring in more of the latter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you think it likely to increase the amount to four?

Mr. SCRIVER. Has the hon. Minister of Finance any estimate of what this duty would represent on the dressed product?

Mr. FOSTER. My object in going into Committee of Ways and Means in order to put this duty of 2 cents per pound on the live hog, is to make an equalisation as far as possible between the duty on the live hog and the duty upon the dead product. A hog of 250 or 260 pounds, allowing for the waste and shrinkage, would about make a barrel of pork of 200 pounds. If that were mess pork at 1½ cents per pound, the duty would be $3. If it were other than mess pork, at a duty of 3 cents per pound, the duty would be $6. Well, if you take a live hog of 250 pounds, the worth of that would be about 4 cents per pound, or $10, 30 per cent. on which would be only $3 ; and as the dead meat coming in may be charged 6 cents, you could import sufficient live stock to make a barrel of 200 pounds and pay only $3, and thus defeat the object of the tariff. You would allow the product, which is ready, or nearly ready to be slaughtered, to be brought in at a less rate of duty than the finished product in the dead condition ; and it is to equalise the two that the duty on the live product must necessarily be higher than 30 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite would be the first to speak of the anomaly of a tariff, which, under the idea of protecting the meat industry, would allow the raw material, ready to be slaughtered, to be brought in at half the duty placed on the dead product.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman makes a distinction with regard to dead pork. Was it not clearly understood, on a former occasion, that the clear pork should come in at the same rate as mess ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that when that subject was last debated, it stood over for revision, and I will have something to say with regard to it in a little while.

Mr. MITCHELL. The reason I spoke of that now was the fancy distinction which the hon. gentleman made in discussing the raw material and the dressed product.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has evidently conveyed a wrong impression to the House. I understood him to convey the idea that the importation of live hogs into Ontario amounted only to two hogs. The thing is too ridiculous. It amounts to something like 5,000,000 lbs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Brought in alive?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly; and paid the duty. The idea of two hogs coming into Ontario from the States is absurd.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am a little surprised at the hon. gentleman for Northumberland opposing an increase on the duty, because I find, from the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year, there was imported into New Brunswick one hog——

Mr. HOLTON. Who was he ?

Mr. LANDERKIN—and into Nova Scotia three hogs, and into Ontario two hogs. Now, the boon which the Minister of Finance is going to confer upon the farmers in those Provinces, is to prevent this one hog, and these two and three hogs, from being brought in to slaughter the markets in these Provinces. The hon. member for Hamilton had better look at the Trade and Navigation Returns before he begins to speak on this subject. He is generally well informed, but in a matter of this kind he is informed without the book. In British Columbia some hogs are imported, but I presume they find it necessary to import them, or they would not do so, and on all they do import there will be an additional tax. The only result to them from this change is an increase tax on the people of British Columbia, but if they are willing to stand that, we can.

Mr. BOWELL. It is quite evident the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, as well as the hon. gentleman for South Oxford, did not look at the full return when they made their remarks. It is true only two live hogs were imported into Canada, and sold alive, but if these hon. gentlemen will look at the sixth line below that they will find that swine were imported and slaughtered in bond in Canada to the extent of 4,823,475 lbs. Now, if the duty of 30 per cent. was the only duty imposed upon the swine brought into Canada for slaughter, they could be slaughtered and sold in the market here at a much less rate of duty than the 3 cents a pound imposed upon the lighter kinds of pork, while the duty on the others

would be as low as 1½ cents a pound. The intention of the Finance Minister in making this change is to prevent the tariff being evaded by the importation of the live animal, its being slaughtered in Canada, and sold in place of that pork which would be imported at 3 cents per pound for general consumption, at 1½ cents a pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he intends to tax swine imported in bond for exportation abroad; because that would be a new departure with a vengeance. Swine are imported and slaughtered in bond in large quantities to the profit of our carriers and pork packers. Surely the hon. gentleman does not intend to interfere with that. That would not affect the argument one way or the other. We want, if possible, to allow our people to bring in pork in bond and export it after slaughter, and that does not conflict with the interests of the farmers or of any one else.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think my remarks could by any possibility be twisted into any such meaning as the hon. gentleman has attempted to convey to the House. I said nothing about live animals imported to be slaughtered in bond for exportation, but I said that an animal which is imported in bond and slaughtered, and then put on the market, must pay the duty. There is no intention on the part of the Government to interfere with the trade to which the hon. gentleman refers. On the contrary, the slaughtering in bond for exportation, which gives our people work, the present system will be continued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend states that the only swine imported into Ontario for consumption last year were these two hogs, that all the rest were for exportation abroad, and, therefore, this does not affect the question at all.

Mr. BOWELL. As the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) must know from his experience in the Government, there are many articles entered in bond for the purpose of exportation which afterwards go into consumption when the duties are paid.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Public Accounts would show that.

Mr. BOWELL. No. If 1,000 lbs. weight of pork was imported alive and slaughtered in bond, with the original intention of exporting, and the party who slaughtered it and packed it found he could do better by putting it on the market here, he would make the entry, pay the duty, and sell it in the market. In such a case the entry would have to be made and carried into the statistics as having been entered for consumption.

Mr. MITCHELL. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean that. If I understand his contention, it is that, as 4,000,000 lbs. of hogs have been imported in bond for the purpose of slaughter and exportation, if 2,000,000 lbs. should be diverted from the original intention and put upon the local market for domestic use—does my hon. friend mean to say that would not be shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns, because if it would not be shown those returns are very defective?

Mr. BOWELL. These returns show that no portion of the 4,000,000 lbs. was entered for home consumption. But what I said was that, if the disparity in the duty between the live and the dead hog was so great, that would be the effect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So you are speaking *in futurem*.

Mr. BOWELL. The live hog would be entered in bond and slaughtered in bond for exportation, and yet that could go into consumption as pork paying much less than 3 cents a pound duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then the contention of my hon. friend from South Oxford is correct, that the only pork which went into the domestic market of that which was imported was these two hogs.

Mr. BOWELL. The disparity between the duty on the live hog and the dead pork did not exist then.

Mr. HESSON. I see that 3,900 hogs were imported last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Into Ontario?

Mr. HESSON. We are not talking Ontario politics. The hon. gentleman desires to convey to the people the idea that only two or three hogs were imported into the country, but he overlooks the fact that 3,900 hogs were imported into the Dominion last year, and slaughtered for home consumption. Beyond that, the Minister desires to protect the people against the importation of hogs in bond for the purpose of exportation, which are afterwards slaughtered for home consumption, and the duty of 25 per cent. was not sufficient to prevent that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hesson) has apparently been asleep. I stated the results in several Provinces. I quoted the case of British Columbia, and I said that, if the members for British Columbia were willing to stand this tax, we could stand it.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one more resolution I wish to offer:

Resolved, That section 276, 49 Victoria, chapter 33, be repealed, and that it be enacted as follows:—

Glove leathers, when imported by glove manufacturers for use in their factories in the manufacture of gloves, namely, kid, buck, deer, antelope and water hog, tanned or dressed, colored or uncolored, to be rated at 10 per cent.

That is the old section of the Act. We reduce fine kid, imported for making gloves, from the present duty of 20 per cent. to 10 per cent.

Resolutions referred to Committee on Bill.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 143) to amend the Acts respecting Customs Duties.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I find, in taking up this Bill, that the Law Clerk has left out from this section, one item which was reported from the Committee, and I wish to have that inserted. It will be item *j* in the first resolution, stating that the initials "F.O.B." represent the words "free on board." In section 2, there have been left out of the report as it came from the Committee the words "or in any other Act relating to the Customs," which I wish to have inserted after the word "Act" in the third line.

On section 3,

Mr. MITCHELL. I will make one last appeal to the hon. gentleman on this corn business, to see whether he will not allow corn to come in free as well as cornmeal. I am not going to make a speech, but I am only going to appeal to the hon. gentleman, as a matter of common justice, whether he will not allow corn to come in free of duty for human food and the cornmeal to come in free also.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very sorry to say to the hon. gentleman that, after the very full discussion we had on this subject, and the agreement arrived at by the House, I hardly think I could go against the expressed will of the House, even to oblige the hon. gentleman, which I would otherwise do.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not like any hypocrisy about this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I was trying to be as pleasant as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman ought also to be honest. This course is taken because the Government have so determined, not because it is according to the will of the House. The hon. gentlemen behind him would as soon support what I asked, if the hon. gentleman had adopted that view, as they have supported the Government view. The Finance Minister should consider the condition of some other portions of the Dominion outside of Ontario, in regard to the corn question.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one point in regard to the corn question to which I would like to call attention. A change has been made to prevent the importation of a certain class of pork except at a very high duty. It is well known that that class of pork cannot be produced without using corn. If you permitted the importation of corn for feeding purposes free, you would greatly aid in producing the quality of pork required for lumbering operations. When you exact a duty on corn and make the farmers pay it, you hamper them in producing a commodity which you tax to keep out of the country. Pease will not produce the quality of pork that corn will produce, and in order to make the production of the quality of pork required by lumbermen a lucrative calling for the farmers, you should permit corn to come in free for feeding purposes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am ready to believe that the Government, in framing this clause, were animated by a desire to relieve the consumers of cornmeal from the duty which formerly applied to it. I would ask the Minister of Finance if he thinks it is possible to frame an Order in Council that will enable the Department to completely control the meal after it leaves the miller's possession? I have thought the subject over and I have conversed with merchants who handle cornmeal, and I am satisfied the Government will be unable to frame an Order in Council which will enable them to keep track of the cornmeal and establish the fact that it is to be used for human food. It would be better to strike out the provision, because the seller will have to take an obligation from the party who buys a single barrel that none of it is to be used except for human food. An old woman could not give her chickens a feed of cornmeal without violating the provisions of this Bill. In regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), as to having the corn ground, I think that clause should be removed as well. I invite the attention of the Ministers to these two points, as the adoption of the suggestions made by me would relieve the Department of much trouble, and would also place the consumers of cornmeal in a better position.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have had some communications on this subject from those in the trade, and it has been pointed out that an honest miller will not be able to make a declaration that the cornmeal is used for human food, because he sells it in small lots and does not know how it will be used. On the other hand, a man less conscientious would be able to get such a statement and get the benefit of the rebate.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter has been very carefully considered. As the hon. members are aware it was discussed before in committee, and I do not see any way of making the clause different from what it is at present, namely, that all corn shall be kiln dried before it is ground.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the object?

Mr. FOSTER. The keeping qualities of the cornmeal are increased by the corn being kiln-dried before it is ground. It is quite true that you may grind corn without its being kiln-dried if it is for early consumption, but that does not militate against the fact that the bulk of the cornmeal used for human food and an article of commerce is kiln-dried. As to the Customs regulations, the Minister of Customs and myself have very carefully considered that. It would not be well to leave this matter without any regulations for the prevention of gross frauds. It will be found possible to give very great relief to those who import corn for meal for human food, amounting to nearly the whole of the duty paid on the corn which goes into the meal, without any ill effects resulting in other respects. I do not see how this provision can be changed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says the Government will return nearly all the duty. That is another reason why the hon. gentleman might as well dispense with the restriction. If they returned only a small portion of the duty, I could well understand the objection of the hon. gentleman. In this, there is only 10 per cent. retained on the duty, and it would amount to very little indeed. The hon. gentleman says it is usual to kiln-dry meal so that it will stand longer, but sometimes it is not kiln-dried, and if the millers who handle the corn are willing to run the risk, I think it would be a great deal better not to place any restrictions upon them.

Mr, GILLMOR. I do not know whether it is any use speaking about this matter further; but if the Minister of Finance wants to encourage manufactures in Canada, he has now an opportunity to find work for the grist mills on the frontier. In my county, there are four grist mills grinding corn. It is not at all important that this meal should be kiln-dried, because it goes into immediate use for consumption, all over the county, to a population of 26,000 people, and it is not even barrelled, but placed in bags. You will encourage these mills, if you allow them to

grind the meal without kiln-drying it. If it were going to be exported, or to remain a long time in barrels, it would have to be kiln-dried, but we have only a very small export of meal from Canada. This meal goes into immediate use, and a restriction should not be put upon its manufacture. This kiln-dried meal is used for animals as well as for the food of human beings, and my neighbors and myself have been in the habit of using it for cattle. The Government would be doing a great favor to the mills in my county, if they allowed them to use their corn without kiln-drying it. If you do not allow them, they will have to put up some sort of a pretence of a kiln, and go to that expense, which will not add a single cent to the value of the corn. I think it is consistent with your National Policy to encourage these grist mills to grind the corn which is used in the country, instead of compelling them to bring their kiln-dried meal from the States and to pay a duty upon it. If you enforce this provision, the difficulty remains that it is almost impossible to tell when a man takes a bag of meal from the mill, whether it is going to be used for human food or food for animals. Some of it is used for feeding the turkeys and the hens, and of course if the people eat the turkeys I suppose they would be complying with the law. This kiln-dried meal is also fed to the cows, and the cow suckles the calf, and when you kill the calf you eat the veal. Now, what is the difference whether you take it in meal or take it in veal?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). After the statement made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) I think that this word "kiln-dried" should be struck out. If not it will cause a great deal of expense to the millers.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not expensive.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is expensive, and, besides, it is utterly useless.

On section 10,

Mr. FOSTER. I propose, in item 5 of this section, to strike out the word "hogs" and make that item read "cattle and sheep, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*," also I propose that item 5½ should read "live hogs, 2 cents per pound."

Mr. DAVIS. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance, that he should substitute the word "horses" for "hogs." My opinion is, that, in the interest of the part of the country from which I come, there should be this protection afforded for the breeding of horses. We have been breeding horses for about five years, but they can breed horses in the United States cheaper than we can, as they have been at it longer. They send them in here, suffering from glanders and other diseases, to spread the contagion throughout this country, and they pay only 20 per cent. duty. If there is any industry in the country that should be protected, it is that of raising horses in the North-West. We have taken a great deal of pains to introduce a first-class breed of horses into that country. During the last five years there have been introduced from England, the United States, and other countries, at least 150 of the best stallions in the world. We are trying to breed a class of horses that will be suitable for shipment to the old country for the English army, and we also expect to supply the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec with all the draught horses they need. Therefore, I think we are entitled to some protection for that industry.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that every vacant and undisguised statement of the objects of protection ought to entitle the hon. gentleman's claim to the favorable consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. Item 5 was inserted as part of the general policy of the Government with respect to the protection of meat products; and the three kinds of animals mentioned here, cattle, sheep and hogs, are those from which the meats are produced. Horses come under a different category. They have now, I think, a duty of 20 per cent., which is a pretty fair duty. My hon. friend speaks about diseased horses coming into the North-West from the United States; but a duty of 30 per cent. would scarcely prevent their introduction, I suppose, if a duty of 20 per cent. does not. I think there is a pretty large proportion of horses at present imported into the country; but by-and-bye, when the North-West develops, and the production of horses is carried on there on a larger scale than at present, perhaps my hon. friend's suggestion will have more weight. At the present time I do not think the Government feel themselves in a position to increase the duty on horses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is very hard, Mr. Chairman. Here, when we import two hogs from the United States, the hon. gentleman is willing to put a duty upon them; but when we import only 4,000 horses from the United States, valued at $175,000, and send to the United States only 56,000 horses valued at $2,113,000, it is quite contrary to the hon. gentleman's principles to give the trifling favor which his supporter seeks. It is all in accord with the hon. gentleman's whole policy.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides, I thought the principle of protection was to protect the infant industry and nurse it into vigor; whereas the hon. gentleman says that when this infant industry has increased itself and gets stronger, then he may give it some protection.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must, for the last time, enter my solemn protest against this duty of 30 per cent. on sheep. It is well known that at the present moment the United States are considering a proposition to increase their tariff on sheep and lambs going from this country to the United States, where we send about a thousand lambs per day. I think it is to be regretted that the Government of the Dominion should take the lead in increasing the duty on this article. They are assuming the responsibility of virtually saying to the Americans: "Go on, gentlemen, we are ahead of you." If they had waited until the Americans had imposed their duty, and had been driven to the necessity of retaliating, the increase might have been pardonable; but to act in the way they are doing, in the face of the enormous trade which exists at the present time, is simply to strengthen the hands of the party on the other side, who are moving in the same direction.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. After item 22, the following item which was agreed to by the House, has been

inadvertently omitted from the Bill, and I propose that it be reinserted :—

Buttons of hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, 5 cents per gross and 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

In item 32, "collars, of cotton, linen, celluloid or xylonite," I wish to add "xyolite." In item 45, I wish to insert the same word. In item 67 there is an error in the print ; "one cents" should be "two cents." In item 69 after the word "manufactures," insert the words "of glass," making it "all other glass and manufactures of glass." The next item is No. 83, which has crept into this by mistake. It was repealed in the Committee and should be left out. That is the item dealing with wrought iron tubes. In item 84, insert in the last line the words "N.E.S." Items 85 and 86 I wish to drop and leave the duty exactly as it was before. This is iron sheared and unsheared, sheet iron, common or black, not thinner than No. 20 gauge, "N.E.S."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for that ?

Mr. FOSTER. I made the change in order to take skelp iron out of the duty placed upon it under the impression that it was not made in this country. We found out it is made by nearly all the rolling mills in the country. The only reason which induced the change, namely, that it was not made in the country, having fallen to the ground, we revert to the original duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that an increase or a diminution ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is exactly what it was before. It is practically an increase on skelp iron, as proposed in the new item. Items 85 and 86 are dropped. After 95, I wish to introduce a resolution passed by the Committee with reference to glove leathers. We will call it 95½. Glove leather at present pays a duty of 10 per cent., and I wish to add to that the item of kid glove leather, which now pays 15 or 20 per cent. I now come to the item of pork. It will be remembered that the result of a discussion on this item went to show that the definition was a loose one, owing to the different brands and great variety of mess pork which comes in, in various ways, and is put up in different sized pieces, and very different parts of the hog, consisting of parts of heavy hogs and of light hogs as well, branded each in a separate way. After taking into account the varying character of the pork coming in branded as mess pork, and then the inconvenience which might arise from the definition of mess pork as stated in the general Inspection Act, it is considered best to define the pork which comes in at 1½ cents per pound as follows :—

Barrelled pork in brine made from the sides of heavy hogs, after the hams and shoulders are cut off, and containing not more than sixteen pieces to a barrel of 200 pounds weight.

That is a definition which can be easily determined.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How are you going to find out ?

Mr. FOSTER. In the same way as now, by actual inspection ; there is no other way to carry out the idea with which the Government started, and which I explained to the Committee — to put a duty of 1½ cents per pound upon the heavy pork commonly known as mess pork, made from the sides of heavy hogs, according to the definition in our own Inspection Act of hogs not less than 200 pounds weight, and which is used very largely in the lumber districts. This definition takes in no part of the pork except between the ham and the shoulders, and the size of the hog is defined by the number of pieces which must be in a barrel. It takes a hog that weighs 250 pounds or thereabouts to make a barrel of sixteen pieces which will come under this definition.

Mr. MITCHELL. The definition given by the Minister now is not that which he gave to this House in the previous discussion, because my hon. friend will observe that what he is now describing is clearly what is purely known among business men as mess pork, and not what we were contending for before, namely, clear pork. Clear pork may have more than sixteen pieces in a barrel. It may be cut out of the portions of the hogs, as described by my hon. friend, between the shoulders and the ham ; but yet, having more than sixteen pieces in the barrel, it would come under the duty of 3 cents per pound. Now, that is not what was tacitly understood and practically agreed to by the hon. gentleman when this subject was discussed in detail before, and I think my hon. friend is not carrying out what he led this House to believe would be consented to by the Government. I would ask him to reconsider that and include in the 1½ cents per pound rate those portions of the hog between the shoulders, whether or not there are more than sixteen pieces in the barrel.

Mr. GILLMOR. This definition will drive all the clear pork into the class of $6 a barrel, because there must be fifteen or sixteen pieces or more in a barrel of clear pork. This definition is just the opposite of what I understood from the Finance Minister was his intention before. This is throwing all the clear pork that I know of, cut from the same part of the hog as the mess pork, into the duty of 3 cents a pound, because the thin part of the belly of the pig is made into bacon, and the Minister of Customs understood that exactly. He said he would take that off and call that bacon. The part next the backbone of the pig, which is mess pork, is cut into pieces of four pounds, five pounds, six pounds and seven pounds, and this is just throwing all the clear pork, which comes out of the same part of the hog, with the bones taken out, into the 3 cents a pound duty. It was understood that you had fixed upon a definition and that it would not be necessary to say any more about it, but now we see that all the clear pork will come under the duty of $6 a barrel.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I presume that is the object of the Minister. He gave the Committee to understand that mess pork and clear cut pork corresponding to mess pork, would come in at the lower rate of duty. That was the impression left on this side of the House by the Minister, but, when the discussion came up on the second occasion, he was taken rather roughly to task by some of his followers, who, I suppose, have brought pressure upon him to make this definition. But he is only making trouble more confounded. He says this must be cut from a hog weighing not less than 200 lbs. Is he going to obtain a butcher's certificate or a coroner's certificate that these

hogs, when they were slaughtered, weighed not less than 200 lbs? He must have some certificate, or it will not be possible to enter these at the lower rate of duty. Then, if the bones are taken out of the mess pork, and it is made clear pork, which is of more value, of course, these pieces will weigh so much less, and it may take more than the sixteen pieces which the hon. gentleman has stated are to constitute a barrel of pork. Consequently, that will be under the higher rate of duty. I think this interpretation will cause endless trouble. The Department will have to open every barrel and have every piece counted, the brine will have to be taken off, and they will require a certificate of the birth and the weight of the hogs when they were slaughtered. The hon. gentleman is going to give himself endless trouble, and is going to make the clear pork subject to the higher duty. Our fishermen do not always use the same kind of pork, but whatever pork they do use will come under the higher rate. I again protest against this interpretation. I think it is a most ridiculous one and one which the Government will find it difficult to carry out with any regularity, because what may be called mess pork in one Custom house may be given another character in another Custom house, and there will be favoritism which will lead to a great deal of difficulty, with the result that the honest man will be defrauded, while those who desire to defraud will escape.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman cannot have listened to the explanation. I understood that the pork must be made out of a hog weighing not less than 200 lbs., but that this classification contemplated using heavy hogs requiring only sixteen pieces to make a barrel. I think this definition is preferable to that which was proposed before.

Mr. MITCHELL. The objection I have taken has not been answered. The class of pork now recognised as clear pork will often contain more than sixteen pieces to the barrel. That is the class of pork largely used by fishermen and lumbermen, as well as by the laboring class in the towns. That will not be classed as mess pork, and will, therefore, be charged at 3 cents a pound, according to the interpretation which the Minister now contends for. In Chicago, while the clear pork realises more than the mess pork, seeing that mess pork is the pork of commerce, when speculation is rife and pork is largely speculated upon, the mess pork, which is inferior to the clear pork, will sometimes sell for $1 to $1.50 a barrel more than the clear pork, which is worth from 50 cents to $1 a barrel intrinsically more than the mess pork. It seems that I have failed to convey to the hon. gentleman the distinction I have made between the two classes of pork, but I think it would be well for him not to put such an inconsistent regulation as this in force, but while he permits the mess pork to come in for half the price of the clear pork, he should, to be consistent, let them both in at the same rate of 1½ cents. They are both cut from the same part of the hog, between the shoulders and the hams. The people who cut up these hogs often cannot cut up the hog so as to get only the sixteen pieces into the barrel, and, if there is one more piece in the barrel, it will be liable to be charged 3 cents a pound instead of 1½ cents.

Mr. FOSTER. Carried.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, if hon. gentlemen choose to treat reasonable objections from this side of the House with that silent contempt which they have chosen to adopt towards me during the last hour, all I can say is, perhaps, it will not facilitate getting on their business. I would like to have the hon. gentleman explain to this House why it is that reasonable objections are not answered, and why the Finance Minister treats with silent contempt just objections that are made from this side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure that my hon. friend would not ask me to be always on my feet answering every objection the hon. gentleman so often reiterates; though it is not out of any want of courtesy to himself or to the House that I did not answer him. The very same objection that my hon. friend made to-night he made when we discussed this for hours in the Committee, and the answer was given at that time over and over again. It was simply because of that state of things that I did not reply to my hon. friend, but if he wishes, I will give him again the reasons which I thought I stated a moment or two ago. The Government set out with the idea of placing a less rate of duty upon that kind of pork made from heavy hogs which has been less produced in this country, and is, at the present time, less produced in this country than pork of lighter hogs, and which is used by the lumbermen more especially, and by the fishermen to some extent. We set out with the idea of placing a lighter duty upon that than upon the lighter pork. Then came up the question of the definition. The definition that was discussed in the House before was admitted on all sides to be indefinite, and the object was to make a definition based upon the principle which I have just stated and which would clearly define the article to be introduced at 1½ cents a pound, in order that the trade and the Customs officials should understand just what was dutiable, and to what extent. Now, in pork which is made and barrelled from hogs of more than 200 pounds weight—and that was the definition with which we set out, and it was based upon the principle on which we set out, and that is the same principle which is kept in view the present clause which I am proposing to substitute for the other—that pork, made from the sides of heavy hogs, with the ham and shoulders off, whether it be clear pork or rib pork, whether it be mess pork, as is generally understood, or with the rib out, and therefore clear pork, if made from the heavy hog, and if it fulfils those conditions with which we set out that it should be made from hogs of 200 lbs. and more, that pork shall come in at the lesser rate. This tariff was framed for the purpose of putting a higher degree of protection upon that class of pork which is more largely raised and which is more easily raised in Canada, and to allow this heavy hog pork to come in at a less rate of duty. For the reasons I have stated this definition carries that out. I would be infinitely sorry if my explanation does not satisfy my hon. friend. But that is the definition which we intend to submit to the sense of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has stated that the definition which he has placed upon this class of pork was the same that was under-

stood to be adopted when this matter was discussed before.

Mr. FOSTER. I say it is based upon the same principle.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not the same. He led this House to understand that this pork, known as clear pork, should come in at 1½ cents per pound. The hon. gentleman now comes in with another explanation. I have no fault to find with the explanation. He has at last treated me courteously——

Mr. FOSTER. I always do.

Mr. MITCHELL—by giving such explanations as I think I had a right to demand. But still, he says on the one hand that the pork which is allowed to come in at the 1½ cents per pound duty is pork cut from the shoulders to the hams of hogs over 200 lbs. in weight, but in the next breath he says there shall not be more than sixteen pieces in the barrel. There is where the whole rub comes in. The fact is that pork is not all cut up so as to make just sixteen pieces in the barrel. In the case of clear pork you will find, as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) correctly stated, sometimes twenty or thirty pieces, but it is all pork cut from between the two points mentioned, it is cut from between the shoulders and the hams, but in consequence of the way it is put up, which gives it the definition of clear pork, there are more than sixteen pieces in the barrel. I object to that limitation of sixteen pieces. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the pork to be admitted at a cheap rate shall be pork from hogs over 200 lbs. in weight, cut from the shoulders to the hams. That is right enough, but let it be all the pork that is cut between those points, and do not put any limitation as to the number of pieces in the barrel; then you will get clear pork in as well as mess pork at 1½ cents per lb. I am sure my hon. friend, in one portion of his explanations, led this House to believe that by the wording of his resolution he cuts away clear pork and allows it to come in at 3 cents a pound. If my hon. friend means to let clear pork come in at 3 cents a pound, we can understand it, but if he means, what his words would imply, that all pork cut from the shoulder to the ham of pigs over 200 lbs. weight, should come in at 1½ cents duty, then I say the resolution does not carry that out.

Mr. FOSTER. Now that my hon. friend is down to a more reasonable basis, I want to say one word to him to show that there is no inconsistency between my present reasoning and the statement I made before. I have only to recall his attention to this fact, that by the definition given in the general Inspection Act, it was very plainly stated that the hog must be of more than 200 lbs. in weight.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not object to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, if my hon. friend admits that, he admits that I am consistent, because today I allow to come in by this definition the parts from the same hogs, cut between the shoulder and the ham, of more than 200 lbs. weight. But my hon. friend says, we ought not to define the number of pieces—"that is where the rub is." If there were no pieces defined there would be no rub at all, for the smallest kind of pork, so long as it is cut from between the ham, and the shoulder, could come in. You might take hogs of 100 lbs., or 50 lbs., and as long as you cut them up between the ham, and the shoulder and have no rule as to the number of pieces, they could all come in, and the very object we had in introducing this measure, which was to provide that the largest rate should be paid by the smaller kinds of pork, would not be attained. So my hon. friend sees that I am consistent, and the very fact that I am consistent drives me to adopt the definition I now propose.

Mr. MITCHELL. Your hon. friend sees that you are not consistent. I agree with you that hogs, making mess pork and clear pork, should be over 200 lbs. in weight. But there is a great deal of pork cut out of these hogs besides these large round pieces that go to make up mess pork; it is those smaller pieces out of the large hogs out of which mess pork is cut, that makes clear pork. My hon. friend, in pretending that I am inconsistent, has failed to realise this fact, that in the hog of 200 lbs. weight, in addition to the large pieces that are cut from the centre of the back around to the belly, there are pieces that are not cut in that way; there is still pork from a 200 lbs. hog cut between the shoulders and the hams, that is clear pork; and what I want to accomplish is that the whole of these portions of the hogs of over 200 lbs. in weight, cut between the shoulder and the ham, shall be included and come in at 1½ cents a pound.

Mr. GILLMOR. I thought this was well understood. The Minister of Finance and Minister of Customs in conversation across the floor both publicly and privately stated there was no difficulty about the definition. The Finance Minister now has rightly said that the number of pieces is what fixes his definition. What is the difference whether you get 32 pieces of pork in a barrel or 16 if they come out of the same sized hog?

Mr. FOSTER. How do you propose to find out whether a barrel of pork, which has 50 pieces of clear pork in it, contains pieces every one of which came out of a 200 lbs. hog?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is one of the difficulties of your system.

Mr. GILLMOR. You would ascertain it precisely the same as you would ascertain any such matter in a private transaction. The difference would consist in the size of the pieces and their weight. The Minister of Finance will not deny that all this is clearly defined, and we felt satisfied that clear pork imported would cost only 1½ cents a pound duty. New light has, however, dawned on the hon. gentleman's mind, and the result is that lumbermen and fishermen will be called upon to pay a duty of $6 per barrel instead of $3, because there are 32 pieces in the barrel and not 16. I regret very much this change in the definition has taken place, but the result is we will have to pay $6 per barrel duty instead of $3.

Mr. COOK. To what duty will mess pork be subjected?

Mr. FOSTER. If it is cut from a hog that weights 200 lbs. or more it will come in at 1½ cents, provided that there are not more than 16 pieces in the barrel.

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose in accordance with the hon. gentleman's plan he does not propose to reduce the duty on lard.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is a fair duty considering the rate of duty on the meat product.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). In regard to item 152, I should like the duty to be struck off timothy and clover seeds, which we are not able to raise in sufficient quantities for our own consumption. Almost all of that imported should be admitted free of duty.

Mr. FOSTER. The former duty was 15 per cent. and it has been reduced to 10 per cent. Last season was a rather poor season for raising these seeds and consequently a pretty large importation is shown, but the returns also show a large exportation. A fair protection of 10 per cent. is due to the farmers who raise those seeds in this country. I do not think better timothy seed is grown anywhere than by our own farmers.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman takes credit for giving the farmer 10 per cent. protection on his seeds, while the implement manufacturer, from whom the farmer has to buy his implements, has to pay 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman ask me to raise the duty of 35 per cent. on timothy and clover seeds?

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take the duty off agricultural implements and also seeds. We do not grow enough timothy and clover in our country for the needs of the farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the reason why the duty was made low. It is a question of farmer against farmer to a certain extent. One farmer produces the seed, but the majority must buy it.

Mr. MITCHELL. As a matter of fact, a large quantity of timothy and clover used in this country is imported, and that is so, particularly in the part of the country I come from.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). We raise some timothy, but we have been unable to raise almost any clover for five or six years past, since the clover midge came in.

Mr. FOSTER. The clover midge cannot last for ever.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It may last as long as the Government last.

Mr. FOSTER. It would have a long life if it did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do not prophesy unless you know.

Mr. McMULLEN. Judging by your past prophesies, they are not to be relied upon.

Mr. FOSTER. On item 152, I propose to add after the word "bases" the words "matrices and copper shells."

Mr. MITCHELL. I appealed to the hon. gentleman on a former occasion in relation to these electrotypes. I suppose there is no use appealing to him again when he has made up his mind he would change nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is use; and in consequence of the fervent appeal of my hon. friend, added to other representations that have been made, I have introduced this change in order to reduce the duty on these from 2 cents to ⅔ of a cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite approve of that reduction, but I did not hear the hon. gentleman make that statement at the outset.

Items 178 and 179,

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to reduce the duty on these to 3 cents instead of 4 and 5 cents.

On item 254,

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the ensilage corn, the Committee will see that this limits it to two varieties; the variety known as "Southern Dent Corn," namely, "Mammoth Southern Sweet," "Western Dent Corn," and "Golden Beauty." I have found that that limits it altogether too much, and that there are kinds of corn of a different name, but in which there is very little difference of quality, which are just as good, and which are more used for soiling and for ensilage purposes. I propose to widen that clause by making it read:

Indian corn of the varieties known as Southern White Dent, or Horse Tooth ensilage corn, and Western Yellow Dent, or Horse Tooth ensilage corn for soiling or ensilage.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would just say to the Finance Minister, that I pay double the amount for corn for seed purposes that I do for corn for feeding purposes, so that no farmer will buy corn for seed and feed it to his cattle.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you pay for seed corn?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Sixty or 70 cents for seed corn, and 35 or 40 cents for corn for feeding purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. In item 305, I wish to add to the free list, "and hard rubber in sheets but not further manufactured." I wish also to add to the free list, "florists' stock, namely, palms, orchids, azaleas, cacti, and flower bulbs of all kinds."

Mr. MITCHELL. In item 151 the hon. gentleman charges 2 cents per square inch for stereotypes, and in 152 he charges two-thirds of a cent for the same article.

Mr. FOSTER. In 152 they are used for books.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why should the same articles, when used for newspapers, be charged 2 cents per square inch, and in other cases be charged only two-thirds of a cent? That is not treating the press fairly.

Mr. FOSTER. The object of 151 and 153 is to make the printers do the work here. All that class of work can be done as well here. With reference to the books, these matrices and copper shells must be imported.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is matrices and copper shells in 151 also.

Mr. FOSTER. But the class of work there is almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets and other like work for commercial purposes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot see why the book printers should get their stuff in at ⅔ of a cent per square inch while the newspaper men have to pay 2 cents for the very same thing. We cannot get these things here. We have to import them. I believe there is a one-horse shop in Toronto

which does something in that way, but it cannot supply the demand for the trade.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we can change this.

Mr. BROWN. There is the article of sumac and the extract of sumac which is largely used as dye stuff in the cotton mills. I would ask that that go into the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. I will put that in.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the hon. member for Hamilton kindly interest himself in one or two things, which I wish to have considered? He appears to be the only man who can get anything done.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that the duty in item 151 of 2 cents per square inch on stereotypes and electrotypes is in the interest of printers employed on newspapers and that such was the reason for that duty?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then how is it that in item 153, stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns are charged only ¾ cent per square inch, if 2 cents are necessary in item 151?

Mr. BOWELL. The first is to protect that kind of work which can be done and is done in every printing office in the country. It refers to almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspaper advertisements or engravings. I might add that since the high duty has been placed on this kind of work, it has increased a thousandfold in this country. It used to be imported principally from the neighboring republic. In 152 the duty is at a low rate to cover books, whether copyrighted or not, and which are produced principally in England. In purchasing the copyrights, the parties also purchase at the same time either the matrices from which the stereotype is made in this country, or the stereotype in England. In 153, the three-fourths of a cent per square inch and the 2 cents is to protect the typos in this country, who set type in the different printing offices.

Mr. MULOCK. On one class there is only a duty of three-fourths of a cent.

Mr. BOWELL. Three-fourths of a cent per square inch on the stereotypes, but it is 2 cents per square inch on the matrices or copper shells.

Mr. MULOCK. The three-fourths of a cent is for one thing and the 2 cents for something else.

Mr. BOWELL. The 2 cents is on what they call plate matter imported from the United States and put in the newspapers as reading matter.

Mr. MULOCK. The duty on that is three-fourths of a cent and that is for newspapers, yet in 151, the duty on stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids for newspaper work is 2 cents per square inch. In item 151, a part of the material used by printers is protected 2 cents per square inch, and in item 153, part of the same material is protected at three-fourths of a cent per square inch.

Mr. BOWELL. If you reckon that up, you will find it is equal to what is paid for composition in newspaper offices.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you going to have two classes of duty for the same thing?

Mr. BOWELL. That is what is intended in order to prevent the importation of stereotyped plates which are put into newspapers, of advertising matter chiefly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why should you prevent that?

Mr. BOWELL. When advertisements of quack medicines or matters of that kind are brought in for newspapers, they should pay a higher price.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why not charge the same duty upon the bookmakers' material in item 152?

Mr. BOWELL. That distinction has always been drawn in the tariff.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I desire to refer to section 154.

Mr. FOSTER. That has reference to binding twine, and was fully discussed in Committee, and the sense of the House was tested in regard to it on a motion of the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). Surely my hon. friend does not desire to press the matter any further.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I only desire to say that this is very hard upon the farmers. We have first to pay 35 per cent. duty on implements, that is on the binder, and then we have to pay 25 per cent. on binding twine, which places the farmer in such a position that he is likely to put his binder aside and tie up his grain by hand as formerly.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise and report the resolutions.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very much to be regretted that before the tariff was changed the Budget Speech should have been printed in full. If the tariff had been amended first, that speech might have been of great service to the country. Last year we paid for the Budget Speech something in the neighborhood of $2,500. Now, the Budget Speech goes forth as the tariff was brought down, and with the tariff incorrect in that Budget Speech. If we could only have had that speech printed after the tariff was amended so that the people could have been benefited by it, I do not think they would have objected to the money being spent for it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend sees that the Budget Speech must be the Budget Speech if it purports to be so, and that has been printed and distributed, and is the speech as it was delivered by the Finance Minister. That has always been the custom. The tariff changes as proposed by the Finance Minister are a part of the speech, and are printed with it. They do not purport to be the tariff as it is enacted, that is, the Budget Speech does not purport to be the law, but simply contains the propositions brought down by the Finance Minister. The tariff, when it becomes law, will be distributed by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, who then puts it into the hands of all his officers, and, with his usual generosity, gives copies to any person who may wish for them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Finance Minister will see that if it were not issued so early, all these amendments could be included, and the people would be better informed on the tariff.

Bill reported.

Order that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply, read.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is objectionable. We have not had time to examine these items, and a good many of them require to be examined in detail. I do not want to obstruct business, but it is not fair to bring down Estimates embracing a million and a half dollars, covering nearly a hundred items, at six o'clock, and ask the House to pass them at eleven o'clock, with a long intervening debate.

Mr. FOSTER. As the House is anxious to get through with the business we might take up those items to which there can be no objection, and allow those to stand which hon. gentlemen desire to discuss at length.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no reason in the world why these Estimates should not have been brought down before to-day. The hon. gentleman is not treating the House fairly, when he brings these Estimates at the eleventh hour and asks the House to go into them at the twelfth hour.

Mr. FOSTER. I am willing to acknowledge that the Estimates should have been down before.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is not fair that the House should be asked to take up these Estimates to-night. They involve a million and a half dollars of the people's money, and they were only made known to the House at six o'clock this evening. Now, I think that a great deal of time will be saved by allowing the members to have an opportunity to consider these items. If you force the House into committee on them to-night, I very much doubt if you will make as much progress as you would if you allowed the House an opportunity to consider them. If it is despatch you want, I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford will promote that end. For my part I strongly object to this course. I believe it is a vicious course. It is a bad precedent, it is encouraging the Administration next year to repeat the very shortcoming which the Finance Minister says he has been guilty of in this instance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that as the hon. gentlemen opposite have been assisting the Government a good deal to-day in carrying on business, and as we are in sight of prorogation, perhaps if we allow hon. gentlemen to go home to-night they will return to-morrow with renewed spirits prepared to carry the Estimates. So I will move that we now adjourn, and we will go home and sleep over mess pork.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 7th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE HEREFORD RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that Bill (No. 147) respecting the Hereford Railway Company and the Maine Central Railway Company be placed on the Orders of the Day, for consideration in Committee of the whole House immediately after Routine Proceedings, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the seventeenth report of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

P. R. A. BELANGER.

Mr. TURCOT asked, What is the daily salary of P. R. A. Bélanger, surveyor, of L'Islet ; how many days did he work in 1889 ; and how much money remains due to him ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Bélanger is not now in the employment of this Department. He was employed for 232 days. Mr. Bélanger's accounts with this Department are yet unadjusted, and it is, therefore, impossible to state at present whether any money remains due to him.

CUSTOMS OFFICER McLAGAN.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) asked, Have the charges of improper conduct made against Customs Officer McLagan, of Sarnia, been brought to the notice of the Minister of Customs ? If so, what action has been taken ?

Mr. FOSTER. In the absence of the Minister of Customs, I may say that charges have been made against him, and they are now under investigation.

THE *NEW YORK MERCURY*.

Mr. SCRIVER asked, Whether the attention of the Postmaster General has been called to the fact that a newspaper called the *New York Mercury*, containing matter of an immoral character, is being circulated in the Dominion ? And if so, whether it is his intention to take steps to put a stop to the further importation and circulation of the said newspaper ?

Mr. HAGGART. My attention has been called to the fact that a newspaper called the *New York Mercury*, containing matter of an immoral character, is being circulated in the Dominion. What is to be done in the matter, is at present under the consideration of the Government.

THE QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Has the attention of the Government, or of any member thereof, been called to the following publication contained in the issue of the newspaper called *Le Canadien*, published at Quebec on the 30th April, 1890, that is to say :

" STATEMENT OF MR. O. E. MURPHY.

" I have been a member of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., since..... our first work being the Graving Dock at St. Joseph, Lévis, a contract made with the Harbor Commissioners, Quebec.

" In 1882, our firm made another contract for dredging in connection with the harbor improvements, with the Harbor Commissioners.

" It was with this contract that I first became acquainted with Robert H. McGreevy, Queber (brother of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, a member of the Harbor Commission, and a member of the House of Commons of Canada), and who became a partner with us (Larkin, Connolly & Co.) for the contract of dredging, becoming interested to the extent of 30 per cent. The Hon. Thomas McGreevy was aware of his brother's interest in this work; an agreement in writing was made by Larkin, Connolly & Co., setting forth his interest.

" I. In the spring of 1883, we (Larkin, Connolly & Co.) tendered for the construction of the cross wall in connection with the harbor improvements, Mr. Robert McGreevy becoming interested to the extent of 30 per cent., by a written agreement signed by us all. The Hon. Thomas McGreevy was aware of this before the tenders went in.

We (Larkin, Connolly & Co.) became aware of the position we held as tenderers before being informed officially, and governed ourselves accordingly by the withdrawal of John Gallagher's and George Beaucage's tenders; and in consideration of $25,000 paid to R. H. McGreevy, in presence of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, we obtained the contract. This payment of $25,000 was made in June, 1883, by promissory notes made by one member of the firm and endorsed by another, which notes were subsequently retired by the firm at maturity, and charged to expense account.

"II. On or about the 23rd June, 1884, Larkin, Connolly & Co. signed a supplementary contract for certain works for completion of the Graving Dock at St. Joseph, Lévis, and erection of the Caisson, with the Harbor Commissioners, for the obtaining of which contract Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid the Messrs. McGreevy the sum of $22,000 in promissory notes of one member of the firm to another, which notes were subsequently paid.

"III. On or about November, 1884, Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. signed a contract with the Department of Public Works of Canada for the erection and completion of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt, in British Columbia, Mr. R. H. McGreevy being, with his brother's (the Hon. Thomas McGreevy) knowledge, a partner in the said contract. That immediately after the signing of the said contract, I paid the sum of $5,000 in promissory notes of Larkin, Connolly & Co., for obtaining said contract and for his services to be given to have changes made for the benefit of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co.; and later on, and to the end of the work, various large sums were paid to, or for him on said contract, amounting in all (exclusive of R. H. McGreevy's share of the profits) to $20,000, as per statement of the accountant of the firm.

"IV. That on or about the month of January, 1887, on a proposition made by the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, our firm met and agreed to pay him (the Hon. Thomas McGreevy) the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000), on condition of his obtaining for us 35 cents per yard for dredging in harbor works to the extent of 800,000 cubic yards, or thereabouts, instead of 27 cents, our contract average price. The money was paid most of it direct to himself; part through Robert H. McGreevy. I have seen a memorandum in pencil on this subject, among others, and I recognise the handwriting of Michael Connolly, on behalf of the firm. We received the 35 cents per cubic yard for dredging afterwards, beginning with the season of 1887. * * *

"VI. That large sums of money were paid to the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, including special ones above set forth between 1883 and 1889, amounting to over $100,000. * * *

"VIII. There were paid to the Hon. Thomas McGreevy through Nicholas K. Connolly, $3,000 on the 29th December, 1883, or thereabouts, charged to the British Columbia Dock.

"IX. I paid, on or about March, 1886, to the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, $5,000; on this I have letters of P. Larkin, dealing with that sum. * * *

"I have a statement, signed by the accountant of the firm, setting forth all the payments, and others, as above.

"O. E. MURPHY."

"STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. M'GREEVY.

"I have read over the statement of O. E. Murphy, Esq., one of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., for the various contracts of the Quebec Harbor Improvements and Graving Dock, British Columbia. I have a knowledge that all the statements are correct, and add the following:—

"To paragraph 1. That I handed the twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) in notes to Thomas McGreevy for his own use.

"To paragraph 4. That I handed ten thousand dollars ($10,000) of this sum to Thomas McGreevy. * * *

"On paragraph 9. Of this I know that it was charged in the accounts, and I paid my proportion.

"That I paid to Thomas McGreevy seventy-five thousand dollars ($75,000) out of my share received from the firm on these contracts, and eighty-five thousand dollars ($85,000) or thereabout from the other sums paid by the firm, as stated by O. E. Murphy.

"I know, that since 1884 Thomas McGreevy has been the owner of the steamer *Admiral*, subsidised by the Federal Government, and benefited solely from the traffic earnings, the steamer being in the name of Julien Chabot, afterwards in mine, and recently back again to that of Julien Chabot.

"It was in February, 1888, that I got the steamer transferred to my name, at the instance, and for the benefit of Thomas McGreevy, and for the purpose of borrowing from Nicholas K. Connolly the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000), which sum I handed to Thomas McGreevy. I have never received any of the subsidy.

(Signed) "ROBERT H. McGREEVY."

And to the following publication in the same paper of the issue of the 1st May, instant, that is to say:

"If contract is entered into with Harbor Com..... for 800,000 yards of dredging to be at 35 cents, to be dumped in river, or in more difficult place to be paid extra, we give.....$25,000. All over $200,000 at Lévis Dock. Extra, B.C., about $73,000, of which we give $23,000.

(Signed) "LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO.

"Jan., 1887."

And to the following publication of the same paper of the issue of the 2nd May instant, that is to say:

"Our friends' call for another $5,000 on account of B. C. is not in accordance with the agreement we had when the $50,000 was divided. Bear in mind, my dear fellow, that there is a large amount due .....and that if we continue donating as we have been doing, there will be nothing left to pay us except old plant. Keep the Eleventh Commandment in view; that is, look out for yourself.

"P. LARKIN."

And to the following publication in the same paper of the issue of the 3rd instant, that is to say:

"ESQUIMALT.

"Now, about the dock here; if the two hundred and fifty thousand pass in the Budget, we, of course, will have some work to tear down, &c., but if you can get a lump contract for extending at $250,000, we can give fifty thousand dollars.

"M. CONNOLLY."

"ESQUIMALT.

"I told you in a letter lately that if $250,000 were granted for extending the dock, we would give fifty of it for some charitable purpose.

"M. CONNOLLY."

"Should we get an order to lengthen the dock 100 feet, or even 75 feet, I would be quite willing that $5,000 should be given at once.

"P. LARKIN."

2nd. Is the majority of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners appointed by the Federal Government? 3rd. Is it true that 35 cents per yard for dredging in the works of the harbor mentioned in said publications has been paid to the contractors instead of 27 cents, as affirmed in the statement above referred to? 4th. Has the contract for the building and completion of the dry dock at Esquimalt, referred to in the above statement, been granted to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and has the Government approved of said contract? 5th. Have there subsequently been any changes or additions to said contract, and have the Government approved of the same? 6th. Has the steamer *Admiral* been subsidised by the Government, as stated in the foregoing quotations from *Le Canadien?*

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the first question, the attention of the Government has been called to that publication. In answer to the second question, that Commission was only partially appointed by the Government. I think, that, in the first instance, there were three appointed by the Government, and the others were appointed by the Board of Trade and the shipping interest, I believe. Since 1875 the majority are appointed by the Government, one is appointed by the Boards of Trade at Quebec and Lévis, and the others by the shipping interest. In answer to the third question, that is a matter which is under the control of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec. I understand that the contract given by the Harbor Commissioners was for 27 cents in the inside basin and in the tidal basin it was 47 cents.

When that portion of the contract had been executed, the Harbor Commissioners wanted to have a greater depth in the inside basin, or the wet dock. They asked the contractors what amount they would charge for that. The contractors, if I am rightly informed, stated that having taken 27 cents in one case, and 47 in the other and putting them together and dividing the sum by two, they would charge 37 cents. Evidently the Harbor Commissioners would not assent to that, and gave them 35 cents for the depth to be acquired. My information is obtained from the Quebec Harbor Commission, whose statement will be laid before the House, with some other documents that I will speak of in a moment. In reply to the fourth question, my answer is, yes. The contract for the completion of the dry dock at Esquimalt was granted, after public tenders had been invited, to Larkin, Connolly & Co.; their tender was accepted by the Government and the contract given to that firm. These papers, as well as the others, will be brought down. In reply to the fifth question, my answer is that I understand there was some change made with respect to large blocks of stone. The papers in connection with that matter will also be brought down. In reply to the sixth question, my answer is that the steamer *Admiral* has been subsidised by the Government, and the contract was given to Mr. Julien Chabot, the steamer to ply between Dalhousie and the ports on the way to Gaspé. That contract will also be brought down.

I. C. R.—COAL RATES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, The Minister of Railways, in reply to an enquiry, having stated that coal was carried over the Intercolonial Railway from Pictou mines to the Londonderry iron mines at 30 cents per ton, being at the rate of one-half of a cent per ton per mile; does the Government intend to make the same proportionate rate apply to coal carried to Halifax for local industries and for exportation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention of the Government to make the same proportionate rate apply to coal carried to Halifax for local industries similar to that to Londonderry for the manufacture of iron from the ore, turning out an equal quantity of pig and other manufactured iron to transport over the Intercolonial Railway; but it is not intended at present to make it apply to coal for exportation.

HEREFORD RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 147) respecting the Hereford Railway.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COLBY. I desire to make a change in the Bill, changing the head office of the company from Cooksville to the city of Sherbrooke. I have here three clauses to that effect.

Mr. LAURIER. Have these changes been considered by the Railway Committee?

Mr. COLBY. No; but the whole Bill was considered and reported.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill was introduced at a very late stage of the Session; and while I have no objection to its adoption in the form it left the Railway Committee, I object to any further change being made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. COLBY. If any hon. gentleman can conceive of any reasonable objection to the proposed change, I would certainly defer to that view; but about 2 o'clock this afternoon I received a telegram from Mr. Ives, who is in Portland, and who is in conference with gentlemen to whom the road is to be leased, requesting to have this change made. It is not of essential importance, but it might obviate the necessity of another Bill being introduced next Session.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think it is advisable to look into these amendments at all.

Mr. COLBY. If the hon. gentleman sees any objection, I will not press the matter further.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. First Minister stated last night that he would, on the House meeting to-day, mention when the two questions, that affecting the report of the Rykert Committee and that connected with the Bremner claim, would be taken up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have come to the conclusion that we can, without inconvenience, devote the whole of next Monday to these two subjects. We hope to get through all important Government business to-day and the two following days.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should like to enquire from the hon. Minister of Agriculture with respect to a return moved for on the 12th February, asking information about six persons who were designated as Pagans in one of the parishes of Quebec, and wanting the original return so as to know who they were.

Mr. CARLING. I will make enquiries at the Department and see that the return is brought down.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Minister of Railways inform the House when the railway subsidies will be submitted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I stated yesterday that they would be brought down to-morrow. My answer will remain the same, in order to be consistent. We have been going over the proposed subsidies a good deal, and there is considerable difficulty in regard to the descriptions of the various railways and portions of lines to be subsidised. I hope to be able to devote this afternoon to the settlement of these technical questions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call again the attention of the First Minister to the fact that a return I moved for, with respect to the cost and number of the official cars on the Prince Edward Island Railway, which was ordered by the House very many weeks ago, has not been brought down yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had to send down to Moncton for the particulars which the hon. gentleman wants. He will have them to-morrow or next day.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I wish to ask about a return ordered in reference to the revenue of Digby wharf.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had to send to the wharfinger for the particulars. They will be here soon.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact, that the members have not yet received the report of the Committee on the Bremner furs case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not wish to be considered as the messenger of the House. If there was an Order of the House given they should be brought down.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I thought they should be distributed, because they have been received by some members of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I enquired from the Clerk of the House, and I find that no order was given for the printing and distribution of these documents. It is for the House to give an order, but it is not my duty to do so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I certainly understood that a motion had been made to have the documents printed, when the report was presented.

Mr. BLAKE. We certainly understood yesterday that the report was to be printed, when the Secretary of State produced a copy of the printed report, which the Minister of Justice handed him. I do not know that there is any special distribution to members of the Government, or to members of the House, of papers which are not distributed to other members of the House. It seems an extraordinary course that an order should enable hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to obtain papers, and that there should be no order to distribute them to members.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No doubt they were distributed to members of the Committee, but there is no order of the House to distribute them to members.

Mr. GIROUARD. I think I recollect the facts of this case. I examined the report exhibited yesterday, and I find that it was one which was printed for the use of the Committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I never received the report myself, and I never said I received it.

Mr. GIROUARD. I think I recollect, when the report was presented, that there was no motion made that it should be printed.

Mr. LAURIER. When that report was brought down, I asked the Government to fix a day for the discussion of it, and the Prime Minister told us he would require time to look at the papers, and that then he would give me an answer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should explain how I came to have in my possession a copy of that report. I found one on my desk, which might have been left there by some member of the Committee; and in handing the copy to the Secretary of State, I presumed it had been generally distributed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend the chairman of the Committee (Mr. Girouard) had the papers prepared, and I understood they had been sent to the printing office.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not say they are not there, but I say I am not a messenger of the House, and if there is no order of the House, I cannot give one myself.

Mr. HOLTON. I think there must be some distribution of this report, because I have received a copy of it, bound in blue book form.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Is not the hon. gentleman a member of the Committee?

Mr. HOLTON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose a member of the Committee has a preferential right to receive these books.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. An order of the House has not been given.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the papers are not printed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are printed.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is to distribute them?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know. It is not my business to give an order for the distribution.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that these papers are in the hon. gentleman's office.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are not in my office.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, where are they? If they are printed they must be somewhere.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They must have been printed since some members have received copies, but I have not yet received one. They are probably in the Distribution office at the Government Printing Bureau, and that office is at the disposal of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is for the purpose of distribution that the printing took place. The printing was either authorised or unauthorised. Either these papers have been printed by authority, and in that case ought to be distributed, or they have been printed without authority.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend knows that the report of the Committee of which he was an important member, was printed by order, for the use of the Committee. If they had been distributed to the House, in that case it would have been an infringement on the rights of the Committee. This case is exactly similar. The evidence is printed, but the Distribution office of the Printing Bureau is waiting for an Order of the House to distribute them.

Mr. LAURIER. I move that an order be given to have the report of the Committee, the evidence and the minutes of proceedings distributed among the members of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Since this discussion commenced, I sent in to my box in the post office, and I found a printed copy of the report distributed there, among the other blue books.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the Secretary of State will enquire who has been guilty of this awful infringement of the rule, in distributing that without authority.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps my hon. friend would see that the officers of the House have done their duty by ordering the distribution, and that the papers are in his box, as in the boxes of other members of the House. All I have to say is that I am not the distributor or the messenger of the House.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to take up the sections we passed over. In section 2, line 26, I wish to strike out the words, "and includes also specifications of timber." I find that these specifications are only in the certificate given by the culler to the cove-keeper, upon which the cove-keeper gives a receipt, upon which the advance is made. Then, I propose to drop out sub-section *f* of the same section, defining the expression "ship" or "shipment," as it is only used in one clause, and it does not seem necessary to include it in the interpretation clause.

On section 18,

Mr. FOSTER. In accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member for North Norfolk, I propose, in the fifth line, after the word "held," to provide for a record to be kept of the proxies. It will read as follows :—

A record to be kept of the proxies to a time not exceeding thirty days, within which proxies must be produced and recorded, previous to the meeting, in order to entitle the holder to vote thereon.

On section 28,

Mr. FOSTER. This section stood because of the objection that the directors might reduce the stock below the amount of paid-up capital which a bank must have in order to start, and I think the objection was well taken. I propose to add sub-section 6 : "The capital shall not be reduced below the amount of $250,000 of paid-up stock."

Mr. MULOCK. With reference to section 26, I quite approve of the direction of the proposed legislation, namely, that there should be some restriction placed on the powers of the bank to increase its capital. What would be reasonable ground for causing the Government to withhold the certificate? Do the Government propose, when application is made for a certificate to allow an increase of capital, to enquire into the correctness of the statement made to the Government before they grant such a certificate? I think the power heretofore used by banks to increase their capital, of their own motion, is capable of being abused, if in fact it has not already been abused. The Federal Bank, for instance, increased its capital stock and issued new stock at a very considerable premium, on a statement which was unsupported by the true condition of the assets of the bank. Had there been an examination into the affairs of the bank by independent authority, that would probably have resulted in the withholding of the certificate. The report made was misleading and caused wide disaster.

Mr. FOSTER. What is sought to be obtained here is a sort of supervisory power by the Treasury Board. What form that may take will have to be regulated by the circumstances in each case. Take the circumstance alluded to by my hon. friend, where the bank paid a very large dividend and then increased its stock, which it did not put upon the market, but sold to another corporation within itself, and so got very large deposits. That was at the time fairly well known, and a subject such as that should be taken up by the Treasury Board, provided it had the supervisory power, and fairly sifted.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Government take to themselves a veto power, they also resume the responsibility of its exercise ; and if they assent to an increase on capital stock, they, to a certain extent, endorse the statement given to the shareholders and the public, on which the directors propose to make the new issue. The Government can only properly discharge that responsibility by having a proper examination made into the report issued by the directors, on the face of which the shareholders and the public are asked to take up the increased stock.

Mr. BLAKE. I fear very much that what has fallen from both sides may lead to considerable misconception. The suggestion of the Finance Minister is, taking the particular instance to which reference has been made, that some enquiry would be made which would result in the discovery, in such a case, that a considerable portion of the stock had been floated by means of an institution created by the bank itself. That is impossible. That did not and could not take place in the case mentioned, until after the authority for the issue of the stock had been obtained. It was not until the stock came to be placed on the market that the machinery referred to was used for the purpose of facilitating its being taken up. I do not know of anything that could have been done in that matter, and I am somewhat familiar with the circumstances, unless the Treasury had taken the very extraordinary and invidious course, as a preliminary to giving the certificate, of making such an examination as would result in ascertaining the value of the assets. The difficulty there was that there were enormous assets which were alleged to be, and I have no doubt were, regarded by all the directors as being—I cannot say what the temperament of the cashier might lead him to believe —but they were regarded by the directors, at all events, within a few weeks of the collapse, as being perfectly good. The condition of the bank appeared, long after the increase of capital, to be perfectly good. Its real condition was only to be shown by analysing the value of its assets, by determining whether an enormous sum should be written off from notes and other securities which it held. Is it suggested that the Treasury Board, as a preliminary to deciding whether the capital stock shall be permitted to be increased, shall enter into such an enquiry as that? If that is not the suggestion, then I am afraid nothing can be done. If that is the suggestion, and if it is adopted, I fear a very great responsibility will be incurred by the Government of the day which announces that it has made enquiry and that the proposal is a sound one. In this particular case, I think the proposal was to double the capital at a premium of forty, so that there would have to be an enquiry into the condition of this institution, showing that its present stock was worth at least forty, and that its earning power was such as to justify the public in subscribing at forty. Nothing could be more fatal to the public credit than to make a slight and colorable enquiry ; nothing more arduous than an exhaustive enquiry, and I am afraid that this clause will lead to nothing but difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend has stated as to the responsibility of the Treasury Board, by placing this clause in the Bill, is undoubtedly true. I suppose we would have power to go into the examination of the affairs of a bank as a condition precedent to allowing them to increase their capital stock, but that is not the intention. It might be that the shareholders would decide by a majority to increase the stock, while a large and respectable minority might not agree to that, and any representation by that minority as to the increase or decrease of stock might very well be taken into consideration by the Treasury Board. If we do not go so far as to make a thorough inspection of the condition of the bank, which is not contemplated, I do not think this involves the grave responsibility which the hon. gentleman suggests in regard to the affairs of the bank.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that his present view would be met by putting in a provision that a certain majority shall be required. If a respectable minority is to have its weight, let that be potential; but the suggestion that the hon. gentleman is going to make an inspection as to the expediency or the justifiability of this increase in stock, is a very dangerous one.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot agree with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) as to a majority being allowed to regulate this matter, because it must be recollected that we have not only the interests of the stockholders to protect, but also those of the general public. There might be an object on the part of a majority to float the stock at the advanced rate, and to get out just after. It is true that, if this power is taken by the Government, they assume very great responsibility. And, if they make only a perfunctory examination, they will not only be misleading the public, but will be placing themselves in an indefensible position. I think there is a great deal of danger in that clause.

On section 53,

Mr. FOSTER. In this section I propose a new sub-section. We have two banks, the Bank of British North America and the Banque du Peuple, which are different from the other banks in not having a double liability of the shareholders as security for the notes in circulation. It is difficult to make a change and put these two banks directly upon the same footing as the others, as it would disturb very much their franchises, the business in which they are engaged, the standing of the banks and the position of their shareholders. At the same time, it does not seem quite right that they should have the same limit of circulation as the other banks, whose shareholders give a double liability. I propose to introduce a clause with reference to the Banque du Peuple and the Bank of British North America, limiting their circulation to 75 per cent. of the paid-up capital. If they do not give the double liability, then they shall not have the same limit of circulation, and that, I think, would be a step towards bringing them more on a parity with the other banks. I propose the following as a sub-section :—

Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding sub-section, the total amount of circulation existing at any time in the Bank of British North America and the Banque du Peuple shall not exceed 75 per cent. of the unimpaired paid-up capital of such banks respectively, and each of such banks may issue such notes in excess of the said 75 per cent. per annum upon depositing, with respect to such excess, with the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General, in cash or bonds of the Dominion of Canada, an amount equal to the excess; provided always, that in no case shall the total amount of notes of either of the said banks exceed the unimpaired paid-up capital of such banks, and the cash or bonds so deposited shall be available by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General for the redemption of the notes issued in excess as aforesaid, in the event of the suspension of the said banks respectively.

Mr. BLAKE. They are all bound to make a certain deposit.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not for the circulation fund. The Banque du Peuple, for instance, have $1,200,000 paid-up stock, and they can issue up to that. We say they shall not issue beyond 75 per cent. of that upon the security they now give. If they go beyond they shall put up cash or bonds to that extent.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the penalty apply to these two banks now?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the penalty applies to all the banks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will recollect that a little discussion arose between the Minister of Justice and myself on a point of grave importance with respect to the total amount that might be drawn from the banks, and I understood the Minister of Finance to say that his intention was that under no circumstances should the banks be called upon to contribute more than 13 or 14 per cent. Is that matter now adjusted?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a section for that which I will move shortly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, with respect to sub-section 7. After some conversation across the House, the notice was changed to six days, and the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), thought six days was too long. I propose to suggest that three days notice should be given.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. In sub-section 8 the following will be the sub-section that will regulate the payment by banks towards the impairment of the guarantee fund :—

Provided always, that each of such other banks shall only be called upon to make good to the said fund its share of such excess in payments not exceeding in one year 1 per cent. of the average amount of its notes in circulation. This circulation is to be ascertained in such manner as the Minister of Finance and Receiver General shall decide, and his decision shall be final.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. On section 57 discussion arose with reference to the payment of notes circulating by the different banks, and I will suggest that instead of the word "payment" we put the word "circulation."

Mr. BLAKE. What does that mean?

Mr. FOSTER. That means just what we are driving at, that the notes issued by different banks shall not go below par, and that the banks shall make what arrangements are necessary in order to ensure their being circulated at par, not below par.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose we are a hard money House and the hon. gentleman is a hard money

man. I do not understand how we can declare that the circulation of the bank shall be at par without providing that it shall be payable at par.

Mr. FOSTER. The bank will have to look after that matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is getting to soft money very fast.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to know if by enacting the first part of the section, declaring that they shall make such arrangements as are necessary to ensure the circulation of the notes at par, the banks have to establish agencies at other places than at those mentioned?

Mr. FOSTER. If it is necessary to ensure the circulation of the notes at par, other agencies must be established.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It will impose a very heavy duty on the smaller banks, especially those in the Maritime Provinces, if they have, in order to ensure payment at par of the circulation throughout the Dominion, to establish agencies in every town and city in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. The latter part of this clause is not an adequate provision for the fulfilment of the first part of it, and if it is to be interpreted as an exposition of what the banks are to do in fulfilment of the obligation of the prior part, it is altogether an inadequate fulfilment. The clause would be stronger with its original wording, and with the latter part struck out. I feel there is a great deal of difficulty in the direction which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has pointed out. The difficulty will be very small indeed in regard to the large banks, each of which possesses a considerable number of offices, and each of which can compensate the other by making mutual facilities for redemption. It is different, however, in regard to the smaller banks. Take, for instance, a note issued by the Bank of Prince Edward Island, which is handed in for redemption at Vancouver. If an arrangement could be made between the banks for their mutual accommodation in this regard, the difficulty might be solved.

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangement which is indicated in section 56, is one which the banks have voluntarily taken on themselves. It is not a compulsion laid on them against their will, but it is an arrangement into which they are quite willing to enter. To the representatives of the banking institutions, I pointed out the very objections which the hon. gentleman has taken. The bankers said, that practically those objections were not formidable, because they were even now, and had been during the last year, very materially altering the condition of things by agreements made amongst themselves, and no difficulty whatever would be experienced. It would of course be a quite different matter, if we proposed this compulsory clause against the wishes of the smaller banks.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's statement. If the smaller banks were satisfied, we should be satisfied.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman come to the conclusion as to the desirability of inserting a clause, providing that notes should be taken at par all over the Dominion and not subject to discount by banks on each other's notes?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the arrangements we have made will bring about the object we have in view, of preventing the notes of different banks from circulating below par. There are some objections, I think, to the proposition of the hon. gentleman to making it compulsory on every bank, if it pays or takes the note of another bank, to do it without discount. What we have already enacted is sufficient to obtain the object which is so desirable, namely, that the notes should be taken at par.

On section 57,

Mr. MULOCK. This makes the banks liable to redeem their bills at but one place, namely, the place where they are made payable. That is an old section which no doubt has crept in by mistake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you want to make that intelligible you ought to add the words "except at the place designated."

Mr. MULOCK. You have introduced a new idea in one section, and you let the section of the old Act stand as it is. That is where the difficulty comes in.

Mr. FOSTER. We will strike out all after the word "not" in section 57, line 50.

Mr. BLAKE. Do not you think that sections 56 and 57 conflict? In the earlier part of section 56, a person is to get cash or the equivalent for cash, and he cannot get any more than that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the earlier part of section 56, we state the purpose of the section, and the means taken to accomplish that purpose have been found adequate by the banks. We have nowhere made it compulsory for banks to take the notes of other banks, nor have we in any place made it compulsory, unless we make it compulsory in section 57, for a bank to receive its own notes at other than the place of payment mentioned in the note.

On section 61,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike out all after the word "dollars" on the 46th line. I shall have an amendment to offer later on.

On section 66,

Mr. FOSTER. The new words which are in this section, over and above what were in the preceding section, are the words after "bank" in the second line of the section. We propose to drop out the words "which has accrued and become payable," and leave it as it was in the old Act. There was no limit specified in the old Act, but if there is any great objection to the six months mentioned here being too short, we can make it read twelve months.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be in the interests of all parties concerned to make it twelve months.

Mr. BLAKE. As I pointed out before, I think it is very important that the bank should, as soon as possible, cease to be the holder of its own stock. During this time, the double liability which appears to the public is wholly illusory. Any bank, which is in a position to go on at all, ought be able to sell its stock in six months.

Mr. TISDALE. The people who are interested ought to be entitled to some consideration. The bank might be willing to sell, but it might not be in the interests of the other parties concerned, that within such a short time as six months they should be forced to have their assets realised upon. As there was no limit mentioned in the old Act, surely twelve months is not an unreasonable time to specify here.

Mr. COCKBURN. It may be in the interest of the bank as well as in the interest of the debtor and the other creditors not to sell. Considering that the time was indefinite in the old Act, I do not think the extension to twelve months is dangerous.

Mr. McCARTHY. Besides, the double liability is not affected. The bank only holds a lien, and the double liability still remains for whatever it is worth.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but it is the double liability of a man who cannot pay.

Mr. COCKBURN. The same privilege should extend to the case of an overdue debt. It might be that the directors would carry a man for twelve months and grant him an extension from time to time. I do not think it fair to the other creditors, apart from the bank altogether, that their interest should be sacrificed to the convenience of the bank directors.

Mr. TISDALE. Under the section as it stands, a bank could not even renew a debt.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask whether, under the wording of the clause, the bank would be obliged to sell in the event of the debt having matured, or whether it would be allowed to renew the debt? It might happen that the bank would desire to renew it, and I would suggest that you add the words, "having regard to any extension or extensions of time."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would defeat it altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. As a matter of law, could the bank renew a note for which it had this lien, or would the lien apply to the renewed debt?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The lien would remain as long as the party owed the debt. I see nothing in the section to prevent the bank granting a renewal.

Mr. TISDALE. That is a very good reason why the old law was a wise one. I do not object to a limit, so long as we are careful not to go too far. Under the old law the bank could renew indefinitely; but I am inclined to think that this new provision would take away the power of renewal from the bank. Unless the Minister's object is not to encourage such transactions, I do not see any reason for changing the old law; but if we do change it, let us allow twelve months, at any rate, in which to realise on the security.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the law ought to be made perfectly clear one way or the other. The hon. Minister of Justice says that if we allowed any extension at all, that would defeat this law. Then, the moment the debt becomes due the time limit begins, and when it expires, the bank cannot have a lien on the shares with respect to that debt. If that is the case, we are face to face with a peculiar state of affairs. A shareholder might have a current account, which might be in the form of renewals; but if it could be shown that his debt were part of the original debt for which the security was given, it would be possible to defeat the security. I think it should be made perfectly clear whether the provision does or does not apply to renewals.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know that my hon. friend quite understood what I said. My idea was that we should not give power to extend the liability merely to extend the lien. If we did so, that would defeat the provision by making it work indefinitely. But I do not see that the clause, as it stands, prevents the six months beginning to run from the date of new transactions. It certainly would prevent the period beginning from an extension of the original indebtedness; but if there were a new transaction and a new consideration, it certainly would not apply.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It seems to me that this security ought to be dealt with just in the same way as other securities obtained by the bank for loans, and it ought not to be realised on unless, in the judgment of the bank, the best time has arrived for realising upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that twelve months be inserted in place of six months.

On section 67,

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to insert after "conveyed," in the 27th line, the word "either," and after "acts," in the 30th line, these words: "Or in like manner and subject to the like restrictions as a private individual might in like circumstances deal with, sell and convey the same."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the different Provinces there are two modes of realising on collateral securities. One is the method in force in the English-speaking Provinces by which the lien holder can sell without process of law. In the Province of Quebec, it is necessary, in order to realise upon collateral security, that the creditor shall recover judgment and seize the collateral in execution and bring it to sale. With the view of harmonising these two systems and making the remedy perfectly available, we say that the bank shall sell, either as a private individual may, or—and this is to suit the Province of Quebec—as a bank may do in respect of its own shares. This will make it clear that in any case the bank will not be required to resort to a judgment and execution in order to bring the collateral to sale. I propose to add at the end of these words "sold and conveyed," "but without obligation to sell the same within twelve months."

On section 75,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the section which enables manufacturers to give a lien, by way of security in analogy to warehouse receipts. The changes proposed to be made in that will meet the point raised in the discussion the other evening. That discussion showed the extent to which the words "or producer" might lead us, and I propose, for that reason, to strike out in the second line, and in any other places where they occur, the words "producer," "produced" and "production," so as to leave only the word "manufacturer, &c." Another difficulty mentioned to the Committee is the use of the word "wholesale." It is true that

the continuance of that word may possibly exclude some classes of manufacturers who manufacture agricultural implements and musical instruments of large value, and who can hardly be said to be wholesale manufacturers. Nevertheless, there will be very considerable difficulty if we leave the word "wholesale" out, by extending the clause to manufacturers on a small scale. On the whole, I think it would be preferable to retain the word. There is this to be said in favor of its retention, that by retaining it we are not depriving any manufacturers, who come within the present law, from giving this security. We are widening the clause as regards manufacturers, and I think the insertion of the word "wholesale" will enable the clause to apply to every manufacturer named in the present Act as entitled to give warehouse receipts, to give that security which is in analogy to warehouse receipts. I propose the definition of the word "manufacturer" to be as follows:—

The word "manufacturer" includes maltsters, distillers, brewers, refiners and producers of petroleum, tanners, curers, bakers, canners of meat, pork, fish, fruit and vegetables, and any person who produces by hand, art, process or mechanical means, any goods, wares or merchandise.

The word "produce" was inserted in order to cover certain classes of persons who are manufacturers in the strict legal sense, but not in the ordinary understanding of the term, such as the distiller and the brewer, who might not be supposed, in popular understanding, to be whiskey or beer manufacturers. The mere curer of pork might, also, not be understood to be a manufacturer.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have great doubt with regard to this clause, as it will enable secret conveyances to be made, and third parties will have no means of knowing that they have been made. A manufacturer may transfer to a bank in this way, by a bill of sale, everything he has, and still enjoy the credit resulting from his presumed ownership of his stock on hand. This is contrary to the policy followed in the Maritime Provinces, and in Ontario, where the law, I believe, is the same as with us. In these Provinces, when a party gives a chattel mortgage on a bill of sale, he must register it, or it is of no avail against other creditors. The effect of this clause will be that transactions of this kind will not require to be registered, if this Parliament has power to pass such a law. Assuming it has the power, this clause will enable parties, who are ostensibly owners of their property, but whose property is really mortgaged to banks in this way, to deceive the public as to their business standing.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. I think that the warehouse receipt, which the banks were permitted to take, extended as it has been, has gone far enough. I have some doubt as to whether our present provision does not interfere with the power of the Provincial Legislatures. It is one thing for us to say that the banks may take a warehouse receipt, and it is another thing to declare how it shall effect the transfer of property. Now it is proposed to allow any manufacturer, and so on, by a secret conveyance to mortgage all his property to a bank, so that the bank shall acquire the same rights and powers in respect to the goods, wares and merchandise covered thereby as if it had acquired the same by virtue of a warehouse receipt. In fact, you are putting the banks in a different position from that of any other creditors in the country, which, I think, is unwise, and, I believe, is unconstitutional.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry that my two hon. and learned friends from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and from St. John (Mr. Weldon) were not present in the House when we adopted this clause after a long debate and a division, the only questions left being the definition of the persons to whom it would apply. Of course, their absence does not prevent their raising the question again, but I will state, for their benefit, the points which were taken at that time. As my hon. friends are aware, the original legislation on the subject of warehouse receipts proceeded on the principle of bailment. That is, that one person being the custodian of the goods of another, undertakes, by a warehouse receipt, to hold those goods for the bank or for any other person who has a lien upon them. But we have departed from that principle entirely, and have extended the giving of warehouse receipts to persons who were in possession of their own goods. It has been a struggle on the part of one class of dealers after another to get into the Act and to be allowed to give warehouse receipts, so that practically the provisions of the present banking law extend to a larger number of persons than this clause does. These documents are fictitiously called warehouse receipts, though the property may be in the possession of the owner, and may never have been in a warehouse.

Mr. MULOCK. But the giver of a receipt must be a warehouseman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; he may be the captain of a boat, or a miller, or a man who never saw a warehouse in his life, or who was never entrusted with any other person's property. The change we make is to provide that the term "warehouse receipt" shall be restricted to the instrument properly so-called, given by the warehouseman. But we do not want to cut out the manufacturing classes of this country, who have been accustomed to use the warehouse receipt system, and to get large advances from the banks on that system. We propose to leave that, although the privilege is enjoyed by some persons in respect of their own goods, but it will be confined to the manufacturers, and we shall call it not a warehouse receipt, but a security. It cannot be a warehouse receipt, because the goods are not in the warehouse, but are in possession of the manufacturer himself. We are not widening the clause at all, but we are really cutting it down to the manufacturing class only, and I think that that will be less objectionable than the present law, mainly from the fact that we are confining it to a class of persons who have been accustomed to receive this aid from the banks and in regard to whom the public credit has been guarded in view of the provisions already passed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very glad to hear the explanations of the Minister of Justice. I am glad to hear that the clause he refers to has been omitted from the statute, and I would not at all object to the banks having the power in the limited sense which he has explained; but I think that, when the question is tested, it will be found that we have not the authority to say what the conveyance shall

vest in the banks. I think it should be left to the Provinces to say how it should vest. If the Provinces choose to say that this security can be given to the banks in this way, well and good; but I think that, when it is tested, it will be found that we have no authority to deal with the question of vesting the property.

Mr. TISDALE. The constitutional point raised by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has always existed, but the banks have gone on under the warehouse receipt system very well, and it would be a very serious blow to our industries if any interference took place with the rights and privileges of the merchants and others in obtaining money in this way from the banks. This is confined to a class of men who have these connections with the banks generally. If this right is taken away from the wholesale manufacturers, it will seriously interfere with their power to carry on their business. If there is anything in the constitutional point, I shall be somewhat surprised, because these warehouse receipts have existed ever since Confederation. I think it would be an unjust infliction upon a most important class to be compelled to do their banking in any other way than this. They are willing to take their chances on it; and I think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) showed conclusively the other night that, though there might be a doubt in regard to the matter, it would be well for us not to narrow the provisions of the statute ourselves. This subject was very fully discussed the other night, and I thought the whole question was settled except the definition. There may be members here who did not hear anything in regard to that matter, and I would point out the serious interference with our industries which would result, if this privilege is taken away from them, particularly as regards the manufacturers, to whom it would be a great hardship.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend seems to think this section is an old one. This is entirely a new section.

Mr. TISDALE. I am speaking of the principle of allowing these people to finance in this way.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to draw the attention of the Committee again to the question brought up by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) the other night. I was not able to be here on Thursday night, and I asked the member for Frontenac to move an additional subsection, providing that banks might loan money upon the security of licenses to cut timber. I see by the discussion that took place upon that occasion that the Minister of Finance took the objection that these securities were rather incorporeal, that they were not of a very safe character, that in view of the fact that licenses only extended for one year, and expired within one year after their issue, the security is not what might be desired. But I think my hon. friend overlooked the fact that under the regulations, both in Ontario and Quebec—I cannot speak with regard to the other Provinces—license holders who shall have duly complied with the regulations of the Department of Crown Lands shall be entitled to renewals of their licenses, provided they have done certain things that are spoken of in the regulations themselves. I do not know whether it would be in order for me to move this amendment again, but I desire to say that I cannot conceive of any class of security which it is more desirable that a bank should be allowed to take, or a manufacturer be allowed to give, than the security upon these very licenses. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), as I see by the discussion the other night, took the objection that it would be constituting these banks land banks. Of course, I do not pretend to set up my opinion respecting the nature of these securities against the great legal knowledge of that hon. gentleman, but I have always understood that licenses for such timber did not in any sense convey any right in the lands themselves, that they simply convey the right to cut the trees standing upon those lands. As a raw material for the manufacture of lumber, it seems to me it is a class of security that might very well come within the purview of this Act. For instance, let us take the case of a young man having great experience in lumbering, but with no capital, and having a license to cut timber. Under the law as it stands at present he is unable to go to a bank and say: Here, I have got good tangible security to give you; can you advance me a sufficient sum of money upon this security to enable me to manufacture a certain quantity of the raw material that is standing upon this land, and which I have a right to cut under the license? Under the law, he being unable to do that, the result is that this man must go to some private individual and give securities to him, by subjecting parties to a very large imposition in the way of commissions as a go-between between the bank and the person who desires to manufacture the raw material upon these licenses. As I said, I do not know whether I have the right now to move this resolution, as it was moved the other night; but if I have, I will place it in your hands, and ask the consideration of the Committee upon it.

Mr. BLAKE. It having been once moved and disposed of, the hon. gentleman must wait till the third reading before he moves it again.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 89,

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to move a new clause, as sub-section 4, with reference to the disposition of unclaimed balances in the case of insolvent banks. The Committee will remember that part of that first clause was left out. This is a little solatium.

If, in the event of the winding up of the business of a bank in insolvency, or under any general winding up Act or otherwise, any moneys payable by the liquidator and due either to shareholders or depositors, should remain unclaimed for a period of three years from the date of suspension of payment by the bank, or the commencement of the winding up of such business, if such should take place before the expiration of the said three years, such moneys and all interest thereon shall, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or other Act relating to prescription, be paid to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to be held by him subject to all rightful claims on behalf of any person other than the bank; but in case a claim to any moneys so paid as aforesaid should be thereafter established to the satisfaction of the Treasury Board, the Governor in Council shall, on the report of the Treasury Board, direct payment thereof to be made to the parties entitled thereto, together with interest on the principal sum thereof, at the rate of three per centum per annum for a period not exceeding six years from the date of payment thereof to the said Minister of Finance and Receiver General as aforesaid: Provided, however, that no such interest shall be paid or payable on such principal sum, unless interest thereon was payable by the bank paying the same to the said Minister of Finance and Receiver General; and on payment to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General as

herein provided, the bank and its assets shall be held to be discharged from further liability for the amount so paid.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move the insertion of the following new clause :—

The liability of a bank under any law claim or agreement to repay money deposited with it, and interest, if any, and to pay dividends declared payable on its capital stock, shall continue, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or any enactment or law relating to prescription. This section applies to moneys heretofore or hereafter deposited and to dividends heretofore or hereafter declared.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With reference to the provisions regarding penalties, I propose the following :—

The amount of all penalties imposed upon any bank for any violation of this Act, shall be recoverable and enforceable with costs, at the suit of Her Majesty, instituted by the Attorney General of Canada, or the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General, and such penalty so recovered or enforced shall belong to the Crown for the public uses of Canada; but the Governor in Council, on report of the Treasury Board, may direct that any portion of any penalty may be remitted or paid to any person so employed, in any manner best adapted to secure the object of this Act and to promote the administration thereof.

Motion agreed to.

On section 61,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In respect to this section, it seems to me that the penalty ought to be different in respect to the procedure and application, from the penalties imposed upon banks. We have just passed a provision to strike out of the section the manner in which the penalty should be recovered and the disposal of the penalty, namely, a moiety to Her Majesty and a moiety to the prosecutor. It strikes me, however, that that provision ought to remain in this section. This is a penalty not upon a bank, but upon a person or corporation other than a bank. In respect to this it may be thought proper to use the service of a common informer, as the Minister of Finance or Attorney General may have no means of knowing anything about the prosecution in such a case, which might probably be brought at the instance of a bank.

Motion agreed to.

On schedule D,

Mr. FOSTER. I propose, in deference to the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), to substitute in this schedule the word "sum" for "balance."

Mr. MULOCK. An hon. gentleman opposite, who takes an interest in financial matters, whom I do not see in the House, asked me to illustrate this case, and we went together to the library and found that the gross liabilities of one of our banks to the public, according to our Canadian returns, amount to $8,000,000, whereas, as a matter of fact, they amount to $27,000,000; but from that amount we deduct the amount of domestic liabilities, which left its liabilities to outside creditors twice the amount that they appear to be by the returns. The requirements of the present schedule enable any bank in Canada to transact any amount of business it chooses outside of the limits of Canada, and to make no intelligible return whatever of that business to the Canadian public; so that the return to the Government is absolutely misleading. It is worse than no return, because it is supposed to give the public an idea of the actual position of the bank, while it gives an entirely erroneous one.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. COCKBURN. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) wants a return to show the entire liabilities of the banks doing business outside of Canada. An attempt was made, eight years ago, to have the returns include outside business, but it was found that that system created such an amount of confusion that the House passed a law doing away with it. If the hon. gentleman desires to obtain this knowledge, I would suggest that it might be better and clearer if, instead of throwing these statements into one, a supplementary statement of outside business were given by those banks doing business outside of Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no objection to its being made in that form.

Mr. TISDALE. I think we had better leave well enough alone. It was found under the old law that the system proposed did not work well, and a special Act was brought in, a short time after the Banking Act was passed, to change it to the present form. Now, the Department, the banks, and the public are all satisfied with the present system, and it is now proposed to change it without any consultation with the banks. I do not pretend to understand it, but it seems to me quite unnecessary to make a change.

Mr. BLAKE. I confess that it is very difficult, for me at any rate, to judge which form is best. We ought certainly to obtain all the information which we can without unduly hampering the operations of the banks, and we ought even to obtain such information as is essential to a fair view of the situation, though it may, to some extent, hamper them. But we know that some of our banks occasionally place large sums of money at particular points in the States, and do considerable business there. A bank, for instance, may have a large sum of money at an agency in New York and another at an agency in San Francisco; and if you take into account the gross sums due by and to these agencies, you might get, I will not say a perfect view, but a considerable insight into the amount of Canadian funds invested in the United States. That would be very interesting, if it did not unduly hamper the operations of the banks in the United States. We do not at present ask how much of a bank's capital it is using in Toronto, Montreal, London or other places where it is doing business. Is there any public ground why we should do what is now proposed, if it is going to interfere with the business of our banks in the States? The only ground that has been suggested is, that if it is found that they are investing any large sums of money there, some business tax may be imposed upon them. We know that some of them are obliged to pay a business tax now. I suppose they would like to be in the position of some people who are taxed on income, that nobody but themselves should know on what income this business tax should be computed.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think it is material to find out the details of the balances, if these balances exist as cash; but I think it is unsound to take the amount of the notes which they hold in their agencies, and deduct from them the amount they borrow from the public, and say that the balance represents the true state of that agency. I may tell the Minister one reason, it appears to me, for the adoption of the existing form. At any rate, we know when there were two systems of payment in the

United States—legal tender and gold—Canadian banks had two separate accounts in the United States agencies. There might be gold to their credit, and there might be a debit against them in currency; and, in that case, it was very usual to strike a balance between these two accounts, according to the market value of the gold and currency at the time. But to extend that principle to the particular notes of customers, which may be in the possession of a New York agent, as gold, and to deduct them from what is due the public, and call the balance a true representation of the position, is wholly illusory. I say, therefore, that the term "balance" is not an appropriate term.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has had full opportunity of laying his views before the House, and as it is now six o'clock, I propose that the Committee settle this matter at once. Taking all things into consideration, I know of no reasons which have arisen in the practical working for changing the present system. I therefore think that the word "balance" should be left in this second clause.

Schedule agreed to on a division.

Committe rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

BANKS AND BANKING.

House again resolved itself in Committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would beg to move a sub-section to section 89. It is intended to provide for this case. We have to guard against the possibility of the liquidator of an insolvent bank distributing the assets of the bank in liquidation, while some of the notes of the bank remain outstanding. If we do not make some special provision on that subject, we shall find that the assets of an insolvent bank have all been distributed, and that the outstanding notes will remain a charge upon the redemption fund. There are two principles to be kept in view. The first is that the outstanding notes ought to be redeemed, notwithstanding the lapse of time, because it has been shown by experience that in the liquidation of an institution of that kind, many years elapse before all the notes come in; and the Government agree that a bank note, once in circulation, should be susceptible of redemption, no matter how long it may be outstanding. The second principle is that these outstanding notes ought not to form a charge on the fund put up by the other banks after the distribution of the assets of an insolvent bank; and I propose in regard to this, as well as to the unclaimed balances and dividends, that the liquidator shall pay an amount to the Government sufficient to cover the notes still outstanding. The sub-section I propose is as follows:—

Upon the winding up of a bank in insolvency, or under any general winding up Act or otherwise, the assignees, liquidators, directors, or other officials in charge of such winding up, shall, before the final distribution of the assets or within three years from the commencement of suspension of payment by the bank, whichever shall first happen, pay over to the Minister of Finance and the Receiver-General a sum, out of the assets of the bank, equal to the amount then outstanding of the notes intended for circulation issued by the bank; and upon such payment being made, the bank and its assets shall be relieved from all further liability in respect of such outstanding notes.

Sub-section agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the only provision remaining is the one to which the hon. member for South Oxford gave some attention when the Bill was in Committee before. It is desirable to provide, as far as we can, for penalties in the case of notes issued by way of over-circulation. That is not so simple as it appears, in expressing the term "over-circulation," because the fraud, which he pointed out as quite possible under the present system, and which he pointed out as having more temptations under the new than under the old system, is not merely the fraud of issuing a larger amount of the notes than the bank has power of issuing, but of issuing them within their power for fraudulent purposes, but in excess of any legitimate want of the bank. For example, the Bank of Montreal, having power to issue notes to the full extent of its paid up capital, has now the power to issue, I think, $12,000,000. Its issue has never reached half that amount, so that if we merely provide a penalty for issuing more than the bank is entitled to issue, there might be a fraud anywhere within the margin of the $6,000,000 which still remain. The fraud the hon. gentleman dwelt upon is really the fraud of issuing notes not then in circulation, for the purpose of defrauding, and I think the following section will cover it as nearly as possible:—

Every person who, being the president, vice-president, director, principal partner, general manager, or cashier, or other officer of a bank, with intent to defraud, issues, or delivers, or authorises, or is concerned in the issue or delivery of the notes of the bank intended for circulation and not then in circulation, and every person who, with knowledge of such intent, accepts, receives or takes, or authorises or is concerned in the acceptance, receiving or taking of such notes, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to a term of imprisonment not exceeding seven years, or to a fine not exceeding $2,000, or to both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any limitation been fixed within which the guarantee fund shall be liable for notes?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. Of course, the whole fund is available for the redemption of any outstanding notes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is no period fixed within which these notes shall be presented?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is already provided that, if all the notes are not presented when the bank is wound up, the liquidator shall pay to the Government a sufficient amount to meet all outstanding notes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But in the case of a bankrupt estate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course the liquidator can only pay out of the assets of the bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, that leaves it undetermined as to the time within which the holders of notes must apply for the redemption of those notes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no limitation of time with regard to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for the hon. gentleman to determine. I should have thought that a limitation of time would have been

fair and reasonable, but, if the bankers do not want it, I say nothing further.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise and report the Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the Committee rise, I wish to draw attention to a matter in connection with the banks that causes a great deal of inconvenience to business men and to the public generally. The members from Ontario are aware that the general practice is, all over the Province, to close the banks at one o'clock on Saturday afternoon, and I understand the same practice prevails in the other Provinces. I need not tell this honorable House that Saturday, for business men, is generally the most busy day in the week. That is the day on which the largest sales are made, and it is a matter of great importance that the bank should be kept open as long as possible in order to enable business men to make their deposits. It is not only a great inconvenience to business men but it is a great inconvenience also to the farming community. For instance, a farmer comes on Saturday to the market town, after travelling, perhaps, fifteen or twenty miles, with a load of produce; he sells it to warehouses, which are always crowded on those days, and it is, perhaps, after one o'clock before his goods are discharged and he gets his cheque for the money. There is nothing for him to do but to go back all that long distance and come into town again the next week, in order to get his money and make the purchases he intended to make on Saturday. That is found to be an intolerable hardship amongst the farmers generally. Business men have complained to me about it bitterly, and letters have been written to me about this matter since this Bill came before the House. Now, I submit that it is not a great hardship for the banks to keep their branches open on Saturday until the same hour as on other days. That makes only thirty hours in the course of the week that the bank is kept open, and if it is necessary to shorten that time by two hours, it could be done on some other day which is not a large market day. The custom prevails in the city of London, and, I believe, in most of the towns and cities in Ontario, of making Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays the principal market days. If you go into most of the towns and cities on any other day of the week you will see little or nothing being done. I think it is the duty of the banks to the public to make this change. I need not tell the Committee that the banks receive large franchises from the country; they are chartered to do business with the public; they receive their profits and emoluments from the public, and I think it is the duty of this House to provide that these institutions be run as far as possible, for the convenience of the public in this respect, if that can be done without any serious inconvenience to the bank. For these reasons, I move that the following clause be inserted in the Bill:

That all branches of the various banks chartered under this Act be kept open for business on Saturdays until three o'clock in the afternoon, save and except when a bank holiday falls upon a Saturday.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt an inconvenience arises to parties who come in from the country on Saturday, as one of the market days, and who find the banks closed after a certain hour, that hour being quite early in the afternoon. That, however, is an inconvenience of which the House heretofore has not taken cognisance by means of an enactment. It is a thing, I think, which is more to be remedied by the law of demand and supply. These banks wish to do all the business they possibly can, and I think they are always found ready, for the sake of doing business, to accommodate the largest possible number of customers; but I do not think that we could go so far as to fix the hours during which the banks are to be kept open.

Mr. TROW. I entirely concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and I am in favor of his resolution. If Parliament has anything to do with making rules and regulations for the banks, I think it would be a great convenience to the public that this regulation should be adopted. We all know that Saturday is a very busy day for business men, and for the farmers who bring their produce into market on that day, and after they have sold and delivered it, and have partaken of refreshments, it is usually after one o'clock, and the result is that large sums of money that are paid after banking hours cannot be deposited in the bank, nor can cheques be cashed after that hour. I have had experience myself of this inconvenience. Parties have put thousands of dollars into my hands to be kept until Monday, because these parties had not received it until after banking hours on Saturday. I do not know if the House has anything to do with this matter, but if it has, it would be a great convenience to the public to make this regulation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We make regulations for the banks in other matters, why not in this, too? The Minister of Finance says, that competition amongst the banks for business will regulate this matter. But that has not proved to be the case. There is not one iota less business done by the bank, but it is done at inconvenient times, and that is what the public complain of. All that is asked is that Saturdays be made the same as other days of the week, and that the bank be kept open until three o'clock the same as other days, for the accommodation of the public. I submit that this House would be failing in its duty if it does not make some provision in this respect. The banks agree among thomselves to close at that hour. Formerly the banks were kept open Saturdays until the usual hour; of late years an arrangement has been made amongst themselves to close at one o'clock in the afternoon. Some of the banks, I understand, wish to make a change, but none of them desire to be the first to break this agreement. I insist that the people have a right to this accommodation; that is the way in which business is done.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the House cannot fix the hour on Saturday for the banks to close, let it be understood that the banks that close at one o'clock on Saturday cannot protest a note on that day.

Mr. MULOCK. They cannot protest it until three, anyway.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Before the Committee rise, I desire to revert to a point, that seems to me important, in relation to the monthly returns made by the bank. The public of Canada, I believe, have been under the impression that the monthly

returns gave the exact condition of the banks making those returns. But, as stated by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in an earlier part of this discussion, it appears these returns are largely misleading. He cited in support of his contention the case of the Bank of British North America. I do not think that bank is singular. I believe the Bank of British Columbia, the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Commerce, the Merchants' Bank, and other Canadian banks having agencies in the United States stand in the same category. The fact appears to be this: That when they return their liabilities in the monthly statement to Ottawa as being so and so, their actual debts are very much in excess of that amount. I have here a statement from the return to the Government on 31st December, last year, of the Bank of British North America, and a statement made to the shareholders for the same date, from which I find this, that whereas the deposits were represented to the public of Canada as only $7,500,000, the actual deposits in that bank exceeded $11,000,000, namely, $11,300,000. The circulation in both returns is identical, because the bank has not the privilege of circulating its notes outside of Canada. The total liabilities are returned to the public of Canada as $8,827,000, whereas, as a matter of fact, the total liabilities of that bank on 31st December last year exceeded $21,000,000. There appears in the statement of the Bank of British North America to its shareholders this extraordinary item: "Bills payable and other liabilities, $8,650,000," a sum which cannot be found in any part of the return made to the Government of this country. So it is if you look at the assets. The total amount of loans by the bank is returned to the Government as $9,500,000; the estimated total loans of the bank, according to the return made to the shareholders, amounted to $21,000,000. I do not say for one moment the bank is not in a solvent state, I believe it is one of the strongest banks we have in Canada; but I do say this, that the creditors in Canada, who accept the notes of the bank and entrust their money to the bank, rely to a great extent on the faith of the double liability, and if it so happened to the bank that in its operations in New York, Chicago or London, engaging as they do in large commercial transactions in those cities, if its assets of a merchantable character proved insecure, if at the time of a commercial crisis they involved a heavy loss to the bank, the security implied would be largely reduced so far as the creditors in Canada were concerned. It is the duty of the Government to so regulate the returns that the true and exact condition of the banks is really known to the creditors in Canada. I know in the case of insurance companies doing business in the United States, the Canadian Life Insurance Company, the Royal Canadian Insurance Company, and other companies of that large class, they are required by law to make a return, not only of their business in this country, but in the adjacent country. The same principle should apply to the banks. Yet to-day we are passing a Bank Bill which does not call on any bank to return its business outside of Canada; and I, therefore, say that the returns hereafter, as in the past, will be utterly misleading in regard to any bank doing business outside of Canada, so far as its creditors in this country are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House before recess when this subject was discussed upon the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), to change the words "balances due at the agencies in foreign countries, and the United Kingdom," by inserting the word "sums," which would give the total gross amount of both assets and liabilities, and thus enable the balance to be arrived at. The opinion of the Committee at that time was, that it was not necessary to obtain from the banks a statement as to what business they might be obliged to carry on in the United States, as they very often have to carry on business there, in New York, in San Francisco or Chicago. Of course it is a matter for the Committee to determine, but the determination of the Committee having been given before recess, I do not think it is best to reopen the question.

Mr. BLAKE. I sympathise with the statements of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and I suggest to the Finance Minister that, as I do not suppose he intends to take the third reading to-night, he should consider the subject and communicate with the banking authorities to ascertain whether there is any real difficulty that can be stated by him on the floor of the House in the way of the suggestion being carried out, because the statement of the hon. gentleman certainly shows that we do not get anything like approaching the facts in the return.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to allow it to go in that way.

Mr. KENNY. I understood the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) to refer solely to the Bank of British North America.

Mr. BLAKE. No; he said there were several others doing business in the United States to which his remarks would apply.

Mr. KENNY. The Bank of British Nort America makes no return to the Canadian Govern ment of its business done in New York, or in San Francisco, or points outside the Dominion, but simply a return of its Canadian business. It is working under an English charter, and it is not under a double liability provision. So it stands in quite a different position from the other chartered banks of Canada. I quite agree with the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) that it is most desirable the returns made by the chartered banks to the Government should be as accurate and as full as possible, in order to give the public the most correct information as regards the condition of the Canadian banks; but I do not see it is advisable that we should call upon the large banks of Canada, to which the remarks of the hon. gentleman evidently referred, to give us the exact details of the exact amount which, every month of their existence, they may have deposited in the United States.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move in amendment:

That every bank which closes before three o'clock on Saturday shall not be allowed to protest any notes on that day.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill reported.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 143) to amend the Act respecting Customs duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion for the third reading I desire, although I am sorry—I am afraid we on this side of the House cannot give effect to my desire—to enter a protest for the last time against the policy the Government has adopted in imposing these additional burdens on the people of Canada. The case before us is one of a very singular character. We have here the Minister of Finance, coming down to the House in his official capacity, informing us that he had a surplus of $2,500,000 or thereabouts—a little less, perhaps, as I calculate it, $2,000,000 I think—on last year's transactions, that he anticipates a surplus of about $2,500,000 on the present year's transactions, that he expects a further surplus of $2,500,000, be it more or less, for next year ; and yet, in spite of the surplus for last year, the surplus expected for the present year and the surplus expected for next year, the hon. gentleman, contrary, I may say, to the practice of all civilised nations, proposes, instead of using that surplus for the purpose of alleviating the burdens of the people,—he proposes, notwithstanding his surplus, to add largely to the taxes already inflicted on the people of Canada. I am at a loss to understand how the hon. gentleman can justify such conduct to himself, or to the people for whom he is guardian and trustee. I think that the matter is made the worse in the present case, from the extraordinary fashion in which these new taxes are being imposed. If there be any principles which are well established, and which ought, I think, to commend themselves to the common sense of everybody, they are : That particularly in a country which desires immigration, and particularly in a young country, with large areas to settle up, we ought to avoid imposing taxes on articles of prime necessity to the whole people. We should take care to so adjust our taxation, that it should be, as far as possible, equitably distributed over the whole country, and that, above all, taxation should be so arranged that it should not press unequally on the various classes of the population, and most of all, that it should not press heavily on the poorer classes. That we should take care that taxation would be so adjusted as to avoid increasing the taxes on the raw material, and that in a Confederation like ours, no particular section, or no particular Province, should say that a tax was imposed in favor of one Province and to the detriment of another. I might add, Sir, that under existing circumstances, and bearing in mind the relations existing between ourselves and the United States, we ought to be particularly careful not to impose taxation in such a way as to invite retaliation by our neighbors. I doubt whether any tariff was ever submitted to this House, or to this country, or to any other country, which flew more directly in the face of these plain and obvious principles than the tariff which we have now before us. In the first place, that tariff, with the expected surplus of $2,500,000, is likely to add something like $1,000,000 to the burdens of the people, whether or not it brings that amount into the treasury.

The hon. the Finance Minister did not give us, at the time he made his Budget statement—as I think he ought to have done—anything like a fair estimate of the total amount of the burdens placed on the people by this taxation. But looking at it, as far as I can see after the discussion which has taken place here, I should say that his tax on flour and his tax on meats of various kinds will, in all probability, result in an addition to the burdens of the people of at least $300,000 or $350,000 ; and more likely the latter than the former sum. The total amount of taxation which he proposes to levy on the various kinds of fruit and fruit trees, is not by any manner of means, easy to estimate ; but, apparently, it will approach something like $200,000. At least, that would be the amount which we would have to pay, if our people continue to import as many of these articles in the year now approaching as they did in the past year. The duty on woollen goods and other articles of that description will apparently involve an increase of $125,000, and the duty on minor items, such as animals, fancy goods, cloths, &c., will, I think, approximate very closely to $150,000 ; that is to say, on the basis of the importations which we are at present making. If, to these, you add the extra duty on spirits—whether you take the hon. gentleman's computation, or the computation made on this side of the House—you would have an increase ranging from $150,000 to $200,000. These calculations do not take into account divers minor increases in the tariff, but the total increases of the burdens of the people will amount to at least a million dollars ; whether you get that sum into the revenue or not it is very difficult at present to form an idea. More than that, Sir, you find when you come to examine these various taxes that they are open, in detail, to pretty nearly every objection that can possibly be urged against taxes. The tax on flour and the tax on meat, of necessity, must and will add to the cost of articles of food, and articles of food which are consumed among a very poor class of the population. They will, in addition to that, injure an industry which we are able to do nothing to benefit. They will, more or less, increase the cost of the production of lumber, and they will, more or less, therefore, interfere with that important industry. I can only repeat here what I have said before: that, if the hon. gentleman desires to benefit the farmers of this country, the way in which to do that is, not to increase the duty on pork, but to admit free of duty the corn which is the raw material out of which the pork is made, and that would be in reality a very great and important benefit to the people of Canada. The duty on woollens is bad in itself in every way. That duty, as is perfectly clear, will, as a specific duty, press with special severity on the poorest classes of the population, and will add to their burdens. It is a most objectionable duty on that score alone. I have spoken on the duty on fruit in some detail, during the discussion in this House previously, and I content myself with saying that I cannot imagine a duty which has less to recommend it. It is a duty against health, it is a duty against a wholesome luxury, it is a duty which presses very unfairly upon particular portions of the community, and especially on the Maritime Provinces. It is a sectional tax, therefore, and it is

a duty also which practically invites retaliation on the part of our neighbors. Moreover, a useful and important trade was growing up in these articles which the hon. gentleman's policy tends to check, if not to altogether destroy. So it is with the extra duties on iron, and, I may add also, the bounty of iron; in this case we had already a most enormous duty. We had a duty which interfered with the raw material on all kinds of manufactures, and we had a duty which pressed with special severity on the agricultural portion of the community, to whom the hon. gentleman gives no sort of practical protection, and to whom he can give no sort of practical protection, because the price of the great majority of the staple products of the farmer is not and will not be regulated by anything which the Government can do, but by the price in the markets of the world. What the hon. gentleman practically does to the farmers, is to add to the price of everything they have to buy, while he cannot materially increase the price of any important portion of the articles which they raise. Sir, I may ask—and it is a question which is being asked very earnestly throughout the country, even by those over-protected manufacturers, or by many of them whom the hon. gentleman especially desires to conciliate—why meddle with this tariff at all? Many of these persons are aware that the hon. gentleman's policy has done them no good. They are aware that he has disturbed and injured trade, and that he has, by piling on these taxes, added to the opposition which is fast gathering head against the whole protective system. Now, Sir, these changes are mischievous in themselves, and the hon. gentleman and his friends, by reason of their policy, have succeeded in making Canada a very dear country to live in. It is utter folly on the part of the hon. gentleman, and it is utter folly on the part of his friends, to attempt to justify their course by the example of the United States. As I have often and often stated in this House, and as, I think, every man who considers the position of the two countries must feel, even admitting, for argument's sake—although I would not make the admission except for the purposes of argument—that the United States have benefited from their protective system, that is no sort of reason why we, in Canada, should benefit from a protective system here. The truth of the matter is this: The market of the United States is so large, their range of climate is so extensive, their population is so great, that, to a very great degree, they are able to produce, within their own limits, everything a nation can require. In Canada we have no such advantages. We are much more competitors than customers of one another, and, therefore, I repeat, Canada is a country in which it is singularly unwise for us to introduce a protective system; and I may add that all this has been to a very great extent, responsible for the deplorable failure—which every man who has the interest of Canada at heart ought to deplore—not only to attract immigrants to Canada in anything like the numbers which we ought to expect, but, what is much more important in my opinion, to keep our own Canadian-born citizens in our own country. If, to-day, we find a million of our people in the United States, and three out of every four immigrants who come to this country leaving us, there is no greater cause for it than the policy of which this identical tariff is an extreme example. I do not want on this occasion to do more than record my protest, and with these few remarks I will move:

That all the words after "That" in the main motion be left out, in order to add the words: "in view of the official statement of the Minister of Finance, showing a surplus revenue for the past year, and a probable surplus for the present and succeeding year, the increased taxation proposed to be inflicted upon the people by this Bill, is unjustifiable and unnecessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentle man who has moved this motion has been laudably short in his presentment of his side of the case, and in that respect I shall endeavor to follow his example. The first objection my hon. friend took to this tariff was, that it was brought down by a Finance Minister who had only a few weeks before declared a surplus for the past year, and probable surpluses for the current year and the coming year; and that the effect of the tariff being, in some respects at least, to increase the amount of revenue to be collected, it was against all principles of finance, and therefore reprehensible, that a rate should be levied in advance of what had formerly been levied. I may say, in answer to that, that the changes in this tariff were not made with any idea of increasing the amount of revenue of the country; that was not the purpose for which these rates were levied. As I stated in bringing down the propositions to the House, the changes were necessary, in the opinion of the Government, for two reasons: First, to adjust certain anomalies which had arisen during the years which had intervened between the former arrangement of the tariff and the present; and, secondly, certain other changes had taken place which called for a readjustment of the rates of duty in accordance with the general policy which has guided our legislation in tariff matters for the last ten or twelve years. It was to correct these anomalies, and to provide for certain industries new in themselves, which were not sufficiently protected, and especially, and largely, for the protection of certain farmers' products in this country, that this tariff was introduced and pressed to a conclusion in this House. Now, it is not clear at all, as my hon. friend has admitted, what amount of increased revenue will be the result of these different changes. My hon. friend has been swift to mention all the cases of the increases in the rates of duty from which he supposes an increased revenue will be obtained; but he has not been swift to mention the cases, not inconsiderable in number, in which very large reductions have been made in the duties on articles which come into consumption in this country. Now, I want to point out to my hon. friend, and the House, that there are two elements to be considered before we can come to any conclusion as to what will be the net result in regard to actual revenue that will be obtained. In the first place, there are certain articles in which large reductions have been made, and which, on the basis of the importations of former years, will give us a largely decreased revenue, such as the items of glass, molasses, and other items which I might enumerate. On the other hand, there are certain items on which the tariff has been raised; but if the effect of the increase in the tariff, as my hon. friends opposite have for years contended, is to prevent importation, then it will prevent

the gathering of extra revenue in proportion to the amount of reduction in the imports from foreign countries of goods which are consequently produced in our own country. For instance, we have received large revenues during the past years from meats imported from the United States. If the result of the tariff be what we claim it certainly will be, to reduce the importation of those meats from foreign countries by the increased production of the same classes of meats in our own country for the supply of the necessary consumption of the country, the practical effect of that will be, not to increase the tariff, but to decrease it ; and we require to have some months, or perhaps a longer time, of actual experience to know just what will be the net result of the changes we have made. For my own part, aside from the increased revenue that will result from the increased rate of duty on intoxicating liquors, I do not think the increased revenue will be a very large amount, taking the average of the two or three years next to come. But, on the other hand, we have gained, what it was the object of this tariff to gain, and what I think the people of this country, and especially the farming community, will, consider a very great boon. We have, by this tariff, protected the products of the farm to an extent to which they have never yet been protected. We have given our farmers, by protecting them against the importation of meats from the United States especially, the monopoly of the meat supply of this country ; and the good to the farmers in that respect will, I think, be appreciated by them, from one end of this country to the other. So that, in the first place, it is not sure at all, that we shall have made, in the net result, any very large increase of revenue ; and in the second place, if any increase of revenue should come to us in the net result, it will be more than balanced by the good which will result from giving an increased impetus to the agricultural industry. I am free to state that, as the intention was not, by the imposition of these higher rates, to increase the revenue, if, after the new rates have gone into operation, it is found with tolerable accuracy that their net result has been to make the revenue much larger than it is at present, it will be the duty of the Government to see where reductions of taxations can be made, which will inure to the benefit of all classes. My hon. friend's next objection is that the result of this legislation will be to destroy the prospects of immigration. He contends that if we make of this country a dear instead of a cheap country to live in, we, to the extent to which we succeed in doing this, repel immigration from our shores. Well, there is no country in the world which has been, and still is, a more signal example of the attractive power of new lands to immigrants than the United States, whither immigrants go by hundreds of thousands every year ; and the immigration to that country has never been greater than since the inauguration, some twenty or twenty-two years ago, of its protective policy, which policy has ever since been continued in force in an increasing degree. The argument of my hon. friend is not standing on all fours, when he says that by a protective policy we necessarily repel immigration, because the absolute consequence of such a policy is to make the cost of living greater. Immigrants ask for two things. They ask especially that the country to which they go may be a country where they may earn a fair wage, where they may be able to keep their families in ease and comfort ; and it is a very poor argument to say to a man who wishes to leave the old world for the new, that the country he is going to is one where he can get food for next to nothing. He asks for something else ; he wants to know what are the means of employment and what are the wages he can earn ; he wants to know something about the conditions of society there, the state of its Government and the nature of its institutions. Sir, I believe to-day that Canada can put before intending immigrants from the old country, who are full of vigor and energy, and wish to make homes for themselves under the best conditions, a country second to none in all the countries in the world which are now inviting immigration. If the effect of this policy has been marked in any one respect it has been in this, that while it has not increased the cost of the necessaries of life to any appreciable degree, it has induced a development in this country which gives to the honest, earnest, industrious man assurance of employment for every working hour and a fair return for his labor. I do not think my hon. friend has at all proved that the fiscal policy which we have adopted and are to-day carrying out, is raising a barrier against that immigration which Canada so much needs. Taking into account the industries which have been developed in this country and the amount of labor engaged in those industries ; taking into account our development through the immense lines of communication which we have built, through the facilities for transport we have furnished by means of large expenditures of public money, and the advantages these facilities for cheap transport give us in competing in the markets of the world, we have secured by means of this policy, counteracting compensations which go far to diminish any disadvantage that may be conjured up by hon. gentlemen opposite, and have made this country one of the most desirable fields for earnest, honest and industrious immigrants that the world affords to-day. My hon. friend has also stated, as an objection to the tariff, that it is exceedingly offensive to and invites retaliation from the country to the south of us. I do not need to argue that point to-night. I think we have heard something of that before in this House. I think it would be unworthy of a great and generous people like the Americans to find fault with a country like Canada, or with any other country, for undertaking to advance its own interests by carrying out its own independent line of policy. Whoever hears that prominent politicians in the United States, that the organs which influence public opinion in the United States, have ever uttered one word, since this tariff has been introduced, in the line of calling it a petty or an audacious piece of retaliation, or offensive legislation? The people of the United States are too great and too generous for that. They carve out their own line of policy; they regulate their own fiscal arrangements, in the best interests of their own people, and are generous and great enough to allow every other people on the face of the earth to do the same. We do not hear anything said about offensive or retaliatory legislation except from hon. gentlemen opposite ; for what good purpose they say it, no one can well understand. I have characterised such a statement before, and feel like charac-

terising it again, as imprudent and not designed to inure to the best interest of our people. It is stated that our policy will be a bar to possible reciprocal trade relations between us and the United States. I ask every gentleman, whose memory runs over the history of forty years, whether or not, as the teaching of all this history and the legislation and counter legislation in both these countries during that period, they would feel justified in deferring any longer carrying out any policy, which they think best in the interest of their own people, out of deference to the idea that possibly by doing so they might be doing something which might militate against the probability of developing trade relations between us and the United States? I say that the student of history for the last forty years cannot point out any broad trend of sentiment in the United States which could lead him to believe that by holding our hands and hesitating and refusing to do what we think is in the best interest of our people, we shall thereby approach any appreciably nearer betterment of trade relations between Canada and the United States. If they could point that out, it might be an argument for this country and this House to stay its hands and to wait awhile longer, but I may point out that the legislation which we have undertaken and which we are about completing now does not militate one iota against any betterment of our trade relations with the United States, the moment that the United States shall meet this country half way, and shall sit down together with us in order to see what can be done to improve the trade relations between the two countries. We are in the same position as we have been for several years past, always holding out a hand to the United States, always giving it to be understood, that, when the people to the south of us are willing to sit down with us and discuss this matter, are willing to meet us half way and to arrange a basis of reciprocal trade with us, this country is willing to conclude such an arrangement But what do we find in the history of the past forty years? In 1846 and from that on, there was a large sentiment in this country, and there was also a large sentiment in the country to the south of us, that reciprocal trade relations in natural products would be beneficial to both countries, and would be especially beneficial to this country. And why? Because at that time, our manufacturing industries were not developed; the market for our agricultural products was not developed; we had to import our manufactures, and we had to seek markets abroad for what we produced. Therefore, we felt that if we could get reciprocal trade relations with the country to the south of us, it would be a benefit to this country. That reciprocal trade was brought about, and it was undoubtedly a benefit to us, and also a benefit to the United States. Why is that reciprocity treaty not in force to-day? It is not the fault of Canada, but it is because of the dissatisfaction felt in the United States with that treaty and with its results that, notwithstanding all the efforts made by this country, and by Great Britain on behalf of this country, that treaty was abrogated on the first opportunity, and never since has there been any period when there has been any fair, any practical, any earnest effort on the part of the United States to renew that treaty, or to build up a better one on the ruins of the Treaty of 1854, which was abrogated in 1866. There are certain statements which are put forward, but you have to put up against them the practical trend of sentiment in the United States. They tell us that President Cleveland opened the way to such an arrangement when he proposed in his Message to Congress that an international commission should sit to take into consideration the best means to be adopted, not only for the arrangement of the fishery question, but also for the arrangement of the general trade relations between the two countries. They handed that out to us as being the absolute feeling of the United States of America, showing that they desired to give us reciprocity in trade relations on broad and generous lines. But what did that amount to? A few days afterwards, the Senate of the United States, the dominating legislative body of the United States, by an almost unanimous vote, declared that no such commission should sit. Later on, when Mr. Bayard wrote some letters showing a kindly and a broad sentiment as to trade relations with this country, we were told that he voiced the feeling of the people of the United States. But what did that amount to, put side by side with the result when Sir Charles Tupper was in Washington in 1888, when he proposed that we should sit down side by side with them and try to arrange these fishery difficulties on the general basis of trade relations between the two countries, and when he was told that his proposition could not be entertained, because, if it was entertained by the Cabinet, it would not be entertained by the legislative body of the United States. Now we are told that Mr. Hitt's resolution, which is as general as possible, and as thin as air, which is sent to a Committee and reported back from that Committee, voices the opinion of the people of the United States as to trade relations with this country. Yet, Mr. Hitt's resolution is not dry on the paper on which he wrote it when Mr. McKinley, representing the dominant party in the United States, representing the Republican party which was victorious in the last election on a platform of increased and strengthened protection, as voicing the views of that dominant party, puts forth a tariff resolution in a series of items every one of which, as far as the interests of Canada are concerned, is prejudicial to freer trade in the products which Canada has to sell to the United States of America. I put this practical view of the case against these individual statements of general good-will, and I reiterate that no student of the history of the last twenty-five years can show any broad general trend of sentiment on the part of the people of the United States in favor of freer trade relations with this country. Even if Mr. Hitt's resolution were practicable, what does it amount to? It amounts to this, that we shall give up our right to make our own tariff regulations, that we shall build up a wall against the whole world, and take down every barrier between us and the country to the south of us, that our internal taxes shall be placed on a level with theirs, and, I may ask, at whose domination? At that of the people of five millions or at that of the people of sixty millions? Any one can answer that question without difficulty. That is the sort of trade relation which is offered to us. Trade with the United States, and a Chinese wall against the

rest of the world, based on a tariff which is at a low average 20 or 30 per cent. higher than the tariff we now possess, and yet the free traders of the Opposition are willing, in that case, to put a tariff wall against the world of 40 per cent., and to adopt trade relations with the country to the south of us on that principle. Giving my individual opinion, and in that I believe I voice the opinion of the party to which I belong, I say that, although we are willing to sit down with the people of the United States, or those of any other country, and, after mature deliberation, to enter into a trade relation which would be mutually beneficial, we are not willing to adopt any such scheme as unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union opens up to us. I repeat that we have waited long enough, that the trend of sentiment in the United States does not justify us in waiting any longer, and that what we have to do is to sit down here, as the citizens of a great and free country, and to make our own tariff square with our own interests, and, in a spirit of courtesy and a spirit of prudence, with the heartiest goodwill towards the country to the south of us and to every other country, to do what we consider best for our own interests. That is what we are doing now. Our hon. friends opposite say we are trying to catch the farmers' votes. We do not legislate in order to catch votes, but, if we are charged with desiring to catch votes on this side of the House, with what greater degree of truth can that charge be pressed on hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, when every cry has failed from 1878 up to the present time, what is the latest cry that has gone forth in trumpet tones from almost every seat on that side of the House, and from almost every hustings in the country? It has been a cry raised by hon. gentlemen opposite to catch the farmers' vote, by trying to persuade them that they are overridden with tyrannous taxation, by telling them that we have legislated against their interest; and the fact that accounts for the milk in the cocoanut to-day is that while hon. gentlemen opposite have been talking, talking, talking about the farmers and doing nothing, we have come down and done something real and tangible for the farmers. Now, Sir, when we have gone so far to protect the farmers as we have in this tariff, a step that is appreciated by nine-tenths of the farmers in this country—and hon. gentlemen opposite know it—a step which commended itself so much to individual members on the other side of the House that I have not heard a miller on that side protest against the increase of the duty on flour, though I have heard one of the most rabid—using that word in its qualified sense — free traders on that side of the House get up a storm in this committee because the duty on pork was not 3 cents per pound all round. Sir, I like a consistent free trader like the hon. member from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) opposite, who is looking at me now, but I cannot understand that kind of free trade, founded on a principle as everlasting and as solid as the rocks, according to which, when the item of pork comes up in which his own constituency is vastly interested, the member for Queen's, P.E.I., raises a storm in this House because we propose to put 1½ instead of 3 cents a pound upon some species of pork. Now, if my hon. friend and his party think that it is unjustifiable. that it is wrong, and not in the interest of the farmer to protect the producers of pigs and the producers of beef in this country, against the ruinous competition from the other side, let them vote against it. They may vote against it, they will not vote it down; but the very moment that they rise to vote against that which the farming interest of this country, despite all they say, know and believe to be to their interest, that very moment they not only fail in voting it down in this House, but they go a long way to voting themselves down in the country at the next election.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is rather an unexpected and a lively episode.

Mr. BOWELL. Who began it?

Mr. CHARLTON. We may ask that question after a while. The hon. gentleman in his speech told us that upon this side of the House we are fishing for the votes of the farmers. Sir, since 1878 there has been one party in this country that has made it its special duty and business to fish for the votes of the farmers, and that party is the party advocating this so-called and mis-called National Policy. Every argument with regard to that policy has been so placed before the country, as to seek to induce the agricultural population of Canada to believe that it was a policy conceived in their interest. Now, after that policy has been in operation for some years, after the farmer is beginning to feel the evil effect of the policy that wrings money from him in every way, that increases the cost of every article that he produces, that wrings from him a vast revenue which the Government derives from Customs duties, that wrings from him in indirect taxation in the enhanced cost of the domestic productions of this country, twice as much as he pays to the Government, a policy that is making him poor, which is driving the population of this country from Canada, which is depressing the value of real estate in this country, which brings upon this country a gloom and depression that are sitting like a nightmare upon every agricultural interest in Canada—when this fact is beginning to be appreciated by the farmers, then the hon. gentleman comes down with this miserable subterfuge that he has to offer to the farmers, and seeks, forsooth, to make them believe that he is giving them some degree of protection that will compensate them for the robbery they have endured at his hands for the last ten years. Sir, the farmers are getting too well instructed in this country to believe any such statement as that made by the Minister of Finance to night, and he will no more benefit the position of the farmer by this tariff than will the McKinley Bill benefit the farmers of the United States. That tariff is now being pressed through the Congress of the United States in order to secure the farmers' votes in the congressional elections this fall.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman and his colleague, the President of the Council, will seek to reconcile their divergent views with regard to reciprocity. The other night the President of the Council informed us that we did not want reciprocity in natural products, that it was not necessary, that Canada did not require anything of the kind. But the Minister of Finance to-night tells us that we are willing to accept reciprocity on a fair basis. Well, what do those two hon. gentlemen mean, and how do they reconcile the respective

views they have placed before this House and before the country with regard to this important question—this question of more importance to the future of Canada than any other question with which we shall be called upon to deal? The one is not in favor of it at all, the other is in favor of it upon certain conditions and terms. Now, I would ask the hon. Finance Minister what he would consider a treaty of reciprocity upon fair terms? Would he consider that reciprocity in natural products alone would be reciprocity based upon fair terms? Would he consider that if he made one step in advance of reciprocity in natural products, he would be accepting the conditions required for reciprocity upon fair terms? I presume the hon. gentleman would say that; I presume he would tell this House that reciprocity in fair terms was a reciprocity treaty confined to free trade in natural products between the two countries. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that that would not constitute a reciprocity treaty upon fair terms, even if it was on that basis that the Americans agreed to the last reciprocity treaty. That was a treaty which enabled us, during the eleven years that it was in operation, to sell to them something like double the amount of productions free of duty that we bought from them; we sold to them about $120,000,000 worth in excess of the amount we purchased from them under the operation of that treaty; and the Americans very justly urged that if the reciprocity treaty was to be one upon fair terms they should be allowed to sell to us some of the products of their labor in return for the products of our labor that they purchased from us. We were selling to them our natural products, and we were not buying natural productions of them except such as came in transit to our country for export. We had very little demand for their wheat for consumption, very little demand for their oats, very little demand for any production of their farmers except corn. We did not buy lumber of them, we did not buy fish of them; scarcely any of the natural productions of the field, the forest or the mines, produced in the United States, found a market in Canada for consumption, and the Americans said: if we are to have a reciprocity treaty on fair and equitable terms, we must have one that will enable us to sell to you some of our own productions in exchange, for the productions that you raise and sell to us. Well, Sir, that is just such a treaty as we must make with the Americans if we ever make one at all; it is just such a treaty as, in the nature of the case, they may fairly demand, and if the Government of the day in Canada are not prepared to negotiate for a reciprocity treaty upon a fair and equitable basis, a treaty that will enable the Americans to sell to us as well as enable us to sell to the Americans, then they are not in favor of a treaty upon fair and equitable terms, they are mocking the country, and the assertions they are making are a delusion when they assert that they are in favor of a treaty upon fair and equitable terms. Sir, they are not in favor of such a treaty; no reciprocity that is attainable, no reciprocity treaty that can be defended upon grounds of equity and justice, would be accepted by the Government that now rules Canada with regard to this and all other matters. The hon. gentleman, in the statement he has made to-night, is misleading the country, and he is endeavoring to mislead this House when he makes the assertion that his party and his Government are willing to accept a reciprocity treaty on fair and equable terms. He told us that the High Commissioner said the Americans would not listen, when he was in Washington, to a trade proposal. Why would they not? Because of the wretched fatuity, because of the recklessness of the Government in its dealings with the United States, because of the irritation caused by their fishery regulations, because of the irritation created by their canal toll discriminations, because of the irritation created by various other acts of this Government, acts that seem to have been expressly designed to create that degree of irritation that would prevent the possibility of opening negotiations for a reciprocity treaty, or of carrying such negotiations through to a successful completion. That is why the High Commissioner when at Washington found the state of things existing in that capital that he did find existing there. He declared that the acts of this Government, the folly of this Government in its treatment of and its dealings with the Government of the United States had brought us to the very verge of war, and one or two more steps in the very direction in which we were going might have precipitated hostilities. The Finance Minister in his speech has told us that the Hitt Resolutions were scarcely cold before the McKinley Tariff was introduced. The McKinley Bill was introduced first this session, and its provisions were invited by the actions of this Government, by the idiocy of the policy of this Government, in its trade relations with that great nation. We are unable to dictate terms to the United States, and it is folly for us to attempt to do it. Five millions of a tail is hardly able to swing sixty-five millions of a dog, and although we are a very great people according to our numbers, we cannot intimidate, we cannot coerce, we cannot by a hostile tariff control a nation of 65,000,000. It is an utter mistake to imagine we can do so.

Mr. DAVIN. We are not the tail of the dog.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member, the blatherskite from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I withdraw the expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly, I have withdrawn it. I did it inadvertently, I thought he was outside, when an unpalatable truth might be stated. The hon. Minister of Finance in speaking of the Hitt Resolutions told us that they were hardly cold before the McKinley Tariff was introduced. The McKinley Tariff Bill is a measure of the character we might expect to have, judging by the policy of this Government towards the United States. It is a specimen of the legislation that this Government has invited, it is a specimen of the condition of things that will exist between these two Governments so long as the policy is pursued that has been pursued and is being pursued by the present Government of Canada. The Hitt Resolutions on the other hand, constitute an offer. They are holding out the olive branch, and they are an indication that if we wish to treat the United States in a spirit of amity and

fairness, and if we are actuated by a desire to have more intimate trade relations with that country, notwithstanding the McKinley Tariff, with all its obnoxious provisions, the United States Government are ready to enter into negotiations with Canada. Those resolutions are not, as the hon. Minister of Finance has told us, a proposition to accept commercial union. It is not a defined proposition of any character or nature whatever, but, it is a broad general proposition on the part of the United States, that whenever this Government indicates a desire to secure more intimate commercial relations, and we appoint three commissioners for the purpose of negotiating as to the terms on which such relations can be secured, the United States will proceed to meet those overtures, by appointing three commissioners to meet our own, to arrange, not the terms of any treaty already definitely defined as to its character, but to seek to arrange a reciprocity treaty, without definitely stating in advance what the basis of that arrangement shall be. And we are not warranted in saying that it must be this thing or that thing, we are not warranted in saying it must be commercial union, we are not warranted in saying it must be unrestricted reciprocity; but we have an offer placed before us, inviting us to see whether the two countries can reconcile their differences and can agree upon a plan, a plan of unrestricted reciprocity, a plan for greater freedom of trade. And if our commissioners were appointed, and if they were to meet those of the United States, and if a treaty could not be negotiated satisfactory to this country, we are not obliged to ratify it. But we believe it is disregarding our highest and best interests in this matter in refusing at least to make the attempt. If the offer is made inviting us to enter into negotiations, surely no one has a right to assert that an arrangement satisfactory to both countries cannot be negotiated. If the Government refuse that overture, if they refuse to enter upon negotiations, if they refuse the offer made by the United States to make an attempt to secure reciprocity, they indicate on their part a determination that they will not have reciprocity, that they have no desire for reciprocity. If they spurn the offer made by a friendly power to see whether our differences cannot be adjusted and whether we cannot arrange a treaty, the Government refuse to take the first step, and they say, in effect, that they will have nothing to do with the overture, but they will endeavor to persuade the country that they could not accept such an offer because, forsooth, we could obtain nothing but terms which would be unadvisable and unacceptable to our people. They have no right to make such an assumption. In refusing to make the attempt to secure such a treaty they are not acting in the interests of the people.

The hon. Finance Minister has told us that the United States tariff wall is very much higher than ours. The amount of revenue derived from customs in the United States is lower than ours by over $1 per head, and, if that is the case, our own tariff wall must be the higher of the two; and if we entered into an arrangement for unrestricted reciprocity, if we were obliged to accept the American duties, the amount exacted from the people would be less than it is to-day. No; we are not invited to enter upon a one-sided arrangement, we are not invited to enter into any arrangement definitely defined. We are merely asked to enter into negotiations to see if an arrangement can be made, and I repeat that the hon. Finance Minister is deceiving the country, whether purposely or not it is not for me to say, when he tells this House it is impossible to negotiate a reciprocity treaty except upon one-sided terms that are not fair and equitable. It is possible that we might negotiate a reciprocity treaty on the broadest and most equitable terms, on terms perfectly fair and in the highest degree advantageous to this country, and I venture to say if the hon. gentleman to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) were Finance Minister, and if the Liberal party of Canada occupied the seat now occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite, that six months would not elapse before a treaty would be arranged between these two countries that would be conducive to the highest interests of Canada, and which would cause this country to enter on that era of prosperity which never will come so long as its affairs are mismanaged as they are being mismanaged to-day, and as they have been mismanaged for the last ten years.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has closed with the remark that if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) were in the position of Finance Minister, and if the Liberal party were enthroned in power where the Conservatives are now, that everything would go on well, that an arrangement would be made with the United States which would exactly suit his view, that a reciprocity treaty would be effected on broad and liberal grounds according to his own statement, and an admirable commercial policy would be inaugurated. You have only to go to *Hansard*, because we had *Hansard* when the Liberal party were in power, and when that hon. gentleman rose and denounced the policy adopted by the Liberal party as its commercial policy, to ascertain that he brought forward a proposal for protection, a strong statement, the strongest statement ever made in this House in favor of protection. I know that I am speaking by the book when I say that he was a protectionist then, as he has remained a protectionist ever since, and as he is a protectionist to-day, and the hollow sound of his oratory in this House, if oratory it can be called, can be accounted for by the fact that it is founded on insincerity; it has the ring of insincerity about it. The hon. gentleman does not mean what he says, and the consequence is that if you listen to him by the hour, you will find that he lays down one proposition at one moment and the next moment he lays down a proposition that contradicts it. The hon. gentleman has left the Chamber now. I remember that on another occasion, outside of this House, and the first time that I had to reply to him, he slunk away from the platform, and they brought their band to drown my voice and to take away the crowd, but they did not succeed in doing either. The hon. gentleman has to-night shown what the result would be if parties crossed the floor of this House. In that event, I suppose the hon. gentleman would have a seat on the Treasury Bench, and the effect on the tone of this House would be that we should see the elegant manners which belong to our friends across the line introduced here. It is a proper thing to interrupt a member when he is speaking, if you do not interrupt him in a way which is intended to disconcert him, and when the hon. gentleman stated that the

5,000,000 tail—it was an elegant expression—could not wag the 6,000,000 dog, I remarked, "but the tail in this case does not belong to the dog, and that makes all the difference in the world." The 5,000,000 in this country are perfectly independent. The 5,000,000, instead of being a tail to the 60,000,000, is a complete and organic animal. It is a political animal destined probably to grow to something even more formidable than the 60,000,000 may come to, and my remark ought to have given the hon. gentleman an opportunity of seeing that this was after all an argument to be met. Now, Mr. Speaker, the speech we listened to from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to-night, is the same speech precisely which we have listened to session after session, and what is the character, invariably, of that speech? Why Sir, if any stranger were to come in here, would he suppose that the hon. member for North Norfolk represented a Canadian constituency? Would he suppose that he represented a British constituency? No; he would fancy that by some extraordinary freak, a citizen of the United States had surreptitiously got in here and taken a seat amongst us, and that he had risen in this House to advocate the claims of the United States, and to denounce everything that could promote the welfare of this country. One need not proceed to refute such arguments as he has advanced. I say that the tone persistently adopted by the hon. member—a tone invariably adopted not only by him, but by other members of the Opposition, although he is the most flagrant offender in that line is invariably *pro* United States, and against Canada; and against everything that could exalt this young and great country of ours. One is accustomed to hear language of humiliation in this House used by gentlemen on the Opposition benches in regard to our vast country with its splendid resources, and with a population as large as England had in the great Elizabethan days, when she began her career of empire. We are accustomed to hear men talking here as though this country, with its vast resources and its splendid population, need to veil its crest and to bow its head before any nation of the world. We have, I maintain, in Canada, with our incohate wealth, with our developed and organised resources, with our institutions and with the character of our population, a country that instead of talking with bated breath, and going as it were on her knees to other countries to beg favors, can hold proud language in the face of any country in the world, and can hold a strong faith that it will culminate in a great nation. I do hope that the attention of the electors, who have sent such men as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to this House, will be directed to the humiliating rhetoric which we hear from him, and that they will send men to us who will have a Canadian note in their utterances, and who will express a feeling of Canadian and British sentiments, instead of sentiments which are degrading and grovelling and which ask Canada to go on her knees to the United States. It is not necessary, Sir, that I should enter seriously into the statements made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), because they have been refuted again and again in this House. He is perpetually twisting the same rope of sand. There is nothing new whatever in his statements, and if we were to sit here up to the crack of doom, I believe the hon. gentleman would be found twisting the same rope of sand. Probably, I might have gone on a little longer if the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. No, excuse me, allow me to finish the sentence. If the inspiring presence of the hon. gentleman from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) were here—because it does one good to see that inspiring presence—I might continue longer, but in the hon. gentleman's absence, my inspiration is gone, and so I will not trouble the House any further.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not consider it my duty to allow the speech made by the hon. the Minister of Finance to pass without a few remarks in reply. The hon. gentleman took the opportunity, at the close of his Budget speech, to attempt to present to the country arguments in favor of what he thinks is protection to the farmer. This is no new argument for the farmers of the country to hear from members of this Government. They have listened to promises of that kind ever since the inception of the National Policy. The hon. First Minister, when the National Policy was inaugurated, declared, that he was going to find the farmers of this country a lucrative home market for their products. There is not one single promise which has ever been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to the agriculturists of this country which has ever been fulfilled. The hon. Minister of Finance puts his points very logically and presents his arguments with great force, but I tell him across the floor of this House, that the farmers of this country have their eyes open to the ruin his policy is causing them, and he will not be able to close them. When he goes before the farmers, and pretends to show them that they are benefited by the operation of the National Policy, and by putting a duty upon pork, in order, if possible, to get them out of the financial embarrassment into which his policy has plunged them, they will realise the fallacy of his statements, and they will tell him that they have suffered too long under the burdens of this policy which has robbed them, and which to-day has them mortgaged to such an extent that they are not able to pay their encumbrances. The farmers have listened too long to the false promises made by members of the Government. They were disposed at one time to alter their political allegiance, so as to give the First Minister a trial. They have given him trial after trial, and were it not for the blinded confidence they have reposed in that man, year after year, they would have spewed out of their mouth the men who robbed them and who deceived them; the men who made statements which have never been realised, and who inaugurated a policy which has driven them to the verge of ruin. Now, Sir, does the Finance Minister fancy that the farmers of this country, in their jeopardised condition, are so foolish as to listen to his statements about the advantages he is going to bestow on them by the duty on pork? He knows perfectly well that we export large quantities of pork. If he had permitted hogs and corn to come in free, our people would have been put in the position to produce the pork which our lumbermen require. But he will not give them that chance. The hon. Finance Minister said that the hon. member for South Oxford was very apt at picking out the

items in which increases were made, but very slow in finding those in which reductions were made; and he gave us two items in which reductions were made. I challenge him to give us two more items in which any substantial reductions were made. He cannot do it. They would not amount to more than $50,000 or $60,000 altogether. Now, the hon. Finance Minister, and those around him, will make very determined efforts to persuade the farmers of this country that they are going to be benefited largely by this policy. He is something like a man I once heard of who was travelling along a road, and who met a very simple, innocent creature carrying the mails from place to place. He was riding on a pony and he had the mail bags in front of him. The man felt great sympathy for the pony, and he said to the mail carrier: "The best thing you can do is to take the bags on your back, so that you will carry the bags and the pony will carry you, and in that way you will carry part of the burden." My hon. friend tries to persuade the farmers of this country that the Government are going to carry part of their burden for them; but the farmers have been so long listening to the wily statements made to them as to how the National Policy was going to make them rich that they will be slow to believe the statements which the hon. gentleman may make to them, and he will find that such statements will not go far to secure their votes. If he wanted to do the farmers any good, why did he not reduce the duty on iron? He admits that he had a surplus last year and that he anticipates a surplus this year and next year. Iron enters largely into the commodities the farmers use, and if he wants to benefit them, why not take the duty off iron and enable them to buy their machinery at a lower cost than they are able to do to-day? The hon. gentleman stated that in the United States a protective policy had secured an enormous influx of immigration, and a great increase of wealth in contrast with Canada. I ask my hon. friend why he did not go to Victoria, Australia, and compare that country with New South Wales. But it did not suit his argument to go there. He would have found that Victoria, since introducing a protective policy, has not had the prosperity that has been enjoyed by New South Wales, whose population and wealth are increasing to an extent not found in the other protected colony. Now, the United States are proposing to put a duty on eggs, and what have hon. gentlemen done? Simply to encourage the manufacturers of egg boxes in Canada, they put a duty on the boxes, and they will not allow Americans to bring their egg boxes to this country without paying a duty on the them. It is by such pernicious and contemptible acts that they have driven the Americans to do what they have done; and I say to the people and farmers of this country that they will never get an unrestricted treaty with the United States or even a treaty in a modified form, such as we had before, so long as hon. gentlemen opposite occupy the Treasury benches of this country, simply because they have pinned their colors to the mast and have declared themselves absolutely in favor of the manufacturing institutions of this country. They have taken the manufacturers under their wing, and the manufacturers, in return, when the time comes for an election, will see that money is forthcoming. It is a bargain that I have no doubt will be faithfully carried out as between the Government and the manufacturers. But I tell hon. gentlemen that they will realise that the farming community of this country are not going to shut their eyes and ears to the facts and arguments presented. They are not going to be deceived as they have been in the past. They are in the position of the poor man to whose house a preacher went to talk religion, and who said: "What is the use, when there is no flour in the house?" You go to them and talk your theories of protection, and they will tell you: "We are reduced to-day to the verge of financial ruin, and you tell us that your National Policy makes us rich." I earnestly hope that the arguments that have been used from time to time with regard to the pernicious results of this National Policy will wake up the farmers of this country, as I believe they are now waked up, to the actual facts of the case.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Innes,
Armstrong,	Jones (Halifax),
Bain (Wentworth),	Landerkin,
Barron,	Lang,
Beausoleil,	Langelier (Montmorency),
Béchard,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Blake,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lovitt,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brien,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Meigs,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mitchell,
Choquette,	Neveu,
Cook,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Platt,
De St. Georges,	Rinfret,
Dessaint,	Rowand,
Doyon,	Ste. Marie,
Eisenhauer,	Scriver,
Ellis,	Semple,
Fiset,	Sutherland,
Fisher,	Trow,
Gauthier,	Turcot,
Geoffrion,	Waldie,
Gillmor,	Watson,
Godbout,	Weldon (St. John),
Guay,	Welsh,
Holton,	Wilson (Elgin).—62.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Jamieson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Jones (Digby),
Bell,	Kenny,
Bergeron,	Labrosse,
Boisvert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bowell,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Boyle,	Lépine,
Brown,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Burns,	Mackintosh,
Cargill,	McCarthy,
Carling,	McCulla,
Carpenter,	McDougald (Pictou),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McKay,
Chapleau,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Cimon,	McNeill,
Cochrane,	Madill,
Cockburn,	Masson,
Colby,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corby,	Moncrieff,
Costigan,	Montplaisir,
Coughlin,	O'Brien,
Coulombe,	Porter,
Curran,	Putnam,
Daly,	Robillard,
Davin,	Roome,
Davis,	Ross,
Dawson,	Shanly,

Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hall,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Hudspeth,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Ward,
Weldon (Albert),
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox).
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—93.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Lévis has voted, and I understand he paired with the hon. member for Haldimand.

Mr. GUAY. I think the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. The hon. member for Haldimand asked me, a few minutes before the vote, to pair because he had to go away. I told him he could pair with the hon. member for Quebec Centre or the hon. member for Dorchester, but for my part, I would not pair with him.

SUPPLY—TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HICKEY. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring before the House a matter in which it is interested and of the particulars of which I think it should be in possession. Some time ago the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made a statement in this Chamber, which I then strongly denied and as strongly characterised. In order that I might speak with more definiteness on this subject at variance between us I caused a motion to be placed on the Order paper, asking for the correspondence and papers relating to the timber limit license for which it was claimed I was an applicant. Finding it impossible to reach the motion, I embrace this opportunity of placing before the House all the facts regarding that transaction, and I believe the evidence will clearly substantiate the correctness of my denial and as truly make bare the base and unadulterated wickedness of the statements of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I do this, not only out of regard for this House, and through it to the country and to my constituents, whose good opinion I properly respect and cherish, but also to myself, for in this matter I have done no wrong either to Parliament or to society, and I will not allow my name to be clouded by the evil machinations of polished hypocrites or by the sophistries of moral charlatans. As to the accusation I find in *Hansard* of 1886, in a speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in regard to the granting of timber limit licenses, on page 1033, the hon. gentleman said:

"I have gone through it carefully, and some of the results of that investigation I will give to the House later on."

And on the next page, 1304, the hon. gentleman said, under the heading of "Members of the House of Commons and Senate who have received Timber Limits by Order in Council for themselves," he specifies that:

"C.E. Hickey, M.P. (co-applicant with Wm. Broder)—Order in Council for self and partner, fifty miles, Lake Kogwankok, Man., April 30, 1884."

On 11th March last, in referring to this matter again, the hon. gentleman said:

"I propose to call attention to some of the things done under this Government; some of the things that the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) voted were right and refused to vote were wrong, when a motion was made in this House in May, 1886, concerning them. I found, on examining the records of the Department of the Interior, that there had been timber limits granted, upon the personal application of members of this House and the Senate, to seventeen different members of those different bodies."

He then mentioned several names, and continued:

"I find that C. E. Hickey was an applicant, in connection with his partner, Wm. Broder, for one limit."

Being out of the House at the time and returning shortly afterwards, I took the opportunity of saying:

"I understand that, when I was out of the Chamber, the hon. member for North Norfolk said that I had been an applicant for a timber limit. I wish to say, that I never made an application for a timber limit in the North-West, or in any other part of this country. The same statement was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk a few years ago, before the last election, and it was brought up against me in my county."

I made some further remarks, but they are not pertinent. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in reply said:

"I rise to an explanation in answer to the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey). The return to my motion for the names of those who had acquired timber limits was received in 1886. There are some 400 or 500 pages foolscap to examine. I went through these returns and selected out the correspondence and Orders in Council making grants to various members of both Houses. I did this in discharge of a public duty, and endeavored to do it impartially; and among the Orders in Council, I found one for C. M. Hickey, M. P., coupled with the name of Wm. Broder. The Order in Council was granted for a timber limit of fifty miles on a lake in Manitoba, and was dated 30th April, 1884. I was governed by the document."

I replied:

"I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that that is his own language. I do not believe that any such Order in Council was ever issued. It is not right to say it is an Order in Council. It is some time ago since this happened and I have not looked the matter up, but I know I never made an application. All I did was to urge the application of Mr. Broder on the Government, and they would decide as to whether he should have it or not."

That is the record with respect to the matter at variance between us. I hold in my hand the return of the Department of the Interior in regard to the application made by Mr. Broder and my association with it. It will be necessary that I should go through the record, but I will do so as rapidly as possible. On 2nd November, 1884, Mr. Broder made this application:

"MORRISBURG, 2nd November, 1882.

"SIR,—I beg to make application for a timber limit fifty square miles situated as follows: On the west side of Humbug Bay commencing at the mouth of the Washow River extending west along said river 8½ miles, thence north by a depth of 6 miles, as shown on the annexed plan.

"I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,
(Signed) "WILLIAM BRODER."

Hon. members will see by that letter that my name is not mentioned, and that the application is made by William Broder, and made for himself. On 8th November same year Mr. Broder wrote:

"MORRISBURG, 8th November, 1882.

"SIR,—On 2nd I made application for a timber limit and as yet am without reply with reference thereto. I trust my application will receive favorable consideration.

"I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "WILLIAM BRODER."

On 13th November there is a letter from the Department, signed by Lindsay Russell, addressed to William Broder, as follows:—

"WILLIAM BRODER, Esq., Morrisburg.

"I have, &c., your letter of the 8th inst., having further reference to your application for a timber limit on the Washow River, and to reply that the ground in question is covered by a grant to the prior applicant.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "A. RUSSELL,

"*For the Surveyor General.*"

On the 22nd November Mr. Broder wrote to the Department as follows:—

"MORRISBURG, 22nd November, 1882.

"SIR,—I beg to amend my application of 2nd November for a timber limit on west shore of Humbug Bay, said limit being partly covered by a grant to Mr. D. Macmillan. I hereby substitute the following: Commencing at a point on the said west shore of Humbug Bay, distant three miles northerly from the mouth of the Washow River, thence westerly along the northerly limit of the berth granted to Mr. D. Macmillan, eight and one-third miles, thence due north six miles, thence easterly parallel to the said southerly limit of Mr. D. Macmillan's berth, to the shore of Humbug Bay, thence southerly along the shore to the place of beginning.

"Your obedient servant,

"WILLIAM BRODER."

I wish to call special attention to this letter, because it will explain the letter I wrote in reference to this matter when I read it; that is in regard to the part covered by D. Macmillan's application. Then, on the 24th November, Mr. Broder finding it was necessary to write another letter in reference to the same application, sent the following:—

"MORRISBURG, 24th November, 1882.

"SIR,—On the 2nd instant I made application for a timber limit on the west side of Humbug Bay, north of the Washow River.

"Finding said limit partially covered by a grant to Mr. D. Macmillan, I amended my application on the 22nd instant, by moving three miles north. I now find that my amended application conflicts with applications made by Mr. W. H. Cooper, who has made application for four limits, although but one can be granted. As it is uncertain which of those four limits will be granted him, I am obliged to further amend my said application so as to take in territory enough to secure a limit of the regulation size, fifty square miles, and beg leave to amend my said application as follows:—

"Commencing on the Washow River, sixteen and two-thirds miles westerly from Humbug Bay, thence north three miles, thence westerly along said river, eight and one-third miles, thence south six miles to a point three miles south of the said river, thence easterly eight and one-third miles, thence north six miles to the place of beginning.

"Also a limit commencing on the west shore of Humbug Bay, six miles northerly from the north-east corner of the limit granted to the said Mr. D. Macmillan, thence northerly along the bay six miles, thence westerly parallel to the northerly line of said limit granted to Mr. D. Macmillan, eight and one-third miles, thence southerly six miles, thence easterly parallel to the said northerly line of Mr. D. Macmillan's limit, eight and one-third miles to the place of beginning.

"I have the honor to be,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "WM. BRODER."

On the same date there is a letter accompanying this, in which Mr. Broder says:

Mr. HICKEY.

"I forward herewith an amended application for a timber limit. I am anxious to secure a limit of fifty square miles, but find one or two men have been allowed to cover so much territory with applications that it is difficult to locate, not knowing which of the limits they have applied for may be granted them."

On 5th December, 1882, Mr. Broder writes the Department again:

"MORRISBURG, 5th December, 1882.

"SIR,—On 24th November I made application for timber limit. As yet am without reply to same.

"I am anxious to know if my application has been considered favorably.

"I have the honor to be,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "WILLIAM BRODER."

Then comes a letter which I wrote, and which I suppose is the foundation of the hon. gentleman's accusation—in fact, I am sure it is. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that all the correspondence so far shows that Mr. Broder's application affected the limit applied for by Mr. Macmillan and some others. Mr. Broder having visited the Department along with me and finding out that Mr. Macmillan's survey was to have been in on the 17th April, and it was then understood that I should go to the Department and see if it was presented on the 17th April. It was understood from the Department that if that survey was not in, then Mr. Broder should be an equal applicant with Mr. Macmillan, as Mr. Macmillan having the survey, had a prior claim. But if his survey was not completed on a certain date, he would stand in the same position with Mr. Broder. On the 20th April, 1883, I wrote the following letter:—

"20th April, 1883.

"SIR,—Macmillan having failed in his agreement to have survey of timber limit in on the 17th inst., I claim, on behalf of Wm. Broder, the right to be a co-applicant for the limit covered by the application of Macmillan.

"I trust we will get that equal consideration.

"Yours truly,

(Signed) "CHAS. E. HICKEY."

Now, Mr. Speaker, no person can possibly mistake that letter, unless he wishes to have it mean what it does not. It is plain that I, on behalf of William Broder, claimed that he should be a co-applicant with Mr. Macmillan—not that I should be a co-applicant. There are no words there to show that I was a co-applicant in any sense, but that I claimed that Mr. Broder should be a co-applicant with Mr. Macmillan, and I trusted, as representative of a county of which Mr. Broder was one of my constituents, that he would get that equal standing, and so I used the pronoun "we." Mr. Broder had repeatedly asked that his application should be considered, and the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seems to have jumped at the conclusion that the Order in Council was granted upon my letter. Now, the proof that my statement in reference to that is correct will be found in the following memorandum from the Department:—

"MEMO.—Mr. Macmillan should have filed the returns of the survey of his berth on the 17th of this month; he states that the survey is made, and I believe he has the plan and field notes in his possession.

"Respectfully submitted.

(Signed) "G. U. RYLEY,

"*Department of Interior.*"

On 26th July, 1883, Mr. Broder addresses the Department again:

"MORRISBURG, Ont., 26th July, 1883.

"SIR,—*Re* my timber limit on Humbug Bay, which was held pending surveys Macmillan and Walkley and Burrow's limits that the number square miles left for me could be determined Macmillan's three miles on either side Washow River, mine comes next north on the bay.

"Have the surveys been completed, that my application can be decided?

"I have the honor to be
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "WM. BRODER."

It is, I think, clear to the House from this correspondence, that I had no relation whatever with that application of Mr. Broder, directly or indirectly. It is true I wrote that letter, and the correspondence will show the bearing of that letter, and nobody could have mistaken it, unless with a malicious intent, which I believe must have actuated the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Here, we have Mr. Broder's letters subsequent to that date, and previous to that date, in which he speaks of that timber limit application as his, and signs himself in his own name, and for himself, and is associated with nobody. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the statement which the hon. gentleman made, and which I read in *Hansard*, was that I had made an application and that the Order in Council had been granted to me as a co-applicant, with William Broder, for this license. I have a letter from the Department which shows that no Order in Council was granted on this application whatever, so that there is not one syllable of truth in the statement which the hon. gentleman has made repeatedly to this House, and has circulated throughout the country. The letter is dated Ottawa, 5th February, 1887, and is in answer to one I had written to the Department, and it says:

"I am unable to send copies of all the papers this afternoon, but enclose herewith a copy of a letter dated the 20th April, 1883, from you to this Department, concerning the application from Mr. William Broder for a timber limit of 50 square miles on the shores of Humbug Bay, an arm of Lake Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, which letter I expect is the one upon which Mr. Charlton makes his charges. The berth in question, however, was never granted to Mr. Broder."

So you will see that the evidence of the Department is that Mr. Broder renewed his application repeatedly in an amended form. In the correspondence which the hon. gentleman said he had gone through carefully, but which it is clear he could not have, he seized on my letter in order to injure me. I have shown that my letter had reference only to the application of Mr. Broder, and that I claimed on his behalf that it should be equally considered with that of Mr. Macmillan who had applied for the same limit. A child who could read could not have mistaken the language in Mr. Broder's letter except with the malicious intent of doing me an injury. But, Sir, to show the artfulness of the hon. gentleman to do wrong, inspired certainly not by a humane motive, but by something of a lower grade, I may refer to an application which Mr. Broder made for another timber limit on the 27th of February, 1884:—

"MORRISBURG, 27th February, 1884.

"SIR,—I beg to make application for a timber limit of fifty (50) square miles situated as follows: commencing at the third rapid on Nimicon River as shown on sketch and extending up said river toward Lake La Croix eight and one-third miles, by a depth of three miles on either side (both sides) of the river.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "WM. BRODER."

I read this simply to show that Mr. Broder was acting for himself, that he had no relations with anybody, and especially not with me. Then, on the 11th of March, there is a letter from the Department to Mr. Broder:

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo applying for a timber berth of 50 square miles on the Nimicon River, Province of Manitoba, as shown on the sketch accompanying your application. In reply, I am to inform you that the sketch and description disagree. So far, however, as can be made out, the application stands thus: If the berth is intended to be on the north side of the Nimicon River, as shown on the sketch, then it is covered by an application of an earlier date. If, however, as stated in the application, it is on both sides of the river, then it partially covers lands already disposed of. The sketch seems to be on no scale, and the third rapid not being shown on our plans, the position of the berth cannot consequently be plotted.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "JOHN R. HALL,
"*Secretary.*"

On 10th April, 1884, Mr. Broder made a third application for a timber limit, which I will read:

"MORRISBURG, 10th April, 1884.

"To the Honorable the Minister of the Interior.

"SIR,—I beg to make application for a timber berth of 50 square miles, described as follows: Commencing on the south shore of Lake Kasgaskok, where it is intersected by the north-eastern boundary of Mr. H. Robinson's berth, thence to extend easterly along the shore of said lake ten miles, by a depth southerly of five miles.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "WILLIAM BRODER."

That application, you will see, is for a timber limit on Lake Kasgaskok, while my letter was associated with an application for a limit on Humbug Bay. This application of Mr. Broder was granted; and to show that my name was not associated in any way, directly or indirectly, with the Order in Council to which the hon. member for North Norfolk has referred, I will read the Order in Council:

"CERTIFIED COPY of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 30th April, 1884.

"On a memorandum dated the 21st April, 1884, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting an application from Mr. William Broder, of Morrisburg, in the Province of Ontario, for a yearly license to cut timber over a berth of fifty square miles, on Lake Kasgaskok, situate south of the 49th parallel, and as shown on the annexed sketch colored in pink, and more particularly described as follows that is to say:"

Then comes a description of the timber berth.—

"The Minister recommends that the license be granted on the terms and under the conditions as to survey of the berth, erection of mills, and payment of dues, that are provided by the regulations approved by Order in Council on the 8th March, 1883, and to be subject to any prior grants or reserves, and upon the survey of the berth being made within one year under instructions.

"The Committee advise that a license be granted as recommended."

That is the Order in Council which the hon. gentleman saw in the correspondence, in connection with Mr. Broder's application, with which he immediately associates my letter, and the character of which nobody could have mistaken, except with malicious intention; yet my name does not appear in that Order in Council, and is not hinted at in one way or another. The only thing correct in his statement, is the date of this Order in Council, which is the 30th of April, 1884. Every

other syllable of the hon. gentleman's statement to this House and the country, is incorrect and without foundation. Then, on the 27th of May, a letter is written from the Department to Mr. Broder, informing him of this Order in Council, and there are the two letters sending me the correspondence, which I asked for at the time of my election. The balance of the letter which I read before, is as follows :—

"On the 10th April, 1884, Mr. Broder made an application for a timber berth of fifty square miles on Lake Kasgaskok, in the disputed territory, and by an Order of the Council dated the 30th April, 1884, the Minister of the Interior was authorised to issue a license in his favor upon complying with certain conditions, as set forth in the regulations of the 8th March, 1883, a copy of which is enclosed herewith. The regulations required that a survey of the berth should be made at Mr. Broder's own expense before the issue of a license to him, and after the license had been issued the regulations required that he should erect a saw mill of a capacity to cut 10,000 feet board measure daily, and that he should pay a yearly rental of $5 per square mile and a royalty of 5 per cent. on the product of the berth.

"Mr. Broder never filed in this Department the returns of the survey of the said berth, and never received a license to cut timber thereon. There is nothing on record in this office to show you are in any way interested with Mr. Broder in the timber berth on Lake Kasgaskok."

So, Mr. Speaker, you will see from this record that the charge made by the hon. gentleman was wholly unfounded, and does not deserve to be characterised by any very light language. But, Sir, I might well afford to leave the case as it stands with his own conscience—if there is a vestige of it left—with reference to truth-telling in this country ; but what will this House think when I tell them that the hon. gentleman not only made these false statements to the House and the country, but he actually sent an affidavit to my county in which he swore to the correctness of his statements, in which I have proven there is not a word of truth. I had been threatened with his affidavit, but in making the denial the other night, I had forgotten at the time that it had been circulated. It did not do me very much harm before my electors, because I openly defied their proof, and all they could threaten me with was the affidavit of the hon. member for North Norfolk ; and while he would not frighten this House or those who know him well, he did not succeed in frightening my constituents. Then, the Grit paper published in my county, called the *Herald*, on 10th February, 1887, in order to give the statement an imposing appearance, published the testimony given by Mr. Millar, who came to the Department and examined the records in the case. His affidavit is an innocent one. It says :

"I, Haldane Millar, of the City of Ottawa, in the County of Carleton, student at law, do solemnly declare that I have carefully compared the paper writing thereto annexed, and paged 1752 to 1766, inclusive, with the official copies of the sessional returns to Parliament, during the Session of 1886, and the said paper writings are true and correct copies of the said return from page 1752 to 1766, inclusive ; and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled : 'An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

"HALDANE MILLAR.

"Declared before me, at the City of Ottawa, in the County of Carleton, this 14th day of February, A.D. 1887.

"F. R. LATCHFORD,
"*Commissioner, &c.*"

Mr. HICKEY.

That affidavit is correct, because it only states that the record which he examined was what he stated it to be before. Then this paper gives my letter and emphasises the term "co-applicant ;" but a mere novice in language would know that I could have written the letter in many different ways ; and it was plain to any body who wanted to know the facts that I was making an application on behalf of Mr. William Broder, one of my constituents, because I stated so. The paper has in addition to this, the following sworn declaration :—

"I, John Charlton, of the village of Lynedoch, Ontario, do hereby solemnly declare and say that I was a member of the House of Commons in 1886. That during the winter of 1886 I made examination of certain returns regarding timber limits. That the returns were voluminous and not printed. That the said returns contained an application from Wm. Broder. That Charles E. Hickey, M.P., was a co-applicant. That the application was made 20th April, 1883, and that an Order in Council for 50 miles on the south side of Lake Kasgaskok was issued upon said application, 30th April, 1884."——

"That my information is derived from returns made by the Department of the Interior in answer to an Order from the House, and purporting to be copies of letters, communications, Orders in Council, &c., regarding the granting of timber limits ; and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and under and by virtue of an Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled : 'An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

(Signed) "JOHN CHARLTON.

"Declared before me at Lynedoch, in the County of Norfolk, this 14th day of February, 1887.

(Signed) "Z. R. SLAGHT,
"*Commissioner, &c.*"

I have shown this was a complete falsehood. It seems this was made on the very day the record was examined here. The information must have been sent by telegram, I suppose, in order that it might injure Dr. Hickey in the County of Dundas. I might stop here and leave the matter with the hon. gentleman's conscience, if he has any ; but that is not enough. I will read for his further satisfaction the affidavit of Mr. William Broder. I am not reading this for the information of the House or the country, but simply for the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman, and I do not know that I owe any gratitude to him for any kindness he has shown me :

"ONTARIO,
"COUNTY OF DUNDAS.

"I, William Broder, of Morrisburg, in the County of Dundas, do solemnly declare that Dr. Hickey, M. P., had not at any time, directly or indirectly, an interest in any timber limit license applied for by or granted to me. That I did not consult Dr. Hickey with reference thereto before making such application, but on not getting satisfactory replies from the Department, I requested Dr. Hickey to write the Minister on my behalf, which I believe he did.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's Reign, intituled : "An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

"WM. BRODER.

"Declared before me at the village of Morrisburg, in the County of Dundas, this 30th day of April, A. D. 1890.
J. P. WHITNEY,
"*Commr., &c.*"

Now, these facts are appalling. They remind one that the habit of bearing false witness, like a noxious plant which spreads itself over a garden, shows itself in every phase of life, rendering the individual detestable alike to those who know him

little and to those who know him much. Sir, the language of Trollope might be applied directly to the hon. gentleman. He says:

"There are few liars who can lie with the full roundedness and self-sufficiency of truth."

How near the hon. gentleman's statements which I have read approach that axiom, I will leave the House to infer, but we do find, as a rule, that this *role* of bearing false witness is generally played by the assumed lamb, who poses as a moralist before his associates. What is the essence of this charge? The hon. gentleman has accused the Government of corruption, because I have, as he asserts, made an application for limits. Supposing I had made an application, I would not have felt that I had done any wrong, or committed any offence against Parliament, or against society But, he charges the Government with corruption and embezzlement, with being supported by a servile Parliament, and with maladministration. And why? Simply because they followed the course which had been adopted by their predecessors in office and gave effect to it. In one part of his speech, he says the conduct of the Government is incompatible with a nice sense of political honor. I wonder what his course would be compatible with in this matter. He says the Government have outraged decency in every manner. Well, if they have, how much has the hon. gentleman respected decency or respected his associates in this House? After making these charges against the Government for corruption, he goes on to state that members of the House of Commons and the Senate made application, as much as to say that those who made application had done wrong. What is the evidence of their wrongdoing. It is that hon. gentlemen in this country saw fit to take advantage of the law of the land, which law had been made by the predecessors of this Government. If this logic were applied to the hon. gentleman or any body else, it would be made to work in this way. If I were discoursing on the evils of intemperance, and somebody said they saw John Charlton going into a saloon, my inference would be, according to his logic, that it was a case of drunkenness on his part. If I were lamenting the miseries, the living death of women who had been seduced, and some one said that John Charlton had been seen going around a street corner with a woman on his arm, I would infer that there was a case of seduction. Or if he saw some gentleman, on a Sunday, in his garden, in his shirt sleeves, looking over the work of the past week and admiring the beauties of nature, he might say, in sepulchral tones: this man is breaking the third commandment; he is violating the Sabbath day. That is the logic of the hon. gentleman. The abandoned woman who flaunts her skirts with tempting art is actuated by an equally virtuous motive as the man who endeavors to delude the people of this country into believing that because A., B. or C.'s name appears in connection with a timber limit, he is guilty of some base, suspicious conduct. That is the logic of the hon. gentleman, which, if applied to himself, he would be the first to resent. He might as well accuse me if I make application, as many members have done, for a new post office, of being guilty of conduct in violation of my duties as a member of Parliament. That is the whole crime I have been guilty of—of endeavoring to secure for a constituent of mine a decision in reference to an application of his. Therefore, the hon. gentleman concludes that I was his partner and guilty of wrong-doing. I do not think I would have been guilty of wrong, if I had been an applicant. It is the want of truth which characterises the hon. gentleman's accusation that annoys me. If the hon. gentleman thinks he is deceiving the public when he tells us he is but doing his duty in making these mis-statements concerning members of the House of Commons and the Senate, he is counting without his host. The people will understand the intentions of the hon. gentleman and will give him the credit accordingly. The public has no confidence in a drunkard preaching temperance, in a liar pretending to talk the truth, in a roué talking virtue, or in a corrupter of female morals preaching continence. They know from what sources a nasty stream flows, and that the ninth commandment is not kept by daily and malicious transgression. I had intended to move the following resolution had my motion on the order paper been reached, but I have no other means now of bringing it before the House than this. I have not much hope that it will be acted upon at this stage of the session, but I will move that all the words after "That" be struck out and the following inserted instead thereof:—

That inasmuch as on the 4th of May, 1886, John Charlton, the then member for North Norfolk, delivered a speech in this House, in which he stated, referring to a return presented on 27th March, 1886, in respect of timber limit licenses, that "I have gone through it carefully, and some of the results of that investigation I will give to the House later on."

That later on, in a list tabulated by himself, under the heading of "Members of the House of Commons and Senate who have received timber limits by Order in Council for themselves," he specifies that "C. E. Hickey, M.P. (co-applicant with Wm. Broder) O. C. for self and partner, 50 miles, Lake Kasgaskok, Manitoba, 30th April, 1884."

That at the village of Lynedoch, on the 14th of February, 1887, the said John Charlton made a solemn affidavit declaring, among other things: "that the said returns contained an application from Wm. Broder; that Chas. E. Hickey, M.P., was a co-applicant; that the application was made 20th April, 1883, and that an Order in Council for 50 miles on the south side of Lake Kasgaskok was issued upon said application 30th April, 1884."

That on the 11th of March, 1890, John Charlton, the present member for North Norfolk, repeated the same specific statement.

That inasmuch as the said Chas. E. Hickey has not at any time made an application for a timber limit license for himself; nor has he at any time been a partner, in any sense, of Wm. Broder, and, therefore, could not have been a co-applicant with him and was not with any other person, and that Wm. Broder made the said application himself and for himself, all of which the correspondence fully sustains.

That no Order in Council was ever issued granting a timber limit license to the said Chas. E. Hickey as has been stated and sworn to have been by the said John Charlton, the member for North Norfolk.

Therefore, the conduct of the said John Charlton in the premises was and is discreditable, dishonest and scandalous.

Mr. CHARLTON. I sent over to the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) ten minutes ago, a request that he would allow me to see the correspondence to which he refers. I sent over to him again the same request but I have not been permitted to see that correspondence, which I believe has now passed out of his hands. I think the hon. gentleman might have had the courtesy to show me the correspondence. However, in its absence, I have only the memorandum which I have been able to make during his speech. The returns to which he has re-

ferred occupied 12,000 pages of manuscript. They were examined in 1886 and I think I found in them a letter of 20th April making an application from the hon. gentleman as co-applicant for William Broder, and using the term "we", and I was naturally led, by the use of that term, to imagine that the hon. gentleman was a co-applicant with Mr. Broder, his brother-in-law.

Mr. HICKEY. There is no such letter in existence.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentlemen read the letter himself, and I would like to see it. I have no intention of doing him any injustice.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. Broder is no relation whatever of mine.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was informed that he was. I may have been under a mistaken impression.

Mr. HICKEY. You have been mistaken all the way through.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believed that the hon. gentleman was a co-applicant for the limit on the 20th April, and there was a limit granted on the 30th April. If the hon. gentleman says he was only officiating on behalf of a constituent, I am willing to accept his explanation. But the hon. gentleman has waited four years before bringing up this matter in the House. I have not had time to go through 12,000 pages of manuscript to verify the statement which I made at that time or to discover that I was mistaken. I do not think that in a mistake of that kind, under the circumstances, and considering the phraseology of the letter, although it may be a matter to lament—and if a mistake is made I do lament it—but I do not think there is anything criminal in making a mistake of that kind, with a letter of that character.

I am greatly gratified to see the amount of conscientious scruples that members of this House now evince as to the charge of having been interested in any way in applications for timber limits. This matter was treated very jauntily some four years ago. There was a great deal of indignation expressed on the part of hon. members when any person on this side of the House called in question the propriety of their making applications for themselves or for their friends; and the hon. gentleman is the only one, so far as my memory serves me, of all the members who were said to have made applications for themselves, directly or indirectly, who denies the charge. The matter is in a somewhat different position now from what it was then. In 1886 a great number of licenses were given through Orders in Council, 25,000 square miles of timber limits were covered by these Orders in Council, they were hawked about the streets, lumbermen were solicited by members of Parliament to take timber limits, they could be very easily got, and there was a state of demoralisation existing here most discreditable to this House and most demoralising to the country. I consider that I performed a public duty, and if, in the performance of that public duty, in going through that great mass of documents—and the work was so onerous and so vast that I was liable to make mistakes—if I fell into errors in doing that duty, I greatly regret it; and if any statement I made is not borne out by a critical examination of the documents, it was made innocently and not with any intention to injure any person. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the choice epithets he used towards me, in characterising me as a false hypocrite, as a moral charlatan, as one who did all these things with malice prepense and aforethought, on purpose to injure him. I have no feelings of animosity towards the hon. gentleman. I could have wished he had indulged in more gentlemanly language in addressing the House, but that is a matter for himself, if he chooses to use those expressions. I have not called him to order, and have not taken any exception to it. It is satisfactory to see hon. gentlemen opposite evince some tenderness about this whole business at the present time. It is a most discreditable matter in all its bearings as regards the Government, and as regards very many of their followers, one respecting which I rejoice to see they feel now that they would like to excuse themselves, one that I rejoice to see is discredited now. I am glad to see that the Government have now abandoned this system of granting timber limits to their friends without competition in the way it was done a few years ago.

I am in this matter, of course, in the hands of the House. If, in pursuing the investigations I have made, it is found that I have in any case made a mistake, I am ready at any time to acknowledge and express regret for that mistake. If it is found I have made a mistake, I am in the hands of the House, and if the House chooses to pass the drastic resolution the hon. gentleman has placed in your hands, why they are at liberty to do so, of course. But I do not think that the country will accept that statement of the case; I do not think that the country will say that my conduct was scandalous and dishonest in the matter of having probed and unearthed this great iniquity that existed, this great iniquity that is a blot resting upon the Government of the right hon. gentleman and all his followers behind him who have supported him in this matter. I have denounced this thing, I denounced it then, I have denounced it since, and I denounce it now as one of the most scandalous episodes in the political history of Canada. The hon. gentleman was securing a limit for a brother, I believe, of a member of the Local Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. HICKEY. You are mistaken again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say so. Had he been a member?

Mr. HICKEY. No; he never was a member.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps I have made some confusion in the names. I understood he was a member of the Legislature; I do not know whether it was this one or not.

An hon. MEMBER. He was a member.

Mr. CHARLTON. But this gentleman, and my friend from Dundas assisting him were operating upon property that did not belong to this Government; they were operating upon that disputed territory of a hundred thousand square miles that the right hon. gentleman parcelled out amongst his followers before he could say that his title was good, before the title was confirmed, before his contention with regard to that title had any basis—he was parcelling it out knowing it was disputed territory, having every reason to know that he had no business to meddle with it at all, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council de-

cided he had no business to meddle with it, that he was dealing with property not his own in all matters connected with this business. The whole affair is one discreditable to the Government. Sir, I repeat that in the course I took, and the labors that I incurred in developing this matter, I do not think I was worthy of condemnation or censure by this House, and if I made a mistake I am ready at any time to offer an ample apology. If there is any statement in that return which is not strictly true, the mistake is due not to malice, not the intention, but to oversight—it was purely a mistake.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has listened for some little time to a series of charges brought against him by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey). It appears that the hon. member made these charges against the member for Dundas four years ago, but he repeated them this Session——

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; in good faith.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With some variation, with some omissions, and some additions, perhaps. He says he has no feeling of animosity against the hon. gentleman; he was very sorry that he made a mistake four years ago, and here in this present Session. Then, what was the object in making that affidavit, I would like to know? There was a very malicious attack upon one man by another; his getting up that affidavit could have been for no other purpose but to injure the character and affect the election of the hon. gentleman. There he stands convicted from his own home of preparing this affidavit and publishing it to the world for the purpose of injuring a colleague in Parliament, a member against whom he says he had no animosity, no desire to injure. Now, the hon. gentleman gets up cringingly to say: If I have done wrong, I am very sorry for it; I did not mean to hurt the hon. member, I did not at all mean to injure him, but a sense of duty compelled me four years ago to make an unture statement and I repeat it here now. In this fashion, and between the two periods, he has made a solemn affidavit for the purpose of injuring a man, and he now says that it was a mistake and he is very sorry, that with such a pile of papers to go through he could not help making a mistake. Why did he not put that into his affidavit—that perhaps it was untrue, perhaps he made a mistake? He swore positively to what has been proved to be a falsehood.

Mr. McMULLEN. Produce the letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hold your tongue, sir. The hon. member for North Wellington is out of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to order. The hon. member has no right to use such language to a member of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I ask for the ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope discreditable scenes will not take place, though, of course, the subject is very apt to produce these scenes. I do not feel like calling the right hon. gentleman to order, because I think the hon. member for North Wellington had no right to interrupt him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he had no right to interrupt me, I had a right to tell him so. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, after finding that he was in a scrape, tries to draw a herring across the track—under the nose of the House, if I may use that expression, and he begins with an attack upon the immorality, and the misconduct, and the corruption of the Government. I deny the corruption, I deny his statement, and his statement in that respect is just as true as the statement he made with respect to the hon. member for Dundas. He is equally unscrupulous as to facts, whether he deals with the Government as a whole, or with those who are opposed to him as a whole, as he is proved to be unscrupulous with regard to this individual member. But I think the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion would have adopted a better course if he had moved it as a separate and distinct motion, and then it could have been dealt with as other similar cases have been dealt with, and the hon. gentleman could have moved that the motion be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. As it is now, it is too late in the Session, and I would advise the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, and to follow it up afterwards as he thinks best.

Mr. LANDERKIN. About five years longer, when he has studied it up better.

Mr. HICKEY. In view of the lateness of the Session, and what has been said, and not in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken across the floor, I will withdraw the motion. I may say that I did not think so much about it until the statement was repeated in March last by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I fought it out in my county, and I did not suffer very much by it; but when it was repeated in this House, I thought it respectful to the House and to myself that I should bring it up, and I have done so at the earliest day available. I now beg to withdraw the motion, with the consent of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the motion is withdrawn, I must protest against the language which has been used by the Prime Minister of this country. The hon. gentleman has not only no right whatever, but he has no cause, to use the language he has used to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). What are the facts? The facts are these: That the hon. gentleman brought an accusation against the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) which that hon. gentleman, after four years, now says is not true. It may be so; I am very glad for my part to accept the denial of the hon. member for Dundas, and to believe his denial is true, as he says it is; but the hon. gentleman must remember that, if the statement is true, he was singularly unfortunate when he wrote that letter which was found against him in the record, and which was brought forward by the hon. member for North Norfolk. He was singularly unfortunate when, in making an application for his friend, he used the word "we," thereby conveying the impression that he was applying for himself and not for his friend. Such things may occur. The hon. gentleman made an affidavit, no doubt in good faith, and no one has a right to say that it was not made in good faith, and even if the affidavit was made under a false impression, no one has a right to taunt him and say he was not acting in good faith. I am very glad to hear that the hon. gentleman was acting,

not for himself, but for his friend. The fact may be correct, but I protest against any insulting language being thrown across the House to my hon. friends on this side.

Amendment withdrawn.

ALBERT RAILWAY GRANT.

Mr. ELLIS. I desire to call the attention of the House to a question in connection with the Albert Railway. In 1886, the Government submitted a proposal to this House to grant the Albert Railway Company $15,000, and the First Minister in making that motion said:

"This road is about forty miles in length, and extends from the Intercolonial Railway station at Salisbury to Hopewell. It has been built for some years and paid working expenses, but very heavy storms of unusual severity have so injured the works of construction that it is impossible to keep it in the same condition—in fact they are unable to repair it, and unless assistance is given the road will be closed. It is very important to the district that the road should continue to be operated, and for that purpose, a loan of $15,000 is proposed. It is an important feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, and its close would seriously disturb the business of that section of the country. The transport and freight will go over the Albert Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway will, of course, collect the freight and pay itself from time to time out of the freights, and recoup itself for this temporary loan which, I think, is absolutely necessary"

The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), then leading the Opposition, made these remarks:

"The Intercolonial Railway will not have anything to do with the recouping, it is a loan from the Treasury. If I rightly understand it, the Albert Railway is bonded up to the hilt. I think the bonds were issued upon the London market by one of those arrangements by which a certain sum is deposited to answer for the interest for a certain time, so that it does not require that the profits of the road should pay more than the working expenses for that time. It is said that about $600,000 is the nominal emission of bonds on this railway. It seems to me clear that under the present circumstances it does not pay working expenses, and it will very shortly have to pay interest on its bonds as well, as soon as the period for which interest is provided expires. It seems to me perfectly plain that this money will never come in again, and we might just as well propose in plain English to made a gift of it, as to propose that it shall be loaned in this way. The hon. gentleman has just hinted a mode of security upon the freight of the company, but I can assure him that if the company has to part with its freights the road cannot be kept open. We will never see a dollar of this money again."

The House voted the money. Some months afterwards, I think in October, 1886, according to a deed which is registered in the office of the Registrar of Wills and Deeds in the county of Albert, an arrangement was entered into by the Minister of Railways of that day (Mr. Pope) and the officers of the company, by which it was agreed that this sum of $15,000 should be advanced to the railway. Attached to the deed is a memorandum of the services for which the money is to be expended. I need not read the memorandum, but it will be quite sufficient to say that under it $10,164 were to be spent on works which are specified and $4,836 were to be available to pay laborers on the road. It was no part of the understanding when the money was asked from this House that any portion of it was to be used to pay wages; but in the agreement it is stated that $4,836 shall be paid for laborers' wages and the balance on the different works enumerated. The road at the time was bonded in England, and this mortgage came in after that of the English bondholders. I do not object to the fact that $4,836 of that amount was to be paid laborers on the railway for amounts due them; but the fault I find with the Government is that they did not see that the agreement was carried out, because I am assured, and I think it will not be controverted, that out of the $4,836 not more than $1,000 was paid to the laborers, if that sum was paid, on account of the amounts due at that time. The money was paid over in five different sums. It appears from a letter from Mr. Bradley, secretary of the Department of Railways, to Hon. Mr. Jones, who became a trustee and receiver for this road under an order of court, that the amounts were paid over in five different sums, as I have stated, namely, on October 27, 1876, $4,836; on December 15, $3,585; February 7, 1887, $422; March 7, $2,592; August 22, $3,321, making in all $13,778, which appears to be the total sum paid over of the $15,000. But according to the Public Accounts, the total sum paid is $14,725, the Government, it appears, having added the interest up to a certain time, to the amount which they had advanced. It appears from the accounts of the company that although this $4,836 was granted to be paid for labor, the sum of $3,232 was not paid to the laborers, but was divided up among the officers of the company. Within a few months of the time they received this money, three directors in the city of St. John, divided among themselves $2,400. They paid their secretary, $378; their solicitor, $320; their auditor, $124; and in addition to that, a railroad that probably spent $5 or $6 in the course of a year for postage, paid a postage bill of $45. This matter has created a great deal of scandal in the county. It is a well known fact, that although the Government agreed to give this $4,836 to be paid directly to the laborers, the money was not paid to the laborers, but was taken by the officers of the company, in the city of St. John. These facts are well known to some members of the Government, I believe, but they have made no effort whatever to call upon the parties to refund the money, and as a result of the condition in which matters were left, the railroad was closed up for a long time after the whole amount of the money was paid over. In the meantime, of course, the road has been sold out by order of the court, and thus the security which the Government has, is entirely valueless. I do not wish to say anything very harsh on the matter, but I do think the attention of the country ought to be called to the fact that this money was practically squandered, that the laborers are still unpaid, and that the intentions of the Government were defeated by the mode which they undertook to do the work.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a matter which should require some explanation at the hands of the Government. As I understand the case as laid down by my hon. friend from St. John, (Mr. Ellis) this railway had been voted a loan of $15,000, and one of the conditions of the loan was that a sum $4,836, which was at that time due to the laborers, was to be paid to them out of the first moneys which were advanced to the company. The moneys were advanced to the company, and out of the $4,836, the laborers were only paid about $1,500. The balance was paid not to the laborers, but to the manager, secretary, and solicitor of the company, so that the money was altogether misappropriated. It may have been

well appropriated in one sense, but it was not appropriated according to the terms of the agreement entered into between the Government and the company. It seems to me it was the duty of the Government to see that the agreement was faithfully carried out by the company, and the moment they advanced the money, it was their duty to see that not a cent afterwards should have been paid out of the loan, unless the company showed the money was expended in a manner according to the agreement. Under these circumstances, it appears to me that the Government should give some explanation of the very serious charges made by the member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) as to the manner in which the money has been appropriated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Ellis) has not taken the course which was most calculated to elucidate this subject, or to benefit the laboring men, if any of them have suffered in this matter. The hon. gentleman has brought up the matter on going into Supply at this late stage of the Session, without giving any previous notice, or without giving an opportunity to myself, as Minister of Railways, to look into the matter, to revive any recollections I may have of it, and to find out if the statements—which I have heard very imperfectly by the way—made by the hon. member, were accurate. I do not at all doubt that the hon. gentleman desires to be strictly accurate in the matter, but having given no notice that he was going to bring up the question, he cannot expect, and no reasonable man could expect, that any answer could be given to it. As for myself, beyond the fact that there was a loan made to the Albert Railway Company, I am as ignorant of the circumstances, as possibly my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was before he heard the statement of the hon. gentleman for St. John (Mr. Ellis).

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the facts would impress you as they impressed me ; that if they are as stated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) the Government is very much to blame.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not catch all the facts, and, therefore, I cannot say whether the Government are to be blamed or not. At all events the hon. gentleman having called my attention to the matter, I shall look into it. If I find there is any wrong done I will admit it at once, and if it can be remedied it will be remedied, but I am slow to believe that the Department or the Government have made either a mistake or an error in the matter.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I wish to say a word or two on the matter now under discussion. Some three years ago, and before the leader of the House had taken the portfolio of railways, I had my attention called to this matter immediately after the election of 1887, and I proceeded as promptly as I could to do what lay in my power to protect the workingmen, who had not received the back pay which they ought to have received. There was so much noise and clamor in the House just now, that I could not hear all my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) said. But so far as I did hear him, his statements of facts were entirely correct, and they agree with my own impressions gained from an intimate acquaintance with the matter. The hon. gentleman's figures tally with my recollection. I remember seeing, on a file of the papers in the Department, a statement to the effect that one of the grounds on which the loan was asked was that $4,836 and some odd cents were needed to pay back wages to the men on the railway, and I know that the first cheque drawn by the Government against that $15,000 loan, was for the exact sum there stated. I remember the exact identity of the figures, and the Government did this no doubt in perfect faith and with a desire to have the wages paid. I have said to the late Minister of Railways, and to the subordinate officials of the Department, that in my judgment, a blunder was made in sending that money to a company which was moribund, which was *in extremis* and which was made up largely of men of straw. I make bold to say in my place in this House, what I have said in the Department ; that this struck me as a blunder. If that money had been given to a trustee, or to the member for the county, or to some independent person, to take charge of, the workmen would undoubtedly have got their back pay. To be just to all parties, I should say that the men themselves were somewhat at fault. There was some $10,000 left, and I have no doubt the men would have got every dollar of their back pay if they had struck ; but they continued to work for the company after there was $3,000 or $4,000 due. The company paid them their weekly wage, but they have never made up that balance to this day. I have tried every conceivable way that seemed open to me to recover this back pay for them. At the time I was elected, all the money had been spent except little more than enough to pay the interest on the loan. I made enquiries about the company but they seemed to be men of straw. If we could have proceeded against them for what was practically a misappropriation of money, that would have been a source of hope to the employés ; but the company seemed to be men of straw. Two years ago they disappeared altogether, and the road was taken over by the bondholders. I think rather more than one-fourth of this back pay of $4,836 was paid.

Mr. ELLIS. About $1,000.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The county of Albert, in connection with the events growing out of that railway, has acquired perhaps a worse name than any other county in Canada. Certainly a most deplorable swindle was perpetrated in connection with this railway nine or ten years ago ; but I am happy to say, for the credit of the people of my own county, that they were in no way responsible for it ; the whole fraud was perpetrated by outside speculators who had got control of the railway. We hope, however, that, in the future, this road will be administered in the interest of the locality.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with the hon. member, that the people of Albert county were not in any way to blame for the gross swindle perpetrated in connection with that road. If I could get the prospectus by which the English bondholders were induced to put their money into that road, I could show it to be as great a fraud as was ever perpetrated. But I do not see why the Government should have come forward, at a time when the railway company were in a state of bankruptcy, and lend them $15,000, which we were assured would be repaid from the freight,

although it was well known at the time that the road did not begin to pay expenses. That $15,000 is sunk forever beyond recall, because the road is now foreclosed by the bondholders, and has gone into the hands of other parties. On what principle was that money lent? The road was no part of the Intercolonial, and had nothing to do with it at all. At that time, I know, there were considerable difficulties in the way of getting that county into line with the Government, and just before the election of 1887 down comes this loan of $15,000 to this railway. At that very time it was loaded with bonds to the extent of $600,000, and when it was sold it only realised $100,000. There was no justification for the lending of that money at all, because the possibility of its repayment was entirely problematical. At that time, as my hon. friend from Albert has stated, the road had got into the hands of other parties, who were supporters of this Government, and who, instead of paying the laborers, divided the money among themselves, paying themselves as solicitors and directors, and leaving unpaid the men whose labor had built the railway. The right hon. Premier says he was not aware of this. The hon. member for Albert states that he has been to the Railway Department putting forward the position of affairs. He has shown that the company, instead of carrying out the agreement they made with the Government, violated it and put the money into their own pockets which was got on the pretence that it was to be paid to the laborers.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood my remarks when he said that I had made these representations to the present Minister.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I said to the Department.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). It was during Mr. Pope's time that I made the representations to the Department. For my part, the matter had become a perfectly dead issue; the company had disappeared, and the money could not be got hold of.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not deserve the animadversions of the hon. First Minister for bringing this matter up. In 1888, I asked the Government to whom the money had been paid, and I was told to the company. I might as well have been told that it was paid to the man in the moon, because there was no company. I also made enquiries about the matter in the Public Accounts Committee. I did not go to the Minister of Railways, but otherwise I did all I could do. I regret that the hon. Minister did not hear my remarks, because I think he would insist on an enquiry with regard to these people, and I would suggest that that should be had. The hon. gentleman will now appreciate the difficulty we on this side of the House have sometimes in hearing him.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. BARRON. I was not here this afternoon when the question on the Order Paper was asked relating to the McGreevy scandal. I understand, however, that the hon. Minister of Public Works, promised to bring down some papers in relation to it, and it is in consequence of that statement that I rise to read a telegram which I received a few minutes ago, and which I think the hon. Minister should be in possession of, because it may possibly suggest some papers which he might not otherwise bring down. It is evident from the second part of the statement of Mr. O. E. Murphy that there were two tenders which the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. by some instrumentality got withdrawn, and it is to that portion of the question that this telegram refers. It is as follows:—

"MR. BARRON, M.P.,
"House of Commons.

"I can produce unquestionable evidence in support of charges published by *Le Canadien*, and prove, moreover, in a conclusive manner, that Mr. McGreevy, a member of Parliament, and of the Quebec Harbor Commission, worked up in Ottawa the charges for dredging from 27 cents to 35 cents in 1887; also that he suggested and advised, himself, the withdrawal of the lowest tenders in the contract for the crosswall in 1883, so that the contract might go to the highest tenders, Larkin, Connolly & Co. You may use my telegram.

"J. ISRAEL TARTE."

I think I am justified in reading that telegram now, so that the hon. the Minister of Public Works may have knowledge of it, and may have the papers brought down which may have any bearing upon it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may inform him that, without that telegram, all the papers in this matter were to be brought down, so that the telegram will not make any change in them. I have ordered the papers to be copied and they will be down, perhaps, by Friday.

LIEUT.-COL. FORREST.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Some few days ago, I gave private notice to the hon. Minister of Militia that I would ask an explanation from him of a charge, appearing in the Public Accounts of last year, of a payment to one Lieut.-Col. Forrest, of Quebec, amounting to $1,235, That charge appears in the Auditor-General's Report, page F-136, as follows:

"Staff and officers—

Lt.-Col. Forrest, War Claims Commissioner, 1st March till the 30th June, 1886, 122 days at $15 per day	$1,830 00
Less pay of rank, 122 days at $4.87	594 14
	$1,235 86

As a member of the Public Accounts Committee, my attention was called to that payment, and I moved in the committee that the Deputy Minister of Militia be summoned before the committee to explain the meaning of that charge. He came before that committee, and the committee asked him with respect to it; but he was unable to give the committee any information whatever. The facts appear to be as follows: The War Claims Commission, consisting of Lt.-Col. Jackson, president, Lt.-Col. Whitehead, and Lt.-Col. Forrest, sat for some months. It does not matter, for the purpose of this enquiry, but, as a matter of fact, Lt.-Col. Whitehead and Lt.-Col. Forrest left Ottawa, having completed their labors, on the 26th February, 1886, and they were paid up to that date. Four or five years afterwards there appears this amount paid to Lt.-Col. Forest and not paid to any other member of the Commission; and when the Deputy Minister of Militia was summoned before the Public Accounts Commit-

tee, he was obliged to admit that, so far as he was concerned, long as had been his experience in the Department, and intimate as his knowledge was of the affairs of the Department, he was unable to give the committee any information whatever as to this gentleman's claim or the work he did. The commission did not sit; no claims were submitted to them; Col. Forrest did not act as a member of the commission; he was not at Ottawa attending on the Department here. He may have come to Ottawa for a day or two, but if he did, the Deputy Minister had no knowledge of it and did not know of any work done by him, and was unable to state any reason why this payment should be made. Under these circumstances, I thought there was a small scandal in the payment of $1,200 or $1,300, to Col. Forrest at a time when he was in Quebec discharging the duties of storekeeper and paymaster, for which he received $75 per month, besides $4.87 per day as the pay of his rank; and this claim was admitted four or five years after the commission had closed. The circumstances were suspicious; the evidence of the Deputy Minister rendered them still more suspicious, and the impression left on the minds of the committee was that a gross job had been perpetrated.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am indebted to the hon. gentleman for his courtesy in notifying me a few days ago that he intended making an enquiry into this matter. I do not know exactly what the Deputy Minister stated before the Public Accounts Committee, as I could not possibly leave the office the day he was called to attend the Committee, and was not present to hear the explanation he made. I am confident that when the facts are brought to the notice of the hon. gentleman, he will find that not only there is not a little scandal but that there is no scandal at all in the transaction. Col. Forrest was one of the officers who, in the beginning of the outbreak in the North-West, was sent there to act as paymaster and attend to the financial portion of the expedition and the different contracts which were entered into between the Government and the different contractors for the supplies and teams required. When the commissioners returned to Ottawa the claims against the Department were submitted to them for examination, as the most of them required to be carefully looked into. I tried, as it was my duty, to reduce the expenditure as much as possible, consistent with the efficiency of the service; and in this view I retained Col. Jackson, the President of the commission here, and for a short time Col. Whitehead; but from the position which Col. Forrest occupied in the North-West during the troubles, from his intimate connection with several of the claims which he himself had looked after in the North-West, it became necessary for me to retain his services as one of the commissioners. The only point, as far as I can judge upon which the hon. gentleman might require any explanation, would be Col. Forrest's employment during his stay at Quebec. I can tell the hon. gentleman that several claims which had to be investigated, were submitted to Col. Forest. I was reducing the expenditure by keeping him in Quebec, and moreover he was sent there to look after a portion of the report which was subsequently published, and which has been submitted to the House. The hon. gentleman will see from the papers that Col. Forrest was returned to the Department of Militia as paymaster. His pay from the 1st March to the 30th June, 1886, as commissioner, 122 days at $15 a day amounted to $1,830, from which we deducted the pay of his rank 122 days at $4.87, $594, leaving a balance due him of $1,235.86. I think the only explanation that could have been required was as to the nature of the services that Col. Forrest rendered. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he was occupied during the time he was in Quebec in arranging the claims which originated in the troubles in the North-West, and in making the report which he had to attend to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman fails to appreciate the point which I put to him, which was, that the War Claims Commission ceased to exist on the 26th February, 1886, and that Col. Forrest returned to his place in Quebec, continued to receive his payment as storekeeper at $75 a month, and the payment of his rank, while the hon. gentleman continued to pay him under the War Claims Commission which had ceased to exist; and the Deputy Minister said he did not know for what Col. Forrest was paid after that date.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman says my deputy could not give him the information, but I have been supplementing that by stating what Col. Forrest did in Quebec. It is true that the commission did not sit as a commission in Quebec, but Col. Jackson and Col. Forrest were employed as commissioners long after they sat in Winnipeg or in Ottawa. The payments made to Col. Forrest are explained by the account which I read, showing that a deduction was made of his pay for 122 days, which left a balance of $1,235.86.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state what work he did?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The work he did was to attend to claims of which he had a personal knowledge, and also to attend to the report which was subsequently published.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state the claims he attended to?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman would not expect me to be able to state those claims at this moment, when the whole of the claims occupy a volume of several hundred pages.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We summoned the hon. gentleman's deputy before the committee and asked him to state the claims which Col. Forrest attended to, and he said he had searched the records, and could not state the claims.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I know that Col. Forrest is a first rate-officer, and that he knew everyone of the claims in the North-West which arose from the troubles there.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. CURRAN. In regard to the question which was previously discussed, I was desirous of making a statement when my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barron) sat down, but I was prevented from doing so by the floor being granted to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. I think it is important on behalf of my friend the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy), that I should now make that statement. This afternoon when the question was brought up, I did not read the document which I had in my hand, because the question was addressed to the Government, but, seeing that the

hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) has now read a telegram he has received from Mr. Tarte, of Quebec, and has thus again brought the matter before the attention of the House, I deem it my duty to read what was placed in my hands sometime ago, in the event of this matter coming up, by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. McGreevy). It is as follows :—

"With reference to the charges made against me I am moved by feelings of sorrow as well as indignation.

"Of sorrow at the thought that my own brother who has received nothing but favors at my hands and who has grown rich at my expense, should, now at the latter end of our days, be found conspiring against me, in the company of a fugitive from justice.

"And of indignation that a man who has taken shelter in this Dominion to escape the penitentiary in the country from which he fled, laden with the spoils of a plundered treasury, should dare become the accuser of men known in this community to be above suspicion and that any hon. member of this House should be so far imposed upon by the two conspirators, as to lay before it so transparent a series of calumnies.

"The accusations although apparently specific, are mere insinuations against myself and others, and the only way in which I can meet them here, is by a simple but positive denial.

"I deny that I had knowledge of my brother's alleged connection with the contracts or contractors mentioned in the accusations.

"The statement that I personally participated in profits accruing to my brother out of such contracts—or that I benefited by them, or that I was paid any sum or sums of money—or that any consideration was ever promised to me, are totally unfounded.

"Therefore, as a member of this honorable House, of twenty-three years' standing, I assure you, Sir, in all candor, that in so far as I am personally concerned these accusations are false, they are only a part of a deep conspiracy to try to ruin me and two or three other gentlemen, who in a fair contest, and to protect our own property, defeated these conspirators in their attempt to gain control of a large navigation company. Having been baffled on that occasion they now seek revenge.

"To this end Murphy concocts his accusations, and my brother endorses them and says they are true.

"I have now to deal with the supplementary accusations added to Mr. Murphy's by my brother, Robert H. McGreevy.

"In the year 1866, upon my retiring from active business, he bought out my plant and material, becoming my debtor in a large sum, which with the other large sums of money I have frequently advanced since, to extricate him from the many unfortunate enterprises in which he embarked, has gone on increasing, until it reached nearly half a million dollars. Whenever he was in difficulties he came to me.

"It is true he has paid me various sums on account, but feeling myself obliged to press for settlement, I, some months ago, sued him for $354,000, balance still due me.

"I now come to the last accusation relative to the *Admiral*. I never owned the steamer, nor never was I contractor with the Government for same."

LIEUT.-COL. FORREST.

Mr. MULOCK. To return to the question which was brought up by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies), there appears to be nothing of record showing the appointment of Col. Forrest to act in any capacity after the termination of the War Claims Commission. I would ask whether the instructions given to him were verbal or are on record. It appears to me that, when any one is appointed to discharge public services extending over weeks or months, as in this case, the appointment ought to be made in a proper business-like way by a memorandum or in some way which should be of record in the Department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman evidently forgets that Col. Forrest, Col. Jackson and Col. Whitehead, after the troubles were over, were appointed a commission by Order in Council to investigate the claims arising out of the troubles in the North-West. That was their authority to act as commissioners.

Mr. MULOCK. In the North-West?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the North-West and also in Ottawa, and the fact of their being in Ottawa, or going to Toronto, did not at all change the character of the duties which had been entrusted to them under the authority of the Council appointing them a Commission for the purpose of investigating these claims. There was no interruption at all in the appointment of Col. Forrest. The hon. gentleman wants to know by what authority he acted as commissioner during these 123 days. By the authority of the Order in Council appointing him. The only way of putting an end to his services would have been to notify him that he ceased from a certain date to be a commissioner to investigate North-West claims. That was done when, in the discretion of the Department, it was considered that his duties were over. During a portion of the time he was working in Winnipeg, during another portion of the time he was investigating claims in Ottawa, and another portion of the time his duties, in the discretion of the Department, were considered to be better fulfilled by his being in Quebec than by being in Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Were all three of the commissioners dismissed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some of the commissioners were dismissed before others were. Instead of paying all the commissioners for the whole period, we paid Col. Jackson who remained a commissioner long after the service of the others had been dispensed with. It would be easy to find out the claims that were submitted to Col. Forrest which he dealt with in Quebec, in Ottawa or in Winnipeg.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. gentleman that it is a very common business economy, after a commission has sat for a time and performed the major part of the business, to dispense with the services of some of the commissioners and let one or two members finish the business. In the case of settling the half-breed claims by the Commission of which the present Justice Street was the head, the Commissioners received all the claims that were presented to them, and visited different points, but some of the claims were left unsettled and one of the Commissioners was left to wind the thing up. In this case, I understand, the commission as a whole sat and considered the claims, and Colonel Forrest and Colonel Jackson, whom the hon. gentleman knows, and knows to be a very good Reformer, were retained to wind up the scattered cases that the Commission as a whole began to settle.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This was in Quebec after Col. Forrest remained there, and Col. Jackson was not there at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I admit that Col. Jackson was here.

Mr. LAURIER. According to the statement of the First Minister, after the Commission had sat for a certain time one or two of the Commissioners were discharged and Col. Forrest was employed further to investigate these claims. Then there must be a report of these claims.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is a report.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand there is a report up to the month of March, but I do not understand there was any subsequent report made. If there was one made, well and good; but if there was no report made after the month of March, surely Col. Forrest could not have been employed in Quebec as Commissioner. Did he make any report of that subsequent period when he remained alone?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may surprise the hon. gentleman when I tell him that even to-day Major Guy, who is in my Department, is giving a considerable portion of time to this Commission, and, acting as one of those who investigated the claims, is employed still every day in settling claims. The hon. gentleman will see in the Estimates, which are brought down, there is an amount of money by Governor General's warrant for the purpose of paying certain claims, which up to that time had not been settled and could not be settled. Some of those claims arose out of teaming. For instance, in the extreme north, some witnesses were away, or else some of the vouchers could not be found, and they turned up only after the first report had been published. Two reports were published. The first report was the most extensive one, and the second report was less so. We kept Col. Forrest in Quebec, as we employed him here, because we required his services there, just as we still keep Major Guy, who is employed on some of the cases. The hon. gentleman will see in next year's Estimates some amounts which have not yet been settled, because we could not get all the evidence which we considered necessary before authorising the payment of these claims.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. Minister inform the House if this service was rendered at the time he refers to, why the payments were not made at that time, why three years were allowed to elapse before these payments were made to Col. Forrest?—because this is the first time his name appears in the Public Accounts. I fail to see that the Minister has given us a satisfactory explanation. I understand the explanation he gave with reference to his discharging the duties of the Commission after the service of the other two Commissioners had been dispensed with; but after three years had elapsed between that date and the date at which this payment was made, and now when it appears for the first time, it looks on the face of it as requiring some more explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given all the explanation I possibly can. I evidently made a mistake in taking so much time to make up my mind, because it does not seem to have satisfied hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, the hon. gentleman ought to state what the facts were by reason of which he took so much time to make up his mind.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have stated all the facts I consider necessary.

LICENSES TO FISHERMEN IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the case of the fishermen on Lake St. Peter. Formerly the Department of Marine and Fisheries forced them to take out a license, and to pay a tax on fishing materials. At the request of some hon. members that provision was repealed in 1887. In 1888 it was re-imposed. In 1889 I drew the attention of the Government to the matter, and orders were issued not to require a license from those who were unable to pay for them. In the year 1889 no complaints were made on that score, but since the month of May has commenced, it appears that licenses are again required, and the fishermen have been called upon suddenly, both at Sorel and Berthier, either to pay licenses, or desist from fishing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask the hon. gentleman to renew that question when the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), who is acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in his seat. He will be able to answer that question, I think, satisfactorily.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee).

To provide for the position of Accountant S. L. Shannon, omitted from the main Estimates, 1890-91..... $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe this gentleman received $1,100 last year according to the Auditor General's Report. Under what circumstances does the Minister recommend an increase to $1,500 now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Shannon was appointed to the House of Commons as an extra clerk in 1880, and he was transferred and appointed as a permanent third class clerk in the accountant's branch of the Department of Railways in 1881, with a salary of $500. Mr. John Short, first assistant accountant, died in 1886. Mr. Shannon performed his duties, and was appointed second class clerk in 1888, with a salary of $1,100. He was appointed only a second class clerk although his predecessor was a first class. The accountant in the Department, Mr. Bain, died in November, 1888, and, subsequently, Mr. Shannon was appointed accountant without an increase of salary. By Order in Council he was promoted to be a first class clerk on 6th January. The late accountant's salary was $2,400; Mr. Shannon's salary if voted will be $1,500, making a saving of $900. Mr. Shannon is reported to be an exceedingly clever fellow and a good accountant, and although at the time a third class clerk he was found to be fit to perform the duties of Mr. Short, and as a second class clerk the duties of Mr. Bain, and he is now accountant of the Department, and we propose to give him $1,500 as against $2,400 received by his predecessor.

Additional amount required for Contingencies, Department of Railways and Canals..... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why is this amount required?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is merely a transfer. The collection of canal tolls was formerly made by the Department of Inland Revenue, but as the Department of Railways and Canals had officers in charge of the canal works and the Inland Revenue Department had their own officers there simply to collect the revenue, a new arrangement has been made by which the whole service is

transferred to the Railways and Canals Department and a considerable economy will be effected. This change, however, necessitates the transfer of four clerks at the united salary of $1,786.

Department of Finance — Amount required to pay balance of printing statistical diagrams..... $1,440 38

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what statistical diagrams does this refer?

Mr. FOSTER. To those diagrams which form a large part of the printed public speeches of the Minister of Finance in 1888 and 1889, and to the graphic statistics. These diagrams were also published in book form.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a vote to which we must object. It is not a proper or judicious expenditure of public money, and I must say those statistical diagrams reflected no credit on the party who prepared them. In one or two cases they were distinctly deceptive and intended to deceive. Such was the case in regard to the diagrams prepared with respect to the number of bankruptcies for a number of years. Instead of going back as they should have done and was done in other tables, to the years 1868 or 1869, and placing the statistics as ought to have been done, to show there was no material alternation in the revenue tariff between 1870 and 1874, the statistics were so arranged as deliberately to deceive the public, and to make it appear that a large number of bankruptcies had taken place under a revenue tariff and the number had been diminished under a protective tariff. In order to have made these tables of any value to the public the number of bankruptcies ought to have been given at least from 1870, if not for 1867. And more than that, they should have stated, what is known to be the fact, that the bankruptcy law was abolished, I think in 1879, and consequently after that time it was not possible to obtain accurate statistics. The Minister of Finance well knows that the statistics we now obtain are by no means as reliable as we obtained when the bankruptcy law was in operation, the fact being that an enormous number of compositions are made which are never publicly known. In any case an enormous sum has been voted for these statistics, and it is utterly improper to bring forward in the Estimates for 1891 a sum for payment, under any pretext, for work done at the time Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Finance. This is in no respect a reasonable vote, and it is one on which we most certainly divide unless a much better explanation is offered.

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation is I think simply this. Whatever the hon. gentleman's opinion may be as to the value of the statistical diagrams, the fact is they were printed. When I came into office the matter was being settled. I went into it very carefully myself with the Queen's Printer, and especially with his assistant, Mr. Gliddon. I went through it very carefully, and we cut down the bills that were presented so far, that he reported that as being a fair minimum cost. There is no doubt but that we have paid large sums for these diagrams. The process of making them was much more expensive than I am informed it is now, owing to some improvements having been made. These diagrams were all printed and used, and this is for a balance which is due to the engraver, and which I think ought to be paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very odd thing that an account of this kind should be allowed to remain unpaid for three years. It appears to me that it should have been settled by Sir Charles Tupper, before he left office, or by the hon. gentleman on his coming into office. This is not a proper way of doing business, and it is the very best way to ensure unreasonable charges being made. I think that the total amount for these diagrams was $7,000 or $8,000 in addition to the charge for printing the Budget Speech, and I cannot see that we have received any value for our money.

Mr. FOSTER. There were some diagrams also published in the graphic statistics, and they were printed in different colors which made them cost a good deal more than ordinary work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Seven or eight thousand dollars for this purpose, in addition to the cost of printing the Budget Speech, was a most outrageous charge, whether the statistics were accurate or not.

Mr. FOSTER. It was a very accurate and a very excellent speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was as accurate and as reliable as some of the declarations which the hon. Minister made before. It was as accurate as his declaration that we would have 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from Manitoba; as accurate as his declaration that we would have $58,450,000 on the 1st January, 1891, both days inclusive; and as accurate as his declaration that the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway would save 45 miles, when the First Minister told us the other night that at the most it would save us seven miles only.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a little too sweeping in that last declaration. I do not think any one has pointed out an inaccuracy in those statistics. The selection may have been found fault with, but not the accuracy of the description.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the bankruptcy statistics, it was deliberately intended to deceive. I do not know whether the man who compiled it did so of his own proper motion, but I say that the manner in which they were placed could, and did, and was intended to deceive.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to these statistics, I might say, that at the time Sir Charles Tupper made this speech, he spoke with regard to the duties on iron, increasing the number of smelting furnaces throughout this country. He mentioned Kingston, Cobourg, Port Hope, Belleville and several places in which we were going to have smelting furnaces in a short time. These graphic statistics also showed the importation of iron, and Sir Charles Tupper pointed out what an advantage would accrue to the country by the adoption of his policy. This has also to be put down amongst the false prophesies mentioned by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We should not be asked to pass this item without knowing how they were distributed and where they were distributed. I received only about half a dozen copies.

Mr. FOSTER. They probably thought you appreciated them so little that they did not send you any.

Mr. McMULLEN. I appreciate anything that is worth appreciating, but this was not worth appreciating, and the money of the country should not have been squandered on it.

Mr. HESSON. I trust that they have been appreciated, for they are one of the most valuable works that have been presented to the House. I hold one of the copies in my hand. The business failures and the notes overdue are the only two items that do not go back to the time of Confederation; I do not know why they do not go back to 1868 instead of to 1873; but it is one of the most interesting works that have been prepared, and it shows the progress of the country in an excellent manner. As to the distribution, I do not suppose that I have been specially favored, and I got a dozen or two of them, and I think the hon. gentleman could have got them also, although they were grabbed up by everybody, who wanted to circulate them through the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is talking about statistics. It is not the statistics we are talking about, but the diagrams.

Department of the Interior—to increase the salary of H. H. Rowatt, from 1st July, 1890, to 30th June, 1891..... $200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what ground is this asked for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Rowatt is one of our most experienced shorthand and type-writer officers. He joined the service two or three years ago and passed the civil service examination at a time when it was not obligatory to pass the optional subjects at the same time. Subsequently the Treasury Board altered the regulations, which prevented him going up for his optional subjects. He is one of our best officers and is worthy of the salary which we propose to give him, and which he should have had at the time he joined the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his present salary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $450.

Mr. MULOCK. You are paying him on the same scale as all others?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The same.

To pay the salary of A. H. Whitcher, Agent of Dominion Lands, Winnipeg, who is to be transferred to Department at headquarters as a first class clerk..... $1,700

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this arranged?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When our main Estimates were before the Committee, I asked to strike out $3,600, of which $2,400 was the salary of Mr. Whitcher. I stated at the time that I proposed to ask for a vote of $1,700 for his salary in the Supplementary Estimates, as I proposed to bring him to the head office, and he was willing to come here for that salary.

Mr. WATSON. Did Mr. Whitcher resign the position of land agent at Winnipeg, or why is the change made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no necessity for the office. The business of the office can be conducted, and it is proposed that it shall be conducted, by Mr. Stevenson, the Crown Timber Agent. He will carry on both duties.

Post Office Department—to provide for reappointment of Mr. M. Finn as third-class clerk..... $650

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the reason of this?

Mr. HAGGART. Some time ago he left the service, and was reappointed at the salary he had before.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he dismissed or did he leave the service?

Mr. HAGGART. He was suspended for inattention to his duties.

Mr. McMULLEN. For how long a time was he suspended before he was reengaged?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have some knowledge of the circumstance. He was removed from the Post Office Department by the late Postmaster General, for inattention to his duties, and the Postmaster General, with the view of giving him a second trial, agreed to engage him as a temporary clerk for the purpose of seeing whether he would reinstate him. He was in that position for upwards of two years, and having been found attentive to his duties and deserving of being reinstated, this vote is to reinstate him at the salary he had before. In order to qualify himself he has had, in addition to the loss for two years of his position as a civil service clerk, to undergo an examination and qualify himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who filled the position while he was suspended?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. During two years he was employed as a temporary clerk doing the same work.

Customs Department—To provide for an additionnal third class clerk to be appointed at the rate of..... $550

Mr. BOWELL. This is to put a young lady by the name of Miss Fraser upon the permanent staff. She has been employed for the last two or three years in the Corresponding Branch. She passed the examination, and also passed on an optional subject as short-hand writer and type-writer, and I thought it only just to the young lady that she should be placed permanently on the staff.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether the Government, under the Civil Service Act, have power to appoint at a higher salary than the minimum, or whether they are tied down by the Act.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a provision that temporary officials must be paid at the rate mentioned in the Act unless we come to Parliament for a higher rate. Miss Fraser has been paid at about that rate.

Department of Indian Affairs—To appoint F.R. Byshe, a packer at $500 per annum, from 1st July, 1890..... $500

Mr. DEWDNEY. I explained this when the other Estimates were up. Mr. Byshe had been performing two duties, messenger and packer, and had been paid in two appropriations for a couple of years—$350 as messenger and $15 per month as

packer. The Auditor General said this was irregular, and I said I would bring down this item in the Supplementary Estimates.

Contingencies—Further amount required for care and cleaning of Departmental buildings, including amount required to pay for firing noon gun, $100, which amount may be paid to a member of the Civil Service, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $7,150

Mr. FOSTER. This is an increase asked for for several years. Chief among the charges is the expense of looking after the new Department—cleaning it and seeing to the rooms and fires. Formerly a good deal of this help was paid out of contingencies of the different Departments, largely out of Public Works and some out of the Marine and Fisheries Department. All that has been placed under one head. The vote is aggregate instead of being paid out of contingencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the vote in 1889-90 was $197,000 and that the hon. gentleman increased it to $209,650, an increase of $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This item simply has to do with the care and cleaning of the departmental buildings. All other contingencies in that $209,000 in 1889 include the contingencies of the different offices, but not the care and cleaning of the departmental buildings. For the care and cleaning of the departmental buildings in 1889-90 we asked $20,300, and for 1890-91 $20,000, and I am now asking for $7,000 more, making $27,000 for the coming year. The previous vote only included the work which was in charge of Mr. Conroy, but outside of that a large sum was paid out of contingencies from the different Departments. Now this has all been drawn together and placed under the charge of Mr. Conroy, who is under the control of the Finance Minister and the Treasury Board.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not observe any deduction in the other contingencies.

Salary of the Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I..... $300

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is that for the whole year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is for the half year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If the Vice-Admiralty Courts are abolished next year, the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island may be put on the pension list and will get as much as if his salary were $600 more than it is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot sufficiently express my regret that the Government do not see fit to deal with this matter in a manly and straightforward way. This is simply to increase the salary of the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island in another way. I have again and again contended for years past that the salary of the Chief Justice of that Island should be increased. His salary now is $4,000. In the Province of Ontario you pay your assistant judges a much larger salary than that, and I do not see why the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island should be paid less than any other official in the Dominion occupying a similar position. If his salary is increased, however, it should be increased on its merits; and the salaries of the assistant judges, who are now paid only $3,000 a year, should also be increased. One of those assistant judges happens to be a very wealthy man. He has occupied his position about forty years, and he does not care very much whether his salary is increased or not; but the other judge does not possess a large fortune. At the Bar he made more than twice the salary he receives now, and he accepted his present position when he was not in the best of health. He is also Vice Chancellor, and is worked from one year's end to the other, and I think that common justice and decency would dictate that he should be put upon the same footing as the judges in other Provinces. I have referred to this so often that I almost apologise to the House for referring to it again.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Finance Minister says "hear, hear," but he does not do justice to the judges in Prince Edward Island. In fact, there seems to be a malignant disposition to keep the salaries of the judges in that Island below those of any others. Why should they be paid less than the judges in Manitoba or British Columbia? The population of the Island is as large as the population of Manitoba, and I think more business is done in the Island, as we have a marine port there. These judges are the equals in education and ability of the judges in any other Province, and I speak with some knowledge of the judges of the other Provinces, because I have had the honor to practise before them. What I object to is singling one judge and increasing his salary in this indirect manner, while the salaries of the other judges are not increased at all. It is unfair and unjust. I take this opportunity of thanking the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) for the kindly expressions he uttered the other night in favor of the House listening to the prayer and recognising the claim of these judges to an increase of salary. I must again raise my protest against the treatment of these judges, and my objection is intensified when I find that one justice is singled out for an increase and the others are left without any.

Mr. HESSON. While I have no reason to complain of what the hon. gentleman has said, I desire to point out that the County Court Judges in the Province of Ontario discharge just as important duties and deserve consideration. The judge in my county who discharges the duties required for a population of 65,000 which I think is more than half the population of Prince Edward Island. I have no doubt that he was able to make $10,000 a year at the Bar. That gentleman receives some $2,200 or $2,300 a year and I think that, if the Government are going to be liberal, they should take up the case of the County Court Judges of Ontario first. I object to any increase being given to the salaries of the Superior Court Judges when the County Court Judges are left out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I quite appreciate the zeal with which the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has pressed the claims of the judges of Prince Edward Island. We have not dealt with the subject of the judges' salaries. We would not, in any case, have dealt with them in the Estimates, but by amendment to the statute regulating their salaries in a comprehensive way. But I cannot allow his remarks to pass unchallenged when he says we are singling out one judge

for the purpose of increasing his salary. It is not for the puppose of increasing the salary of the Chief Justice at all. Every thing the hon. gentleman has said with regard to discrimination between the other Provinces and his Province is pertinent in support of this vote. The Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island holds the position of Vice-Admiralty Judge; the same officer in Nova Scotia receives $600 a year, and the County Judge in St. John, performing the service, receives $600 likewise. If I had omitted to provide for the salary of the Vice-Admiralty Judge of Prince Edward Island, I would have expected the hon. member for Queen's to have insisted that this sum should be put into the Estimates, and to have asked me why it was that in every other Province, including Quebec, where we know a not much larger business is done than in St. John or Halifax, the judge receives $4,000 a year, and he would have asked why the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island should be expected to discharge the duties of that office for nothing; and I should have no answer to make to him. The circumstance that the judge has to discharge somewhat less business, is somewhat pertinent, although not entirely conclusive. If he holds the office and has to discharge all the duties that devolve upon him, he should receive a reasonable remuneration. But when it is a question of only $600, it is not worth while making deductions on that account.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman quite misunderstands me if he thinks I was complaining of the increase to the salary. On the contrary I think the salary of the Chief Justice should be placed at $5,000; but I think it would be better, when you do increase the salary, to increase it fairly. The late Chief Justice filled the position of Vice-Admiralty Judge for 13 years, and I hope that the Minister of Justice will consider the propriety of recognising the services he performed during that period for nothing. The new judge is receiving $600; that is right enough, but why should he be paid $600 extra a year while the assistant judges, who do as much if not more work, remain at $3,000 a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are not Vice-Admiralty Judges.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But they discharge the duties of Chancery Judges which the Chief Justice does not, and they sit as many as 50 or 60 days in a year. What I ask is that when you do attempt to rectify the injustice which has existed there, you should do it fairly as between the three judges and not single out one alone. The hon. member from Perth (Mr. Hesson) always brings up the question of the County Court Judges. What in the world has that to do with this case? When the salaries of the County Court Judges come to be discussed they will be discussed on their merits, all over the Dominion. I say the system of making a broad mark upon the judges of Prince Edward Island, and saying they should be paid a less salary than another judge in the Dominion, is an indefensible one; and knowing as I do the high qualifications and attainments of those judges, I cannot refrain from expressing the opinion I do.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would remind the Minister that the judge performing the business of the Divorce Court of New Brunswick, is obliged to perform a great deal more labor than is performed in the Vice-Admiralty Court of Prince Edward Island, and if the Minister of Justice thinks that the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island should be paid for performing the duties of the Vice-Admiralty Court, I do not see why the same principle should not be applied to the Judge of the Divorce Court, who does not receive one penny beyond his salary as Supreme Court Judge.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to say, with regard to the salary of judges generally, that it appears to be popular with hon. members to criticise unreasonably that branch of the service. I regret that the Government have not dealt with the question in a more comprehensive and satisfactory way. For my part, I think it is the duty the Government owes to the country to see that the gentlemen who, from time to time, fill those important positions, are placed in such a position of independence that they will feel perfectly free from all cares and anxieties, and have nothing to disturb them in discharging their high duties. I think there is no branch of the service that is more entitled to be considered, and it is unfair to the judges themselves who are supposed to be entirely removed from the ordinary struggles of life, that their position should be subjected to the small criticism that takes place from time to time on the floor of Parliament. I hope the Government will have the courage to deal with this matter properly before another Session has gone by.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.55 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 8th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved the adoption of the third report of the Select Committee to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the present Session. He said: The report embodies a recommendation to increase the salaries of the amanuenses of the official reporters of the House, and that they be placed on the same footing as the sessional clerks. At present they receive $12 per week. For last Session they received only $168; for the present Session of sixteen weeks the amount will not exceed $192. Under these circumstances, it is considered just that they should be paid at the rate of $3 per day, instead of $2 per day. I might add that, perhaps, we ought to have gone a little further, and have considered the claims of the translators for an increase of salary. As the Committee has not thought proper to make such a recommendation, I propose the adoption of the report in its present form.

Mr. CURRAN moved:

That the report be not now adopted, but that it be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to amend the same as to give the translators of *Hansard* salaries adequate for the work they have to perform.

He said : From a remark which fell from the chairman of the Committee, I think his sympathy is with the translators, who have also very arduous work to do, and the work has been done this Session in such a way as to avoid the complaints made against the translators in former Sessions. Those gentlemen sent in a memorial to the Committee, in which they asked that their claims be considered. It does not appear from the report that any action whatever was taken on the prayer of the petitioners, and it is not even referred to in the report. It is agreed on all hands, that the translators' work is one of very great difficulty and requires great expedition, and necessitates very many hours' work every day. It is not a mere matter of handwork, but it requires a great deal of skill and intelligence, and as such should be properly paid. I hope the House will take my amendment into its favorable consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that this amendment will not exactly do, because it is simply an indication to the Committee to raise the salaries of the translators. I have no objection to the report being sent back to the Committee to consider the case of the translators, but it can hardly be sent back for the purpose of increasing their salaries.

Mr. IVES. I do not think my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) would have any difficulty in securing a sufficient number of translators at the present salary. I believe they are all Montreal men, and the patronage seems to be confined to Montreal, principally. As nearly as I can find out there has been no scarcity of applications for the position of translators at the present salary, and, as far as I am concerned, I should not be disposed to consent to an increase in the salaries of the translators until it is made to appear that competent men cannot be obtained for the present salary. I am perfectly certain that if the gentlemen who now fill the position are not satisfied, others can be found who would fill it equally as well at the same salaries.

Mr. CHARLTON. This question was fully considered in the Debates Committee, and, after full consideration, the proposal to increase the salaries of the French translators of the *Hansard* was voted down by a very considerable majority.

Mr. AMYOT. Only one.

Mr. CHARLTON. A considerable number of the members of the Committee were absent, and that is a very large percentage of the number. The information before the Debates Committee convinced us that there was no difficulty whatever in securing all the translators we require at the present salary, and that if a position became vacant at the present time, half a dozen at least were ready to take it. Under these circumstances, it was not considered necessary to make a representation to the House, that the salaries of the translators should be increased.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I am very much surprised to see that a proposal is made this year to increase the salaries of the translators. We had a good set of translators some years ago, perhaps the very best we ever had, and there never was a proposal made to increase their salaries then. Three of these gentlemen, the very best of the entire number, were dismissed two years ago——

Mr. CURRAN.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was not for translating; it was for traducing.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Last year the translation was very badly done. It was a perfect disgrace to see the way in which the translation was made, and I stated to the House last year, that I considered the translation of the debates into French a perfect waste of money. I have not yet been able to ascertain, this year, whether the translation is so backwards ; but I may mention a fact which has become public property lately, that the speeches of the leader of the Opposition, which were published in French, lately, by a certain gentleman, had to be re-translated for publication. He found the translation so bad that the hon. gentleman was made to say, by the translators, the very reverse of what he stated in the House. I remember that during a debate in the early part of the Session, a great outcry was raised in the Tory French press of the Province of Quebec, against the leader of the Opposition, which was attributable to the abominable translation made by the translators of the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman was made to say, by these translators, that practically, the French race was to be wiped out of the country, while the hon. gentleman, as every one knows, made no remark which could be even remotely construed into such a meaning. Although those gentlemen who were dismissed two years ago, were dismissed because of their political opinions, which they wrote in the newpapers, and because they had the misfortune to belong to the Opposition——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Who says "no?"

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman demanded their dismissal on that very ground.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). It was on that very ground they were dismissed. They were charged with having written unfavorably on the Secretary of State in the newspapers, and the great complaint against Ernest Tremblay, one of the very best translators we ever had, was that he had published a pamphlet about the Riel matter against the Secretary of State. I read that pamphlet myself. It is not a violent pamphlet. It is, of course, an Opposition pamphlet, but it is written in very moderate and very proper terms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Probably the hon. gentlemen who say "no" have not read the pamphlet ; but I have read it, and I repeat again that there is nothing improper or insulting in it. Mr. Tremblay was dismissed because he wrote in the Opposition press. It was considered a crime for a public employé to write against members on the opposite side of the House, but it is no crime for the translators now to write against members on this side of the House, and most of the present translators are members of the Tory press of the Province of Quebec. I would be glad to see them getting an advantage, but I do not like to see a system adopted whereby, since all the translators who were Liberals have been dismissed, an attempt is made to increase the salaries of the present translators. If this increase of the salary of the

translators is necessary now, it was necessary two years ago when those gentlemen who have been dismissed were in office.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend who proposes this amendment assumes that the Debates Committee did not fully consider this application of the translators. It was not only considered once, but it was considered at two meetings of the Committee, and we went fully into the matter. There were gentlemen present who are fully competent to discuss the question, gentlemen who understood what translating is, and we had present the representative of the translators and also the representative of the official reporters, and examined them. We went very fully into the question, and at each meeting, the overwhelming sentiment of the Committee was against raising the salaries of the translators, because the feeling of the Committee was that the $1,000 they are paid at present was an adequate remuneration for the services they perform. If there had been a full meeting of the Committee, I believe that the proposal to add $200 a year to their salaries would have been snowed under. I was willing to yield that point, but we must remember that the claim made by the translators was for $2,000 a year, because they say they ought be paid the same as the official reporters. It is of course preposterous to suppose that the duties of the translators are in any way so onerous, or call for such skill, or entail such responsibility, or require the same nervous strain as the duties of our official reporters. We have a responsibility in that Committee. There is not a year since I have been a member of this Committee, that applications are not made either to raise the salary of some person, or to recommend the employment of some additional person on the staff. But, Sir, we have a responsibility, and I am bound to say that the Committee are fully conscious of that responsibility, and I think they have done and are determined to do, their duty. The hon. member for Montreal Centre seems to assume that we did not consider this matter. I reply that we fully considered it and discussed it from every standpoint. We had the principal translator there; we estimated the time in which it would be necessary to translate a page of *Hansard*; there were three or four gentlemen there who knew something about the matter; and it is my firm conviction that what actually took place was the sense of the Committee at large; and if the report is referred back at this stage of the Session, I do not think any result favorable to the view of my hon. friend will follow. It will be much better to let his motion stand over for another year, and let this report be adopted. If the report is referred back, I know very well that his view will not be adopted, because I know the sentiment of the Committee. On the other hand, if it should be referred back at this stage of the Session, and a large number of the members of the Committee should be absent, and a catch vote should take place, then I am perfectly certain this House would not respect the recommendation of a very small committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. As a member of the Committee to whom this matter was referred, I may say that some members of the Committee made the statement that the translation which is now costing us $9,000 could be farmed out for $3,000. I think the best solution of the whole difficulty would be to wipe out the whole expenditure of $75,000 which the publication of *Hansard* is now costing, or, at any rate dispense, with the reporting of the proceedings in the Committee of the Whole, which will do away with half the cost and shorten the Session. If the matter is referred back, the same report will have to be made again, for the members of the Committee are fully satisfied that the translators should not receive a larger indemnity than the members of Parliament.

Mr. CURRAN. With regard to the observation of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), that the translators who were dismissed were the most competent men we had on the staff, I can only say, so far as my experience goes, that in certain speeches I remember very often the exact reverse of what was intended to be said was translated into French. Those men were dismissed because they took part in political discussions and wrote political pamphlets. It may be the hon. gentleman's idea that there was nothing offensive in what they said and wrote, but, so far as my memory goes, the mildest expression they used towards the hon. Secretary of State, or any member of the party on this side of the House, was that we were a lot of hangmen. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) states that the translators are all Montreal men, and that their employment is Montreal patronage. I may say that I had nothing to do with recommending any of them to the position; I was not aware until my hon. friend stated it that they were Montreal men; and I do not think that the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Lepine) either had anything to do with the suggestion of their names. I am informed that on the staff there are gentlemen from Montreal, Three Rivers, Sorel and Quebec. I do not know them personally; and it is not at all on account of the place they come from that I have thought it proper to take charge of this matter. Although the motion is in the exact words used by my late colleague, Mr. Coursol, on a former occasion, if the form does not suit, we can change it, so that this matter may be referred back for the further consideration of the Committee. Then, if the Committee in their wisdom think that we should not increase these salaries, I shall have sought to do my duty to those gentlemen who have a very arduous work to perform.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose no one can seriously contend that the translators who were dismissed were not the best members of the staff we have had. It is true, some of the translation was not as good as it might have been, because the work was distributed, and all the pages of the same speech were not done by the same men and were not done equally well. You find that to-day. But we certainly did a poor service to the translation of the debates when we dismissed those three translators. It is true, some of them may have spoken strong words against the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues; but, after all, that is not a serious thing. I know some members of this House, whom I have in my eye, who used as harsh or harsher language, but who have not received as bad treatment from the Government. An hon. member says that the chairman of the Committee, whose report we are now discussing, used equally strong language; if he had been a

translator, he would have been dismissed, but being a member of Parliament he was raised to the position of chairman of the Committee. As I understand, the Committee, having looked into this matter, say there is no reason for an increase, and I see no reason why we should depart from the report of the Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This is not the first Session this question has been before the Committee. The translators have been applying for an increase from year to year, asking to be placed on the same footing as the reporters. The Committee, not only this Session, but in previous Sessions, have fully considered and discussed the matter in all its bearings, and have almost unanimously arrived at the conclusion that the translators are sufficiently paid now. I cannot see what is to be accomplished by the motion of the hon. member from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) being adopted, because, if the Committee have to take this matter into consideration again, I cannot understand how they can come to any other conclusion than that at which they have arrived. They have no desire to increase the expenditure of publishing *Hansard*, which is apt to run up from year to year. I think the Committee have endeavored to be economical in all matters. With regard to the recommendation increasing the pay of the amanuenses, I think that is an increase which this House will justify; but I do not think the Committee will consent to increase the salaries of the translators, and I think it is useless for the hon. member for Montreal Centre to press this motion. If he gets the House to pass an order that the salaries of the translators shall be increased, all right; but there is really no use in sending this report back to the Committee, for the Committee have already determined on that matter, after the fullest and most complete investigation, and they can receive no further information than the information they have now, on which they have based the report.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The price usually paid for translating an ordinary page of blue book is $1 per page. I do not say that is not a very good price. It is, but a page of blue book and a page of *Hansard* are very different things. A page of *Hansard* is one-third more than a page of blue book. When we consider that the *Hansard* today has reached 4,639 columns, and that by the end of the Session it will reach between 5,500 and 6,000 columns, the *Hansard* translators will not be paid more than 25 cents per page as compared with the $1 per page for the translation of the blue books. I am not making a motion to increase their salaries. I am not one of the Committee which has been examining into their petition; but I say that for translators who have to possess the intellectual faculties and the knowledge of the two languages, which the translators of *Hansard* require, to be paid at a rate less than 25 cents per page is not treating their work fairly. I need not add a word to what has been said about the old feud concerning the translators who were dismissed. I never said they were not good translators, but I said they were very good "traducers;" and it was not for translating, but for traducing they were dismissed. They were not dismissed because they had political opinions, but because they gave expression to them in an improper manner, in a manner discreditable to themselves and this House; and I may add that the example made of them has already produced good fruit.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Secretary of State has delivered a most convincing speech. At least it has convinced me; but what it has convinced me of is, not that the salaries of the translators of *Hansard* should be increased, but that the salaries of the translators of the blue books should be reduced. Because we have learned from hon. gentlemen who have examined into the question that they are satisfied, first of all, that the salaries of the *Hansard* translators are adequate; and, secondly, that plenty of translators can be found of the same class at the same price. And yet the hon. the Secretary of State alleges that they only get about one-fifth of the price paid for the translation of the blue books, which, he says, is a work requiring much less skill than the translation of the Debates.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand so. It seems to me, therefore, while not sending this report back to the Committee, the Printing Committee, if it has anything to do with the translation of the blue books, should, when it next meets, have some regard to the speech of the hon. the Secretary of State in this connection. With reference to the other feature of the controversy, the hon. gentleman says these persons were not dismissed because they were bad translators but because they were traducers. But they had great examples of the fact that traducing of this description ought not to lead to such results. One example has been quoted, and I will refer to another. I remember the language used by the late Senator Rolland, when but a simple citizen, language more violent than any I can recollect being used by the translators, and he received his reward for that language, which he used on the *Champ de Mars*, by being elevated to the Senate.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The historical reminiscence of the hon. gentleman is wrong. Senator Rolland presided at that meeting, and he it was who prevented any resolution being adopted by the meeting.

Mr. BLAKE. I speak of his speech which I read.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. His speech was not as represented.

Mr. LAURIER. I was there and heard it.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend was there with his musket.

Mr. AMYOT. I fully concur in the proposition that the part of *Hansard* which relates to the Debates in the House when in Committee of the Whole should be dispensed with. I think that part of the *Hansard* is a great means of extending the Session to undue length. But as far as the translation of what appears in *Hansard* is concerned, some gentlemen do not seem to understand the importance that should be attached to having a proper translation. There is certainly a certain tendency, not only in this House but all over the Dominion, to do away with the French language, and we must protest against it.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. AMYOT. I will quote facts to prove what I say. If the Committee, on a question concerning the French, do not find it advisable to do justice, we must feel it and say it. The *Hansard* is not translated into French in the Senate, and I, for one, say that is a gross injustice. Our constituents have the right to have those debates translated. They have that right, under our constitution, which makes both languages official. I do not see upon what authority any branch of this Legislature can dispense with the French language The idea of doing away with that language has originated in some very noble minds and hearts ! but the fanaticism which animates them is too prompt. The time has not yet arrived when it can be given effect to ; we are still too numerous to endure it. The dream of these people may go like a nightmare, and in any case they will have to wait some generations before it can be realised. At all events, the *Hansard* is not translated into French in the Senate, which is a gross injustice. A great many documents are filed of which we receive the translation only six or seven months afterwards. Those documents are communicated to the English press, which receive and publish them at once, and the French press have to go to the expense of translating them when that translation should be done by Parliament. This is not a laughable question, but a question of right. An hon. gentleman has said that the characteristic feature of a people is its language. Well, our characteristic feature is the French language. We are entitled to it, and I tell hon. Ministers that we will hold them responsible before the people if justice is not done. We do not like to delay proceedings, and we thus discuss Bills which often have not been printed in French, and which we receive in French only after the discussion is finished. We do not complain ; we do not throw any embarrassments in the way ; but we do not want to give in when it is a question of principle. We do not want to give in when the attempt is made to do away with the French language as it is made in the Senate. Next year I intend raising that question in the beginning of the Session. We are entitled to have the *Hansard* of the Senate translated. We have the right to be on an equal footing with our English countrymen. If Confederation has been established on wrong principles let us say so, and we will alter it if we obtain the unanimous consent of the interested parties ; otherwise we must stand by the terms of Confederation. With regard to the *Hansard* translators, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe says we could find any number of translators who would be happy to have the position. That is a method of reasoning which is not worthy of the hon. gentleman. We might find hundreds and thousands of persons ready to take his place ; but when we employ a man, we must do him justice. I think that those translators who are employed, not only during the Session, but who have to stay here a month or a month and a half after prorogation, and cannot have any permanent employment any where else, but have only that to depend upon for the sustaining of their families, should be considered. I think that, under circumstances like this, when the Session lasts over four months, we should take into consideration what is necessary for them to live and to keep up their families. The Committee, on a division of five to four, came to an adverse conclusion. Of course, the feelings of the Committee might have something to do with that. Perhaps they would have arrived at a different conclusion if they had been otherwise advised. Now, it is complained that the French translation costs $9,000 That is immense ! But the whole English *Hansard* costs $66,000. That is natural ! That is the tendency everywhere, and I protest against it. It is not for myself that I protest, but for the people I represent, and for the future of this country. The two races and the two languages are necessary for the welfare of this country, and the rights of each must be respected. For my part, I will not yield one inch when it is a question of our rights, which have been secured by treaties and guaranteed by Imperial charters.

Mr. DAVIN. I would desire to make an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) had a perfect right to oppose the amendment of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), but I think it was out of place and most unfair to the translators of the *Hansard* to treat them as he has thought proper to do. He knows that, last year, owing to the difficulties which arose and the sickness of the chief translator, some delays occurred.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). And this year also.

Mr. DESJARDINS. This year they have done their duty well. They have done their work in such a way as to claim the praise of everyone who has taken the trouble to read their translation, and, if the hon. member was not led astray by his political feelings, or as to the treatment of his own political friends, I think he would have shown a better spirit than he has. I think his remarks were altogether undeserved.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think the insinuation of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), that the members of the Committee were actuated by any national feeling, is altogether unfounded. I repudiate it on my part, and I say emphatically that the members of the Committee had nothing of the kind in view, and that they considered the matter altogether in view of the claim of the translators for increased compensation.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sorry that the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has created so much discussion. Somehow, whenever you discuss anything in regard to the French, it creates a row. It reminds me of a statement made to me by one of the translators, when this question was before the House on a previous occasion, that the only increase the translators had was that they had some more pages to translate. I believe, if the matter was referred back to the Committee and properly weighed, the result might be different. I think last year the Committee proposed to increase the salaries of the translators by $200, which shows that the question might be again considered. However, I rose simply to answer a statement of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Langelier). It is the second or third time that insinuations of that kind have been made, no doubt from perfectly good motives, by my hon. friend for Quebec East, and, some time ago, by my hon. friend for North

Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). To-day the hon. member for Quebec East says that certain Ministers and certain supporters of the Government could not be very proud of some speeches made by them in 1885 and 1886, and that some of the members of Parliament who are sitting here to-day are in the same position. I do not know whether the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Langelier) looked at me in that connection. He looked in this direction, but I could not tell at whom he was looking, as there are two or three of those miserable men of 1885 and 1886 sitting in this neighborhood. I wish it to be understood plainly, and I leave it to my hon. friend himself, with whom I was travelling during those bad times, when I had the honor to go into forty-two counties in the Province of Quebec, that I do not deny that I did everything, politically speaking and in every other proper way, to hurt the Government, because of their policy in regard to the North-West; but I will leave it to the hon. gentleman to say if I uttered one word which could prevent a Minister of the Crown from meeting me, shaking hands with me, and even asking me to his house. This insinuation has been thrown out very often. Some gentlemen may have been heard to say so, but I came to this House to occupy a seat here independent of everybody as to what I should do afterwards, and leaving it to my constituents to decide whether or not they had confidence in me after that.

Mr. ELLIS. I have no political feeling in regard to this matter, and had none in the Committee. I am not very well acquainted with the political feeling in Quebec. The Committee simply looked at the amount of time taken by the translators to do the work and the amount they received. The Secretary of State has said that he pays $1 a page for other translation, and that he considers that good pay. Well, if you count the number of words in an ordinary blue book, say the Report of the Minister of Agriculture, and the number of words on a page of *Hansard*, you will find that you obtain, at least, $2.50 a page at the present rate of translating the *Hansard*. The Secretary of State will not deny that. The *Hansard*, when it is completed this year, will, according to the calculation of the Secretary of State, make about 5,550 columns. Well, we will pay $9,000 for translating somewhat less than 3,000 pages. Now, I think the Secretary of State must admit that this is paying $3 a page for translating the *Hansard*, and that it is a pretty fair price, and the Committee viewed it from that point of view alone. I may say for myself that I am in favor of abolishing the *Hansard*. I have observed since I came to this House and became a member of the Committee, that the cost of *Hansard* rises like the tide in the Bay of Fundy, and it does not fall off at all. It is constantly increasing, and I do not believe it is worth what it costs the country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In looking at the French translation I find that it is only completed up to the 27th March last, therefore it is hardly of any use to those of us who wish to send off the speeches that we made five or six weeks, or two months ago. Like my hon. friend who just spoke, I think we had better abolish the *Hansard*, or at least make it less expensive.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to make one observation in relation to this matter. I think the debate has travelled entirely beyond the question before the House, and I think we should come down to our *moutons* now, as they say. What strikes me about this is that a respectable Committee of this House, whose particular duty it is to deal with this question, and which have, as it is admitted on all sides, dealt with the question after the most mature consideration, have come to a conclusion, and I, for one, am prepared to support the conclusion of the Committee, unless I hear some reasons to induce me to alter that decision, and I certainly have heard none since. I think it is wasting the time of this House to raise a discussion on the question of the French language. The question of the French language is not up now; it is too important a question to be dealt with as a mere side issue on a matter of how much the translators should be paid. Therefore, I shall support the recommendation of the Committee.

Mr. POPE. In order to settle this question of the languages, I would suggest, that for the future every member should pay for the printing of his own speech. I think, that would save a good deal of expense to the *Hansard*.

Amendment negatived, and main motion agreed to.

THE HARBOR OF PICTOU.

Mr. COLBY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) to amend the Acts respecting the Harbor of Pictou. He said: The object of this Bill is to lighten the charges on ships entering that harbor, and it is done at the request of the Harbor Commissioners themselves. Their proposition is, that the Act shall be so amended that in the future, vessels entering that harbor shall pay dues three times a year instead of each trip, as heretofore. As this proposition comes from the Harbor Commissioners, I suppose it will be very acceptable to the commercial public.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PIERS AT NICOLET.

Mr. BOISVERT (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have received petitions from several parishes of the county of Nicolet, asking that works may be carried out in the River St. Lawrence with a view to prevent the overflow of the water in the spring? If so, what do the Government purpose doing in the matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In reply to the hon. member, I will say that petitions dated the 6th of March last have been sent by the residents of Nicolet, and that petitions dated the 18th of March last have been sent by the residents of Bécancour. Those petitions were transmitted by the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Boisvert) himself. The mayor and residents of St. Grégoire, the residents of the municipality of St. Jean Baptiste of Nicolet, have also sent petitions dated the 3rd of March last, asking for the construction of wharves and piers at Cap à la Roche, with a view to prevent the overflow of the water in the spring. The chief engineer of the Department has reported that a survey was necessary to decide about the usefulness of those works. According to his idea those works will cost at least $2,000,000.

SUBMITTING LOANS TO A POPULAR VOTE.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose a measure to the effect that no more loans be negotiated on behalf of the Dominion of Canada without submitting them to the test of the popular approval ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions :—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a branch line to be constructed from Glenboro' westerly, a distance of about sixty miles, to a point on the proposed branch railway of the said company running from Brandon southwesterly.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a branch line of railway from a point at or near Brandon, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, south-westerly to or near Township three, Range twenty-seven, west of the First Principal Meridian, and thence westerly, a total distance of one hundred miles; and also a similar grant at the same rate per mile, for the said company's proposed branch railway from a point on the line just described at or near Township three, Range twenty-seven, west of the First Principal Meridian, easterly to Deloraine, a distance of about twenty-five miles, making the total length of railway to which this grant is applicable one hundred and twenty-five miles.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not less than six thousand four hundred acres per mile for the line of railway from a point in Township one, in either Range twenty-three or twenty-four, west of the First Principal Meridian, to Deloraine, a distance of about seventeen miles.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Lac Seul Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a line of railway from a point at or near Shelley Station, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to a point at or near White Mud Lake on the Winnipeg Railway, a distance of about eighteen miles.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary to a point at or near Edmonton on the North Saskatchewan River, a distance of about two hundred and ten miles; and also a grant of six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary to a point on the International boundary between Canada and the United States, a distance of about one hundred and twenty miles.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding three thousand eight hundred and forty acres for each mile of the company's railway from Lethbridge to the Crow's Nest Pass, a distance of about one hundred miles.

7. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that the said grants be made in aid of the construction of the said railways respectively, in the proportion and upon the conditions fixed by the Orders in Council made in respect thereof, and that, except as to such conditions, the said grants shall be free grants, subject only to the payment of the grantees respectively, of the cost of survey of the lands and incidental expenses, at the rate of ten cents per acre in cash on the issue of the patents therefor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is adopted I would request the hon. Minister of the Interior to be prepared, when he goes into Committee on these resolutions, to lay on the Table of the House statements of the total amount of lands that we have granted to the other railway subsidies in this way. That, I presume, he has, or can easily obtain.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, I have that in my desk.

Motion agreed to.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the sum of ten thousand dollars per annum be appropriated for the expenses in connection with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Motion agreed to.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the Bill is read the third time, I wish to propose an amendment. Yesterday I moved in Committee that a clause be inserted requiring banks to keep their various branches open until three o'clock on Saturday afternoon. I do not intend to take up the time of the House by going over the reasons which I then urged in favor of this amendment. I now move that the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to insert the following clause :—

That all branches of the various banks chartered under this Act be kept open for business on Saturday until three o'clock in the afternoon, save and except when a statutory holiday falls upon Saturday.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Before this Bill is read the third time, I desire to call the attention of the House and the Government to a section which, I think, is very objectionable and which has not so far received due consideration from this House. I regret I was not in my seat when this section was discussed. But, if I am correct, certain points of the section have not received due consideration. I refer to section 54. This section says :

" The payment of the notes issued or re-issued by the bank and intended for circulation, and then in circulation, together with any interest paid or payable thereon as hereinafter provided, shall be the first charge upon the assets of the bank in case of its insolvency ;"—

I do not object to that part of the section ; but it goes on and creates a privilege with respect to payments due to the Government, in these terms : —" and the payment of any amount due to the Government of Canada, in trust or otherwise, shall be the second charge upon such assets ; and the payment of any amount due to the Government of any of the Provinces, in trust or otherwise, shall be the third charge upon such assets.

I know this section has been fully discussed as to the advisability of creating such privilege, and my intention is not to deal with that part of the question, but to raise the question as to its constitutionality. I believe this section is *ultra vires* of this House and this Parliament. It is of no great consequence so far as the majority of the Provinces are concerned, because, I think it is conceded that this privilege existed before in all the Provinces, except the Province of Quebec. However, I believe that if it does not affect the other Provinces, and if this Parliament has no jurisdiction over this question, at all events, so far as regards the Province of Quebec, it should be left

alone. I understand this section is framed for the purpose of convenience. As to the question of advisability, I entirely agree in the opinions expressed by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) who proposed an amendment to strike out that privilege. I do not see any reason or justice in placing the Government of Canada in a more advantageous position than the ordinary creditors of the bank. There is a further reason why this privilege is not advisable. Parliament provides ample legal machinery to give the Government control over the banks. It provides for a very severe system of inspection of audit and of return, and I think the Government are in a better position to guard the public moneys than are individual creditors of the bank, because the Government receive the bank returns monthly, and while it is true that these returns are published in the *Official Gazette*, I believe no one will contend that the Government are not in a better position than are individuals in regard to knowing the condition of the banks. But the point I wish especially to raise is that of constitutionality. I cannot see any other provisions by which this legislation could be claimed by Parliament than that the words contained in section 91 of the British North America Act: "banking, incorporation of banks and issue of paper money;" and a little further on: "bankruptcy and insolvency." I quite understand that everything which is necessary for the efficient organisation of the banks, and for the efficient working of our banking system, is within the power of the Dominion Parliament; but I question whether it is a necessary element of our banking system that this privilege should be given to the Government. It is doubtful whether this privilege exists in other Provinces, although I understand by the decisions given in two cases that it is generally conceded that this privilege does exist in Provinces other than the Province of Quebec; but in the Province of Quebec this privilege has never existed, and the law on the point is very clearly laid down in our Civil Code. Two articles deal with this subject, and it is not necessary that I should trouble the House by reading them, but they are very well known in that Province. Moreover, the question has been tested, and it was tested in the case mentioned in the discussion before the Committee, the Exchange Bank of Canada and the Queen. The case is reported at page 12 and at pages 130 and following of the *Legal News*, volume 9. The facts are quite simple: In September, 1883, the Exchange Bank of Canada was put into liquidation under the provisions of the Act 45 Victoria, chapter 23. Liquidators were appointed. On the 15th of March following the Attorney General for the Province of Quebec filed a claim against the estate of the bank for $75,000, being the amount of a deposit made with the bank in September, 1883, payable with interest at the rate of 5 per cent., and demanded that the amount due in principal and interest be paid by privilege out of the assets of the bank. Two creditors, Mr. Massue, a creditor for $20,000, and the Merchants' Bank, a creditor for $3,050, contested that claim. On the 10th of March, 1884, the Government of Canada filed a claim for $237,840. The question was raised in this House the other day as to the difference between deposits and money loaned to the bank. The question arose in this case. This claim of $237,840 was composed of $200,000 for two loans of $100,000 each and $37,840 for an ordinary deposit. The Government of Canada also demanded that this last claim, in principal and interest, be paid by privilege, in preference over the other creditors, out of the assets of the bank. Mr. Massue and the Merchants' Bank contested that claim also. The judgment of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec dismissed the claims of both Governments for privilege. The Governments appealed from that decision to the Court of Queen's Bench, which reversed the decision of the Superior Court, one judge, the Chief Justice, dissenting. The case was then brought before the Privy Council, which, by a unanimous decision, reversed the decision of the Court of Appeal, and confirmed the decision of the Superior Court. It had always been admitted in the Province of Quebec that no such privilege existed; but the question was raised in regard to an article of the Code of Civil Procedure, which created some doubts. The holding of the Privy Council is as follows:—

"Held, that Article 611 of the Code of Civil Procedure should be modified so as to give full effect to Article 1994 of the Civil Code, and that the intention of the Legislature in these articles was to enact to the following effect: That, subject to the special privileges provided for in the Codes and Statutes, the Crown has such preference over chirographic creditors as is provided in Article 1994 of the Civil Code; and that the expression 'persons accountable for its moneys,' in the latter article, is not applicable to a bank receiving money of the Crown on deposit or current account."

The only privilege granted by Article 1994 of the Civil Code is contained in paragraph 10 of that Article:

"The claims of the Crown against persons accountable for its moneys."

The Privy Council decided that the bank were not persons accountable to the Crown for its moneys. Their decision went further: Lord Hobhouse, in giving the judgment of the Court, said:

"Their Lordships are also clear that the law relating to property in the Province of Quebec or in Lower Canada, from 1774 to 1867, when the codes came into force, must be taken to be the "Coutume de Paris," except in such special cases as may be shown to fall under some other law. Probably such was the true effect of the statute 14 Geo. III, cap. 83, but at all events there has been an uniform current of decision to that effect in the colony, dating back forty years or so before the date of the codes, which ought not now to be questioned."

It is very plain that this is our law in the Province of Quebec. It is very plain also that, in the opinion of the Lords of the Privy Council, this question is one relating to property; and if it is, it certainly comes under section 92 of the British North America Act, enumerating the exclusive powers of the Provincial Legislatures. Paragraph 13 of that section says:

"Property and civil rights in the Province."

I can quite understand that the Government should assume this privilege if it were really necessary to the proper working of our banking system; but I cannot see that the existence of that privilege is a necessity of this Banking Act. The only ground on which this privilege can be created is that it is necessary to legislation on banks and banking; but surely, if we have a right, on the ground of convenience, to assume jurisdiction over this matter, which is exclusively within the power of the Local Legislature, we could, on the same ground, assume jurisdiction over every matter

which the British North America Act stipulates to be within the exclusive power of the Local Legislature. For the Federal Government to assume this privilege might not create any new privilege in any other Province; but, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, it is an encroachment on our Civil Code, and a law which was in existence before the Confederation, and which has been conceded to us by the British North America Act; and I feel that it is a duty on the part of all the members of this House, more especially the members from the Province of Quebec, to defend our rights and privileges in this matter. If we allow this encroachment to-day, anything of the kind can be repeated at another time. I especially call the attention of the hon. Ministers who belong to the Province of Quebec—the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Secretary of State, the hon. Minister of Militia, and the hon. President of the Council—to the fact, that this House is undertaking to deal with a matter which properly comes within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. I do not wish to deal at length with this question, but I thought it my duty to call the attention of the House, and more especially of the hon. gentlemen who take an interest in the matter, to it. I believe, Sir, that if ever a constitutional objection could be raised to a Bill, it is on this occasion; and in accordance with these views, I beg to propose the following amendment to the third reading of the Bill:—

That this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the whole House, with instructions to amend section 54 of the said Bill, by striking out all the words after the word "insolvency" in the said section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will call attention in the first place to the fact that the hon. gentleman's amendment proposes to leave entirely out of the Bill the provisions respecting the rights of the Crown; the priority of the Government in Canada, and the priority of the Governments of the Provinces, and to leave these questions to be settled by litigation in the way they have been dealt with heretofore. Having said that much, I will refer to the hon. gentleman's argument upon the other points, namely, that we are proposing an unconstitutional provision, and one dealing with property and civil rights. The subject which the hon. gentleman refers to did not escape the attention of the Committee of the whole House or of the Government, and it was discussed in committee, although I admit we had not the advantage of having it so fully considered as the hon. gentleman has enabled us to consider it this afternoon. Without undertaking to make an elaborate argument on the question—and I hope the hon. gentleman will not suppose that I do not do so because of any want of respect for his arguments, as he has given so much study to the question—I merely wish to state, briefly, my views, for the purpose of showing that the matter has not escaped the attention of the Government who prepared the Bill, or the Committee who passed it. I think the hon. gentleman has much overdrawn the effect of the decision he has quoted. It is quite true that it recognised the right of the Provincial Government to certain priority upon the assets of an insolvent bank, but the hon. gentleman seemed to think it led to the conclusion that legislation with respect to that priority would be *ultra vires* of this Parliament. I submit to him that such is not the conclusion to be drawn from that decision. In the first place, although the decision relates only to a claim of priority on the part of the Crown, in relation to a bank in the Province of Quebec, the question really stands in the same position in all of the Provinces, and a recent decision of the Supreme Court of Canada has recognised that right of the Crown, in respect to the Province of New Brunswick. With regard to the foundation of our right so to legislate, I submit to the House, that we have a right to do it in pursuance of our power in relation to banks and banking. Inasmuch as we have the right to constitute the banks, and inasmuch as we only have that right, we have surely the right to control the banks as to all the business they may pursue, and all the liabilities which they shall incur, and we have the right to say what liabilities shall be imposed on the shareholders who engage in the business of banking from time to time, and how their various creditors shall stand as regards priority. Besides that, it seems to me to come directly under the powers of this Parliament, in relation to bankruptcy and insolvency. We have the right to say what class of creditors, as regards citizens generally, shall have priority upon the assets of insolvent citizens, and we surely have the right to say, in respect to banks above all others, they being the creations of this Parliament, what right their creditors shall have in regard to the assets of the bank. We thought it better to state the priority distinctly on the face of the Act, rather than to leave it to be inferred from the Code in Quebec, or from the common law in the other Provinces, what the law is upon that subject, so as to give fair notice to everybody who takes the pains to examine the Banking law, as set out in this statute. The transactions with banks are by no means so large on behalf of the Provincial Governments, as they are on behalf of the Government of Canada. In some of the Provinces the bank account consists principally of debits for the greater part of the year, but in some, I dare say, sums to their credit in respect to which they may require to be made effective from time to time. However, in the collection of revenue in all parts of the country, the banks stand in a different relation to the Federal Government from that which they hold in relation to the Provincial Governments. We are under far greater necessity to use the banks. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken with regard to the superior means which the Federal Government has of judging of the solvency or standing of a bank. The hon. gentleman has referred to the audit provisions by which we might be enabled to make inspections and to ascertain, from time to time, what the condition of the bank is, but all these provisions have been eliminated from the Bill. Even the provisions with regard to the audit by persons appointed by the shareholders have been dropped, and there is no provision in this Bill which was not in the old law with regard to anything of that kind. The returns which are furnished to the Minister of Finance afford the same information to the Provincial Governments, to all the creditors of the bank and to all the shareholders, as they do to the Federal Government. In point of fact, nothing of the transactions of a bank is open to the Finance Minister which is not open to every citizen of the country, if he takes care to

examine the returns which are published in the *Canada Gazette* from time to time. These are the grounds upon which I venture to think, notwithstanding the very careful argument presented by the hon. gentleman, that this is not a matter affecting civil rights, but that it is a question affecting banks and banking, and bankruptcy and insolvency, and therefore within the powers of this Parliament.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—I. C. R. BRANCH LINES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you leave the Chair, I desire for a few moments to invite the attention of the House to a matter which arises in consequence of some views expressed here by some hon. members of the House within the last two weeks. When discussing matters concerning the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) proposed, as a way to deal with the various branch railways connected with the Intercolonial Railway, that they should be consolidated with the Intercolonial Railway, and should form one line. In the course of that discussion, it was stated by the hon. gentleman that there were some sixteen or seventeen branch railways in that position, operated under separate managements, but connecting with the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway. It came out in the course of that discussion that a few weeks before the general election of 1887, certain encouragement was held out to the people of the Maritime Provinces by Sir Charles Tupper, then a member of the Government, that such a proposition would be favorably entertained by the Government. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was endorsed in this statement by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), and thus it would appear that there is a movement on foot at the present time to induce the Government to adopt the policy in question, to take over these numerous branch railways and make them part of the general railway system of Canada. It is only fair to say that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in making that proposition, only urged that these roads should be taken over at their fair value. It may be a question, however, whether some of these roads have any value at all. I did not understand him to make an exception, but he proposed that the consolidation of these branches should take place at the expense of the country. If the Government is to undertake any such policy, I think it is material that the House and the country should know in advance the nature of some of these enterprises, in order to see whether it is in the public interest that such a policy should be adopted. I, therefore, venture to call attention to one of these railways, which is known as the Caraquet Railway. This railway, as the House knows, commences at Bathurst on the Baie des Chaleurs, and extends 67½ miles in an easterly direction on the south side of that bay, running through the whole distance in close proximity to the water, and terminating on the east at Shippegan Harbor. I find that, in 1883, a proposition was made to the Dominion Parliament to grant aid to that road.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

On that occasion, the proposal was brought into the House by Sir Charles Tupper, who did not give to the House any information in regard to the prospects of the road or the financial basis of the company, but stated that the then member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), who now also represents that constituency, would afford the House such information as would enable it to decide on the proposition to give aid to the road. Accordingly, on the 17th May, 1883, in response to the invitation of the Minister of Railways, the hon. member gave to the House his views as to the arguments in favor of granting aid to that road, and his utterances are of record on page 1266, of the *Hansard* of 1883. After quoting from Sandford Fleming, the hon. gentleman goes on to state his own views as matters of inducement for the vote the House was asked to grant. He says:

"Therefore, I say that on that ground alone——"

That is, the ground of short distance—

—"the promoters of this scheme would be warranted in asking this House to aid a railway which, in the future, at all events, will be of incalculable benefit to this Dominion at large. But, Sir, the scheme is not put forward on that ground alone; it is put forward, perhaps with even greater force, on other grounds, and this is the immense trade the road would develop, and would tend to build up, not only in that particular locality, but over the Dominion as a whole. By the construction of that road, an enormous trade would be given to the Intercolonial Railway; as a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, it is not second in importance to any other road."

I commend this statement to the attention of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). Here it is stated that the trade of the proposed Caraquet Railway is not exceeded by that of any other branch line which we are asked to purchase. It is interesting to know that this is a sample of the sixteen or seventeen roads we are asked to purchase. He goes on to say:

"And, because it is a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, I assume that my hon. friend opposite can have no objection to it. As I understand him, he is in favor of any road that will feed the Intercolonial Railway. To give an idea of the amount of trade done along that road, and of the population interested in it, I may inform the House that, between the point where it is proposed to connect with the Intercolonial Railway and the terminus of Caraquet or Shippegan, a distance of 45 miles, there is a population of 18,000 souls. The whole country, from end to end of the proposed road, is settled. The value of the products of that section of the country during the past year amounted to some $1,000,000, made up as follows: Lumber, $300,000; fish, comprising canned goods, codfish, salmon, herring, mackerel and oysters, $500,000; grindstones, $50,000; farm produce, $150,000. There are a number of other industries which would contribute to give the road a large trade, and all of which would find its way to the Intercolonial Railway. To the West this road will be a great benefit, inasmuch as it will afford the people an opportunity, which is now denied them, of getting their fish in a fresh condition, and they will have a larger market for their products, as well as the East a larger market for theirs."

Now, that was the picture that was held up to the House in order to induce the House to grant subsidies to the proposed scheme, and the House, doubtless moved by consideration for these arguments, did grant the proposed subsidy—first, a subsidy of $115,000, then a short time after it was increased, and to make a long story short, I find that the various grants made by this Parliament to this road amount, in all, to $224,000. In addition to that, the road obtained aid from the New Brunswick Government to the amount of $180,000, or in all, $404,000. I may further say that the line was subsequently extended, to be in all, 67½ miles in length. Well, with the endorsement of

this Government, the construction of the road was undertaken; but the aid of this Government and of the New Brunswick Government not having been sufficient for the construction of the road, it became necessary to appeal to the English capitalists, and accordingly two prospectuses were issued to the British investor, one through a firm of brokers named Mee & Billings, and other through the Imperial Bank of London, England. The prospectus in regard to the enterprise, I presume, duly set forth the substance of the remarks of my hon. friend the member for Gloucester; I have not the prospectus by me, but from what I have read from the English journals, I presume it told a flattering tale. The first prospectus intimated to the public that the gross earnings of this road would amount to about £660 per mile, or, in rough figures, $3,200; the next prospectus, the one issued through the Imperial Bank of London, estimated that the net earnings of the road would be not less than £200 sterling per mile, which implies a gross earning power of about £600 or $3,000 per mile. The second prospectus was issued in the month of June, 1886, and it contained the following statement made by the president of the road, the member for Gloucester:

"The receipts from both passengers and freight had exceeded the company's most sanguine expectations and since regular and daily trains have commenced running, the carrying capacity of the line has been taxed to the utmost."

At this period a portion of the road had been constructed and was under operation; I am not aware that the whole line was finished at that date, but I find from the communication of the president of the road that, at all events, the full line of 67½ miles was completed in the month of May, 1888, and I will assume, for argument's sake, it was not fully completed at the time of the issue of this prospectus; but you observe that it was running, and that the carrying capacity was being taxed to its utmost, and that the results had exceeded the most sanguine expectations of the promoters. That was the paragraph on which the second issue of bonds was made. Well, it is interesting to know that that statement may have been literally correct, because the carrying capacity of the road appears to have consisted of two passenger cars, two box cars, twelve flat cars and two locomotives; so I do not think we can quarrel with the statement at that particular point. I may say that the earnings which had exceeded the most sanguine expectations of the promoters, amounted, for the year ending June, 1886—that is the month in which that prospectus was issued—to $11,359.72; the operating expenses for the period amounted to $11.181.20, leaving a net surplus of $178.52. That was the financial result of the operation of this enterprise which was on that occasion presented to the public of Great Britain as most attractive, and likely to be most attractive. There were at this time 40 miles of the road in running order, and the figures which I have giving indicate that the gross earnings of the road at this particular time amounted to $283 per mile as against what was intimated in the prospectus as the gross earnings. Thus the prospectus on which the capitalists were further invited to put in their money, indicated that the gross earnings were $3,000 per mile, the fact being that they had only up to that moment realised $283 per mile, something less than a tenth of what the prospectus held out. The gross earnings for the following year amounted to $12,635.04, operating expenses $12,002,53, leaving a surplus of $632.51. Then for the year ending June, 1888, the gross earnings were $11,631.94, and the expenses were $11,311.94, leaving a surplus of $320. In May, 1888, the road was fully completed. It may be said with regard to these other figures that they were not complete, but as regards the last statement, issued about the close of the fiscal year ending June, 1889, no such observation can correctly be made, because the road had then been in operation from end to end. The gross receipts of the whole road of 67½ miles for the last fiscal year, amounted to $18,210.67, while the working expenses for the same period amounted to $27,409.23; in other words, the road was operated at a loss, during that period, of $9,198.56. In other words, if that statement is correct, and it was the statement made by the Government on the floor of the House, this year, in answer to a question put by myself to the Government, then in such case the road is of no value, it is of no commercial value, it is a loss to any person or company that is obliged to operate it. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another feature in this case. The bondholders, having discoverd that they were likely to lose, held a meeting in London, England, and the result of that meeting appears in the *Canadian Gazette* of the 11th April, 1889. Mr. Mee, one of the firm of brokers which floated the first loan, is reported as having explained to the indignant bondholders how he came to broach such a rotten scheme upon the London markets. He said:

"In regard to the statements made in the prospectus, I may say that they were based for the most part on official reports made to the Canadian Government at the time when the subsidies were granted to the company by the Dominion and New Brunswick Governments."

Now, if those statements made to the Government, on which this Government induced Parliament to vote this money, had been laid before this House in proper time to be examined and investigated, perhaps this matter might have been intercepted. But what happened here is happening to-day; that the proposal to grant subsidies was submitted within a few days of prorogation, just, as I suppose some more subsidies are going to be submitted, and the result again will be that the House would have no opportunity to investigate the statements. It is true that the same remark cannot be made in respect to the Government, because it was the duty of the Government before, having decided on the policy of recommending the House to grant this aid, to ascertain whether the statements made were likely to be sustained or not. But this course does not appear to have been adopted. The Government appeared to have endorsed those statements, and on those statements, which now turn out to be wholly false, the House was induced to grant aid, and the action of the House in granting aid was used as an argument to induce the public to follow suit, and not only was public money so lost but the credit of the country was also impaired. The *Canadian Gazette*, commenting upon this meeting, said:

"The recent meeting of the Caraquet bondholders discloses a state of things which assuredly reflects disgrace on the president and directors of the company, and upon all connected with the issue of the prospectus.

"We had surely a right to assume that, in making a free gift of nearly £80,000 towards the construction of the line, the Dominion and New Brunswick Governments were satisfied of its importance and would see that the money was properly and judiciously expended."

I call the attention of the House to the fact that when this Government guarantees aid to such enterprises, it has not only to consider, in my judgment, the question of voting away so much of the public money, but the effect of the endorsement by this Government of such a scheme when it is called upon to require further financial assistance. In this case the Government, by its unwise action, has become instrumental in inducing investors to embark in this enterprise, whose capital is now absolutely lost. A year rolled by and the bondholders again had a meeting, and in the *Railway News* of March 29, 1890, there is a further report as to the state of the company. In the published report of the proceedings of the bondholders it was disclosed there was a movement on foot to induce the Canadian Government to buy the road, and remedy, as far as they could, the wrong they had been instrumental in doing, through their negligence or recklessness, to English investors. Let me read some extracts from the proceedings. The meeting was held on March 25, 1890, at the offices of the English Association of American Bond and Shareholders (Limited), in London, Mr. Joseph Price occupying the chair. After referring to the financial position of the company, the chairman said :

"It was suggested that negotiations had been going on with the Canadian Government, and might be carried to a successful termination, to obtain something for the railway. The members of the committee thereupon suggested that they should see Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for the Dominion, and ascertain his views."

I should say, that prior to this meeting, a committee of bondholders had been looking into the matter, according to a previous portion of the report with which I will not trouble the House, and it was in reference to the doings of that committee the chairman spoke. The members of the committee saw Sir Charles Tupper and obtained his views. The report continues :

"When he went down to Westminster he was astonished to find that the petition had been sent out from this country, and it was more astonishing to him because the parties knew that there was a committee in existence. He was more greatly surprised to find that the president had been in this country and the committee did not know of it, and that he had attended a meeting at Sir Charles Tupper's with regard to the negotiations. Sir Charles Tupper told him that the negotiations had been going on, but it would not be prudent to state what he said. Well, he went so far as to say that he had cabled out for the Government not to act on the first petition until Mr. Burns had arrived out. He called yesterday morning and found that Sir Charles Tupper was away on the continent, but his secretaries telegraphed up to him to say they had not received any answer, and the position was that there was a petition over there, and that subsequent representations would be made on Mr. Burns' arrival, and no doubt he was there now. Of course, it would be far more satisfactory if they could come to some arrangement with the Canadian Government rather than resort to law proceedings; but the question was, what would the Canadian Government do? Of course, they were all aware that a great number of representations were made in the prospectus with regard to assurances from the Government engineer with reference to this line receiving certain support and that it would, perhaps, be made a part of the true line of communication from England to Canada. He did not know what was the form of the petition. He had written to Messrs. Mee & Billings to ask, but they had treated that like they had done a great many of other communications. Their answer was that the committee had not taken them into their confidence, and they did not know why they should act in a different way to what they had done."

Further on, it appears a letter was sent to Messrs. Mee & Billings, and the chairman read their reply, from which I read an extract :

"March 24.

"GENTLEMEN,—You are no doubt aware that a meeting of the bondholders of the Caraquet Railway is to be held here to-morrow. From an interview with Sir Charles Tupper, at the beginning of this month, I learn that you and the trustees and the president had been to see the High Commissioner with reference to a petition to the Canadian Government."

I have substituted the word president for the gentleman named—

"It was surprising that, knowing, as you do, the existence of a company representing the bondholders, you did not inform them of the steps which would be taken."

Further on there is another statement :

"Certain negotiations are proceeding with the Canadian Government, but we have not the permission of any of the parties moving in the matter to make the same public, and, indeed, during the progress of the negotiations referred to, which it is hoped will be carried through satisfactorily, and which are of a character likely to benefit the bondholders, it is considered very undesirable that there should be any comment thereon."

Further on, Col. Sparks said :

"So far as he knew, the trustees and English directors had asked the Government to take up the whole organisation, take over the railway, and so on."

Mr. Brown, the manager of the Imperial Bank of London, wrote upon the subject, his bank having been censured by the bondholders for having floated a portion of the loan. He said :

"He hopes that you may be able to make some favorable arrangement with the Dominion Government, and so on."

It turns out that we have a movement disclosed to induce the Government to unite these branch lines, among others the Caraquet Railway, and have them taken over and operated by the country. We have evidence in what I have read that the bondholders of this company feel they have a claim on the Government in this particular case, to pay the bonds that have been issued, relying upon the action of the Government. We have also the anti-election utterance of Sir Charles Tupper in 1887, to the same effect. All these facts, I think, justify the public in coming to the conclusion that such a movement is on foot, unless it is anticipated, and that it will materialise at an early day ; in other words, at about the time of the next general election. It is unfortunate the fact was not known before the vote was granted, that the president was the owner of a large portion of the road, in fact was the principal owner. It may have been an accidental omission on his part. The position of matters now is : The Government has lost all the money it put into that railway, the bondholders have lost all their money, the credit of the country is injured, the road is not worth running, it takes an average of $10,000 a year to run it over and above the earnings, and now an attempt is made to unload that burthen upon this country. If this country is to work that road, I venture to say that the yearly loss will far exceed $10,000. Probably that $10,000 a year loss is the result of the most economical management and how it will be if it is run under the management of the Government, we can well understand. The Intercolonial Railway is an annual burthen to us of over half a million dollars ;

and in the name of those whom I have the privilege of representing on the floor of this House, I protest against any further addition to the burthens of our people, by the purchase of bankrupt and rotten railways, which are of no advantage to the country, which might as well not have been built, for all the use they are, and which now the country is asked to pay for. Why, Sir, look at that line of railway. Had the Government shown proper foresight; had they laid before themselves the map of the country, they would never have asked the House to consent to a subsidy for building this line. The inducements offered to Parliament were, that it was to be a part of the through line, sending the wealth of the East to the West, and carrying the products of the West to the East; and an enormous trade was to be built up; a trade which, in 1886, was said to have exceeded the most sanguine expectations of the promoters, but which realised only one-twelfth part of that what was represented to be the case. That is the enterprise which the members for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and Albert (Mr. Weldon) ask us to take over at its value. Its value would be, that the Government should receive half a million dollars for working it, the interest of which might be sufficient to enable the Government to make up the annual deficit. If there is any other proposition than that on which this railway is to be taken over by the Government, it will have to be viewed with the utmost care, and, therefore, I raise my warning voice on this matter.

THE CARAQUET RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE. I take the opportunity of speaking on this matter now, as I think it only right that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) should hear what I have to say, before he addresses the House in response to the remarks of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). I regard this case as a typical case, illustrative of the policy of the Government in many aspects, and as an important case historically, for the purpose for which history is mainly useful to us, namely, as teaching us what to do and what to avoid. It is important with reference to those lessons for us, to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, and as proving the care which ought to be taken, and which has not been taken, with reference to the character of the enterprises which are aided by the Government. It is important with regard to the care which ought to be taken, and which has not been taken, in reference to the construction of subsidised roads; the care which ought to have been taken, and which has not been taken, with reference to the solvency and the *bonâ fide* character of these enterprises; the care which ought to be taken, and which has not been taken, as to the results which may accrue to us—the injurious results to Canada in a financial and moral point of view—with reference to the business honesty and with reference to the financial solvency of the schemes which are undertaken. It is an important case, also, with reference to the relations of members of Parliament to the Executive of the day, and to the Parliament of the country. In all these respects, Sir, this is a typical case, which has engaged my attention from an early date, and to which I have called attention in some aspects, although in some aspects only, in my own Province, in respect to which hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches attacked me for the course I took. I thereupon decided that I would take the first opportunity which should arise to express my views on the floor of this House, in the presence of the Government, and in the presence of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns). Now, Sir, the Caraquet Railway Company was brought to the attention of Parliament in the first place, at the close of the Session of 1883, upon a proposition made by Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Railways, that Parliament should grant it, in common with a number of other enterprises, the subsidy which was then fixed at the mileage rate, of $3,200. The Minister of Railways then made a statement, which was a little fuller, I imagine, than my hon. friend from North York thought, and which, in order that justice may be done to the Minister and to the Government which he represented, I want to place before the House. Sir Charles Tupper then said:

"Then it is proposed to provide a subsidy for the Caraquet Railway Company for thirty-six miles of railway from a point near Bathurst to Caraquet, in New Brunswick, not exceeding $3,200 a mile, and in the whole $115,200. I may say to the House that this is also another branch of the Intercolonial Railway. During the time that the Intercolonial Railway was being located and constructed, the House will remember that Mr. Fleming brought forward a project of reaching the sea by constructing this branch of forty-five miles from the Intercolonial Railway down to Shippegan, and that this project was viewed with very great favor by a large portion of the press, and by a great many people in this country. The Government made a survey of the line, and found that it could be constructed at a comparatively moderate expense, and that there were no serious difficulties in construction; but it has not been proceeded with as a Government work; a company, however, is organised for the purpose of constructing the line from the Intercolonial Railway to the harbor of Shippegan, where navigation is reached; and they have also obtained from the Government of New Brunswick, a subsidy of $3,000 a mile for forty-five miles from the Intercolonial Railway to Shippegan. They have applied to this Government for additional aid; and after having given to the subject the most careful consideration, we feel that we would be warranted in asking Parliament to provide $3,200 a mile for thirty-six miles, which is the shortest distance that will take them from the Intercolonial Railway to tide water where they will be able to reach navigation. This line also runs through a very interesting section of country that is susceptible of great development, and we believe that it will afford, in the same way as the Baie des Chaleurs line, to which I have already turned the attention of the House, means for enabling the fishermen of that portion of New Brunswick to have infinitely greater advantages than they have at present and increase the value of their catch, because, as in other instances, they will be able rapidly to send fresh fish at a small cost by rail to the western portion of Canada, and to the various markets of the United States. This line will also so develop that section of that country, and so increase the receipts on the Intercolonial Railway by giving us additional value of traffic, that we believe it will make an ample return to the Government for the subsidy which the House is invited to give. I have no doubt that if any further information is required with reference to either of these lines, my hon. friends who represent the line provided for in Quebec, and my hon. friend the member for Gloucester, with relation to the Caraquet Railway, will be able to satisfy the House that this is a wise and judicious appropriation of public money, looked at in the light of the commercial results which are to occur in the increased development of the country, and in the increased value of traffic over the Intercolonial Railway, which has cost this country so large a sum of money, and which it is desirable should be rendered as useful as possible to this country by promoting the construction of these subsidiary lines and branches that will throw traffic into it."

So you see, Sir, that having made a general statement, rose colored and not detailed, as most of the statements of that Minister we know were, laying out the general lines of the particular discussion which was to follow, the hon. gentleman appealed,

and by anticipation, entrusted the detailed statement which was to be made to the hon. member for Gloucester. Well, that hon. gentleman began, as my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) said, by reading a report of an earlier date, by Mr. Sandford Fleming, in which he detailed the glories and advantages of the harbor of Shippegan, and the probable result based on mileage distances, and on sundry calculations, which, after all, have very little to do, indeed, with the complicated questions which are involved in the success of an ocean terminus, and a combined land and water communication. I say, reading some of these calculations with great unction, the hon. gentleman pointed out that this was, after all, the short route to Europe—that it was through the great port and entrepot of Shippegan that the commerce and oceanic travel of this country were to flow in the future. Nor, Sir, have we been altogether without ministerial warrant for so considering the port of Shippegan, for I well remember when the then Minister of Railways, in his annual orations on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, approached the subject of the trans-continental connections, and when, to avoid any undue rivalry, he used to hurl at the head of the House the names of half-a-dozen or more different Atlantic ports which were to be the terminal ports on the Atlantic, the name of Shippegan was to be found in the long roll of Atlantic ports. Then, Sir, the hon. member for Gloucester, summing up the results of that part of his case, said :

"The railway will in the future, at all events, be of incalculable benefit to the Dominion at large."

That was the general statement of the hon. gentleman ; and I think on this occasion I must admit—and it is doing him high honor—that he "went one better" than his predecessor, the Minister of Railways, the greatest master of tropes that I know of. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to deal with what, after all, might be supposed to be more within the grasp of an ordinary member like myself. He said :

"But, Sir, the scheme is not put forward on that ground alone ; it is put forward, perhaps with even greater force on other grounds, and that is, the immense trade the road would develop and would tend to build up, not only in that particular locality, but over the Dominion as a whole. By the construction of that road an enormous trade——"

It was an immense trade a moment ago ; it is enormous now.—

—"an enormous trade would be given to the Intercolonial Railway ; as a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway it is not second in importance to any other road, and because it is a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, I assume that my hon. friend opposite can have no objection to it. As I understand him, he is in favor of any road that will feed the Intercolonial Railway. To give an idea of the amount of trade done along that road, and of the population interested in it, I may inform the House that between the point where it is proposed to connect the Intercolonial Railway and the terminus of Caraquet or Shippegan, a distance of forty-five miles, there is a population of 18,000 souls. The whole country, from end to end of the proposed road, is settled. The value of the products of that section of the country during the past year amounted to some $1,000,000, made up as follows : Lumber, $300,000——"

Who was the lumberer ?—

—"fish, comprising canned goods, codfish, salmon, herring, mackerel and oysters, $500,000 ; grindstones, $50,000 ; farm produce, $150,000. There are a number of other industries which would contribute to give the road a large trade, and all of which would find its way to the Intercolonial Railway. To the West this road will be a great benefit, inasmuch as it will afford the people an opportunity, which is now denied them, of getting their fish in a fresh condition, and they will have a larger market for their products, as well as the East a larger market for theirs."

Can you doubt that after those statements the Opposition was dumb ? Of course, as happened before, as has happened ever since, as is happening to-day—nay, not to-day—to-morrow, to use the hon. gentleman's favorite word, at the earliest—three weeks after the normal termination of the Session, we are not placed in a position to consider properly the rose-colored statements made with reference to proposed railway grants. We had then no opportunity of checking those figures, discounting those tropes, dissecting those flowers of rhetoric and figures of speech with which the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Gloucester overwhelmed us ; and so the vote was passed for those 36 miles which were represented as necessary to reach the coast by the shortest route ; and to ensure these great advantages $115,200 was voted. But, Sir, you know, the way politic people do these things is not to alarm at first. They ask for a little ; they make a beginning ; they do not put the blunt edge of the wedge to the timber and hammer on the thin edge, but they put the thin edge in, and give the wedge a gentle tap, and when the timber is well opened, they insert another wedge a little further. And so, with regard to this enterprise, we were seduced by the statement that $115,200 would give us all these grand advantages to which I have referred ; and, for my part, I frankly confess to you, taking them at their word—nay, giving that appropriate discount which one ought to allow in valuing the statement of a Minister and the statement of an interested representative—I did think the road was cheap at the money—that the grant was very small for those great advantages. Well, a year passed, and the happy time arrived for those who had been expecting their fortune in railway subsidies in the Session of 1884 ; it came on the 10th of April in that year, when the same Minister was called upon to deal with the question of further subsidies to railways, and what did he say ? Sir Charles Tupper said this :

"Then, Sir, at the last Session of this House, we provided for a line of railway from the Intercolonial Railway to Caraquet, and it has been found, as in the other cases adverted to, that the line was too short to enable the parties to make the necessary financial arrangements."

Too short, Mr. Speaker ! I have always thought that for a great through line of railway, the shorter your line the more likely you would be to succeed ; but it seems that the line was too short :

"It is now proposed to ask the House to extend the subsidy granted last Session for twenty-four miles further, from Caraquet to Shippegan Harbor, thus making that short line of communication to which great importance was at one time attached, I know, by this Government, and I believe also by my hon. friend opposite, from the Intercolonial Railway to the harbor of Shippegan."

So you see we begun by making a grant for 36 miles, and then it is proposed, on the ground that the railway is too short, to go 24 miles further, and so obtain the further inestimable privilege of access to the port of Shippegan.

"And I am instructed——"

Says the hon. gentleman, who on this occasion took instructions—

—"by my hon. friend the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), that the appropriation of $3,200 a mile for the additional 24 miles will enable him to secure the prompt construction of the 40 miles between the Intercolonial Railway and Shippegan, furnishing, as I have said, a most valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway."

Well, a little discussion arose on that occasion. The First Minister proceeded to discuss, upon the same day, to some extent, the general policy and its propriety as applicable to the case in hand. He said:

"The present policy has been already explained by my colleague. There are very many tracts in the country which would be very much aided and developed by reasonable assistance. The people say——"

The people, mark you.—

"The people say: We would like to have a railway, but we cannot start it; we have not capital enough; we cannot interest capitalists in our line; our municipalities are not rich enough to commence these lines, and, therefore, we must do without them. So that, if a tract of country is really eligible for a railway, which is likely to be ultimately a commercial success, the Government are encouraging the people by giving them a subsidy of $3,200 a mile, and if there is anything in the scheme the people will undertake it. They will go to the municipalities along the line of railway, get the stock lists up, and start a real basis to work upon. Thus, without overburdening the Dominion Treasury, you will have a number of really good schemes, having some real merits in themselves started. As my hon. friend has said, that is a good test whether a railway scheme has any real merit. Parliament grants a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for a particular line; if it has any real merit the road will be established, and, if it has no merit, it must, to be built, throw itself upon the public treasury altogether, and then——"

What do you think?

"It will never be built."

The Oxford and New Glasgow, the Great European and American Short Line, and other enterprises, speak in trumpet tones to prove the truth of the hon. gentleman's statement. Subsidies were granted those lines; assistance was given to them; but the test, which the hon. gentleman suggests, of real merit being applied to them, they could not get on. The road, not having any real merit, was not established, and in order to be built:

"It must, if it has no merit, throw itself upon the public treasury altogether."

It had no merit; it did throw itself upon the public treasury; and then—I must alter the words in the record, and instead of saying, "it never will be built," say: "it will be built accordingly." That is what history tells us. We are building these roads out of the treasury to-day. A little further, in the course of the same discussion, when the vote came up for the extension of the line of railway from Caraquet to Shippegan, N. B., —a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 a mile, nor exceeding in the whole $76,800 — which was the second instalment, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"I propose to amend this resolution, so that it shall read: To the Caraquet Railway Company, for the extension of the railway from Caraquet to Shippegan Harbor, which makes a distance of 60 miles. A company has been already organised for the construction of the work, and this is to enable them to cover the entire distance from the Intercolonial Railway to Shippegan Harbor."

I ask the attention of the House to that statement, for a reason which will presently appear. We get into Shippegan Harbor, we have the statement of the Minister that 60 miles will cover the entire distance from the Intercolonial Railway to Shippegan Harbor, and that the vote proposed would enable the company to cover that entire distance; and once again we grant a subsidy, and an increased subsidy. Would you not imagine, Sir, that we had got to the end? We began with 36 miles, which was to give us all these advantages. Then the road was too short to be built, so we had to add 24 miles, and we are told this is to be the end. But in 1886 the present First Minister, being then in charge of the business, had occasion to bring up the Caraquet Railway Company again, and being asked for some explanation, gave the explanation I am about to read. I congratulate the hon. Minister and the country at large that there was one session—the session of 1885—in which the Caraquet Railway did not turn up. In 1883 it was to the fore; in 1884 it came to the fore; in 1885 the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) was, happily for us, dumb, perhaps sucking the sweets already secured; but in 1886 he was back again milking the cow. The First Minister then said:

"That railway is destined to leave the Intercolonial Railway at Bathurst, and run in a north-westerly direction to Shippegan. Sixty miles have already been subsidised——"

Now, we knew all that before, and we thought we had certainly got to the end of it.—

—"and the present subsidy is to extend the road to Shippegan——"

This is a conundrum of which I did not find out the meaning for some years, and the meaning of which I will tell you, Sir, presently. Sixty miles brought us to Shippegan as long ago as 1884, but, in 1886—

—"the present subsidy is to extend the road to Shippegan, which is favorably mentioned by Mr. Fleming in his report of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, as a deep harbor."

He recommended it as—

"being the stepping-off place to Europe."

There was the hon. First Minister's statement that we now wanted 10 miles more to get to Shippegan Harbor from the Intercolonial Railway. First, it was 36 miles to Caraquet; then 24 miles more were to bring us right on to Shippegan; and then a further 10 miles—how many miles more shall we have to subsidise to get to the same point, I wonder?

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the debate is proceeded with, I desire to say that I see it stated in the *Empire* that the Canadian Copyright Act is to be allowed by the Imperial Government. I would ask the First Minister if he has any information in regard to that matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no official information; we have only seen the statement in the papers.

THE CARAQUET RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE. When the House adjourned, I had just read the observations of the First Minister on the proposed additional ten mile grant of 1886, and I had pointed out the circumstance that this extension or expansion had taken place without any explanation. Upon that subject I made an enquiry, being puzzled as to how the land lay and as to how the railway lay, in these terms:

"The prior grant was to a point called Lower Caraquet. I do not observe this to be mentioned at all. The first grant was to Caraquet, and then to Shippegan Harbor, and this grant is from Lower Caraquet, which is presumably the termination of the present subsidised portion. I do not know the ground, but perhaps the hon. gentleman does.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know the ground."

So neither of us knew anything about it. It was not my business to know the ground, but it was the business of the hon. gentleman, as he was proposing the additional ten-mile grant. Not finding anything about the lay of the land, I thought I might find something about the company, and so I asked :

"Can the hon. gentleman tell me something about the names? A person named Burns is the owner of eleven out of the twelve shares of the stock of the company, and the application is made by him. Has he any connection with the member for Gloucester?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the hon. member himself, and, if the hon. gentleman enquires, he will find that it is due very largely to the enterprise of Mr. Burns that this very important road is built. He has thrown himself into it with enthusiasm, and without that enthusiasm the road would not have got so far.

"Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has exhibited so much enthusiasm. Why should he not, when he owns eleven-twelfths of the enterprise? If that amount should not give him enthusiasm, I do not know what the hon. gentleman could be enthusiastic about.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. His enthusiasm was manifested by his becoming the owner."

Well, so much passed in 1886, at which time we find the Caraquet Railway to have uncoiled, like some great serpent, and to have expanded itself to the length of about 70 miles between Caraquet and Shippegan. I have now to open a new scene in the drama, because, in 1887, on the 23rd June, a proposition was made to substitute seven miles for the last ten miles of that road. The road which had grown so much, which had grown so portentously, was shrinking now, and it was to be cut down to 67 miles instead of the 70—but not so with the subsidy. The subsidy was to stand for the 70 miles, though the road was to be cut down to 67 miles. The proposition of that date was to continue to subsidise the last hypothetical ten miles at $32,000, though only seven miles were to be constructed. Not all the contrivances of the hon. member for Gloucester, to which I shall subsequently call attention, could stretch that road to 70 miles, but still it was to have the subsidy granted for 70 miles. The late Mr. Pope, then Minister of Railways, said, on this occasion of 1887, that this was a very important road and connecting with a very important point on the Bay. My hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) pointed out that the proposal was practically almost doubling up the subsidy; in fact, that it amounted to $4,570 a mile instead of $3,200 a mile, but no explanation whatever was vouchsafed in regard to that. The same thing has been done elsewhere. I admit that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) is not unique in this respect. There are other cases where persons have asked for a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for a greater length of road than they constructed, and Government have afterwards come here and said to Parliament: You voted that $3,200 a mile; it is true that the railway is not more than two-thirds of the length; still, you were willing to give $32,000, when you thought you were getting ten miles, and you may as well give the same amount for the short length as for the long length. That is what was done in this case. I believe that a mystery which has remained undeveloped so far may find some solution here. We have been trying to discover where Shippegan is. We know that it is somewhere in the Gulf, we know that it is an important terminus, we know that it is one of the termini proposed for the ocean steamships. My opinion is that the failure of the negotiations with the Andersons in regard to the new mail line must be owing to the insistance of the Government that they should include Shippegan among the points at which their fast steamers were to call. It will be observed that, in the debate of 1886, I pointed delicately to the fact that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) was the owner of at least eleven-twelfths of the Caraquet enterprise, and upon that occasion the First Minister pointed out the meritorious character of the attitude of the hon. member for Gloucester in that regard, and stated—and I cordially agree with him in that respect—that, but for the enthusiasm, as he called it, of the hon. member for Gloucester, the railway would not have got so far as it had. During the electoral campaign of 1886-7, I quoted, and I admit not infrequently, the facts which I have narrated here to-day. I stated these facts, and I used the member for Gloucester as a shocking example. On various platforms I pointed out the circumstances which, I conceived, rendered it inconsistent with the independence of a member of Parliament that he should occupy the relation to the company and to the Executive which he did in connection with this railway. For that course I was the recipient of a very severe rebuke, nay, of two very severe rebukes from a pair of Ministers who were perambulating Ontario upon the occasion of the campaign. At London the First Minister said this :

"Mr. Blake said in his speech at Ottawa the other day, with respect to the system of granting bonuses to railways:

"What we wanted to show was the relation which existed between the members of Parliament and the Executive, which prevented the former from independently exercising their duty in Parliament. How could a member of Parliament be supposed to vote conscientiously on a question when he knew that the memorial for his railway subsidy was in the Minister's office, and its being granted depended upon whether that vote was yea or nay? It was not in human nature to do otherwise when business was being conducted in this way. The influence of party was strong. The difficulties of a man separating himself from his party—more especially when that party was in power—were many; and if the influences of the Executive were added to these, and the relations the member bears to both, the greater become the barriers in the way. Why! the member's vote is in the Minister's pocket."

And the hon. gentleman went on to say :

"So Mr. Blake was of opinion that no subsidy should be given to any railway in any part of Canada if a member or his constituency was in any way interested in it. How could a member be independent, said he, if a railway going through the constituency was before the Government or before Parliament?"

You will observe that the hon. gentleman adopted that method of argument which we have heard so often from him for these many years, and with which we are quite familiar—he misapprehended, I will say, the point, and misapprehending it, of course, he misstated it. He alleged here that I objected to a member of Parliament advocating the interest of his constituency in reference to a railway. I objected to nothing of the kind. I objected to a member of Parliament putting himself in such a position that his pecuniary interest conflicted with his public duty. The hon. gentleman went on :

"Why, gentlemen, the principle in England and in Canada is very plain. No member of Parliament can vote on any measure in which he is personally interested,

and if he is not personally interested it is his duty, gentlemen, to do all he can for his constituents. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Why, according to Mr. Blake's interpretation of the duty of a member of Parliament, your good member, Mr. Carling, would be guilty of a dereliction of duty, if he had fought for the railway going through here westward, and so with all members of Parliament."

This, Sir, was an unfortunate allusion; for many in that audience must have remembered with shame, that it had been discovered that the present Minister of Agriculture, to whom the hon. gentleman was referring, had, while retaining the outward appearance of disinterested independence, entered into a private bargain in connection with the first, the Allan, Canadian Pacific contract, under which he secured to himself a half share in the interest of the late Major Walker, one of the directors and chief subscribers, with whom Mr. Carling was a secret partner; and thus became personally interested in securing contract terms the most favorable to the company, and the least favorable to the country he was professing to serve. The hon. gentleman continued:

"If this doctrine be true, no member of Parliament can fight for any railway which directly or indirectly benefits him or his constituency. I do not believe in that doctrine. I believe the people send members to Parliament to do the best they can for their constituents, and the more he works for his constituency the better. To show you how unjust these charges made against some members of Parliament are, I will give you one instance. There is Mr. Patrick Burns ——"

It was not Patrick; but he was speaking largely to an Irish audience, and he thought he might thus insinuate that the member for Gloucester was an Irishman. His name is Kennedy, not Patrick.——

"There is Mr. Patrick Burns, the member for Gloucester, in the Province of New Brunswick. He is a Roman Catholic gentleman "——

Therefore, of course, he is a Paddy !—

"He is a Roman Catholic gentleman, coming from Ireland, and he has, by hard work and good character and great ability, made a considerable fortune. He was anxious to assist his constituents; he was anxious that a railway should be built—the Caraquet Railway—to the sea. He found that nobody would come forward—because railway enterprises have not been profitable in Canada—and out of public spirit he put his hands in his own pocket and spent his own money, and after doing so, so far as prudence would allow, he came to Parliament in order to get assistance. We had only to consider whether it was a good road, one for the advantage to the country, or not. We found it was to the advantage of the country, and we gave the road a grant, and Mr. Blake attacked him by name, charging him with corruption, because he held the stock of that road, when nobody else would come forward to his assistance. I said, when the matter was brought up, that he deserved great credit for his public spirit and for having put his money into the enterprise. Why, his independence was not gone, because he was already a Conservative of the strongest type, elected to support the Government (hear, hear and cheers); and it was certain he would support the Government whether he got the money or not. We were only too glad to assist Mr. Burns in his patriotic efforts, by giving it a reasonable grant to help him to build the road."

Then the hon. Minister of Justice followed in the same strain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he call him Patrick, too?

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no; I do not think his dignity would have permitted him to do that. It is only the First Minister who can afford to unbend in that way. Says the Minister of Justice:

"We have the policy of slander in the Province of Ontario. The men who represent you, you are told from platform to platform, have been soiling their hands with public treasure. I observe that in the speeches delivered in Ontario that matter is not so lavishly handled as it used to be, and special prominence is given to members living in the more distant portions of the Dominion. For a time a set was made upon dozens of members of the House of Commons, who, one after another, came forward and, with most conclusive evidence, showed those charges to be false. (Cheers.) Lately it has suited the policy of Mr. Blake, as Sir John A. Macdonald has told you, to select for a victim a gentleman who is not so well known as a representative in Ontario; a gentleman who comes from the Province down by the sea. The case of Mr. Burns has been repeated from platform to platform as if he were the most abandoned wretch who ever disgraced a Parliament in any country. Let me tell you that Mr. Burns is a man of the highest character—a man who, if Mr. Blake had ten times the courage he possesses, he would not dare to assail in his own Province (cheers); but it suits, perhaps, the moment, to slander a man like Mr. Burns in places where he is not so well known as in the Maritime Provinces. Without repeating the statement of Sir John A. Macdonald, I may be allowed to repeat some of the points of the case, to show you how extravagant was the course pursued by our opponents in that gentleman's case; to show you how strong the language was that was used respecting Mr. Burns. It was simply the case of a member of Parliament desiring to obtain the construction of a railway for the people he represented. They are people thrifty, economical and not noted for enterprise, but have a reasonable and strong claim upon the Government to give them a public work like that to encourage their industries. (Cheers.) Mr. Burns felt that his duty as a representative of the people, and being one of them, was to put his hand into his own pocket and contribute to the full extent he was able. (Hear, hear.) Having done this, a contribution which no man of common sense would expect to get a profit from, and which was made entirely out of sympathy for the people he represented, he came to Parliament and said: 'We have done all that men can be expected to do, will you deal with us as you have dealt with railways in Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia?' and we said in honesty to the people he represented: 'We will give you the ordinary subsidy to railways of that kind.' This is known to everybody in Parliament, and yet Mr. Burns' conduct has been made the subject of reproach. Mr. Blake has stated on platform after platform in Ontario that Mr. Burns was a corrupt representative, because he had received eleven out of every twelve dollars given to that enterprise. He received not one dollar. (Cheers.) The money that the Dominion of Canada contributed to that enterprise went into the work for the purpose of finishing it, and went where Mr. Burns' money had gone. Yet anybody reading that statement of Mr. Blake, would presume that the money which was granted by the Dominion Government towards the railway was transferred to the pocket of Mr. Burns. That was a statement which nobody would dare to make in the Province where the work is in progress, and yet it is made to do duty among the intelligent people of Ontario. They most strongly realise that we people down by the sea are strangers to you people in Ontario, and unable to speak in our own defence, or to look you in the face, and when our country is slandered are unable to speak up in defence. But, thank goodness, we are able to stand up in defence of our nation, our Province and our men, and that, too, in the Province of Ontario, before the people before whom we have been slandered. (Cheers.) Then, sir, the policy of slander is the policy for Ontario."

Well, the Minister of Justice, with what I should have been disposed to call sophistry, declared that I had said, or used language from which it might have been inferred, that this money went directly into Mr. Burns' pocket. I cannot conceive how any fair reader or hearer of anything I said could have supposed such a thing for a moment. The statement made throughout was that Mr. Burns was the owner of eleven-twelfths of the enterprise, and was, therefore, interested in eleven-twelfths of the subsidies and aid which made the enterprise valuable. But you will see presently how far and how long they remained out of the member's pocket. In substance it was hardly in truth the company that was subsidised, because the hon. gentleman was the company, he was a corporate Burns; there was but one-twelfth in other names, of which, if my information is correct, a portion belonged to himself. But at any rate he represented and owned eleven-twelfths of the subsidies of the company,

and the corporate Burns received, even if we allow that there was an alien interest of one-twelfth, out of the subsidy a very large sum. There were $224,000 of a Dominion subsidy, of which his eleven-twelfths would be $205,000. There was a New Brunswick subsidy of about $180,000, of which his share would be $165,000, making a total for the corporate Burns from both Governments of $370,000. As to the New Brunswick subsidy it was simply an element in the financing of the road, and in regard to this particular part of the transaction, in which I am dealing with the hon. gentleman's relations to the Executive and to this Parliament, it is not material. But being thus interested in the road, being, in fact, the company, and, in fact, the road, the hon. gentleman was kept on tenter-hooks for three or four years. He was doled out something in 1883, he was doled out something more in 1884, he was doled out something more in 1886, and he was doled out something more in 1887. That was the condition of parliamentary independence in which the hon. gentleman stood for all these years. Now this is said to be not a singular case. I observe in an address which has been issued in a constituency now vacant, the candidate says:

"Why I should be singled out for public censure when there are dozens of members in the same House, who, not only have applied for and obtained limits for themselves, but sit there daily voting moneys into their own pockets, I cannot understand."

Mr. CHARLTON. Who is he?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. His name is John Charles Rykert.

Mr. BLAKE. I take the earliest opportunity of repeating here the view which I have expressed elsewhere on this subject, and of repeating the distinction, obvious I should have thought to anybody, between an hon. member who, interested as he ought to be, in the welfare of his constituency, does exert himself for the benefit of that constituency, and an hon. gentleman who, being a member, becomes substantially the proprietor of an enterprise, and is substantially the person subsidised by the Executive, through the action of Parliament on its advice. But I have something more to add. The case in hand is one which exemplifies in almost all its aspects the mischief of the Government's course, as that course has been carried out, and the recklessness of their methods in carrying out that course. The greatest harm has been done to us as to the character of our investments, as to the character of our Parliament, as to the character of our Government, and as to our financial and commercial morality, and it seems to me it is eminently needful that Parliament should intervene. Some time ago, I caused further enquiries to be made as to this railway and as to the methods which have been used in respect to the course of financing this enterprise, to the extent to which it was financed in England, apart from the two Government subsidies to which I have referred. I believe that it was represented that the capital stock was subscribed to the full amount of $950,000, that it was paid up to the extent of a little over three-quarters of a million, some $751,000 odd, leaving of course about $200,000 uncalled and available. I believe, as a matter of fact, that statement was not true. Possibly on a small part of the subscribed stock, somewhere about 5 per cent. had been temporarily paid, but even that trifle, I believe, had been recouped out of the subsidies or other assets of the road, to those who paid it. I believe the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) was the contractor, the company, the railway. In truth, he seems to me to have beaten Poo-Bah "out of his boots." He was the shareholder, he was the president, he was the manager, he was the contractor, he was the customer, he was the financier, and he was the supplier of the railway company. He was all these things; and so you may call him everything in connection with this company, however inconsistent, rolled into one. I believe the alleged cost of the construction of this road, as represented in England, was the modest sum of $23,200 per mile, while, in fact, it would not cost, at fair values, rails included, and with contractor's profit, more than about one-third that sum. I believe that the whole cost of the enterprise, rails included, at fair values, with contractor's profits, was provided out of the Government subsidies and the sales of the bonds in England for £100,000 sterling; and not merely was the whole cost, at fair values, with contractor's profits, so provided, but there was left an excess of a very considerable amount, which went into the pocket of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns). So that he received eleven-twelfths of the stock, and he made a considerable fortune out of his construction contract. It is quite possible to project a railway which will result as disastrously as this railway has resulted, and yet to make a fortune out of the undertaking. The railway may be useless, but the contractor may become a proprietor and a man of fortune. I believe the hon. member paid a very large proportion, probably about three-fourths, of the wages and local supplies in truck out of his store; and that he issued a sort of ticket, which passed as a local currency in the country to some extent, and by this means of paying in truck he made a very considerable addition to his profits. In fact he could give a wrinkle to his colleague the Finance Minister, who was troubled a good deal in getting the Banking Bill through the House, which has now fortunately gone to the Upper Chamber, with respect to the redemption and circulation and the keeping up of our currency at par. I am told that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) by means of these little tickets, which came down to very low denominations, managed, for the cost of paper, type and ink, to keep in circulation a considerable sum, and to subsequently redeem it, I will not say at par, but in a manner that left him very handsome profits indeed. I believe there is an explanation of the lengthening of the line, which must have puzzled us all, which puzzled me for a long time, for I could not at all understand how it turned out that this line which was to be only 60 miles from Bathurst to Shippegan could afterwards be represented as being 70 miles in length, and how even when that extreme length had been curtailed there could still remain 67 miles. It is to be accounted for thus. The hon. Minister, as I have told you, stated, during the progress of this affair through Parliament, that it was a great misfortune to have too short a railway; and, carrying that view into practical execution, there are two arrangements for lengthening the mileage. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) has a couple of mills in

that neighborhood. To one of these a branch somewhere about a mile long was built, which forms part of the mileage, and to reach the other mill he deflected the road, increasing its length in that way, five or six miles. Thus it was, and in these two ways, that he found a method by which to swell sixty into sixty-seven or sixty-eight miles in getting from Bathurst to Shippegan. Why, Sir, the great highway between the East and the West, the great link stretching from the ocean port of Shippegan, connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, and thence with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so on to Vancouver, thus linking England with China and Japan, was lengthened seven or eight miles, in order that the traffic to be derived from the mills of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) might not be lost to the world! Well, seven or eight miles may not be much, but it is between twelve and thirteen per cent. on a mileage of sixty. Now, Sir, I have acquired some verbal, and some written information on these subjects which I wish to communicate to the House. A correspondent says:

"But, according to my mind, the most objectionable point on the line is the curve to Burns' mill. It makes the road longer by at least seven or eight miles, for which, not counting the extra expenses for building the road, the expenses of travelling and freight will be much higher than if it followed a straight line to Caraquet, which could have been very easily done. If, at the mill, there was a kind of town, there might be some reason for a deviation from the straight line, but the only traffic there is that of the mill. As far as I know, the right of way has not been paid yet, which causes more or less murmuring among the people,"

This letter was written some years ago; I hope it has been paid since.—

"But Mr. Burns promises that it will be all right by-and-bye. The people who worked upon the line have been, I think, pretty well paid, although I heard many complaints, that they had to wait long for their pay, and even forced to accept store pay; but I cannot say to what extent these complaints were founded."

Then, Sir, I have another letter from another correspondent who says:

"I do not know how many stockholders there are, but feel safe in saying that there are not more than eight or nine besides Burns. The original stock list contained a large number of names and the amount subscribed was in the vicinity of $1,000,000. In order to get rid of such an unwieldy number a call of 5 per cent. was made on the subscribed stock. The stockholders were, of course, unable to pay, and many of them transferred their stock to the president, others declined to pay and their names were struck off the list. Some say that the stock was sold and Burns bought it in, but as I never saw the required notice of sale in the *Royal Gazette*—although it might have been published—I am inclined to the belief that the stock list was reopened. Seven of the subscribers were allowed to hold sufficient stock to enable them to act as directors and went through the form of paying the 5 per cent. call. I heard that two others were retained. Burns then took the balance of the stock allowed by law, $950,000. I cannot speak with certainty, but it is generally understood and believed that the amount which was paid upon the stock by a few of the stockholders has been since refunded. I was told by a man who had a contract for grading a section of the road that the grading would not exceed $2,000 per mile. I judge that the cost of grading and bridging from Bathurst to Caraquet did not exceed $2,500 per mile. From all the information that I have been able to gather I should say that about one-fourth of the whole was paid in cash, and three-fourths in goods from the stores of the president; the sleepers cost 8 cents apiece and were paid for chiefly in goods. Then men employed on the road, placing the sleepers and rails, ballasting, &c., are nearly all paid in goods, as so far as I can learn nothing has yet been paid for land taken for the road, nor for damage to crops, except a trifle, nor for lumber cut upon the lands through which the roads runs and used in building culverts, &c."

As I said before, this letter was written some years ago, at the end of 1886.—

"They have two pretty old looking second-hand locomotives, one cheap second-class passenger car, two freight cars and ten or twelve flat cars. This fall they bought a snow plough. There is a station house at the junction worth about $700, one at Burns' Mill, Bathurst, one at Clifton, one at Grande Anse, one at Burns' Mill, Caraquet —now called Burnsville——"

So that the hon. gentleman has got his name on a town if he has not got his name in the railway.—

—"and one here at the village of Caraquet. The average cost of these would not exceed $350 each. You will have a better idea of the cost of rolling stock and rails than I. I heard the company's engineer state, at a dinner given by the president, that the subsidies would be sufficient to build and equip the road. He had then about completed his survey and based his estimate upon it. The roadbed is very good for a new road, and rails, although considerably lighter than those on the Intercolonial Railway and New Brunswick roads, are, I believe, of very good quality. Besides the station houses there are eight small platforms along the road for landing and receiving freight. I have not gone over that portion of the road from Caraquet towards Shippegan ten miles, but speaking from my knowledge of the country, there is not one bridge in that distance and not more than four culverts on small streams."

Then from another correspondent:

"I think Burns procured his rails by hypothecating the first mortgage bonds of the company to the full amount of issue authorised by the company's charter. A small portion of them only have been actually sold. This would leave Burns his two subsidies to grade and equip his road, and I am quite convinced that he would not have more than from $2,000 to $2,500 to give out of these subsidies, but he would most certainly have that much of a margin. It is a well-known fact that Burns was in pecuniary straits at the time he went into the railroad, and he is now in good standing. I am satisfied——— is right as to Burns being the company and owning the whole undertaking, and that not a dollar of private moneys have been put into the enterprise by any here connected with it. It is true there was a deviation in the line of the railway permitted to reach and take in a mile of Burns, adding six miles to the length of the road."

Then from another correspondent about the same date:

"The road starts from the Intercolonial about one half mile south of the Nepesiquit River and runs down following nearly the course of the river about four miles; there is a branch from there to Mr. Burns' mills about one mile. From Grande Anse the road curves running south to Burns' mills on Caraquet River, eight miles from Grande Anse; this deflection lengthens the road about five miles. The bridge across Bass River has a small granite abutment at each bank, one granite pier in the centre of the stream and two box truss spans of about thirty-five feet each. The bridge on Caraquet River has only one span of about thirty feet. At Bertrand's Brook, about four miles below the mill, there is a wooden bridge about 400 feet long, built upon bents and trestles, and a small wooden bridge at Pokeshaw. At Little River, Caraquet, there is a cedar bridge built in blockwork, about 500 feet long. These, I think, are the only structures on the whole of the line that can be called bridges. There are, I should say, eight to ten wooden culverts, large and small, on brooks and hollows, with earth fillings from six to twelve feet. The grading of a considerable portion of the road was let in short sections to several contractors by private contract. One of those contractors told me that the grading would cost about $1,000 per mile. The grading and bridging of the whole road would not exceed, I should think, $2,000 per mile. The rails are very good, of medium size. There is a station house at the Junction, one at Burns' Mill, Bathurst, one at Clifton, one at Grande Anse, one at Burns' Mill, Caraquet River, and one at Caraquet, average cost of each about $350. Mr. Burns appears to be building the road himself; whether he has gone through the form of having a contract from the company, I do not know. I cannot say correctly what proportion of the work was paid for in goods at his stores, but I think it safe to say that three-fourths of it were paid in that way and one-fourth in cash. I presume that the subsidies if properly managed would build and equip the road as it is now equipped; in fact, I heard the engineer of the company state that they would,

after he had made a survey. First mortgage bond was sold in England for £100,000 sterling on the 60 miles, at £98, at 6 per cent. interest. A call of 5 per cent. was made upon the subscribed stock; of course only a few responded. I believe just a sufficient number to form a board of directors (7), others transferred their stock to Mr. Burns; this is how he got possession of nearly all of the stock.

"The cost of the road is represented in England to be about $24,000 per mile.

"It is generally believed that whatever was paid has since been refunded from the subsidies."

Now, Sir, I turn to the English business. There were two prospectuses issued in England, the first of which I have not had the opportunity of seeing, but of the second I happen to have a copy. It appears to have represented that there had been a prior allotment of £30,000 out of a total bond issue of £100,000 stg.; and the prospectus was for the issue of £70,000, being the unallotted portion of £100,000 of 6 per cent. first mortgage sterling bonds of £100 each, redeemable at par in 1904, and secured as a first charge. They appear to have been issued at 98. The prospectus states:

"The Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of New Brunswick have given a joint guarantee to the Caraquet Railway Company of £1,280 per mile, amounting in all to a free grant of £76,800, being more than one-fourth of the cost of construction. As security for the payment of the interest on the whole amount of the bonds for three years, viz, up to the 1st of July, 1889, inclusive, a sufficient sum has been set aside and will be deposited with the Imperial Bank in the names of the trustees. The Caraquet Railway is a branch from the Canadian Government's main line, connecting with the Intercolonial at Bathurst, and thus with the Canadian Pacific and the whole of the Canadian railroad system. It runs from the Bathurst Junction to Shippegan Harbor, the eastern extremity of the Province of New Brunswick, establishing a through communication right across British North America from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboard. The line has been built in the most substantial manner by contract, at a cost of £290,000, under Government supervision. Already over forty miles are in operation, and the remaining twenty miles being far advanced towards completion, will, it is expected, be finished and opened by September. The location of the Caraquet Railway is eminently favorable for the earning of steady revenue; its course being through a long settled country whose communities are engaged in important mercantile pursuits, the resources of the district being very large. The amount of mortgage bonds authorised by Act of Parliament is limited to £100,000 and represents a charge of only £1,700 per mile upon a railway costing £4,833 per mile, the ordinary share capital of the company is $950,000 (or £190,000), the whole of which has been allotted in Canada. The mortgage bonds take priority before the share capital, both as to principal and interest, and are further secured by a mortgage under a trust deed of the value of the railway, rolling stock and other assets of the company, besides the uncalled capital, namely, by mortgage of sixty miles of railway, whereof forty miles are in operation, having been completed and equipped at a cost of £4,833 per mile, or equal to £193,320; by twenty miles of railway in course of construction, under contract, for, say, £96,660; by uncalled capital of the company, £44,460, making a total of £334,440, or more than thrice the amount of the entire issue of bonds authorised; thus affording security of the highest class. The amount required out of the revenue to pay the interest upon the whole of the bonds is only £100 per mile annually. A carefully prepared estimate based on the traffic already existing shows that a revenue of at least £200 per mile may be expected. Since the opening of the line now in operation the earnings have been highly satisfactory. Mr. K. F. Burns, M.P., the president and general manager, reports: 'Thus far the receipts from both passenger and freight have exceeded the company's most sanguine expectations.' And, indeed, he adds: 'Since regular daily trains commenced running the carrying capacity of the line has been taxed to the utmost, with every likelihood of continually increasing business. The working expenses and cost of maintenance will be exceptionally low owing to the absence of steep grades, sharp curves and heavy bridges.'"

There, Sir, was the statement on which the issue took place. Now, what was the result of all this financing? Ostensibly, the subsidies amounted to $404,000, Dominion and Provincial, or $5,950 a mile for sixty-eight miles; the bonds, allowing off 20 per cent. for the reserved interest and for the discount at which they were sold, should net $400,000, or $5,900 a mile; making a total of bonds and subsidies of $804,000, equal to $11,850 per mile; there was an alleged cash result from the paid-up stock, represented at $751,887, being equal to $11,050 per mile; making the pretended cost of $22,900 per mile; or, if you take the bonds at their face value, $23,200 per mile, which was the price set up in this English prospectus. The true value of the work, as I have stated, was probably, including contractor's profit, a good deal under $8,000 a mile, instead of $22,000 or $23,000 a mile, and the facts I have given indicate that, subject to the question of the margin of profit. You will observe that it is stated here that the work was done under governmental supervision, which I do not understand to be correct. It is quite true the Government engineer has to report to the Government that the work is so far constructed as to entitle the subsidy to be paid; but that that is the sense in which this term is used here, it is not fair to suppose. It is unfortunate that the Government of Canada was brought into this prospectus. It is also said that the road is a link of the transcontinental highway, a statement which, of course, unless the port of Shippegan is to be made, in fact, an ocean terminus, cannot be in any sense correct. It is said that the road cost $1,450,000. That is false. It is said that three-quarters of a million of stock was paid up. That is false. The road cost only a little over half a million; and nothing was paid on the stock. Then there are observations made with regard to the eminently favorable character of the location, and of the country through which the line runs, and then you have the report of President and Manager Burns as to the results. There you get the statement that it will require only £100 per mile of earnings to pay the interest on the bonds, which is correct; it would require, in truth, only about $450 per mile, to put a fine point upon it, to pay the interest on the bonds of $30,000 a year. It is stated by Mr. Burns that, according to this careful estimate, a most careful estimate, based upon the actual result of the traffic at that time, a revenue of £200 or $1,000 per mile, or double the amount required to pay the interest, may be expected. Net earnings of £200 or $1,000 mean, of course, gross earnings of three times that amount according to the ordinary accepted calculation for roads of this description, which is that you will net only about one-third of your gross returns, so that the net estimated earning of $68,000 a year, which is alleged in this report to be justified by a careful estimate based upon the traffic existing at the time, would require a gross earning of $204,000 a year. Now, if you turn to the railway statistics, it will be found that in the earlier years, although this line was in part completed and in part running, no details were supplied; but details were supplied for the year 1888, and have been supplied and are in the hands of the Government for 1889, although we have not got them. The details for the earlier year indicate, I think, two engines, which quantity, I believe, has been increased by as much as 50 per cent., because I

believe there are now three engines, one first class car, two second class and emigrant cars and fifteen platform cars, so that it would not be extremely difficult to tax to the full, or even to over-tax, the resources of a company so scantily equipped. The return of the operations of 1888 shows a total tonnage of 11,195 tons moved, namely :

	Tons
Flour	600
Grain	15
Live stock	25
Logs	5,000
Firewood	1,280
And all other goods	4,275
Total	11,195

The return shows besides 3,500 passengers moved, and a total train mileage of passenger and freight trains of 23,500 miles, and it shows a cost reported to the Government of the enterprise of $1,135,000. The gross return in money from the passenger traffic was $2,432.75 and from freight $9,199.19, making an aggregate gross return of $11,631.91, while the expenses, I believe, were $11,311, or a handsome net profit of $320 on the year's running. There was, however, I admit, a very great and extraordinary development in one branch, that of railway casualties. The losses by collisions, or trains thrown from the track were such as would amply meet the emergencies of a much larger and more important enterprise. In that respect, if in no other respect, the hon. member for Gloucester was equal to the situation, because he produced a number of casualties which might fully satisfy the ambition of a much greater road, and of even a larger railway manager than himself. In that year of 1888, these railway statistics show that there was one passenger killed, and seven employés, or, in all, eight deaths, and there were besides five injured, making in all, thirteen casualties. I am afraid that one of those very substantial bridges must have gone down or some other dreadful accident must have happened to produce that loss of human life in this year, and, perhaps, to produce unhappy results, as to the running expenses of the road, in the following year. I believe, also, this road is closed up frequently, in fact for several months in each year, so that notwithstanding the very active industry of the district, and the great demand existing there for a railway, the inhabitants are obliged to suffer for the want of an open road for some months each year. For this year the Government have not brought down the railway statistics, but the Minister of Railways gave us the other day the general returns of the expenses and earnings. He gave us $18,000 as the receipts and $27,000 as the expenses ; and this is the year in which the money was wanted to pay interest on the bonds, for up to this year the interest was provided, I presume, out of the amount realised from the bonds, and put into bank ; and the calculations in the prospectus, therefore, have reference to this period. At this time the fund provided for payment of interest is exhausted, and the calculations of the prospectus declare that out of the revenue ample funds will be obtained to meet the interest for the remaining period. How are those calculations verified? In this year, $18,000 are the gross receipts, and $27,000 are the expenses, making a deficit of $9,000. I cannot account for that at all, unless it be that it is utterly impossible to keep the railway open at all on such a nominal amount of traffic without incurring a larger expenditure than you can charge for, at any reasonable rates, on that small amount of traffic. Or, taking the other alternative, that some serious accident took place involving an additional charge on the earnings of the year. For the hon. gentleman has no longer a capital account to which he can resort, as can the right hon. the First Minister, who, when an accident happens on his road, or he wants to buy some new cars, or build a new bridge, has only to call on us and charge the amount to capital account. But the hon. member, having no capital, except that uncalled capital, which is fructifying in the pockets of the one shareholder, himself, the hon. gentleman, I say, when he cannot pay any demand out of running expenses, has to charge it somewhere, and makes a debit balance. This year the road was to have earned gross $204,000 in order to earn a net $68,000 ; but instead of that it shows a gross of $18,000 only, and a deficit of $9,000 on the year's work. It is perfectly obvious that the English people who were induced to subscribe to the bonds have been gulled. It is perfectly obvious that this prospectus is false ; and one immediate result of it is that an application has been made this Session to the Government to take over the road. As the First Minister has told us, and as the communications which the hon. gentleman for North York (Mr. Mulock) read indicate, negotiations are going on for the assumption by the Government of this valuable asset. All these matters must be seriously considered. They have a direct bearing on, and should affect our consideration of the general result of the Government's policy of subsidising railways. They affect the question of the duty of the Government as to the information they ought themselves to obtain, and to communicate to this House, upon which a decision is to be based by them, in the first instance, and then acted upon by us, as to whether subsidies are to be given or no. They affect the question of the great policy of assumption by the Governmeet of these lines, which the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) have raised, the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), himself, not being wholly indifferent, and which the right hon. the First Minister said was a subject eminently deserving serious consideration and would receive that consideration. They affect, both here and in the mother country, our own financial and moral standing as a people, as a Government, and as a Parliament. They affect the honor and the independence of this Parliament itself. And we are bound to consider them all, if we would preserve the public consideration for ourselves.

Mr. BURNS. I have no fault to find with the utterances of the hon. gentleman who initiated this discussion. I must, of course, ascribe to him a desire to influence the House in case any proposition should be brought forward by the Government looking to the acquirement of the roads connecting with the Intercolonial Railway. I cannot find fault with him in trying to produce hostility to the Government in respect to its railway policy. No matter what his object may be, he has succeeded in giving the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) an opportunity of launching

out into a tirade against the Government, against the Caraquet Railway, and incidentally against your humble servant. I cannot, with my limited powers, attempt to follow the hon. gentleman in dealing with this matter, in any way approaching his language and style. All I propose to do is to call the attention of the House to a plain statement of facts, which I hope will have the effect of dispelling any false ideas which may have been created by misrepresentation in regard to this railway. Many of the statements read by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Blake) are not founded in fact. With my limited knowledge of parliamentary practice, I do not know whether it is due to me or to the House that that hon. gentleman should produce the letters he has read, or name his correspondent. Whether he is bound to do that or not, I can, metaphorically put my finger on the writer of the communication he has read to the House. I have heard these statements over and over again. They were brought forward against me at the last election, and they were then entirely disproved. I will refer to one or two statements in reference to the construction of the line. The hon. gentleman seeks to create an impression on the minds of those listening to him, that the longer the line was, the more money was put in the pockets of the shareholders, meaning myself. That is the plain statement which the hon. gentleman has made, and he argues, that if that line was increased in length, a certain amount of money for every additional mile went into my pocket. I say, that the longer the line was, the more money was taken out of my pocket. In point of fact, the line was not lengthened to any degree greater than, I think, three miles, and that was in order to reach a mill, which I owned, and which was an important point for the railway to reach, as the trade and the traffic which that mill would give to the road would be an important item in the earnings of the road.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNS. Some hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I should like to know what a railway is built for. Is it intended to carry traffic or simply to go through a country where there is no traffic? The road was built to that mill, and obtained that traffic, and that was financially important in connection with the line. There were two considerations in that. The bridging of the Caraquet River, where it was very wide, and the reaching that mill, influenced me—I take the responsibility on my own shoulders—to build the line by way of the mill. The hon. gentleman has tried to say that other considerations existed. First, he says, there was an appropriation for 36 miles, to bring the road to deep water. It is true that the first appropriation was to bring the road to Caraquet Harbor. In 1884, there was a further appropriation for 24 miles to extend the road to Shippegan Harbor in Lower Caraquet. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the geography of that country know, and those who are not can see by reference to the maps, that Shippegan Harbor is at the eastern extremity of Caraquet. In fact, Shippegan proper is on one side, and Caraquet proper at the other side of Shippegan Harbor. This appropriation for twenty-six miles was to extend the road to Shippegan Harbor. With a view of getting traffic for the road, it was considered desirable to extend it to Shippegan village, which is on the other side of the harbor, necessitating a detour around the head of the harbor, and, therefore, it was that the appropriation for the additional ten miles was granted. At that time, the actual distance had not been ascertained. After it was ascertained, I made application to the Government to appropriate the whole amount of $32,000 for the distance built, which was about six and a half or seven miles, and thus it was that the extreme end of the road received about $32,000 for about seven miles of railway. The subsidy from the Government of New Brunswick was only for sixty miles, so that for the extreme end we had no subsidy from the Provincial Government at all. This company was chartered in 1874. At that time I had no connection with it. I believe it was organised with the view of carrying out the scheme propounded by Sandford Fleming in connection with a line of steamers to Newfoundland, a railway across that Island, and a line of fast steamers thence to Europe, Subsequently, I think, in 1878, the charter was revived. A subsidy of $5,000 per mile was granted by the Assembly of New Brunswick, but notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding that authority was given by that Assembly to issue bonds to the extent of $12,500 per mile, no company was found to take up the scheme. Let me explain how authority for the issue of bonds for $12,500 per mile was given. The popular idea of the length of the line, as there had been no survey, was that it was about 40 miles. Subsequently to 1878, the Assembly of New Brunswick reduced the subsidy from $5,000 per mile to $3,000, and thus the matter stood till 1882. In that year a new company was organised, and at the solicitation of those interested in the construction of the road, I consented to take the presidency. Those who know me, those who are familiar with my position in my county, need not be told that the chances of having that road constructed, even if I were not a member of this House, would be very much better —I do not say this in any egotistical spirit at all— would be very much better in my hands than in the hands of anybody else in my county. At the time of the reorganisation I subscribed for $10,000 in stock, an amount which I felt I could pay, and an amount which I felt was all I could afford to put into an enterprise of that kind. A survey of the road was made, and in order that the necessary expenses attending that survey should be forthcoming, and in order that the company might start on a fair business basis, a call was made. After that call was made, one after another —now I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, I am making a plain statement of facts—one after another of the stockholders came to me and professed, either their inability or their unwillingness to pay the calls on their stock. I, having gone into the enterprise, having regard for my position, commercially, socially, and politically, said to myself: I will put my shoulder to the wheel, and I intend to keep it there and push this scheme through if it is possible to do so. With that object in view, and animated by that spirit, I said to the subscribers: If you cannot and will not pay the calls on your shares, transfer them to me and I will pay those calls. I did so, not that I expected to make any money out of the operation, but solely with a desire to start the company on a business basis, that it might

commence operations. When I came here in 1883, I was the possessor of $10,000 in stock of that road, and not a holder of eleven-twelfths of the stock of the road, as has been represented. Moved by a desire to benefit my county, and impelled by a desire to promote my own business interests, which were the interests of the county, I asked the Government to appropriate an amount in aid of the construction of that road. In doing so I felt I was discharging my duty to my county; I felt I was but doing what had been done by many other members of this House on both sides, who sought to advance the interests of their counties. I have a practical and a particular interest in it which I did not conceal from my constituents when I asked them to elect me. I said: "I believe your interest will be safer in my hands, I believe they will be better guarded and promoted if you elect me than if you elect one living a couple of hundred miles distant from you, who does not hold an acre of soil in this county, who has no interest whatever in it." I said to them: "If you elect me as your representative I will have a double motive in serving you, a motive that should animate every public man to serve his constituency, and also a motive to serve myself, because my interests are bound in this county." That, Mr. Speaker, is a frank statement of what I said at that time. Well, Sir, moved by these motives, animated by a desire to serve my county, I came here and made representation to the Government which led them to accede to my request; and they asked Parliament for an appropriation in aid of the construction of that road. The statements I made then were made in good faith, they were based on statistics I had before me, on the census returns, and on my own knowledge of the county. The Government shared my view, every man who had given any consideration to the matter shared my view. I was not singular when I looked forward to a very large trade being done on that road. In 1884 I came back, and I asked the Government to complete the appropriation necessary for the construction of that road. At first, I asked the Government to ask Parliament to grant an amount sufficient to build to Shippegan harbor, but they only asked this House to appropriate a sum for thirty-six miles of road. Subsequently, I asked them to complete the undertaking by granting an appropriation for the other twenty-four miles, and that was acceded to. In 1882 I went to England with the view of securing the construction of that line. The result of my mission there was that I secured the rails and fastenings for that line, as has been truly said by the hon. member for West Durham, by hypothecation of the bonds. It was the only means we had of getting them, and parties in England had sufficient faith in the enterprise to furnish them on the hypothecation of the bonds. I came back, and the work of construction was commenced, and went on with very little intermission until its completion in the fall of 1888. While I felt that a large traffic would develop on that road, and that in time it would be self-sustaining and pay interest on the bonds, I thought it was necessary that I should deposit in London an amount sufficient to cover the interest on these bonds during the construction of the road, and that amount was deposited. Well, shortly afterwards, I think it was in the fall of 1884, a sum of £30,000 of those bonds was taken, I think, by a syndicate connected with the firm who furnished the rails and fastenings. On the construction of about forty miles of the road, the remaining £70,000 was offered to the public, and, I think, with rather indifferent success. Speaking from memory, and subject to correction, I am of opinion that the whole amount of that £70,000 was not taken by the public, but that it remained in the hands of the underwriters; and that to-day, there is no very considerable amount of those bonds in the hands of the general public. I believe that a very large block remains in the hands of the original syndicate. In 1888 the line was completed. During the early days, or when only a portion of the line was completed, a large traffic was done over the road, and I felt rather elated, and believed that the road would pay not only its working expenses but interest on the bonds, and might almost give a dividend to those who had put their money in it. Thus it was that the statements I made in a private letter to my correspondent in London were incorporated into the prospectus. In estimating or in stating that the road would pay interest on £100,000 in bonds, I do not think I did, I am certain I did not wish to draw an exaggerated picture, but I simply stated what I believed would be a fact. A careful estimate was made by myself and others as to the traffic which was expected to be secured for that road, and the result of our enquiries was that we felt that, in time, at all events, the road would earn quite enough to pay interest on its bonds. I have stated to the House, in answer to the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), how it was that I became possessed of a large amount of stock. Let me explain how it was I became possessed of the larger amount of the stock. Shortly after the commencement of the construction of the line it was found that the company as a company were not in a financial position to carry out the undertaking, and it became necessary that the firm, of which I am the head, should take over the line and construct it. It was then deemed advisable that the whole amount of the unsubscribed stock should be transferred to my firm as part and parcel of the contract for the construction of that line, and that stock remained in my name. As regards that stock I have to say this, that from the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite it has been shown that the stock is useless, and therefore all the worse for me; and I will be prepared at any time, and I am now prepared, to hand over that stock to any persons interested in the road who believe that they can make more money out of it than I can. Unfortunately, the road has not earned enough money to pay interest on its bonds, and that fact no one regrets as much as I do, not even the bondholders. I have put my money into the road, I have bent all the energies I possessed to the construction of the road, and naturally I feel much chagrined and disappointed that my expectations have not been realised. While it has not paid interest on its bonds since 1st January last, for the interest on the bonds has been paid up to 1st January, I yet feel sanguine that in a short time, in the course of time at all events, that road will pay well. We have had a great many difficulties to contend with, and I believe, were it not that hostile influences were at work in London and elsewhere to decry the road and to decry me, the stockholders with a plain

statement of the facts before would have been content to wait in the same expectation as I entertained that in time they would receive interest on their money. If you compare the receipts for the first year with those of the last, and it is quite true the receipts for the first, second and third years were small compared with our anticipations, yet if you compare them with the last returns, you will find that the last returns show nearly double the amount. I feel hopeful that this year's earnings will be still larger, considerably larger, without any increase in the working expenses. I think, and in saying this I am subject to correction, that the answer given by the Government, in reply to a question as to the earnings and expenses of the road for the year ending 1890, was incorrect or based on a misapprehension. I speak subject to correction, but a memorandum I have, and which is incorporated in another document, goes to show that the earnings for the year ending 1889, were $17,000 and the working expenses $20,000. Let me here ask this question: Who will be the greatest sufferer if the earnings of the line fall short of the expenses? Hon. gentlemen I am sure can very readily answer that question for themselves. Every dollar expended over and above the earnings has to be paid out of my pocket, or out of the pocket of the firm of which I am the head. I can say this, that the Caraquet Railway has no floating debt further than anything it may owe to my firm. Every employé on the road is paid, every account is paid, every bill for rolling stock is paid, all its obligations have been discharged by the firm of which I am the head; and, therefore, I ask hon. gentlemen who will suffer most if the earnings of the line fall short of the expenses? Speaking on this particular question, let me reply to the statements made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or rather statements repeated, because they have been given to him by an anonymous correspondent; a correspondent, at all events, with whose name the House is not familiar, but whose name, I think, I know perfectly well. He here makes a statement, which I most emphatically denied in my place in this House a few days ago, that the bulk of the labor for the construction of the road was paid out of my store or out of the store of K. F. Burns & Co. In answer to that assertion I have simply to repeat what I said the other day, that on the 20th of every month the paymaster went along the line and paid every man the last cent due to him. True it is that in this case, as in the case of all public works of such magnitude, the men require supplies during the month; and naturally under these circumstances, considering that K. F. Burns & Co. had the contract with the line, the men took their supplies from our firm; but I want to impress this fact on this House, that the men were not precluded from getting their supplies at any place they chose. They were told: Get your supplies where you will. Storekeepers were invited to furnish the men with supplies; and as regards the amount coming to them, they were paid at the end of every month. So much with regard to that statement; and I may be permitted to repeat that every dollar of the wages due to the men at the end of the month was paid them in cash. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has also alluded to a matter, a very painful matter, which has given me very great concern, and that is the casualty which happened on the road. He was not quite frank in his statement in regard to that matter; at all events, I am afraid that hon. gentlemen would draw the inference from what he said that a number of casualties occurred.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not know more than what was in the railway statistics.

Mr. BURNS. I think I am right in saying that the inference drawn by hon. gentlemen from the statement made would be that there was more than one casualty. Unfortunately there was one very serious casualty, caused by the displacement of the top of a bridge, from the ice, with an extraordinary high tide and a gale of wind. That led to the disaster which the hon. gentleman has made reference to, and which entailed on the company and on myself a great deal of pain and grief, knowing, as I did intimately, a number of the men who had lost their lives, and it also entailed on the company—which is a very unimportant matter compared with the loss of life—considerable monetary loss in rebuilding the bridge. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell the House, that the letter he read was rather an old one, and dated as far back as 1886. His correspondent says that the right of way had not been paid on that road, or at all events that it had only been paid to a minor extent. Let me tell this to the House. The charter of that company, granted by the Assembly of New Brunswick, practically gave the right of way free, and every dollar paid out of the pockets of the company, or out of my pocket if you will, for right of way, was money paid gratuitously. The Act of 1874 stated that in order that any land owner should be entitled to any compensation for the land over which the road ran, he should give notice in writing to the company within twelve months. That was generally known. That charter was granted at a time when people were very anxious for railways through their district, and in point of fact were quite willing to grant the right of way free. It was in view of that, and also to safeguard the interests of those who did not wish to be compelled to give the right of way, that there was a provision inserted, giving the right to any land owner to obtain compensation for damages, by giving notice to the company within twelve months from the time of commencement of the construction, or the appropriating of the lands. Thus, Sir, the company were entitled to the right of way free, and in only a few cases that I remember of just now, was there any demand made by any land owner on the company for damages; and I am frank enough to say one stands unpaid to-day, for the reason that the owner was so hostile to the construction of the road, that he, or some member of his family, stood with an axe upon his land, in order to prevent the surveyor or the contractors from entering upon it; and that because he demanded ten times as much for his land as it is worth, and as the company were willing to give him for it. We are quite willing to give him the fair value of the land, on the same valuation as was given to his neighbors. In 1886, the line was still under construction, and these land matters had not been all arranged, but I think I am right in saying that with a few very unimportant exceptions, the right of way has been paid in cash, and that without our being

under any obligation to do so. I do not claim credit to myself for having done this; I think we simply did what was due to the people, and I believe they appreciate the fact. I wish the House to understand that in paying for the right of way, no matter whether large or small, the company acted in the most liberal manner and gave what was, practically, a gratuity to the land owners. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has alluded to the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper, when the resolutions were introduced, looking to the obtaining from Parliament, of authority to pay these subsidies, and he also alluded to the speech that was delivered at London, by the right hon. the Premier and the Minister of Justice. I will not attempt, in my humble capacity, to defend these gentlemen, but I can say that, if the High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, were here, I am quite sure he would be able to give the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) a Roland for his Oliver. I am certain that the right hon. the Premier can defend his conduct and the conduct of the Government, in appropriating money for this and for other roads, and the hon. the Minister of Justice is able to do the same. The right hon. the Premier has stated that I, actuated with the desire to discharge my duties to my constituents, had gone with all the energy I possessed into that enterprise, and that I put my hand in my pocket and aided in the construction of that railway. The right hon. gentleman has stated what is quite true. I did go into the enterprise and I went into it largely with a view of benefiting my constituency, and somewhat with a view of improving my own business position in the county, because my business in the county was bound up with the county, and the county's interests were bound up with my business to a very large extent. Now Sir, I do not know that I have much more if anything to say. I have endeavored to make a plain statement of facts, and I think I have succeeded. Let me add to what I have said, this: that taking out the commissions, and taking out the interest which was deposited for three years, and the expenses attending the issue of the bonds, and interest during the time of the construction, and the discount on the New Brunswick bonds—because it must be remembered by the House that this $3,000 a mile was not paid in cash by the New Brunswick Government, but in 4 per cent. bonds—taking the discount on these bonds, which if I remember aright brought an average of about 93 or 94, and summing up the whole of these deductions, it will be found that only about $600,000 cash was available to that company outside of its shares, for the construction of the road. That is a sum equal to about $8,500 per mile, certainly not $9,000, and I ask this House: is that an extravagant amount? I do not know that it would be quite proper for me to go into the particular figures here, because I think it is a matter which the House does not require, but if any hon. gentleman is desirous of obtaining any particular information, I shall be most happy to furnish it to him, and I shall show him beyond question that the statement I made, as to the net amount of money available for the construction of the line, is perfectly correct. Now, Sir, with that $8,500 per mile, or at the most $9,000 per mile, a railway of 70 miles in length was constructed. It is constructed as well as, if not considerably better than, any local line in New Brunswick, and in making that statement I cannot be contradicted. I assert that the Caraquet Railway, from beginning to end, is the best local line in New Brunswick. Several station houses, as has been stated by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), have been built, but not at a cost of $350. The man who made that statement economised truth in a most remarkable degree. These stations are very good ones, and they cost on an average $1,200 each. The bridges and structures of every kind on that road are very good; the road is well ditched and well graded; it has snow fences where they are required; and in every respect it is a road which will do credit to any part of the Dominion of Canada, and, I think, does credit to its constructors and to those interested in it. The hon. member for West Durham has made allusions to the fact that a mile branch was constructed to the mill of Mr. Burns at Bathurst. Let me explain that. Mr. Burns' mill at Bathurst, happens to be located just where it is necessary to have a station for the accommodation of the town, and it was necessary to construct what might be called a branch, but what is really part of the main line, to that particular point in order to bring the railway as near the town as it could possibly go, without bridging the Nepesiguit River. This part of the road joins the Intercolonial at the junction, and in point of fact, for all business not going to the Intercolonial Railway, it is the terminus of the road, and cannot be styled a branch; and, therefore, I am not open to the imputation of deflecting the line by the construction of that portion. The hon. gentleman has attacked the Government on their railway policy generally, and he has referred to the fact that these railway resolutions have been brought down and hurried through at a very late day in the Session. I am informed that that hon. gentleman himself was a party to a similar move during the time he was a member and perhaps the leader of the Government of Ontario. I am informed that at that time, though he had frequently denounced the subsidising of railways, the Government of which he was a member brought down some railway resolutions which were hurried through in as rapid a manner as any resolutions were ever hurried through this House. If that is the case, it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to attack this Government for having done the same thing. Why do the Government bring down the railway resolutions at the end of the Session? It is because they require all the time to ascertain the wants of the country before they can appropriate public money to meet those wants; they require all that time in order that they may obtain from the members the information necessary to enable them to come to a correct judgment as to the railways to which they should grant subsidies. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am done. I think I have explained my position in connection with this road; I think I have shown the House that I have done nothing that I should be either afraid or ashamed of. Every statement I made in connection with the road from beginning to end was made in good faith, on information which I believe to be sound and good, without the slightest desire to

mislead anybody ; and if any harm has been done to any person by the construction of that line, the greatest harm has been done to myself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I shall only occupy the time of the House for a very short period—in the first place, because it it of very great importance that we should get on with the business of Parliament at this stage of the session, and in the next place, because the main portion of the speech of the hon. member for West Durham was directed against the position and standing commercially, socially, and politically of my hon. friend who has just spoken ; and the House will have seen that the hon. gentleman prepared himself to deliver a most exhaustive and elaborate speech, with his usual amount of labor bestowed upon the attack ; and it was addressed to us with the zeal and energy of the skilled advocate, whose duty it was to obtain a verdict of conviction, rather than in the style of a representative of the people trying to do justice to the country and the House, and to ascertain the truth. The manner was histrionic, and the matter was so arranged as sometimes by ridicule and sometimes by sarcasm to crush the hon. member who has just spoken. On the other hand, the House has heard the plain, straighforward statement of my hon. friend, which I think will commend itself to the good feeling and moral sense of the hon. members of this House, and, I think, they will feel that it was unjust and unworthy of the hon. member for West Durham, to use all his long experience, his great ability, and his eloquence, to make an attack on a man who he knew, from his previous training, was quite unable to do battle of a like kind with him. But my hon. friend has made his plain statement ; he has told all the facts ; he has stated what we must know, that he has been pecuniarily a great loser from his connection with this railway ; and why the hon. gentleman should go out of his way in order to injure a fellow creature, I cannot see. As regards the attack, if it be an attack, on the railway policy of the Government, I need not keep the House long in discussing that. It is an old story. Our policy has been well known ; it has been carried out for years ; it has received the sanction of Parliament ; it has received the approbation of the country ; and notwithstanding the strong opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Government are convinced that they have done a great and lasting service to the whole of the Dominion by carrying out a liberal railway policy, and they will not be deterred by the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite from continuing to carry out that policy with prudence and caution, but yet with enterprise. Yes, Sir, the policy of the Government was announced by myself in that speech which the hon. gentleman quoted, in which I said that it was the desire of the Government to assist all parts of Canada, by every reasonable proposition for the development of the means of transport by railways ; and we promised to make the moderate advance of $3,200 a mile to any railway in a fitting portion of the country where a railway would seem to be required, if sufficient additional means should be furnished otherwise to build it. It was a matter of no consequence to the Government or Parliament how the balance of the money for the construction of the railway was obtained, whether by

stock or bonds, or by voluntary aid for a philanthropic purpose. It was a matter of no consequence to Parliament, provided the several localities were assisted by the means which Parliament voted. The reason why the $3,200 was selected at first, and why it was continued, was that it was held by the Government, and sanctioned by Parliament, that whenever, in any particular portion of the country, a railway was commenced and graded, the ties laid down, and the road ballasted, Parliament should assist such a railway to the extent of furnishing the iron. That $3,200 was then the current price for railway iron, and, therefore, it was considered a sum sufficient to enable any railway company, undertaking the enterprise of constructing a railway to purchase their iron, when they had all the rest of the road ready for the iron. The hon. gentleman says we ought in this case to have been more particular in our enquiries as to the probability of the road being a paying road. Well, I do not think that in this case we are open to the charge of not having made the proper enquiries. In the first place, we had that report, which has been mentioned, by Mr. Sandford Fleming, who was the engineer, under both Governments, for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. He made elaborate reports during the progress of the Intercolonial Railway, of its advantages and its means of extension and improvement generally. He took up enthusiastically the idea that a railway running from the Intercolonial Railway as far as Shippegan would be a great advantage. He was fully impressed with the idea that a railway running to Shippegan and connecting with a steam ferry running across to George's Bay, Newfoundland, and then making connection with a railway across Newfoundland, would bring England within four days of America. Those who have taken the trouble to look back so far, will find that was strongly impressed upon Government and upon Parliament by an eminent civil engineer, such as Mr. Fleming was. That same opinion was given in the most marked manner by the Government and Legislature of New Brunswick, who knew, or ought to have known, all about that country, and who made a grant in aid of this railway. But remember, Sir, that the Parliament of Canada, in helping these railways by subsidies, does not do so for the purpose of building up roads in order that the shareholders should become wealthy. The object of the Government was to furnish to the people of Canada means of transport by aiding the building of railways wherever the people desired to have them, and all that the Government cared for was that by means of such assistance these railways should be built. The only caution that ought to be taken by the Governments in that regard would be that railways should not be built which would not afterwards be run ; and I think that any one who will look over the list of railways which have been constructed with the assistance of this parliamentary grant, will find that, with one or two unimportant exceptions, all these roads have been completed and are running and in every instance whether they have returned any interest to the investors or not, the country has had the advantage of them, and the people have had the advantage of them, and those advantages are recognised everywhere by the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon.

gentlemen on this side, are well aware of the advantages which the several localities have reached from these roads and the proof of that is that a good many hon. gentlemen on both sides have been with me this Session, as being the Minister principally in charge of railway matters, pressing for an extension of the same privilege and the same assistance as were given to the Caraquet and other railways, being given to the railways in their counties. So that the policy has been successful, and the pressure now is from all parts of the country to have that policy carried out to an extent much larger than the Government think the credit or the means of Canada will at present allow. Now the hon. gentleman sarcastically spoke of the railway being, first, for 36 miles, and then 57 miles, and 60 miles, and so on. Why, that happens very frequently. The Government assists a railway by degrees, so that the company can construct a portion of the road and then continue the road to some other point, and then year by year the Government will come to Parliament and ask for additional grants until the whole projected line is finished; and I cannot see any objection in the world to that policy. It is a prudent policy. It encourages the localities through which these lines are projected and the municipalities, where there are municipalities, to contribute to the construction of the road, and so, by degrees, without unduly taxing themselves, in one, two, three or four years, they secure the desired railway accommodation. The only thing I will further allude to will be the remark of the hon. gentleman that he thinks it exceedingly unfortunate that members of Parliament should engage in enterprises of this kind. I differ with him altogether on that point, and, if he will look at our great exemplar in England, he will find that such a doctrine would be scouted and laughed at if it were said in the House of Commons in England that men who were engaged in railway enterprises, or in any other industry, should not, for the advantage of their constituents—aye, for their own advantage—press any legislation for their benefit or the benefit of similar industries or enterprises, but that they should stay out of Parliament if they are engaged in any industries that may be the subject of legislation. Instead of that doctrine prevailing in England, it is understood that the leaders, the great men at the head of any of the great industries, or enterprises, or professions, or trades, should be represented in Parliament, and the only restriction known there is that no member of Parliament shall vote on a measure in which he is pecuniarily interested personally. We all remember one gentleman who was long and favorably known in Canada as a railway man—I mean Sir Edward Watkin. He is the exponent of railway matters in the House of Commons in England. He is at the head of one of the greatest networks of railways in England. He is the president and the manager of all these great roads.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are those roads bonused by Parliament? That is the point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought not to interrupt me. Sir Edward Watkin is not only connected with railways in England, but with steamship lines running to France, and with railways in France; and, though they are not bonused by Parliament, they have great interests, which are involved in parliamentary legislation; their interests are prejudiced or promoted by legislation. These gentlemen cannot vote themselves when any measure immediately affecting them is before Parliament, but they are there, and all their influence is used to secure legislation to the advantage of the business in which they are engaged. See what took place the other day in regard to the brewers in England. They are all represented in Parliament, and see what the course was which they took in respect of the duties on malt and on beer. It was said that they ought not to be in Parliament, or to use their influence or to endeavor in any way to influence legislation on that matter because it might be an advantage to their own business. The other day when we had the Banking Bill before this House, I have no doubt that many members who voted on it were interested as shareholders in the banks, but I did not observe any hesitation on the part of any hon. gentleman on either side in voting on that measure, although the effect of some of the clauses was such—if we are to believe the deputations of the bankers—as were calculated to injure the banks, to reduce their profits and to injure the interests of the several institutions they are connected with. This kind of affected purity, which does not mean anything, is a very cheap kind of morality and is only from the teeth outwards. I, therefore, differ with the hon. gentleman on these two points: first, that the policy of the Government is a mistaken policy in regard to railways; and second, that the pressure brought to bear on the Government to lay measures of aid to railways before Parliament, has been such that the Government has been reckless in its course. I think the policy of the Government has been very beneficial to the country, I believe it has been a wise policy, I believe it has not been imprudently exercised, but that the country has gained great advantages from that policy. Until I am convinced—and I have not yet been convinced—that the policy is wrong, I shall adhere to the opinion that the do-nothing policy is not a policy to adopt in a young country, or, for that matter, in any other country. One thing more and I will sit down. There is an apprehension expressed that the Government are going to buy up all the branches and railways connected with the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway is burdened enough, and I do not think——

Mr. MITCHELL. It is no burden to you. You bargained for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) is irrepressible, and I suppose I must submit. He is a chartered libertine, and neither you, Mr. Speaker, nor any one else can keep him in order. I will not try to do so, but I will submit with as much Christian resignation as I can. Meanwhile I may proceed to say that no one in or out of the House need be alarmed that the Government are going to absorb any of the railways referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one statement made by the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) with which I am able entirely to concur, and which the country, in view of the facts which up to the present time have attended his administration of the Intercolonial Railway,

will receive with satisfaction, and that is the statement—made, I fear, for the moment only—that he has no intention at present of further burdening the country by acquiring these branch lines, unless political exigencies should compel him to do so. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman ever made an unfortunate statement in his life, it was when he undertook to compare the railway policy in England, and the well understood conditions under which members in the English Parliament act with the system which has prevailed here of late years. Can the hon. gentleman state, does he dare to say, that he knows of one solitary instance in England in which one member of Parliament has supported a government and received a subsidy for a road in which he was interested ? Can he show in the whole history of English legislation, one case in which a subsidy was given to a road in which members of Parliament were known to be interested—let alone their being the principal proprietors ? I am willing to give the hon. gentleman the floor if he will state such a case. If the hon. gentleman knows a case in which a member of Parliament in England has voted in regard to a railway bonused by the Government of the day, I should like to know it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They do not bonus any railways there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No ; they do not, and, therefore, the statement of the hon. gentleman is wholly false, is wholly misleading, and is simply designed to blind the members of this House. Now, I think that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) deserve the thanks, not merely of this House, which, perhaps, they will not get, but of the people of this country, for the pains they have taken to bring to our notice an object lesson calculated, if it be possible for any lesson to do so, to open the minds and the eyes of the people of Canada to one of the main modes by which the right hon. gentleman has retained power up to the present time. Sir, the facts which were stated, first, by the member for North York, and, secondly, and more at length, by the member from West Durham, show us what is the natural fruit of a throughly rotten system, supplemented by a thoroughly rotten method of administration. A few days ago I was taken to task in this House by some hon. gentlemen, because, in dealing with another sort of case, I told this House that the particular case I then alluded to might best be described as a peak, representing a mountain of undeveloped corruption ; and I think that the lesson of to-night's proceedings will show that one other portion of the peak, at any rate, is fast emerging from below the waters. Up to the present time the hon. gentleman appears to have been able to maintain himself in power chiefly by these four methods : First, by the free distribution of the public domain to certain favored parties, of which we had recent, eminent and notorious example ; next, by a system, I was going to say of thinly disguised bribery, but I will say instead, by a system of open bribery on the part of contractors in testimonials and otherwise ; next, by a system of tariff corners and subsidies ; and lastly, by the method of which we have had so notable an illustration just now, the method of railway subsidy distributed among various constituencies and among various members of this House. Now, Sir, I shall proceed to call the attention of the House again, and in particular the attention of the hon. member for Gloucester, to the several charges and statements which were submitted by my hon. friend, and I call the attention of the House, also, to the manner in which these charges were answered. It was stated here, and so far as I heard it was not denied, that whether or not the member for Gloucester was in the first instance the chief proprietor of this road, shortly after the subsidy had been got, or at the time the subsidy was got that hon. member was, to all intents and purposes, the sole owner of the road, that is to say, that he owned and controlled so vast a portion of the stock that he was, to all intents and purposes, the Caraquet and Shippegan Railway. It was stated, in the second place, that the hon. gentleman had put no money whatever into it. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not venture to state definitely that he had put money into it, he made some general statements to which I will allude in a few moments ; but he did not venture to assure the House that he had put any definite sum of money into this work. It was stated, in the next place, that the hon. gentleman had been concerned in most grossly misrepresenting the condition of that road ; the prospectuses on which the hon. gentleman's statements were based were read to the House, and minute details were given, and the hon. gentleman did not venture to deny one word of the statements read to the House by my hon. friend from West Durham. As to the question of the cost of the railway, I shall proceed to speak a little more in detail. The gentleman did not give us what he believed to be the real cost, although, I think, he led us to understand that it would be something like $9,000 or $10,000. The hon. gentleman did not, and, I presume, he could not, deny the further statement made that he had constructed the road himself, a fact which, as everybody acquainted with railroad matters knows, would enable him, and has often enabled other persons than himself, under pretence of securing a road, to turn into their own pockets a most undue proportion of the cost of its construction. But, Sir, the member for Gloucester put one or two curious queries to the House. The member for Gloucester desires to know : What is a railway built for ? Well, Sir, it is built for two purposes, as a general rule. Sometimes it is built on fair and good grounds, for the purpose of developing traffic and of making a fair return to the shareholders and bondholders, out of fair earnings. But, I am sorry to say that our annals and those of the United States show that in far too many instances a railroad is built and bonuses are obtained from the public treasury there and elsewhere, and loans are received from confiding bondholders, not for the purpose of honestly constructing a railway, not for the purpose of honestly developing traffic, but for the purpose of enabling the fortunate contractors, or the fortunate parties who have obtained the construction or the control of the road, to put a large sum of money into their private pockets, without risking one penny themselves. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that he does not expect to make any money out of this road. The hon. gentleman further told us that he was prepared to hand over the stock to any one, and I do not doubt him in the least, under the circumstances ; I should say, under the circumstances, that it would be a

very dangerous gift for anybody here or elsewhere to accept. He was good enough to enquire of us, lastly: Who, forsooth, would suffer most if the earnings failed to pay expenses? Well, Sir, I do not think it would be the hon. gentleman for Gloucester, I think it would be those unfortunate and deluded English bondholders who were induced to put £80.000 or £100,000 sterling into this enterprise, by representations which have been shown on the floor of this House, and not denied by the hon. gentleman himself, to be most grossly incorrect, not to use a harsher word. Now, I want to call the attention of the member for Gloucester to this fact: the hon. gentleman told us that only $600,000 were available out of the subsidies paid by New Brunswick and Canada, and out of the £100,000 sterling of bonds floated in England for the construction of the road. Now, on our $225,000 there was no discount whatever; on the $180,000 obtained from New Brunswick, there may have been a discount of $10,000, and I give the hon. gentleman the benefit of it. That makes $415,000 in hard cash out of the $600,000. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that after reserving three years' interest and the requisite commissions, his £100,000 sterling sold in London, only yielded $175,000 or $180,000 ?—because that is what the hon. gentleman's statement results in. If the hon. gentleman declares to the House, in his place, that the net result of the £100,000 sterling was to leave him $185,000, a little more than £35,000 sterling, all I can say is that the hon. gentleman must have contributed very largely to the enrichment of somebody in England, or somebody elsewhere. I cannot for the life of me see how or under what circumstance the hon. gentleman could make the statement that only $600,000 were available. I do not think the bondholders in England will receive that statement, when the report of this debate reaches them as it surely will, in a spirit of perfect credulity. But there is another side to this question. The hon. gentleman tells us that this road cost $600,000, as I understood him, he may correct me if I am wrong; that $600,000 were available. The prospectuses read by my hon. friend, endorsed apparently by the hon. member for Gloucester, known at all events to him, put forward as a statement under his authority, stated, if I followed my hon. friend correctly, that the road had cost £290,000 sterling, that is to say $1,400,000. Now, if there were but $600,000 available it might interest this House, and it would add materially to the exculpation of the hon. gentleman, if he would kindly inform us where the other $800,000 came from. Who supplied it, or how was that money furnished? The question will be of interest. It would throw a flood of light on the method of financing this road, which, the hon. gentleman has told us, is the best feeder of the Intercolonial and the best built road in New Brunswick. Until that matter is cleared up, until the difference between the $600,000 available and the $1,400,000 of cost has been explained, I must say that the hon. gentleman places himself in rather an odd position either before this House or before the English bondholders by the statement he has made. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) put another question, and it is an interesting one. Why, he asked, did the Government bring down the railway resolutions at the end of the Session? There are many reasons. One I will suggest is, that it is infinitely easier to get through jobs like this when they are brought down at the end of the Session than it would be if full time was given to discuss them, as we ought to have, while the House is fresh, when information can be obtained, when we can send, if necessary, to the portions of the country where the roads are to be constructed, and when, in a word, we can obtain reasonably full information to govern us in making the grants we are asked to make. The First Minister was good enough, following up the line of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) to insinuate that this hon. gentleman was a loser. If we had possessed, as we ought to have possessed, some reasonable estimate as to the probable cost, if such an estimate had been laid on the Table of the House, if we had the reports of surveys we might have known something more about the undertaking, and we might have formed some reasonable idea as to whether, in view of the subsidies advanced for such a road, any one would, under any circumstances, have come out a loser. The First Minister defends his policy on the ground, he says, that he is prepared to grant $3,200 per mile to every road that applies. The hon. gentleman cannot do it. He told us the other day there were a hundred applications made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ninety or a hundred applications.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say that we were prepared to make a grant to every road that applied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I took down the hon. gentleman's words. Perhaps he did not mean to say that, but when *Hansard* appears he will see that that was what he said—that he was prepared to grant it to every road, with the restriction that the people should show they were willing to contribute. If the hon. gentleman wishes to modify that statement, I will accept his modification, of course. I can understand that had the hon. gentleman adopted a plan somewhat like that prevailing in parts of the United States, where everybody is allowed to construct railways under certain restrictions and in compliance with certain well established rules, of which giving estimates is one, showing the public that the individuals who propose to build are able to construct the road is another, under these circumstances I can understand there might be something to be said for this policy, that is to say there might be something to be said for this policy, if we were a legislative Government such as exists in England. But in a confederation like this, one composed of Provinces in different states of development, this is a most ill-advised and unwise policy, and although in a few individual cases out of many scores, some good may have resulted, in the vast majority of the cases it has been simply a source of injury and corruption to the people of the country. The hon. gentleman talked of the pressure brought to bear upon him. I do not doubt that an enormous pressure is brought to bear upon him constantly for the construction of roads; I do not deny that in the least. There is nothing which a great number of persons in this House, or outside of it, desire more than to control a charter with a subsidy attached.

Mr. BLAKE. Or a subsidy with a railway charter attached.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whichever you please. There is no one thing which many members of this House, to their proper shame be it said, have trafficked in more than railway charters, and the possibility of trafficking, the making of improper gains, of filling their pockets at the public expense, has been infinitely increased by the policy inaugurated by that hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) has not denied the main facts, or indeed any of the material facts alleged by my hon. friend. He has not denied the receipt of a subsidy, he has not denied that in the various prospectuses issued in England a misstatement of the most extraordinary character was made, he has not denied that in one of those prospectuses it was claimed that this road would develop a traffic of $3,200 per mile, that it was claimed in another prospectus that the road would have a net profit of $1,000 per mile; he has not denied the fact that the total revenue of this road did not even pay the running expenses, let alone a profit of $60,000 or $70,000 a year. He has not denied any of these statements. He has not denied the statements made in the newspapers; he has not paid the slightest attention to the language used in the public press with respect to his undertaking, nor did he state that any material portion of the $700,000 or $800,000 subscribed had been paid up. On all these points the hon. member for Gloucester practically let matters go by default. Some things, however, remain exceedingly clear. It is perfectly clear that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) was the sole proprietor of this road to all intents and purposes, that it was very largely subsidised by the Government, that year after year, first in 1883, then in 1884, then in 1886, then in 1887 or 1888 the hon. gentleman was dancing attendance on the Government of the day, he was a supplicant and applicant for further favors at their hands. Such a position is wholly and utterly inconsistent with the position of a member of Parliament. I say that the man in this House, be he who he may, whether a Minister or a member, whether a member of the Opposition, or a supporter of the Government, who being largely interested in a railway, is an applicant to the Government for a large sum of money for the benefit of that road in which he is largely personally interested, that man to all intents and purposes is merely a bond slave to the Government, he has ceased to be a free agent, he cannot be a free agent, he is unfit to sit in this House or to vote in this House, for the simple reason that he is no longer a member for a constituency, but a member for a railway, be it the Caraquet and Shippegan or any road you please. How can such a man pass an honest judgment on any demand made from any quarter of this House for a grant of money for the purpose of constructing a railway elsewhere? His mouth is tied, his vote is gone to all intents and purposes. Such a practice opens the door for the grossest imaginable irregularities of all kinds and to corruption in every shape and form. I do not wish to go over the long list of men we have known or have heard of as trafficking in charters within the bounds of this Parliament. I will recall one case. I do not see my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) in the chamber, but there was a case brought up—I am sorry to say too late in the last Parliament to enable us to investigate it—in which if my memory is correct it was stated on the floor, and was admitted by the accused party to be true, that a member of the late Parliament had obtained a subsidy of $3,200 a mile and had charged somebody else a commission of $320 per mile for transferring that subsidy and a charter of which he got control. I am speaking from recollection and therefore under correction if I have overstated the case, but at all events there is the *Hansard* in which the statement will be found recorded. My recollection is that the statement was made and that the facts were admitted on the floor of the House. Now, Sir, what are the lessons to be adduced from all this? One of these lessons is, the gross and extreme folly of granting subsidies as we have been doing, and are likely to be asked to do within a few hours. I say, Sir, that if the Government continue this practice, if they choose to go on with what I believe to be the mistaken practice of granting subsidies in the fashion they are now doing, they are bound in all honor and conscience to take reasonable precautions to prevent just such occurrences as those which have been detailed to-night. I say that no Government which was true to the country would grant one of these railways a subsidy until there were first laid before the Minister of Railways and submitted to Parliament, sufficiently fair and accurate plans of the country to be traversed, to enable the Minister and the House to form a reasonably accurate estimate of the total cost of the road. In the second place, evidence should be given to the Minister, and should be transmitted by him to Parliament, to show that the parties in connection with it had reasonable facilities, and reasonable means to enable them to construct the line; that they were not men of straw, and that they were willing to invest a fair amount of their own property in the enterprise. Lastly, Sir, and, perhaps, as important as any: it is a gross violation of all propriety, and of all constitutional rule and precedence that these propositions to grant subsidies to railways should not be laid on the Table of this House several weeks before prorogation in order that we may have time to examine them, we must go on with this policy, in order that we may have time to ascertain which are reasonable and fair applications likely to benefit the country, and which on the other hand are likely to result in disaster and injury. In this present case, it is perfectly apparent that everyone of these conditions were utterly disregarded. There is not even a pretence that when the Government came down here to ask for the original subsidy, or, for the matter of that, for any of the other subsidies, that they had before them any plan or survey, or any proper estimate of what this road would cost. There is no evidence at all that they took any pains to ascertain what amount of money the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), or any of the other parties connected with him, were going to invest of their own proper funds; and it is notorious, as was stated by my hon. friend, that we were forced to discuss these matters and to vote upon them in some twenty-four or forty-eight hours from the time they were brought down, and that they were purposely delayed until the last moment before being brought down to this House. For what reason

was this? It was for the reason, that while important discussions were going on; while sometimes the fate of Ministers, strong as they are, had been trembling in the balance, it was very convenient to have railway subsidies, dangling before recalcitrant supporters, and to hint to these gentlemen that if they did not choose to support the Government of the day, they would find themselves left out in the cold when the time came for dividing up the plunder. There is a fourth reason which goes to show how great and grave has been the injury done to the country by the hon. gentleman's policy. These facts which my hon. friend recalled to the attention of the House, have been already made a subject of most unfavorable comment in the mother country. The English shareholders who were induced to put £80,000 or £100,000 sterling into the Caraquet and Shippegan Railway, on representations of a net profit of $1,000 per mile, on representations of a traffic of $3,200 per mile; what will they think, when all these facts are brought before them? When they know that the total sum received from this road scarcely amounts to $300 per mile, let alone $3,200; when they know that a road that was to pay $1,000 per mile net profit, according to the statement of the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), showed last year a dead loss of $3,000 on running expenses over receipts, and which showed, according to the statement made by the First Minister, something like $8,000 or $9,000 dead loss of expenses over receipts. I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that we have very little credit to throw away in this respect. Why, Sir, only the other day I was obliged to call the attention of the House to a matter which I was compelled to characterise as an atrocious swindle. I refer to the Canadian Dead Meat Company. In that, also, representations of the most astounding character had been made, apparently under the sanction, or at any rate with the knowledge, of our High Commissioner in London, and of one very important member of the Ministry. I was glad to hear that gentleman deny that he knew anything whatever about the matter with which his name was connected, although, I must say, that as member for Three Rivers, he might, I think, have been a little better informed. What do we find with respect to other matters? My hon. friend referred to the fact that he supposed this Caraquet railroad was connected with a scheme of a fast mail service. The other day a paper was placed in my hands in which we find that the gentlemen with whom the Government were negotiating for the purpose of constructing a fast mail steamship line, published to the world, a statement which reads as follows:—

"The inspired statement in the Montreal *Gazette*, to which your article refers, aggravates the injustice with which the Canadian Government appear to be determined to treat us in this matter. So far from it being true that the main reason for our surrendering the contract was 'inability to interest sufficient capital for so large an undertaking,' we are able to say without hesitation that if the representations made to us when we undertook the business, and on the faith of which alone we embarked upon it, had been fulfilled, we should have had no difficulty whatever in finding the necessary capital.

"We trust that this is the last time we shall be troubled to contradict these persistent misstatements.

"We are, sir,

"Your obedient servants."

"ANDERSON, ANDERSON & CO."

"PROPOSED CANADIAN ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

"To the Editor of the *Times* (London):

"SIR,—From a telegram published in to-day's papers it appears that in the Dominion House of Commons on Wednesday last the Hon. G. E. Foster, Minister of Finance, reiterated a former misstatement, which we have already had occasion to contradict, viz., that 'he had cancelled the contract with Messrs. Anderson & Co. for an Atlantic steamship service, because Messrs. Anderson were unable to raise the capital necessary for establishing the promised service.'

"We shall be obliged by your affording us an opportunity of stating (1) that Mr. Foster did not cancel the contract and had no power to do so; (2) that we surrendered the contract, not for the reason given by Mr. Foster, but because, in the words of our telegram of October 12, 1889, to Sir John Macdonald, intimating with regret such surrender, 'we can no longer reckon on the cordial co-operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Sir George Stephen having intimated that he has ceased to take interest in our scheme.' We would only add that we are willing and, indeed, anxious that the whole correspondence should be published, and we do not understand the repeated refusals of the Dominion Government to produce it.

"We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

"ANDERSON, ANDERSON & CO."

Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that matters like the Canadian Dead Meat Company, contradictions given in this fashion, by men with whom the Government have entered into engagements, and, over and above all, matters such as those which my hon. friends have brought to the attention of the House to-night—showing, as they do, to say the least of it, gross carelessness on the part of the Government in granting subsidies to roads which cannot pay their way—are things calculated, in a very high degree, to injure the interests of Canada, and to prevent enterprising Canadians, who have really good and valuable schemes to submit to the English people, from obtaining that assistance from them which they ought to receive, and which would help them and us largely in developing the latent resources of this country. But I say for the last time, that there is no safe ground for members of this House to take other than this, that they are essentially and above all things trustees for the people; and being trustees for the people, it is no part of their business whatever to use their position for the purpose of deriving an advantage, whether in the matter of timber limits, land grants, railway subsidies or in any other matter or thing whatever; and until we take good care that that shall be the established rule of conduct for every man in Canada, just such occurrences as this, and just such occurrences as those which we discussed some weeks ago, will continue to lower the position and degrade the character of the Parliament of this Dominion.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, we have heard for a number of years past of these courses of corruption of constituencies being debauched by railway subsidies, and of money being made by representatives in Parliament; but we have at last one charge formulated against a gentleman who occupies a seat in this House. We have stated, in reply to these hon. gentlemen, that a member of a particular constituency, having an interest in it and favoring its development, and perhaps being the man of the greatest means in the constituency, would naturally try to benefit it by getting assistance for some railway or other enterprise in it. We have also stated that the members who embarked in these enterprises, did so with great pecuniary loss to themselves, and that in no case could it be shown that those gentlemen had bene-

fited personally to any extent in the undertakings in which they were engaged. I have never heard or read much of the particulars of the Caraquet Railway until this evening; but I listened to the financial enemies of this company this evening, and I think, when I get through, hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the hon. member who engaged in this railway came out a poorer man than he was when he embarked in it. What are the facts of the case? There was a railway built from Shippegan to connect with the Intercolonial Railway, a distance of seventy miles; it received a subsidy from the Dominion Government to the amount of $3,200 a mile, and from the Local Government to the amount of $1,800 per mile, that is, $6,000 per mile in cash; and according to the statement of the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, he went to London and negotiated the sale of £100,000 sterling of bonds for the purpose of assisting in the building of the road. I have had the curiosity to ask the hon. gentleman what was the actual amount of cash he received from the sale of those bonds. He tells me they were sold at 75 per cent., which would realise $375,000, or, with $55,000 deducted for expenses and commissions, a net amount of $320,000, and that he deposited with the bankers in London $100,000 for the purpose of paying interest on the bonds, leaving $220,000 which he received for his £100,000 sterling of bonds; but of that $220,000 he received no cash at all, but received the whole amount in the shape of rails and fixings for laying the track of the railway. Those were the cash receipts on which this charge against my hon. friend is based, that he took the contract from the company for the purpose of building the road and pocketing a large amount out of the receipts. This road, which the hon. gentleman says is excellently well built and equipped, not, perhaps, in the manner some roads are, but having a certain number of engines and a certain number of cars, was built for $6,000 a mile; he graded the road, laid the track, built the stations, and supplied the equipment to the extent of $220,000. There is the charge made against the hon. gentleman—that he, for his own benefit, for the purpose of pocketing a large sum out of the enterprise, built the seventy miles for the $220,000 which he received from the bondholders. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House who knows anything about railroad enterprises, who does not know that the man who built that road for that money came out of the undertaking a poorer man than he entered into it? There is no mistake about the facts of the case. I have no doubt that any person, in any constituency of the Dominion, having faith in the resources of the country, would be perfectly honest in promising to the bondholders that the prospects were that he would be able to pay the interest on the bonds; and the hon. gentleman has still faith in the enterprise, and has hopes that he may be able to pay the interest on the bonds. But there is the financial statement showing the amount he received in all, and I leave it to the members of this House and to the country to say whether there is any probability that he pocketed a single cent from the undertaking. We have had a good many of these charges, and I am glad to hear some of them formulated in the House, where practical business men, and men acquainted with railways and railway building, are able to divest them of all verbiage, and get down to the naked facts; and they are just as I have presented them—there is nothing in them. The hon. gentleman says that the policy of the Government is one which is not in the interest of railway construction in the country. Let me read a short account of the money we have expended from 1884 to 1889 in all the Provinces, and I will ask hon. gentlemen if the money has not been well expended for the development of the country. The amount we have expended in those five years hardly reaches $1,000,000 a year. I could give the details, for I have the full information here; but that small amount which the Government have paid out in cash for the purpose of aiding in the development of the different parts of the country, has returned to the country tenfold the amount which has been expended in carrying out a policy which is a credit to the Government, and which will redound to the future advantage and advancement of the country in very respect. The hon. gentleman asks why were not these resolutions brought down in the beginning of the Session. Does he forget the example which the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) set him a few years ago? Does he forget that the railway subsidy resolutions were brought down on the 29th of February by the hon. member for West Durham, and the House was prorogued on the 2nd of March? An hon. friend of mine remarked on that occasion that if it had not happened to be leap year, the resolution would have been brought down one day and passed the next. Is it a reflection on a scheme, which is all right in itself, that it happens to be brought down at the close of the Session? As a whole, the policy of the Government of giving assistance to roads in different parts of the country is one which has benefited the country, and indirectly returned tenfold more to this country than the amount expended. I had not the advantage of hearing the whole of the speech of the hon. member for West Durham, especially the statements he made in reference to the prospectus. It may be very well for the hon. gentleman to state what the road may have cost, but perhaps that was the contract price for it. Perhaps the hon. member for Gloucester was only receiving $6,000 in cash, and the balance in the form of stock in the road; stock, which he states himself, and which the statement of the condition of the road bears him out in saying, might not be worth ten cents. But he may have conscientiously entered into a contract for the purpose of building that road, and received only $6,000 or $7,000 in cash and the remainder in stock. I say, if this is the only charge of corruption in the form of bribing a constituency—bribing or corrupting a member of Parliament by giving assistance to his county and making him a poorer man, as he must have known he would be when he went into the undertaking—which the hon. gentleman can bring, it is one which will receive due appreciation by the people of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member from Perth (Mr. Haggart) has chosen to make a defence of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns). The hon. gentleman admits he did not hear the charges made against that hon. gentleman, and, therefore, I think he should have hesitated before undertaking to answer charges he did not hear. He has

chosen however to give a statement of the cost of that road and the net results proceeding from the sale of the bonds and the subsidies received, but as we have had the statement of the member for Gloucester himself, this statement coming at second hand from the hon. the Postmaster General, does not carry very much weight. I will therefore take very little time in answering him. There is only one thing I notice in the statement of the hon. member for Lanark, and that is his failure to touch the gravemen of the charge brought by the hon. member for Oxford, namely, that this granting of subsidies to members of Parliament for lines in which they are interested, as in the case of the hon. member for Gloucester, is an indirect bribe to the member and destroys his independence in dealing with public questions before this House. That question the hon. member for Lanark has never touched. I will say this with reference to the hon. member for Gloucester. I do not disapprove of his course in trying to build a road in his county. It is laudable and perfectly right in so doing; but what I do disapprove is that he should stand in the position of being the sole recipient of the public moneys which he voted himself. That is what I object to as a matter of principle, and that, I contend, is a practical violation of the independence of Parliament Act, and one which should be put a stop to by this House. When, in the Railway Committee the other day, I stated the proposition that these charters should not be granted promiscuously as they had been in past years and that the duty specially devolved on the Government to see that no charters were given to persons to build railways with concessions from the public treasury of the country before the Government, and the committee, and Parliament, were perfectly satisfied of the means and ability of these parties to carry out their charters, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government approved of the position I took; and I have no hesitation in saying that if that condition had been attached to the passing of this charter—which was not granted by this House, I believe, but granted by the Local House—I doubt if it would ever have been granted to the parties who hold it. I do not know that I would have interfered in the charges against the hon. member for Gloucester had it not been for the fact that the other day he deliberately projected himself into a discussion, and charged me with making statements concerning facts I knew nothing about. If the hon. gentleman is not convinced of the truth of the statement I then made by the correspondence read by the hon. member for West Durham, which shows the manner in which the hon. gentleman, by his own admission, made payments to the men, I leave it to the House to say whether I was right or wrong in relation to the matter. I am not going to discuss the question whether the hon. gentleman is right or wrong in relation to some of the matters referred to. The only point I will deal with, as regards his conduct, is to the effect of the representations made in the prospectus which he sent forth upon the character and credit of Canada. I say that those two prospectuses, giving statements of the probable earnings, the character and numbers of the population, which my hon. friend knows is overstated——

Mr. BURNS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. What was the population by the last census? I speak from memory and under correction, but I believe it was between 21,000 and 22,000 for the whole county. My hon. friend knows there is scarcely one-third of the county represented from where the road starts at Bathurst to Caraquet.

Mr. BURNS. Including the parish of Bathurst, fully 22,000 people are served by the line, not including the people in the hon. gentleman's own county.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not asking how many people are served by the line. The hon. gentleman stated in the prospectus that the line ran through a population of something like 18,000. I would like to ask him whether I had correctly stated the whole population of the county, when I say it is between 21,000 and 22,000 at the last census.

Mr. BURNS. The population at the time of the prospectus was between 24,000 and 25,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. The population of the whole county at the last census was something like 21,000 or 22,000. The hon. gentleman admits that when the prospectus was issued it was 24,000; and I venture to say, from my knowledge of the locality, that the portion of the county through which the railway runs does not contain one-third of the population of the whole county. Therefore, the statement of the prospectus with regard to the population is incorrect. I think it is of great importance, when Parliament sanctions schemes and grants bonuses for the purpose of making public improvements in this country, and when gentlemen who get concessions go to the other side of the water for the purpose of raising money, that no misstatements should be made in order to induce investors on the other side to take stock in such enterprises. The earnings of the road show that in that particular the hon. gentleman is also entirely in error. With these remarks, I quit the Caraquet Railway. Now, I have something to say to the right hon. gentleman. He stated, as a justification for granting this subsidy, that the road was for the purpose of making a part of what an eminent engineer said would be a great line of communication between Europe and America. What the hon. gentleman refers to is a visionary scheme of Mr. Sandford Fleming years and years ago, to carry the Intercolonial Railway down to Shippegan, thence by a ferry—as the right hon. gentleman described it—to Newfoundland, thence by a railway across Newfoundland, and then to start the ocean steamers from the eastern cost of Newfoundland. That was the visionary theory Mr. Sandford Fleming had, and I doubt if there was one man on this continent of America, except himself, who ever endorsed such a scheme. It was one of the most visionary and fallacious schemes ever thought of, but the promoter of this Caraquet road, knowing that this scheme was not practicable, knowing that it was not endorsed by one man out of ten thousand, put that in his prospectus, and thus further misled the people who advanced the money to build that road. The right hon. gentleman says the Government were justified in granting this subsidy without further enquiry, because the Province of New Brunswick had granted a bonus from Bathurst to Shippegan. What the Province of New Brunswick did was to pass what they called a Lob-

ster Act, which comprised some twenty railways in New Brunswick. In regard to the particular line we are speaking of, they granted a subsidy of $3,000 a mile from Bathurst to Caraquet, and that formed no part of the Sandford Fleming's suggestion for a line to Shippegan and thence to Europe, as that scheme was exploded. I will read the particular part referring to that. The Act, after enumerating the various line, describes this one as follows :—

"A line of railway from a point in the parish of Caraquet, in the county of Gloucester, to some point on the Intercolonial Railway in the parish of Bathurst, in the said county of Gloucester, $3,000 a mile."

That line, therefore, was undertaken separately, and I quote that now to show that the right hon. gentleman is wrong in stating that it was to form part of the scheme of Mr. Sandford Fleming for a line to Europe *vid* Shippegan. That was not the reason why the Province of New Brunswick gave a subsidy to the road. It was not thought of at the time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say it was.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understood you to say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said in the first place that Mr. Sandford Fleming had pointed out this as a most eligible place for that railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did you believe him ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did at the time, and I was very much taken with the idea. Then, in the second place, I said the New Brunswick Government had not only granted a charter to this railway, but had also aided it, and that, as it was in their own Province, it might be supposed to be a good place for that railway, and that we might take their word for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course, I accept the right hon. gentleman's explanation. However, the Act which the Province passed was a lobster act. They did what my right hon. friend often does when he cannot do a thing alone, he does a lot of things in order to catch everybody, and that is what the Province of New Brunswick did in order to catch almost every county in the Province ; but as not one out of five of these roads could be built, they were pretty safe in relation to their scheme. The hon. gentleman has attempted to justify the policy which he introduced in regard to subsidising railways. I approve of railways receiving subsidies of public money where they cannot be built otherwise, but I do not approve of the manner in which this Government has voted the public moneys. When, in 1880, the treasury of this country was opened for the local improvements of the Provinces, under the overbearing influence of Sir Charles Tupper, I say that this Parliament adopted one of the greatest sources of bribery and corruption ever initiated in any country. We then left any member of this House, who was pressed by his constituents to obtain grants for railways, or canals, or other improvements, open to the pressure of the Government on the other hand. We left it open to the Government to bring these men practically as slaves to their feet. The hon. gentleman attempted to justify that course by illustrations taken from the British Parliament. If he wished to improve by expenditures on railways, on canals, and on other public works, the facilities for travel and traffic through the country, there was a proper way in which to do it. That was to increase the subsidies paid to the Provinces to be expended on these improvements, and to let the Legislatures of the Provinces, who know better how to deal with these matters than we do, attend to them. Then we would not have such an anomaly as the Dominion Government giving a subsidy for the Caraquet Railway and the Local Government giving a subsidy for the line over the same route. But that would not suit the policy of the right hon. gentleman. He wants to control the men when they are here, and, in addition to the question of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to why these subsidies come down late in the Session, I may say—it might be improper for me to assume that hon. gentlemen are controlled by expectation of subsidies—but let any man walk around these lobbies to-day, let him hear the whispered conversations which take place, let him see the depression on the faces of some hon. members, and let him hear the muttered curses of others at their disappointment in regard to the expectations which have been held out to them. These are some of the results of that system, which I believe is a cursed system, a system which has corrupted the constituencies, and has corrupted the representatives of those constituencies, and is fast degrading the character of the men who come here to sit in Parliament. The right hon. gentleman has referred to that distinguished man—as he called him—Sir Edward Watkin, who is so well known in this country, as an illustration of men engaged in making public improvements who are in Parliament, and he said it is no objection to their being in Parliament that they are engaged in making public improvements. Who ever said it was ? It is known that sugar refiners, and tanners, and lumbermen, and millers are in the halls of this Legislature. Has any one ever raised any objection because these and other men engaged in large private enterprises are members of this House ? Nobody has ever contended that. The right hon. gentleman made a far-fetched illustration when he referred to Sir Edward Watkin, who is largely engaged in railways, never having been objected to for sitting in the English Parliament. Does Sir Edward Watkin get subsidies from the British Parliament ? I put the question to the hon. gentleman and he declined to answer it. I will answer it for him. Sir Edward Watkin never got subsidies from the British Parliament for any such purposes. The hon. gentleman said some one on this side of the House had been pressing for subsidies ; I will apply my principle equally to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when I say that any man who is given subsidies for his county, or who is seeking favors of that character, is placing himself in a position to lose the independence which a member of Parliament ought to exercise. I shall not take up any further time in discussing this matter, but I will merely say that the sooner this system of granting railway subsidies is changed the better it will be for the independence and for the morality of this country, because the practice is immoral, the practice is degrading and it ought to be put a stop to.

GENERAL LAURIE'S MILEAGE.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before you leave the Chair I wish to bring another matter to the attention of the House. It will be in the memory of this

House that I drew its attention to the fact that an hon. gentleman who had come from London, England, to attend this Parliament, had drawn a sum of $631 for mileage. I put the question to the First Minister, and asked whether the Government considered that it was a proper interpretation of the statute that permitted that hon. gentleman to draw that money. The reply of the First Minister to my question was very indefinite. I also enquired whether it was the intention of the Government to alter the statute, if they considered that was a proper and legal interpretation, and to that question I got a very indefinite answer. I consider now that it is the duty of this House to place upon record their opinion as to whether they consider it is right that any member of Parliament, living outside of Canada, should be permitted to draw a mileage indemnity from such a distant point beyond the bounds of this Dominion. In order to test the opinion of this House, I beg to move an amendment, that you do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved :

It having come to the knowledge of this House that Lieutenant General Laurie, member for Shelburne, Nova Scotia, has drawn $631 for mileage from England to Canada, to attend the present Session of Parliament, this House affirms that no Member or Senator should draw, or be permitted to draw, mileage from any distant country to attend Parliament, beyond the limits of this Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say a word upon this subject before the question is submitted to the House. This is a resolution that cannot be adopted from any view of the case. In the first place, it is in direct contravention of the provision of the statute on the subject, and the whole subject of mileage, as well as of members' indemnity, is regulated by statute. The 30th section of the Act relating to the Senate and House of Commons lays down distinctly a provision which gives to members of this House and to members of the Senate a right to draw their mileage and indemnity according to certain rules. The hon. member's resolution, if it is in the line of the statute, is unnecessary ; but it is not in the line of the statute, it is an addition to the statute, it is a restriction further than that which the statute imposes, and is in direct conflict with the law of the country. The statute law having provided how much a member of this Parliament, whether a Senator or a member of the House of Commons, shall be entitled to, the hon. member proposes by a simple resolution to declare that no member of this House, nor any member of the Upper House, shall have a right to draw that which the statute gives him the right to draw. Section 30 of chapter 11, states :

"There shall also be allowed to each member of the Senate and of the House of Commons ten cents for each mile of the distance between the place of residence of such member and the place at which the session is held, reckoning such distance coming and going according to the nearest mail route, which distance shall be determined and certified by the Speaker of the Senate or House of Commons, as the case may be."

Parliament has not thought proper to make any restriction as to where the place of residence shall be, nor, in case of the residence being outside of Canada, has it thought proper to make any restriction that the travelling allowance shall be from some place nearer than his residence. The law of Parliament, as declared by this statute, is that as regards members of both Houses, they shall draw mileage from their residence, whether their residence is in the country or out of it.

General LAURIE. This matter has been brought before the House once or twice, and I did not think it necessary to speak again to make an explanation, but as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has again alluded to it, I feel it necessary for me to reply, and I shall have to give practically the same explanation I gave before. I was called upon to sign a declaration stating where I lived, and I found I could not draw travelling expenses except by signing that declaration. The declaration showed that I lived in London, and as it seemed a high amount to charge, the matter was referred to those who were authorities on that point, to find out whether it was right or wrong that I should draw that sum, and it was decided that I was right, and that I should draw it. Now, I have seen it stated that I drew this money to put it into my own pocket, and that is a point upon which I would like to say a word. The hon. member for North Wellington, who poses as the great financial reformer here, and who undertakes to set us all right in financial matters, has himself taken the advantage of the law in 1885, as I find, from the Auditor General's Report, that there was paid to Mr. James McMullen, in that year, the sum of $1,476 as indemnity for the Session of 1885, a part of which sum, I believe, was extra indemnity voted by this House in consequence of the length of the Session. This same hon. gentleman is recorded in the Debates as saying :

"I shall not cheat my constituents out of the money. If I take the money I shall give it to them for the benefit of agricultural work. I say I am opposed to the idea. I am opposed to it on all grounds. I believe the sessional allowance granted to us is quite sufficient, and I think any man who takes it should do as I intend to do with mine."

Now, Sir, as he has posed as a model to us of financial purity, I took it for granted that what he said and what he did was right, and that I might reasonably follow his example. I took the money and I appropriated it, not for agricultural purposes, but for the benefit of the fishermen in my county—that is, for the widows and families of drowned fishermen. I have taken upon myself to do that. Whether the hon. gentlemen did, as he said he was going to do, give that money or not, I am not prepared to say ; but I have notified the trustees that I have placed the amount at their disposal. I have been simply desirous of following the example of a financial purist ; whether he carried out what he intimated he intended to do or not I am not prepared to say, but I took him for an example and I copied what he announced he proposed to do.

Mr. LAURIER. It is, perhaps, just as well to look at this question from a business point of view, without any of the personalities with which it may be connected. The true test of the question is whether the law contemplated that the mileage for the sessional allowance should be granted from any place outside of Canada. The statute says that the mileage shall be calculated from the place of residence to the capital. I question very much, under such circumstances, whether the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) had the right to draw his mileage from any place other than Oakville, but he drew it from London. I question if he had any power to draw it from any place out-

side of Canada, that is to say from London. If I correctly understood him on a previous occasion I understood him to say that his residence at London was not permanent but simply temporary. A man cannot have two domiciles, he can have but one; and if a man is domiciled at a certain place, and if for reasons of his own, for health or pleasure, or any other cause, he goes abroad for one or two years that does not change his domicile. That is what I interpret to be the law. Of course, if the hon. gentleman says that he has changed his domicile, that his domicile is no longer in the county of Shelburne but that it is in London, I believe he comes within the statute, and I would have nothing to say; and my conclusion would be that under such circumstances the law is in his favor, and that he had a right to draw his mileage from the place he did draw it. That may be the letter, but I question whether it is the spirit of the law; I do not believe it is so, and I am sure when the law was first enacted it contemplated that the place of residence would be within Canada. I question very much if an hon. gentleman were to reside in England, or in any part of the British Empire, outside of Canada, and if he were to offer himself to the electors of Shelburne, or any other county of the Dominion, he would have the support of the electors. I do not think he would receive such support. That is not an argument on the legal point, but it has a direct bearing on the question, because it shows, in my opinion, that the spirit of the law is, not that the mileage shall be drawn from any place where at the time the domicile may happen to be, but that the domicile should be in Canada; and the question affirmed in the motion is that this is the spirit of the law and that it should be acted upon. If there is any doubt on this point, if it be pretended that the mileage can be drawn from the domicile of the member though he may have changed his domicile to any part of the universe, it is a question for this House to decide at once that the law be amended so as to make it agree with what is the understood principle of the statute, namely that the mileage shall be drawn from some point in Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very probable that the question as to whether a member residing out of Canada should receive mileage from any point outside of Canada has not been authoritatively decided. It was most probably only in contemplation when the statute was passed that the members would reside in Canada and have their residences within Canada. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing that domicile is mentioned in the statute; the word is residence, and there is a great difference between these two words. A man must have his residence somewhere. The hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) has told the House that he has no residence in Canada, that he has given up his house, and that he now resides in England. Under these circumstances I take it that under the strict reading of the statute he would have a right, if it were claimed, to receive travelling expenses from the place of his residence, as the statute says that the travelling expenses shall be from the place of residence to the place where the session is held. If the hon. gentleman could not claim travelling expenses from England, they could not be claimed from anywhere else, as he must claim them from his residence, and as he has only one residence he must claim them from England. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is a subject for consideration whether, next Session, we should not deal with the question as it has been brought up. In the meantime it seems to me the law is plain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will neither dispute the statements of the hon. gentleman nor the view of the law enunciated by the Minister of Justice. I have a recollection, however, of a similar case, decided in the other way, which is very likely known to the First Minister. This identical point was brought up in the case of Mr. Sydney Bellingham, who went to Ireland to reside, and who claimed his mileage allowance from Ireland, but his claim was disallowed. Whatever the law may be, it never was intended or contemplated that mileage should be paid from points outside of Canada; and if there be, as the hon. Minister of Justice states, a doubt, or if the law be the other way, the sooner it is changed the better.

General LAURIE. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has alluded to the fact that I do not now reside in the county of Shelburne. I never did so. I asked when I resided in the county of Halifax whether I could draw my mileage from the county of Shelburne, and the reply I received was that I could not draw it from my constituency. I submitted that point.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). According to the interpretation of the statute given by the Minister of Justice, the majority of members of this House, if they choose to reside at Melbourne or Sydney, could draw their mileage from distant points, and they would receive over $3,200 for mileage. Of course the statute never contemplated the election of non-residents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On the same theory there could be no objection to any British subject being returned to this Parliament, if over twenty-one years of age, if he lived in Australia, South Africa, or New Zealand. That is sufficient to show the absurdity of the idea that the election of non-residents was ever contemplated. When the statute speaks about mileage being reckoned from the place of residence, it was assumed that the members would be residents in this country. No doubt, according to a strict construction of the statute, the opinion of the Minister of Justice would be followed, as it would be followed in the case of the criminal statute. But the First Minister will remember that he had the same question before him not long before Confederation. A gentleman elected for a county went to reside in the Isle of Wight, and he claimed mileage under exactly the same words as these, and the right hon. gentleman refused to entertain his claim. The right hon. gentleman will remember the case of Mr. Scoville.

Mr. BOWELL. Is the hon. gentleman sure the law was precisely the same as it is now? My recollection is that it provided for the payment of the mileage from the constituency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). From the residence; the words are the same. The present First Minister in that case ruled that Mr. Scoville was not entitled to mileage from the Isle of Wight.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before this matter is passed over I wish to say a few words in reply.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has spoken already.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to refer to something the hon. gentleman said, and I have a right to give a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman says that I drew the additional sessional allowance in 1885. I opposed that increase at the time it was granted, and when the money was voted to me, I took it the same as any other member. I think I earn my sessional allowance as well as any member in this House. Some hon. gentleman said that I did not give the money in the way I promised on that occasion. I tell that hon. gentleman that that statement is untrue. I gave every single dollar to my constituency, in the way I said I would give it to them. With regard to making a declaration, I may say I have been here for eight years and may say I never was asked to make a declaration. I do not know how the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) was asked to make a declaration, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite if they were ever asked to make a declaration? The accountant will give you the mileage set down without any declaration.

Amendment negatived on a division, and House again revolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(*In the Committee.*)

To pay J. G. Moylan for services on Royal Commission in making an investigation at St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary with Mr. Baillairgé.... $250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Moylan is our Chief Inspector of Penitentiaries; in fact our only inspector, and it appears to me that this is a duty which fell entirely within his province, and for which he should hardly be paid extra.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The item is recommended under these circumstances: About the time of the appointment of Warden Laviolette, a very protracted investigation took place at the penitentiary, under the direction of my predecessor. Mr. Moylan thought that the conduct of some of the officers was to be reprimanded, and he maintained there was want of discipline among the officers, which was due to the fact that his instructions had not been followed. Lest it should be supposed that he should be influenced by the previous judgment he had formed, he had associated with him Mr. Baillairgé, who was allowed for his services, $500, and Mr. Moylan claimed the same amount. I am aware of the objection the hon. gentleman has taken, but the practice of paying officers who serve on royal commissions has been pretty well established. In this case it was decided to give to Mr. Moylan half of the amount paid to Mr. Baillairgé, in consideration that to some extent he was performing duties of a special kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can understand that this might be done in the case of an officer taken from one department to another, but I do not recollect at this moment a case in which matters so clearly falling within the purview of the inspector's duty, was made a reason for a grant.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was one of the reasons why only one-half of the sum was allowed. There is an illustration of the same kind in the case of Mr. Schreiber, who was a member of the Royal Commission and also Chief Engineer of Railways.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not sure if I do the Minister of Justice an injustice by saying that he does not appear to be quite satisfied that the course suggested to the House is a good one. I believe that if he were to follow his better judgment he would not have asked this money. The fact that this claim has been allowed to remain unpaid since 1885, shows that the hon. gentleman has been considering it for a long time, and it was, perhaps, after due consideration that he came to adopt it. I think there are grave objections to giving extra pay for extra services, which each officer is bound to perform under any circumstances. The principle seems to be a wrong one, and ought not to be sanctioned in the future.

Mr. McMULLEN. We pay Mr. Moylan $3,200 as inspector of penitentiaries, and I find by the Auditor General's Report that last year he drew $1,600 additional for travelling expenses. I cannot see how this Government are disposed to encourage claims of this kind from men who are getting large salaries. These claims for extra services are increasing very rapidly, and it is not much wonder when the Government are continually sanctioning claims of this kind which are two or three years old. It should not be permitted.

Manitoba Penitentiary—Maintenance and repairs of buildings..... $5,362 65

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House during the last year or two voted the salaries of one or two trade instructors for the penitentiary service. That enables us to have small repairs made by convict labor, instead of calling on the Minister of Public Works continually. I have in my hands a memorandum of the various items of this expenditure, extending over several pages. The principal item consists of $1,500 for 2,000 feet of picket fence. It was stated by one of the hon. members for Elgin the other night that it was very desirable to have a fence about the prison reserve in order that the prisoners might be employed more freely out of doors, and it is intended to make a beginning this year.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although we are not now going to pass the items in the Supplementary Estimates connected with agricultural statistics, I wish to make a suggestion to the right hon. the First Minister with regard to the census to be taken this year. In our various census returns taken heretofore, we have taken no precaution to ascertain the descriptions of buildings and the number of rooms they contain. The First Minister knows that in almost all other censuses taken in other countries, pains are taken to describe the nature of the buildings, whether stone, brick or wood, the number of stories and the number of rooms. This is an extremely valuable item of information, as it affords a good indication of the progress of the country and the way the population are lodged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take a note of it.

Two monuments to be erected on battle-fields of Canada..... $2,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When this matter was brought up in the House before, we had a discussion on the advisability of making a beginning in building up monuments to commemorate the historic events of Canada. The intention is to make a beginning by erecting two monuments, one on the battlefield at Lundy's Lane and the other at Chateauguay.

Mr. DENISON. I was in hopes there would be something in the Supplementary Estimates for the drill of the rural militia this year. I would like to know whether it is possible yet to have an appropriation for that purpose brought down.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Estimates have been brought down, and I feel just as sorry as the hon. gentleman that we could not bring down the amount required to drill the whole force every year, but I hope on a future occasion we will be able to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. When we are charging $6 a barrel on prime mess pork, which is the chief food of the working classes, it is no time to spend money in building monuments.

Mr. GORDON. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Militia if it is his intention to establish a battery of garrison artillery at Nanaimo. It has been recommended by the different adjutant generals of the Province from year to year, and I have frequently called the hon. Minister's attention to the matter. The importance of the coal mines there should not be overlooked in case of war, which I hope will never occur; but at the same time they are the source of fuel supply for all the trade and commerce of the Pacific coast.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My friend has been most energetic in pressing that question upon the attention of the Department. Of course it is very difficult, when we find it difficult to drill the whole force, to increase the force as it now stands. I hope that at some future day we will be able to give Nanaimo the battery the hon. gentleman desires. I hope that at some future date we may be able to give the matter further attention, but I do not see that it is possible to do so at present on the money which is voted by Parliament.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Some time ago I suggested the advisability of furnishing helmets to the Militia force. The Minister of Militia said he would take it into consideration, but he had not at that time enough money to propose to furnish the Militia with helmets. I would like to know if he has taken that subject into consideration?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no item under the head of Militia to furnish helmets to the force. I do not think that it is possible this year. It would require $10,000 per annum for three years to furnish the helmets required for the whole force.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not altogether agree with the Minister of Militia as to the amount required, but I think this is a necessary thing to do, and I believe this Parliament would agree to the vote if it were proposed by the Government. I think it is a case of very serious neglect on the part of the Militia Department. I had hoped from the answer which the Minister gave before, that he would have considered the subject, and that we would have had a more favorable answer. I think $10,000 a year for three years is a very small matter in promoting the efficiency of the force and the comfort of its members.

Mr. GORDON. I would ask the Minister what is the intention of the Government in regard to Nanaimo next year. I know that the young men there are as loyal and as desirous of enrolling themselves in the Militia for the defence of the country as any young men in Canada. If occasion should arise for their services—which God forbid—they would be ready to do their duty. I think proper encouragement should be given to our young men. They are full of vigor and full of energy, and they are now held back simply because the head of the Department, through a dread of expenditure, will not give life to an organisation which could easily be established and formed in that country.

General LAURIE. I was deputy adjutant general in British Columbia for some time, and I tried to reorganise the volunteers there, because I recognised that Esquimalt and Nanaimo were very important strategic points. Nanaimo especially is an important point, because it is a coaling station and is used for the supply of coal to the vessels on the Pacific coast. I think we should protect that place, and should give every encouragement possible to the inhabitants to reorganise themselves into a Militia force. It is simply replacing the old infantry company by a battery of artillery.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I desire to ask if the repairing of the drill shed and armory in Chatham is to be gone on with this year? The building is in a wretched state.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think I told the hon. gentleman when the Estimates were first brought down that there was an item under the head of repairs which would allow me to do what I thought necessary in that direction.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear that the supply of helmets will cost only $10,000 for three years. In that case, however, I think the Government are neglecting not only the comfort but also the health of those young men who enroll as volunteers, in not providing the accommodation represented by so small an amount. If the Minister had himself to turn out in a forage cap after living indoors for a great part of the year, as many of the volunteers have to do, I think he would see the necessity of providing something to protect their heads from the sun. It might be said that farmers' sons would not suffer from this, but I have found that they suffer more than any one else, because, when they are on the farm they are in the habit of wearing wide-brimmed hats when at work.

Mr. AMYOT. I got helmets in London for our battalion, the 8th, consisting of eight companies and 42 men in each, and it cost over $700 for the men in my battalion, and of course, the helmets of the officers were separate from that. Of course it is necessary that the men should have helmets when they drill in summer.

Tay Canal..... $20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this complete the drainage of the town of Perth?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a re-vote. There has been expended up to the 1st March, $15,000, and it is supposed that $5,000 will be expended up to the 30th June, making $20,000 in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this canal going to be equally profitable with the Rideau Canal? On the latter, if my memory serves me, we received $8,000, and spent $60,000, and I should like to know if the same proportion is expected to apply to the Tay Canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The business of the Rideau Canal is increasing considerably within the last two years.

Construction of a wharf, St. Peter's Canal, $12,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is that a new structure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. The hon. gentleman must have seen that there was great inconvenience and annoyance to vessels mooring near the lock, and also in unloading freight. It is to provide a wharf for vessels to load and unload, and to which they can moor.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Construction	$24,900
Remuneration to be paid to L. K. Jones, as Secretary to the Commission of Arbitrators	100

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to cover the probable amount of claims in British Columbia, along the line, and some outstanding claims on the Pembina Branch and east of Selkirk, and towards the probable expenses of the arbitration now going on, and the salary of Mr. Jones, who is clerk to the arbitrators.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, he has figured for a good many years. What has been the total cost of the arbitration to date?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps $25,000. I will ascertain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will get off cheaply if you get off for $25,000. I think we had granted large sums already towards that in other places. I should be glad to know if the Minister of Justice can give us any idea when this business will be disposed of—these Onderdonk arbitrators.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot give any information on that point. The last stage that was reached was an argument before the arbitrators for the purpose of ascertaining if a principle could be arrived at on which the decision should be based. It was believed that if the arbitrators could decide at that stage of the case on a principle on which the award might be made, they could then lay down principles on which the amount should be computed, if the award should be made against the Government, and then cease their labors. Decision is reserved on that point.

Lachine Canal—Electric light..... .. $11,250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What system is being adopted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is for the purpose of changing the present system of incandescent lights to arc lights. It is proposed to transfer the present system from Lachine to Chambly and Beauharnois.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to work this with water power derived from the canal?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so. This is plant for an electric light, and the expenditure will not be repeated.

Welland Canal..... ..... $15,450

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not in a position to say whether these works are demanded, but in addition to the enormous expenses chargeable to income for Canals, a sum of nearly $60,000 more is required. Can the First Minister tell me, putting everything together, what is the cost chargeable to income alone for the maintenance of these canals now, all told?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not got the figures with me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It strikes me as running up to very heavy figures indeed. I called his attention to the enormous disproportion between the receipts and expenses, when the main vote was going through. I am almost afraid to speak from recollection, but it seems to me that the total expense on these canals is getting up to the better part of a million.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The expense is very considerable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And our receipts are getting small by degrees and beautifully less, all the time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope when the canal is built we shall have more revenue, unless the Americans build another Welland Canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would inform the hon. gentleman that when concurrence comes down, I shall ask him for the total cost, all told, of the canals, chargeable to income. He will have to look over two or three different points in the expenditure to get it. I want to know the total annual expense, and the total receipts.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I desire to ascertain whether an item will appear in the Estimates to construct a canal from Port Stanley to St. Thomas, the surveys for which were made last summer. The work will only cost about a million dollars. The promoter has been made a junior judge of the county, and so the duty of pushing forward the work will devolve on myself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I thought it would secure my hon. friend's election against the Equal Righters I might be inclined to bring down such a vote.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman need not trouble about my election. Last time I won against combined influences, and the right hon. gentleman is as strong as the Equal Righters.

St. Peter's Canal—To pay H. F. Perley, C.E., two years' services to December, 1890, in superintending St. Peter's Canal	$500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an addition to his regular salary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Perley is engineer of the Public Works Department, but he had special knowledge of this work and was persuaded to attend to it, although it was against his wish. The payment will cease on 31st December.

Mr. LOVITT. He received his regular salary all the same, but he went to the seaside to have a change from his office duties.

Carillon and Grenville Canals—Repairs.... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have been informed, although I do not make the assertion from my knowledge, that a good many frauds have been committed in connection with the payments on the Carillon and Grenville Canal. Has the hon. gentleman received any information of late touching frauds in connection with pay-lists?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I have not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On page 4--F of the Auditor General's Report the hon. gentleman will find a detailed statement of the parties to whom money has been paid on this canal. He will observe the name of William Bestwarwick, to whom $36 are alleged to have been paid. It is stated that this man has been in the United States for two years. Antoine Boyer is down for $90; it is stated that he departed this life a good many years ago. Then there is a carter named Charlebois, 176 days, $264. It is stated that this man has also been in the United States for two years. There are some other cases, but I will not trouble the hon. gentleman with them. I call his attention to the fact that allegations are made that the items have been improperly placed on the pay-lists, and that a system of plundering is going on. I had been informed that the matter had been brought to the attention of the First Minister himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I have not heard of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, letters may have been sent to the Department, which the hon. gentleman never received.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did the hon. gentleman learn when the frauds commenced?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not aware. The statements made to me are simply that a number of men entered on the pay-list as having been employed could not have been so employed, because they were either dead or absent from the country a long time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see about it to-morrow.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 9th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PATENT BALLOT BOXES.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Before presenting the report of the Select Committee appointed to enquire into patent ballot boxes, I beg to move:

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

That the Select Committee appointed to examine and report upon newly invented ballot papers and ballot boxes to be used in parliamentary elections, have power to send for persons, &c., &c.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Committee ought to have the power of fixing a sum which would pay certain small expenses incurred by persons who appeared before the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought this must be an *ex post facto* arrangement, and that it was not really designed that the Committee should send for persons at this late stage of the Session. I do not think that these persons should be paid their expenses for coming here in pursuit of their own business, and, for my part, I shall object to it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We invited, by our action, a certain number of persons to appear before the Committee and present certain devices which might have been an improvement on the system already existing for receiving votes at an election. Some of these persons incurred expenditure in attending the sittings of the Committee, and it was the unanimous opinion of the Committee that their travelling expenses to come here and to return, should be paid, as well as a sum of $10 for attendance before the Committee. The Committee had three sittings, and some of these persons who were not in a very good financial position were obliged to remain here. It is but just, I think, that a small compensation should be paid them.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that this is very objectionable. These persons have come here at their own risk and peril, intending, perhaps, to benefit by their trip, with a view of having their inventions adopted by the Committee. Under such circumstances, they having come here on their own errand, I do not see any reason why they should be paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition. If people come here with their fads and inventions, not for the public good, but for their own benefit, and fail to get their inventions adopted, I do not think the House should be asked to pay them. I have heard no indication that any of the ballot boxes have been adopted by the Government. If they had been adopted I would have looked upon it with grave suspicion, as they might be loading the dice for the next election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend says "oh;" but I think I have the right to make a remark of that kind.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that Parliaments are not generally remarkable for generosity, but it would be really a case of hardship if these people were not paid their expenses. This is not a proposition which emanates from the Government or from myself, but from the Committee, and members on the other side of the House, who were members of the Committee, will support it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. the Secretary of State. If any one of these ballot boxes had been adopted, it might have been in the public interest, and I think the small sum asked for paying the expenses should be allowed.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to know what conclusion has been arrived at by the Committee?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will present the report now, but I may say, to satisfy the curiosity of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), that the Committee has recommended a trial of three of these devices.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the House made a mistake at all, it was in the appointment of a Committee in the first place. The moment our Parliamentary proceedings contained a notice that there had been a Committee appointed for the examination of these ballot boxes, all those who had inventions of the kind were anxious to have them investigated. These people came here and submitted their ballot boxes and returned with the expectation of not making a single farthing out of their trip. These ballot boxes were submitted to the mechanical engineer for his report, and these people were again notified to return. If the House is not disposed to pay the expenses of these people, they should not have held the investigation. I think it would be unfair to bring these men here twice without paying their expenses. Although I was not on the Committee, I advocated that they should be paid their expenses, and I think so still.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the case is at all parallel to any case we have had before. It was purely in their own interest that these people came here. They came in the hope that their inventions would be adopted, and that they would make money out of them. It seems to be out of the question that we should pay them for three attendances here, and their travelling expenses besides. If we sanction this now, where are we going to draw the line? There is a trial recommended of three of these ballot boxes, and are we going to pay these men for the preliminary use of their invention?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman evidently thinks that anything but his own advice or conclusions are absolutely to be disregarded.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Instead of making the remarks that the hon. gentleman has just favored the House with, he should have appeared before the Committee and witnessed what was done. He sent, it is true, a suggestion from one of the returning officers; one of his own friends, I presume.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it was for Mr. Blackburn, the former editor of the London *Free Press*, and now registrar of Middlesex.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At any rate, the suggestion of the hon. gentleman has not been followed, and necessarily the whole action of the Committee is null and useless. The persons who brought their inventions to be examined were not, of course, entitled to be paid, and were notified to that effect; but after the Committee had examined their inventions we had them remain to enable the Committee to put their inventions to the test of an examination by a special officer. They were kept by the Committee in the city for some time, and that is the reason why the Committee unanimously, without exception of party, made this proposition. I do not insist upon it if the House is disposed not to agree to it.

Mr. BERGERON. I am surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen oppose the granting of this small amount. It seems to me that this Committee was struck because the House of Commons wanted some new means of counting the votes cast in elections. Most of the inventors who make these boxes are poor men; in fact, we know that genius is almost always poor; and I feel convinced, though I do not know it as a fact, that most of them must have borrowed money to pay their expenses in bringing their inventions here. The hon. member for West Durham says they expected to make money. Well, it is quite natural that a man who has worked at one of these boxes for five or six months, would expect that his box would be accepted by the Government. They understood that the Government of Canada were not making a childish offer, when they were asking any man in the Dominion who had made a ballot box to submit it. Every one who came there was perfectly convinced that his box was better than all the others. The hon. Secretary of State says that the Committee have recommended three boxes, and I suppose out of them some choice will be made. Although I like economy as much as anybody else, it seems to me it is not economy to refuse to pay these men their expenses; it is stinginess rather. The House of Commons were asking something in the public interest, and these people had a right to believe that they were bringing their inventions here for the purpose of doing some good to the country.

Motion negatived.

RAILWAY STATISTICS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to lay on the Table the Report of Railway Statistics of the Dominion for 1889. It is rather imperfect, from the fact that some of the railways have neglected, in fact refused, to make the returns required by law.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you propose to take any steps as to that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a matter which we will consider before next year.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a very old complaint, and I think if the existing law does not give the Government power to compel the companies to make these returns, the Government should take such power, or we will never really have complete returns, which are very valuable, in time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only provision is, that it shall be the duty of the railway companies to make these returns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You must provide a penalty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There ought to be a penalty. I will consider that.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That the sixth report of the Joint Committee of both Houses for the Printing of Parliament, be concurred in, with the exception of the tenth paragraph, which recommends a mode of collecting accounts due for members for printing ordered during the Session.

Mr. INNES. As one of the members of the Sub-Committee, I may say that we have had the various matters under our consideration, which

we considered carefully before bringing down our report. Perhaps not all of the members are aware that, under the provisions of the Act for the establishment of a Printing Bureau, the outside distribution of all parliamentary documents now devolves upon that bureau, and in consequence we have recommended that the distributing staff be divided. At the same time, we retain complete control of the distribution of all Parliamentary documents within the House, to members of this House and the Senate. We have recommended that the distribution staff be divided, but have also recommended that Mr. Botterell, the head of the Department, be retained at an increased salary on account of his long and faithful services. Mr. Botterell has been thirty-four years in the service and has been twenty years at the head of this Department; in fact, it was he who organised the present excellent system, and has kept the records and attended to all the distribution outside in a most efficient manner. As regards the further distribution of Government documents, referred to by the Secretary of State, I think some method should be adopted by the House for further distribution of the documents besides the ordinary copies given the members. Some system should be adopted for supplying extra numbers required by the members. A recommendation with regard to this is contained in the memorandum of the Secretary of State now before the House, and it is for the House to say whether they will adopt the method recommended or not. With regard to the memorandum of the Queen's Printer, which has been expunged from the report, we thought at first it would be an excellent method of collecting accounts for supplementary printing ordered by members; but, on reflection, we found it would be contrary to the statute respecting the payment of indemnity of members. At the same time we recommend that some method should be adopted by which accounts should be collected, or these accounts will run up. I do not know what better method could be adopted than, perhaps, to enforce the system of payment at the time the work is ordered, otherwise many of these accounts will not be collected. Even under the old system, while the parliamentary printing was in the hands of the contractors, considerable balances are due to the contractors, which, perhaps, will never be paid. With respect to the messengers, we found, in consequence of the distance between the Bureau and the building here, it was necessary that you, Sir, should employ a pony express, and we recommended that, as the chief messenger thoroughly understands this business, the whole matter should be left in your hands and those of the chief messenger to arrange for the work of carrying messages between both places during the Session.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not intend to discuss the merits of the report as regards the work of distribution, but there is a certain feature of the report of which I would like to have some explanation. The present office is composed of Mr. Botterell, head officer, Mr. Boulet, Mr. Botterell, a son of the head officer, who replaces another son of his who died, and the messenger, making a total cost of $4,400. It is proposed to retain Mr. Botterell, who has $1,600 a year, and give him an increase of $200 on account of his long services; it is proposed, secondly, to keep Mr. Botterell, junior, who has $800 a year, and grant him an increase of $200; it is proposed to keep the present messenger—all which will cost the country $3,600. I do not say that is too much or too little; but I say that though we are asked to take away from that office about three-fourths of the work and to increase the salaries of the two officers, the other officer, Mr. Boulet, is sent to organise another department in which the three-fourths taken away from the present department will be done, and to give him one messenger, and we will not diminish his salary, although he has to work the whole year round. Mr. Botterell, senior, has been twenty-one years in office, and so has Mr. Boulet. Mr. Botterell has had four months' holidays every year, and Mr. Boulet has had none. Practically all the work had to be done by Mr. Boulet.

Mr. MULOCK. Bully for him.

Mr. AMYOT. Yes, they want to bully him. We increase his work three-fourths, and we do not increase his salary. We say Mr. Botterell's son is entitled to an increase of $200 on account of his four years' services. I do not think that is a reason, because Mr. Boulet, who is a most competent officer, and has been working there for twenty-one years, is entitled to something more than a declaration that we will not diminish his salary.

Mr. LAURIER. What is his salary?

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Boulet's salary at present is $1,200, and he has been in the Distribution office for twenty-one years, the same time as Mr. Botterell. I have seen the way in which Mr. Boulet has been treated. His chief has kept him in a dark room, and has used his own son as secretary in the light of the open room. Now, we propose to send Mr. Boulet to organise a new department without any increase of salary, while we increase the salaries of Mr. Botterell the father, and Mr. Botterell the son, and diminish their work by three-fourths. There must be some feeling at the bottom of this. Of course, the Committee will say they have examined the matter. I say that, if they examined any one except the chief, they would have seen that there was some one else who deserved consideration besides him and his family. We will see next some member moving for the number of messengers and their nationality, and the number of employés of the Library and their nationality, and he might possibly ask for the number of washerwomen and their nationality, and the result of the return would be spread over the country with an intent to mislead the people, because it is certain that, if we are fairly represented in the lower kinds of employment, we are not represented in the employments of real importance. I presume the Government are not animated by wrong motives in this matter and that they desire to do justice; but I call their attention to the fact that this is a gross injustice. We will have three or four employés here with high salaries and nothing to do during the recess, while we chase one from that office who will have all the work to do and without any increase of salary. This is an injustice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If Mr. Boulet has not been fairly considered by the Committee, the fact that he goes from the present Department to the Department of the Secretary of State, is

likely to be for his benefit. I have never heard that my hon. friend the Secretary of State has any particular prejudice against a French Canadian. The Committee could scarcely propose that Mr. Boulet's salary should be raised, when he is transferred to another Department. That question will be no doubt fully considered by my hon. friend the Secretary of State. Another matter has been spoken of. I am very sorry to hear that there was any necessity for this memorandum in regard to accounts outstanding owing by members, who have taken parliamentary documents without paying for them. I object, however, to this clause being in the report.

Mr. BLAKE. That clause is expunged. I quite agree in the view that it ought to be expunged, because it would be contrary to the statute which provides for the payment of the indemnity. At the same time, we have been made acquainted with this regrettable fact—I think by the Auditor General's Report—that a very considerable sum is owing in the way of arrears on this account. That ought not to happen, and, if hon. members take advantage of the provision, by which they can obtain public documents at cost price, and do not pay for them, I think the circumstances should be made known. I propose, on the first day of the next Session of Parliament, to move for the names of the members who remain in arrears. We have talked a good deal about clubs here to-day, and we know there is a very good system in clubs of posting the members who are in arrears. I shall propose to post those members of this House who are in arrears in this way.

Mr. INNES. In regard to what the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has stated, I may say that we had nothing to do with Mr. Boulet's salary. We simply recommended that his salary should not be decreased, and that, as there was to be a division of the Department, he should be placed at the head of the new Department, and we left the question of his salary to the Secretary of State, believing that he would see that justice was done to him. We had no ill-feeling in regard to Mr. Boulet. On the contrary, we thought we were doing him a service when we recommended that he should be placed at the head of the new Department, and that the question of his salary should be left to the Secretary of State. There are not three parts of the work taken away from the Department here, as the hon. gentleman said. There is only the outside mailing of the parliamentary papers which go to members of Parliament, to judges and courts, and so on. In addition to that, Mr. Botterell is charged with, and is responsible for, keeping all the documents in his hands which have accumulated for twenty-one years. That is a very responsible position.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was exceedingly sorry to hear the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) cast a reflection upon Mr. Botterell as to the way in which he treated Mr. Boulet. I have met Mr. Botterell almost every day for the eight years that I have been here during the Session, and have found him to be a most courteous and kind man, and I do not think members of this House should permit such a reflection to pass without protest as to Mr. Botterell's acting unkindly or cruelly against any one under him. He is not that kind of a man to treat any one in that way.

Mr. DAVIN. With respect to the arrears which have been referred to, some of the trifling arrears can be easily accounted for in this way: Last year the Committee thought the Government Bureau was charging more to members than it ought to charge, and we agreed that, until a more satisfactory rate was fixed, we would not pay for what we got. I do not think that the rate is satisfactory now, and if it was not so trifling a matter I would go into it and show my hon. friend the Secretary of State, that the amount the bureau is charging members, is in excess of what it ought to charge.

Mr. AMYOT. With the permission of the House, I would like to say that the hon. member behind me stated in the beginning of his speech, that the two officers would be kept under the control of this House; therefore it is no excuse to say that he did not recommend the increase of this salary for the reason that it will be under the control of the Secretary of State. In the second place, he says they ought not to recommend anything about his salary, although they say in the report "and that his salary be not less than at present." What I want to know is, the reason why, since these two officers are kept under the control of this House, since there is an increase to the son of Mr. Botterell, who has been twenty-one years in the service—I do not say unduly; but why increase it, and why increase the salary of Mr. Botterell's son by $200 for his four years' service—I do not say unduly—why do they do that, and why do they not increase Mr. Boulet's salary, whose competency nobody will deny? My hon. friend said a moment ago that both remained under the control of this House. But why decide that his salary shall not be less? The power to say that it shall not be less implies the power to say that it shall be diminished or increased. They say it shall not be less; then they should have given some reasons why that discrepancy exists, why they discriminate in that way. They do not give any good reasons. They leave it to the Secretary of State to take the responsibility, and they might just as well have left to the Secretary of State the responsibility concerning the others.

Motion agreed to.

DUTY ON SAWN LUMBER.

Mr. BRYSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, with the permission of the House, I would like to ask a question which has been put on the Notice paper by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). The question is this: Whether, in the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber to one dollar per thousand feet, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs? It is very important that this question should be answered at the present moment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will answer that question. In the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs. I will take an opportunity of conveying that decision to the proper quarters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A sensible decision, and highly complimentary after the policy announced the other night.

THE *BALTIC* OUTRAGE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whether he will be able to lay on the Table of the House, this Session, the report with reference to the outrage upon the boy Hambley. In asking that the report be laid on the Table, I do not wish in any way to reflect upon the Department. I have had an opportunity of looking into the evidence and reading the report, and I think the Department has done all that could fairly be expected of it in the matter. They have appointed to investigate this subject, perhaps, the best man to be found in Canada, certainly one of the very best men, and they could scarcely be expected to go beyond the report that he makes. I understand that in such cases the suspension of the certificate for a year is the greatest punishment that is inflicted, short of taking away the certificate altogether ; and the Government can scarcely be expected, I think, to take away the captain's certificate altogether, in view of the fact that Lieutenant Gordon had only recommended that it should be taken away for a year. I may mention——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order, unless the House is willing to permit him to proceed.

Mr. McNEILL. I merely wish to say that there is a great deal of painful interest taken in this matter in my constituency, and I am quite sure it would be in the public interest if the report were laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. COLBY. There is no objection whatever to laying the report on the Table, if the hon. member desires it.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COLBY. When we were last in Committee on this Bill the clauses were all passed with the understanding that clause 2 would be subsequently considered, with a view to meet, if possible, the objections raised by some hon. members from the Maritime Provinces, who were very familiar with the subject under discussion. My intention was to have consulted those hon. gentlemen with regard to preparing an amendment to the clause. I was not aware they were then intending to leave,—I refer to the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). Under these circumstances, I have not had an opportunity of consulting them, and I, therefore, withdraw that clause, and we can, if it is thought proper, consider it some future Session.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. On page 3, the following sub-section is inserted :—

But no lists now in force shall be deemed illegal on account of any polling district therein described, containing a larger number of names of voters than is permitted by 'The Electoral Franchise Act,' and in the case of an election taking place before the next revision of such lists, a sub-division of such polling district may be made in due time for such election by the returning officer for the electoral division where such polling district is situated.

The clause has special reference to a case that presented itself in British Columbia. Judge Walkem, one of the revising officers, made a polling district covering over a thousand names. When representations were made to His Honor in regard to the matter, he answered that he interpreted the law as not making it illegal to give such a number of names to a polling district. In case of a difficulty being raised against the list, this clause provides that because the number of names in the polling district exceeds 250, the number prescribed by the Act, that fact shall not invalidate the list ; but, if the election were to take place before the next revision, the returning officer could make a sub-division.

Mr. LAURIER. This amendment is one which can hardly be approved by the House. I do not object to the first portion of it, for I do not see any reason why, if a returning officer through error or otherwise, places more names that 200 or the prescribed number in a polling district, the list should be illegal. But after making such an error, power is given to the returning officer, at any time before the election, to sub-divide the polling district, and this is giving the revising officer power which he might exercise to the undue advantage of the candidate in whose favor he might happen to be. I have known in my own experience, before this law was in force, a returning officer to divide polling districts so as to give an undue advantage to one of the candidates.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The revising officer has been specified as the officer who might remedy any defect for the moment. The law declares that the returning officer has the right to divide the votes into as many polling booths as he deems convenient for the proper carrying on of the election. The amendment is harmless in that sense. He may sub-divide a polling division which is too large to come within the provisions of the law.

Mr. DAWSON. Does this give power to place more than one polling booth in one polling subdivision? I think the returning officer should have power to do so, especially in such a district as that I represent, where polling districts are as large as ordinary counties. The population is often very thin and scattered, and the returning officer should have power to establish two polling stations in one polling district, in order that the people may have the opportunity to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be desirable to have a special provision for a particular case, although it is obvious that there would be danger in adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), because it would give the hon. gentleman's voters the opportunity of voting "early and often" with greater facility. But it is very dangerous to apply the argument that because a special district requires special legislation, that legislation should be made generally applicable. Let me make this suggestion to the hon. Secretary of State : The hon. gentleman says the reason for his change

is because a particular revising officer has been under the impression that the law permitted him to make polling districts of any size he pleased. I think, Sir, that while it might be expedient to provide against injustice arising from some error of a revising officer, so as to avoid the disfranchisement of voters; it is very inexpedient that we should open any wider door for the revising officer to decline doing his full duty. I would suggest to the Secretary of State the advisability at the same time at which he makes provision for a possible neglect or error of duty, of making it still clearer what that duty is. He tells us that a revising officer, who is also a judge of the Superior Court, has construed it to be within his duty, deliberately to make a polling division comprising some 1,100 voters. I do not understand that to be the intention of the law. I understand it to be the duty of the revising officer to restrict the number to 250 voters. If we alter the law as it stood, and add this provision, we will be rendering it more likely that similar results will happen in the future. There are two several classes of cases which occur to me. I think it may very often happen that a revising officer, through error, or perhaps thinking it reasonable, may allow a small number of fifteen or twenty votes in a polling division, more than the maximum. That would be amply satisfied, I think, by just leaving things as they are. I believe there is no difficulty in polling at the one place a larger number than our maximum, and I believe it would be less evil to permit, within a moderate limitation of that kind, the division to remain undisturbed, than to allow the returning officer, a week before the election, in the case of an error of that kind, to dislocate the appointed divisions. There is really no necessity for it in the great number of cases for which we may be expected to provide. Such an exceptional case as the hon. the Secretary of State cites to us as one to be provided against, would be provided against chiefly by making the law very plain, so that he who runs may read, and by stating that it is the duty of the revising officer to divide the polling sub-divisions for each 200 or 250 voters. As my hon. friend has said, we have known in days that are past, very great improprieties committed by returning officers in reference to the discharge of discretionary duties. I have had before me an authenticated instance wherein, at the last general election, a polling station was established, not in the most convenient or central place, but in a place extremely inconvenient to the greater number of the voters who happened to be of one party, and thus creating an absolute injustice. I am not disposed te give to the returning officer, who is appointed shortly before an election, who is appointed at the will of the Government, frequently upon the nomination of the candidate, and who is acting in the heat of a contest, and largely at the suggestion of a candidate—any more discretionary powers than we can avoid. Some such powers he must have, but I think we should limit them to the utmost.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with the hon. gentleman, that the amendment proposed by the Senate is not at all fraught with the danger which is apprehended. It is provided that the polling divisions should consist of 200 names, but the revising officer has the latitude of adding fifty more names. At the last minute, when the Bill was before the Senate, my attention was called to the fact that in one electoral division there has been a polling district of some 1,000 or 1,100 names. I think the clause says that it is only in case of an election taking place before the next revision of the list, that the returning officer may make a sub-division. I state as a fact that there is only one case in the Dominion where it has occurred that this large number of names was put in the one polling division.

Mr. MULOCK. This work should be done by the revising officer, and we should not hand over his duty to the returning officer. The returning officer is as yet an unknown man, and is only appointed after the writ for the election has been issued. If we require to deal with an existing flaw in the law, let us deal with it. If this one returning officer in the whole Dominion has made a mistake, let us enable him to correct it, and to that end I suggest that we should strike out the words "returning officer" and substitute "revising officer," and specify the riding, and the time within which he has to make this correction.

Mr. DAWSON. With regard to the suggestion which I made, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) says, that the voters would have an opportunity of voting often in the same polling district. Let him imagine a polling division 500 miles from one end to the other, as we have in Algoma, and he will see it would be rather difficult for the electors to vote. If there were two polling booths allowed to be opened in such a large district as that, I do not think it would open the door for any more fraud than may or may not exist at present. A great many voters of that large district are certainly disfranchised, because they cannot get to the polling places.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The case mentioned by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is one entitled to the consideration of the House, and, I hope, that next Session the subject will be dealt with. In newly settled districts, or sections of the North-West Territories, where the population is very sparse, a provision ought to be made that the polling districts should be re-divided, although the number of votes may be less than the number now specified in the Act. I think the returning officer might have power to re-divide such large divisions.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I do not think there can be much objection to the suggestion made by the Senate. Of course in the old Provinces where the population is more compact, and where the polling districts are not so extensive, there may not be the same necessity for it as there is in our western Provinces. In my county, at the last election in January, we found, that in one of the polling districts the revising officer had no option at all, and had to confine himself to the number of electors on the list; in one of the polling districts, where the distance some of the electors had to travel to get to the polling place was about 50 miles. In that case, I must say, the other candidate and myself agreed to allow the returning officer to put an extra polling place in the district, in order to facilitate the voting. It was not legal, I admit, but the fact of the matter is, we did not want to deprive about 50 electors of the opportunity to record their votes. I believe the suggestion made is a proper one. It is said that the votes might be duplicated;

but we have a law against that, and under the present law it would be equally possible for persons qualified in different districts to duplicate their votes. On the other hand, I believe the lists are so made that it would be impossible for any elector to vote twice. I believe the provision is a wise one, and if it is not necessary in the older Provinces, it is in the newer Provinces, where population is sparse, and where at certain seasons of the year, when the weather is very unfavorable, the electors have to cross streams and other obstructions to get to the polling places.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) misunderstand the amendment somewhat. It does not relate to the Election Act at all, nor does it touch the subject of providing polling stations. At present, the Franchise Act clearly and distinctly requires that the revising officer shall sub-divide the electoral district into polling districts. He has not done that. The returning officer only has power to sub-divide the polling districts in order to provide convenient stations for polling ; but it is provided by this amendment that the revising officer having failed to divide the electoral district into polling districts, the returning officer, in the event of an election taking place before the next revision, shall do it, and if an election does not take place, the revising officer shall do it when he makes the next revision. As the electoral district now stands undivided, there are no polling districts for the returning officer to sub-divide.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that this provision is exceptional for time and also for place. You have made it exceptional for time, as it is only to apply to the list at present existing and not to a future revision.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that it is limited in point of time, but that it will be perpetually engrafted on the law, so that after the next revision, if you should find that a dozen revising officers had made the same default of duty, you would find a dozen returning officers performing the same duty.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to striking out the words after "Franchise Act," and I move that they be struck out.

Amendments concurred in.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Fisheries Act, chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.

Bill (No. 47) to amend chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : "An Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters."

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

House resolved itself into Committee on the following resolutions :—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a branch line to be constructed from Glenboro' westerly, a distance of about sixty miles, to a point on the proposed branch railway of the said company running from Brandon south-westerly.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a branch line of railway from a point at or near Brandon, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, south-westerly to or near Township three, Range twenty-seven, West of the First Principal Meridian, and thence westerly, a total distance of one hundred miles ; and also a similar grant, at the same rate per mile, for the said company's proposed branch railway from a point on the line just described at or near Township three, Range twenty-seven, West of the First Principal Meridian, easterly to Deloraine, a distance of about twenty-five miles, making the total of railway to which this grant is applicable, one hundred and twenty-five miles.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not less than six thousand four hundred acres per mile for the line of railway from a point in Township one, in either Range twenty-three or twenty-four, West of the First Principal Meridian, to Deloraine, a distance of about seventeen miles.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Lac Seul Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a line of railway from a point at or near Shelley Station, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to a point at or near White Mud Lake, on the Winnipeg Railway, a distance of eighteen miles.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary to a point at or near Edmonton on the North Saskatchewan River, a distance of about one hundred and nine miles : and also a grant of six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Calgary to a point on the International boundary between Canada and the United States, a distance of about one hundred and fifty miles.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, Dominion lands to the extent not exceeding three thousand eight hundred and forty acres for each mile of the company's railway from Lethbridge to the Crow's Nest Pass, a distance of about one hundred miles.

7. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that the said grants be made in aid of the construction of the said railways respectively, in the proportion and upon the conditions fixed by Orders in Council made in respect thereof, and that, except as to such conditions, the said grants shall be free grants, subject only to the payment of the grantees respectively, of the cost of survey of the lands and incidental expenses, at the rate of ten cents per acre in cash on the issue of the patents therefor.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres per mile for a branch line to be constructed from Glenboro' westerly, a distance of about sixty miles, to a point on the proposed branch railway of the said company running from Brandon south-westerly.

Mr. BLAKE. I recollect very well that, during the discussion on the charter which was proposed to be granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with all its aids in land and money, one of the reasons given for the large subsidies granted at that time was that they were necessary for, and in the interest of the country because the company were expecting themselves to construct and were to count on their constructing branch lines through the North-West by means of these grants. I find now that it is proposed to give large subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of those branch lines which we were told they would build in consequence of receiving those large grants of money and land. I would ask the Government to say why this departure is made from the policy enunciated in 1880–81 ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The line from Glenboro' westward constitutes a portion of a line which, I think, was originally called the Winnipeg South-Western. There were two South-Western Railways, and the charters were purchased from the parties who held them by the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that the first resolution would not come under the objection of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware, from the lie of the ground and from seeing the map, that this piece does not run from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but is connected with a branch line which the company has acquired. But it was a part of the understanding with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the branches were to be constructed at their expense. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company took over a branch which had been subsidised by the country, and now it is proposed that an additional piece shall be added to that by the company at our expense in part.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That portion of country, if any in the territories, needed railway communication, and the only possible way was to offer certain inducements. When there was a clamor for railway construction there, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made a proposition to the Government which was considered to be fair and reasonable and which was accepted. An Order in Council was passed on the 11th June, 1889, in reference to granting the usual subsidy to this road and confirming the previous grant of the 17th May of the same year from Glenford to Deloraine. Both these applications were carefully considered, and a strong appeal was made from the south-eastern portion of Manitoba and the south-western portion of Assiniboia, that means of communications with the coal fields should be afforded. If the application for this subsidy had been made by any other parties who showed their *bonâ fides*, the same consideration would have been given to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's statement appears to show that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have chosen to discharge themselves of their obligations as entered into by their political godfathers, and that, I fear, is the result which we have achieved in our relations with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that that company is not doing anything whatever except for special consideration, and now they require even further consideration in regard to the construction of these side lines. If I understood correctly the statements which were made last year by the Minister of the Interior, we were practically giving away our control of almost all the lands in the North-West by these railway grants. According to the statement made last year by the hon. gentleman, there was in the tract of about 400,000 square miles, that is, the tract substantially extending from the Red River on the one side to somewhere on the Rocky Mountain line on the other, by a width of about 400 miles, about 130,000,000 acres of land more or less fit for agriculture. A portion of the balance, he stated, might be fit for pastoral purposes, but he did not venture to estimate that there could be more than 130,000,000 acres, including Manitoba, which were fairly fit for agricultural purposes. I am not quite certain how much should be deducted for Manitoba, where the land is for the most part good, but I presume I would not be far astray in saying that it should be about 35,000,000 acres. That would leave something like 90,000,000 acres of agricultural land at our disposal. I put on one side lands not fit for agriculture but fit for pasturage. We are aware that we have pledged ourselves to give half of the land to actual settlers, so that there remains to us of agricultural land, on the statement of the hon. gentleman last year, something like 45,000,000 acres. Of that, we have already departed with, or made railway grants to the tune of 33,762,000 acres. Now we propose to give about 4,000,000 acres more. We will have, however, to make a further deduction for the Hudson's Bay Co. and the school lands. Practically the result of the proposals now before the House will be that we will leave ourselves, if we carry out the policy of giving half the land to the actual settler, without any land in that great territory of 400,000 square miles—that is, any land fit for agricultural purposes, unless we are to suppose that the railroads will be content to take a large quantity of inferior land, which I, for one, consider unlikely. That seems to be the practical result, that we will get rid of all control or means of making money out of the huge territory lying between the Rocky Mountains and the Red River and between the parallels of 49 and 54. If I am incorrect in that, I should be glad if the Minister of the Interior would point out how and in what degree I am incorrect.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think, if the hon. member will look at the return——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have examined the note of the hon. gentleman, and I know what it refers to.

Mr. DEWDNEY. When I made the explanation last year, I did so on a return prepared for me by my deputy; but, in looking over the debate which occurred then, and enquiring into the matter since that time, I find that the statement I made was not as nearly accurate as I think I could make it to-day. I could not understand from the returns that were given me at the moment, what area of country was included in the estimate that I gave the hon. gentleman; but on subsequent enquiry I find that the estimate had been made by one of the old deputies, Col. Dennis, from a plan which he had prepared, showing what he considered as the fertile belt, and also showing the portions of country which he considered, from the information he had, were of a dry character and hardly fit for settlement. Our information since that time with regard to that matter, has changed our views and changed every one's views; so I went to the trouble of making another estimate; I have got the plan here, and will lay it on the Table of the House. It really includes, approximately, the whole fertile belt, and is more reliable than the return he made before. The hon. gentleman will see that it makes a better showing than the description I was able to give to the House last year. I calculate that in the area of what we describe as the fertile belt, we have 135,000,000 acres, included in which are: School lands, 15,000,000 acres; Indian reserves, 1,459,740 acres; sales, &c., 2,000,000; railway grants, as per schedule attached to this return, 33,672,186, making a total of 52,141,926 acres, which to-day

we may consider we have appropriated, but that does not include the grants which we are asking Parliament for to-day. That would leave a surplus of 82,852,074 acres at the disposal of the Government for other purposes. Of course, when one thinks of the Territories at present, one only thinks of those portions which will be rapidly settled up, which we read of every day, and these would be included within the 49th parallel north of the Canadian Pacific Railway upper reserve. I have another plan which I will also lay on the Table, which the hon. gentleman asked me for, and which will show the Canadian Pacific Railway grants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I am aware, and the House no doubt is well aware, that there may be, and I trust there are, valuable territories north of latitude 54 ; but, for the purposes of this argument, I am taking latitude 54 as the northern limit, and I am taking the Red River as the eastern limit, and the base of the Rocky Mountains as the western limit. I think I am rather exaggerating the area when I put that at 400,000 square miles ; in fact, I know I am exaggerating it, but it is better to be on the safe side. Now, 400,000 square miles are, as nearly as possible, 270 million acres, as the hon. gentleman knows. The essential point I want to get at, is this : I have always been under the impression, and I think the majority of the House have been under the impression, that something like one-half of that 400,000 square miles is not fit for agricultural purposes, although a part of it might, perhaps, be fit for pasture land. That the hon. gentleman admitted last year. Do I understand him to say that he has reversed his opinion on that point, or is he still of opinion that I would be correct in saying that no more than one-half of that can be fairly put down for agricultural purposes ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No ; I think there will be a far greater area than the hon. gentleman supposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Remember, I am speaking now of agricultural lands, not of pasture lands, but what we may describe as agricultural lands fit to be used by settlers. Last year the hon. gentleman stated that he believed it would be about one-half.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I forget whether it is the same area or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to ascertain what proportion the hon. gentleman thinks may be put down. As I now understand, he thinks that his estimate was much too low last year, and that there is more than one-half.

Mr. DEWDNEY. My impression is that my remarks had reference, particularly, to that portion of country along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Moose Jaw, towards the Mountains. I think the hon. gentleman asked with regard to that. I recollect having stated, at any rate, with regard to that, that there was a great deal more agricultural land in that part of the country than was generally supposed, that in all the dips there was a very extensive agricultural country, some valleys three or four miles in width, and all the bottom lands were of first-class quality ; whereas on the ridges that have been exposed to winds, the land is dry and stony. That has been proved, I think, since Sir John Lister-Kaye began to cultivate his farm and has ploughed up a large area of land, and there, we may say, the soil is just as good as in any other part of the North-West. I have also another reason for thinking that if I did make that statement last year, it was an under estimate, because I have gone very closely into the quality of the land in the northern reserve of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I find there is a very small portion of it that is not first-class land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Every man in the House will be very much gratified if the hon. gentleman is correct, and the quantity of good land that he estimated last year proves to be under the mark. All the same, it is quite clear that we are parting with an enormous quantity of land in these various grants. Even after taking what we have purchased back from the Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. gentleman will know, and the House will know, that for every mile we give to the railways we are bound to reserve another mile for the actual settler. So, as the matter now stands, 38,000,000 acres of land are to be given away for railway purposes, say 40,000,000 in round numbers, and then there are the Hudson's Bay and school lands and road grants to be added, all of which, it will be observed, constitutes an enormous proportion of the lands available, making the most liberal additions possible. The distance does not exceed about 400 miles from 49 to 54 degrees ; while from Red River to the Rocky Mountains the distance is not quite 1,000 miles. Deducting the area of Manitoba, and allowing the grants to railways and the grants for school lands and Hudson's Bay lands and roads, we are rapidly depriving ourselves of the ownership and proprietorship of the region which the Government now owns or controls. These grants appear to be likely to be attended with considerable embarrassment, and, more especially so, if the Government do not take the precaution of compelling the railway companies to sell the lands to actual settlers at reasonable rates, leaving on the companies the onus as to actual settlers.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We have become so accustomed to dealing with large figures that I am afraid we do not thoroughly realise what we are doing in dealing with this matter. The Government's proposals cover 4,000,000 acres of land, or about three times the size of the Province of Prince Edward Island, and one-thirtieth of the whole area, good, bad and indifferent, of the Province of Ontario. In addition to that fact, there is one consideration which I have not heard mentioned, and it is one which, to me, is one which may involve serious consequences. We are now dealing as a Dominion with these lands, and we are dealing with them under conditions that will very materially change before these lands are sold. In a very short time, speaking comparatively, all these territories will be divided into Provinces, and these Provinces will, in the end, demand the control of the lands within their areas. But even supposing they do not, shall we impose on these various Provinces the same difficulties which have existed at various times in other Provinces ? We are establishing large tracts of land over which neither the Provincial Government, the Dominion Government, nor the public at large will have any control ; and those who know how much grumbling and dissatis-

faction have existed in the Province of Ontario in regard to a comparatively small tract of land held by the Canada Company, can realise a state of things that will exist in those Provinces, extending over millions of acres held by one great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are very likely to have in the future, as a result of these grants, just such difficulties as have, to a very great degree, existed in Ontario from the existence of a land corporation, so comparatively local and so comparatively liberal as the Canada Company. If the Canadian Pacific Railway is able to carry on its operations without selling those lands, why should they sell them? How can we expect them to sell them? If their lines prove to be sufficiently profitable to enable them to pay interest and to carry on their various operations, even with the disposal of a comparatively small portion of their lands, they would naturally hold the balance for speculation, and we would have, when those territories come to be divided into Provinces, and the people fall under the control of the Provincial Governments, a serious difficulty to deal with, one which, I think, this House hardly realises at the present moment.

Mr. BLAKE. When first the policy of aiding railways in the North-West by land grants was brought before the House, independently of the great grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in regard to which grant somewhat special reasons were adduced, I advanced this view: that although it was eminently advantageous, and it was absolutely necessary, that railways should be built through the North-West; although it was extremely reasonable that that country should bear, by the means we were proposing, a considerable portion of the burdens involved in the construction of those enterprises; yet, still, it was of the greatest possible consequence that we should devise some means to avoid the locking up of large quantities of land, and particularly the locking up of those areas of land alongside the lines of railway, which would be the first desired for settlement, and more especially when these were alternating with free grant sections, which would be sought for before the sections which were to be obtainable only by payment. We know that, during the period in which there was a considerable immigration and an excitement with respect to the values of land in the North-West, the suggestion that advantage would be taken by the railway corporations of their power as land holders, was realised. We know that their behavior was such as indeed we could not complain of; that it had respect to what they thought their interest under the circumstances; and that they raised the prices of their lands, as they had a legal right to do, as we who granted them without condition had no right to condemn, to the highest point that the then inflated condition of the market would, it was thought, allow. Lands, which had been saleable at $1, $1.50 or $2 per acre were raised to $5, $6 and even $8 per acre, and sale and settlement were checked, and the country was injured. The settlement of the country is effected very satisfactorily indeed under those conditions which allow two or three members of a family or two or three close and intimate friends to go together. One of the great difficulties in a new country like the North-West is the separation of the settlers, at the best, from the aggregates of population. That difficulty they must encounter until towns grow; that difficulty is made greater in the North-West by reason of the large areas which we allow for the individual settler, and which make him in a sense remote even from his immediate neighbor. But that difficulty is intensified when under our principles of settlement there is going to be settlement in the first instance only in alternate sections; when you have a set of sections for sale along the railway, and a free grant set of sections, alternating with each other. It is obvious, except in the case of an immigrant who has considerable capital, that a settler will be almost driven to say "the capital I have must be put into fencing and buildings and into implements and breaking the land, and I cannot afford to pay a price for the land;" and, therefore, you have these inevitable difficulties to some extent intensified, even by any system under which there will be a check on free settlement. We cannot avoid that, we cannot eat our cake and have our cake. If it is necessary to make these railway grants to secure the construction of roads, we must do so on the least disadvantageous terms to the public consistent with reasonable advantage to the railways. When these grants were proposed and submitted to the House, I submitted a motion, which will be found recorded in the Journals of the House, for a vote was taken upon it, that the grants should be made only on condition that the areas granted of agricultural lands (I did not speak of land with mill privileges or station grounds or town sites, or other special values, but only of ordinary agricultural lands) should be open for sale on reasonable conditions for actual settlement and in reasonable areas, at a price not exceeding a maximum to be fixed. My object was to ensure that a man who goes out to that country to hunt for land, and takes a map on which he finds the alternate sections indicated, would know that if he has found a choice section on railway lands, he would be as certain to get that section if it had not been entered before, on coming back to the railway office and paying the stipulated price, as he would be certain on coming back to the Government office of getting the free grant which is adjoining it. He could thus choose his free grant, and for his neighbor or friend with whom he wished to live in proximity he could choose the railway land. By this means you would provide against the lock up of land which the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has referred to, and which may be a very serious evil. You would make this land as freely open for settlement as the Government lands, except on the addition of having to pay a certain sum. In the old times when I had an opportunity of taking an interest in these matters—an interest which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) doubts a little sometimes, but which I can assure him, however misdirected was, at any rate, very sincere—I received complaints from persons who had been in that country and who said: "We went here and there and everywhere, and on coming back, having made one or more selections, we found either that the land was a railway grant and we could not get it, or it was held by the Canadian Pacific Railway under that blanket grant of theirs, or it was in the hands of speculators, and we came back disheartened." Your system ought to be one which would leave open on plain terms to actual settle-

ment, irrespective of the will of the railway company, the agricultural lands, out of which, notwithstanding your arrangement, the railway company shall derive a reasonable price. Name a maximum price, and let the lands, subject to the payment of that maximum by reasonable instalments, be open to settlement in reasonable areas. If you do that you diminish the difficulties inseparable from this question, to the greatest possible extent, and, if so minimised, the advantages of securing the construction of a railway are greater than the disadvantages of causing the partial lock up of lands necessary for its construction. I do fear, that if there comes again a time of considerable immigration to the North-West, and of considerable hunting for land, the reckless manner in which we have given, and are giving, these grants will prove in the future, as it has proved in the past, to be a greater obstacle to the settlement of that country than might exist if a different system were adopted. It is all very well to repeat the arguments with which I was met in former years, namely, that it is in the interest of the railway company to sell, and that we may be quite sure they will be glad to set a low price on the land. We have heard that before, and we have had an example of the short-sighted policy in the period of inflation to which I have referred, which prevented settlement just because it was thought a little more money might be obtained later on. I do not want these lands to be used for speculation, either by the individual buyers or by the railway company itself. I want them to be charged, in favor of the railway company, with a reasonably fair price for the settlers to pay; and while subject to that charge, that they shall be as free and open to the settlers as if they were Government free grants of lands.

Mr. DAVIN. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and there cannot be any doubt that the subject which he has brought before the attention of the House is one of vital importance to the North-West. The solitude which is almost enforced at present is oppressive, and we have again and again discussed, in the North-West, the best way of dealing with it. If the Government can make some arrangement with the railway companies, that the land henceforth will be open to settlement on some such conditions as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has pointed out, it would prevent for the future the evil which at present we feel keenly in the North-West. There cannot be the least doubt that any railway will do exactly what the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has pointed out; it will hold its land and sell at the greatest profit. It is human nature to do that, it is what any business corporation will do. But if a maximum of $3 or $4 an acre were fixed—it need not be so low a price as the hon. member for West Durham has stated—that would compel the railway to sell, and it would relieve us of the difficulty we have to deal with in regard to these railway sections. We have in fact many times discussed in the North-West, the possibility of making an arrangement with the railway for getting rid of these lands, and the statesman who devises a means to secure that the railway company, instead of keeping these lands to be sold at the greatest profit, will try to bring settlers on to the land, and be content with a comparatively small profit for ready cash; that statesman will confer a lasting benefit on the North-West. I consider that the railways adopt a short-sighted policy in holding these lands. If they went *pari passu* with the Government in settling the townships in which they have sections, they would be well repaid by the passenger and freight traffic which they would have to and fro, as the result of this settlement. There cannot be the least doubt that this is a problem to the solving of which our statesmen should devote themselves. This is a question of vital importance to the comfort and welfare of all classes of settlers in the North-West. Look what happens under the present system. You have thirty-six sections in a township, and when you take away the school sections and the Hudson's Bay sections, you have not half the number of sections of a township to support the schools, and the various other taxes which must be borne by the settlers of the township. If we could devise some means of bringing settlers on to these sections that are given to the railway, and if the railway would co-operate with the Government in this, we should have thirty-three or thirty-four inhabited sections in each township. If you suppose that each one has a homestead and pre-emption, it would give something like seventy settlers to bear the burdens of the township, but if you have only 160 acres to each, you will have a good deal more than a hundred to bear the various little burdens which have to be borne by the township, such as dealing with schools and other matters of great importance to the settler. This is a problem which will rebound to the credit of the statesman who will solve it, so as to make the railway, whether it be the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other which gets a grant of lands, co-operate with the Government in settling the townships. Any statesman who will provide a means of doing that will command the gratitude of the North-West and the confidence of the country.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

On resolution 1,

Mr. WATSON. I think the arguments advanced on this side of the House show that some restrictions should be placed on railway companies which hold lands in the North-West. We know that two railways, the Regina and Long Lake Railway and the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, which are both practically branches of the Canadian Pacific Railway under other names, have secured cash subsidies as well as land grants. It is well understood by this House and the country that when the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was originally granted, power was given to the company to build branch lines in any direction they saw fit in consideration of receiving 6,400 acres a mile. The land grants already obtained by the different railways—the Manitoba and North-Western, the North-West Central, the Canadian Pacific, the Regina and Long Lake, and the Calgary and Edmonton—take up a great portion of the odd-numbered sections in Manitoba and the North-West Territories; and on looking at the map, I have come to the con-

clusion that the land grants now under consideration will almost entirely absorb all the valuable odd sections north of the Canadian Pacific Railway reserve up to the 52nd degree of latitude. Under these circumstances, I think that in making these grants, a certain maximum price should be fixed for the land for actual and intending settlers. It is well known that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company hold their lands to-day just as any company of private speculators would hold them. It was expected, and with a good deal of reason, that it would be in the interest of the company to throw open their lands for settlement at the earliest possible moment; but they have apparently thought differently, and have come to the conclusion that it is better for them, from a financial point of view, to hold their lands as a matter of speculation, than to allow them to be occupied by settlers. I do not know at what price they hold their lands in the North-West, but in Manitoba they hold them to-day at from $4 to $10 an acre. It appears to me that it would pay the company to sell their lands at a much less price, when they would derive the advantage of their being settled upon and cultivated. These being my views, when the proper time arrives, I will test the feeling of the House on this question of fixing a maximum price.

Mr. ROSS. With regard to the suggestion that there should be a maximum price fixed upon the lands, I think it would be utterly impossible to carry it out. In some parts of the country $3 an acre would be quite sufficient for them; in fact, in certain parts you could not get $3 an acre, while in other parts the land would be cheap at double the price. Then, in the same locality there might be one lot which would be more valuable than another, on account of the hay, or coal, or timber it contained, or because of its close proximity to a station or a town. Such lands might be worth $12 or $15 an acre, and it would be unfair to put a maximum price of $3 an acre upon them. With such a maximum price, the good lands would have to be sold at a figure much below their value, while the poor lands would not be worth the fixed price. In this respect a railway company occupies a different position from an ordinary land company. The Canada Land Company had no object besides that of making money out of its land; but a railway company has two objects —to settle up the country in order to obtain traffic, and to obtain as large returns as possible from the sale of lands. There is no railway corporation in the North-West that is more anxious to hold its lands at a high price than it is to get settlers into the country; on the contrary, I am satisfied, from the efforts made by the railway companies in the past, they are more anxious to dispose of their lands and get settlers into the country, than they are to hold their lands and wait for high prices, because it is only by getting settlers into the country that the value of their lands will be increased. Knowing these facts, and holding these views, I am utterly opposed to fixing a maximum price on the lands held by the railway companies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In answer to this, I know, and every one of us who has the slightest knowledge of the state of things in Southern Manitoba knows, that whatever the railway companies consider to be in their interest, as a matter of fact, settlers have been driven out of that part of the country by the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and in support of the proposals made by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), and myself, who, knowing what has taken place, have been endeavoring to compel these companies to bring the lands into the market, we have these facts staring us in the face, which show that it is impossible that these companies can be depended on. We are practically locking up and abandoning the control of 100,000,000 acres in that country; and I have no hesitation in saying, that no policy could be devised more likely to retard settlement, than giving these railway companies control over enormous blocks of land, without any restrictions whatever. I trust that my hon. friend will persevere in his motion, and put on record the names of those in this House in favor of settlers obtaining lands at a reasonable price.

Mr. BLAKE. To the difficulties that beset the consideration of this question, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) has added other alleged difficulties which do not in fact exist. He has spoken about coal lands, timber lands, and lands in the immediate vicinity of stations and town sites being included. What is the suggestion I made to the House? I excluded lands of this character; I limited my suggestion to ordinary agricultural lands. Lands which the company might have a right to hold as having special values, which did not come within this denomination—lands having a special value, such as coal lands, timber lands, town sites or expected town sites, could, by a very easy arrangement, be withdrawn from the operation of the regulation which would apply, by arrangements to be prescribed by the Government, under the general direction of Parliament, a maximum to ordinary agricultural lands alone. I admit that there are some real difficulties to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, but which also he has exaggerated. He has supposed that my suggestion necessarily applied one maximum to all railway grants. Not at all. It is not necessary, when you are dealing with the lands of one railway company, to apply the same maximum which you would apply with reference to the lands of another. For instance, there is a railway enterprise in which I understand the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) takes a great deal of patriotic interest—the Hudson Bay Railway Company. No one can suppose it would be reasonable to apply the same minimum or maximum to that, which would apply to some of the others. But why complicate unfairly and unreasonably a practical suggestion, whatever its difficulties, by adding these absurd notions of difficulty which the hon. gentleman entertains? We are now dealing with one grant; we are now dealing with one locality; we are now dealing with a certain mileage of railway in one part of the North-West Territories; and we are called upon therefore, if we deal with it intelligently, to determine what maximum should be applied to ordinary agricultural lands in the region of that grant. Even there, there may be great variations in the characters of the lands which will be allotted to the company. There, also, you cannot have a perfect plan because your maximum must have regard, I will not say to

the choicest morsels, but to the highest class of agricultural land properties in the grant. No doubt consideration has been given by the Administration to those questions. I presume the Minister who is proposing the grant, and the Minister of Railways —for I suppose they are jointly responsible—have considered what are the difficulties and probable cost of construction; what the prospects of traffic are, and the general qualities of the lands along this proposed railway, in respect of which this grant of 6,400 acres per mile is to be given. If this, as a branch railway, is going to cost $12,800 a mile, and if we are to suppose those lands, including timber lands, coal lands, town sites and so forth, have only to-day an average cash value of $2 per acre, we are giving the cost of the road. If the road will cost $18,000 or $19,000 a mile equipped, we still are making a free gift of two-thirds of the cost, averaging the lands at $2 per acre. I do not know, we have not the slightest information as to whether there are any special difficulties of construction, whether there are "any more rivers to cross;" whether the bridging, the grading, the excavation and so on, is expensive. I do not know what the particular character of the land is. Upon that no information is vouchsafed. Sir, the Government policy does not regard the difficulties suggested by the hon. member for Lisgar. The grant is 6,400 acres per mile all round, no matter whether the road be easy or difficult to build; no matter whether it is one immediately promising a large traffic or promising only a large traffic in the future; no matter whether the lands are more or less valuable. Except in the case of the Galt Road, 6,400 acres is the general acreage given per mile. We are entitled to ask the grounds of the Government's conclusion. We are entitled to know whether the Government have considered these things—whether they have considered what the probable cost of the road will be, what will be the probable results to the company of the road, what the probable value of this land grant will be? We are entitled to know whether the Government have been appropriating this land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, with some regard to those considerations, or whether it is all pure guess work, or whether there has not even been a guess.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Government have considered this matter, and have come to the conclusion, from the experience of eight or ten years, that land grants will not build railways. If land grants could build railways, we would not come down to this House and ask a guarantee for certain roads proposed to be built in the Territories—one of which is under construction, and one which we hope will be under construction in a short time. It is well known that companies have not been able, on land grants, to raise sufficient money to build railways. I might instance the road which has been most successful in the country, the Manitoba and North-Western. They have, even with one of the largest financial backings in Canada, not been able to raise sufficient money, or anything like it, from their land, in order to carry out their undertaking. Now, with regard to some observations which fell from the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), he, in looking over the plans, stated that he found that all the railway land, north, I think, of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, had been given away to railway companies and that virtually, after this appropriation is made, there will be nothing left. I can tell the hon. gentleman that we have in that portion of the country, from the 49th parallel up to the southern boundary of the northern Canadian Pacific Railway reserve, still on hand 20,000,000 acres, and we are only asking out of that about 3,500,000 to cover these subsidies. Now, with regard to some observations which fell from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) before recess, one of his objections to the policy of the Government in regard to lands, was the giving of them in alternate sections. Well, we propose, in the subsidies we are asking, to give, and the parties applying are anxious to accept, alternate townships in preference to alternate sections. That will free us from one of the difficulties the hon. gentleman mentions. The hon. gentleman states that the price of land in Manitoba varies from $4 to $10 an acre. Well, that may be so.

Mr. WATSON. They are held by the Canadian Pacific Railway at that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman must recollect that those lands have been in the market the last 8 or 10 years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I, myself, in 1885 and 1886, saw the lists of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the lands were then actually held, I believe, at higher prices than they are to-day.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The land commissioner, I know, held these lands at a very high figure then, but the land commissioner who has had charge lately, within the last year or two, has reduced the price considerably of Canadian Pacific Railway lands generally.

Mr. WATSON. Do you know what that price is now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not. I know they are reduced considerably. With regard to the North-West, to my own knowledge, the Canadian Pacific Railway are selling lands at $2.50 per acre. I certainly agree with the hon. member for Lisgar, (Mr. Ross), that the scheme proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, to build railways in the North-West, is utterly impracticable. If we want railways built, we must give lands, and allow the railway companies to dispose of them according as there is a market demand for them. If not, the result will be, instead of giving one acre, we will have to give four acres. I recollect the proposal of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were considering this scheme. They did not propose to give 6,400 acres per mile, but they proposed, I believe, to give 12,000 or 20,000 acres.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was sixteen years ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Interior tells us that the land grants will not build railways. If that is so, we had better abstain from giving land grants. Why should we give the heritage of the people in the future away to speculators now, when they are considered by the Minister of Interior not to ensure the building of the railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. What I mean to say is that the land grants will not be sufficient in themselves

to build the railway. The companies will have to put money in as well.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that it is for the Government to furnish all the money necessary to build the road?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Certainly not.

Mr. CHARLTON. That has been done in some cases, no doubt, and now, if the 6,400 acres a mile can be sold at $2 an acre, that will, in the majority of cases, pay the cost of building a road in a country of that kind. We are embarking in a reckless system of bartering away to speculators the land which will be required by settlers in the future, and that is a matter which many hon. members and the average elector fail to comprehend. If my hon. friend and his colleagues would condescend to learn wisdom from the experience of others, they would look to the experience of a country to the south of us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; any parallel case which is cited from that country calls from the super-loyal members on that side of the House nothing but groans. In that country, they have had the experience of designing speculators, of railway contractors who designed to make a great deal of money out of a very small capital by means of the grants of land. There might be a reason for these grants in the case of a great trunk line like the Union Pacific, or, in the case of Canada on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but the promoters of other lines, with their lobbyists, came to Congress and obtained enormous grants of land, as now they are coming here and obtaining enormous grants of land, not in the interests of the people either to-day or in the future, but in the interests of speculators. What has been the result in the United States? The Central Pacific was organised with a capital of $12,500. That is, that was all that was paid in. The result was that men like Huntingdon, and Crocker, and Sanford, made profits out of that speculation ranging from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 each. The last returns that I saw show that the assets of that company are valued at $287,000,000, and that enormous profit was secured by just such schemes as these, by grants of land which are sufficient to pay the cost of the road twice over, or, perhaps, in some cases, five times over. The whole system of land grants and money grants for railways is a vicious one. Last night we had an example of the system in the bald swindle in connection with the Caraquet road, to which the Government was a party. The action of the Government in granting subsidies in advance of settlement, far in advance of the needs of the country, away in the wilderness, is a reprehensible one, and I think they should wait until these roads are required, because the experience of the United States will show them that, where roads are required, capital will step in and build them. The great difficulty nowadays is to obtain employment for capital. The great monetary centres are overflowing with redundant wealth, and wherever there is a reasonable prospect of return for an investment, the money is forthcoming. Wherever a railway can show that it will pay expenses and return a dividend, the money will be forthcoming to build it, and it is not necessary for the Government to step in ten or fifteen years in advance of the requirements of the country and give large grants of land to secure the premature and unnecessary construction of roads. I repeat that the system is vicious, that it is not in the interest of the country, and I predict that, within ten years from this day, the population of Canada will regret the adoption of this system, and will curse the Government that squandered millions of money and millions of acres of land on these wild-cat enterprises.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I believe my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), in citing the United States as an example, has not been looking into the recent history of the Western States. It may be that the Union Pacific or some other railways may have given great profits to their promoters, but, in Minnesota, Montana and Dakota, he will find that the local legislatures are now granting lots of land to railways in order to promote their construction.

Mr. CHARLTON. In Montana and Dakota the Local Legislatures do not own any lands, because they belong to the Federal Legislature.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. At any rate, I know these grants are made in Minnesota. If you do not give these railways aid in land, you will have to give them a cash subsidy, and I believe it is better to give them lands, because in that way the companies are interested in colonising the country through which their lines run. I believe the present policy of the Government is the wisest and the best that can be adopted. A misinterpretation has been given to what was said by the Minister of the Interior in regard to his statement that the land subsidy did not build the railways. He did not mean to say that by giving that land subsidy we did not secure the construction of railways. We know that the 6,400 acres per mile which we give has no value until the road is constructed, and, therefore, the grant does not ensure the construction of the road. The railway companies have to wait for years before they can dispose of these lands, and then the interest on the money they have invested, and the cost of management of these lands and other things, amount to such a sum that, even if they get $2.50 or $3 or $4 an acre, they hardly get $1 an acre for the land in comparison with what those prices would have represented when the subsidy was granted. But these grants increase the value of the security for the bonds which the promoters have to issue in order to build the line. The present policy of the Government is the proper one, and the only one that can be adopted under the circumstances.

Mr. DAVIN. There seems to be a difficulty in the way of the proposal to bring the railway lands into the market. Since I made a few remarks here this afternoon, I have been thinking about that matter, and I think this would solve it. Let it be reserved that by Order in Council, at any given time, and in regard to any given lands, a certain maximum sum should be fixed. The hon. member for West Durham stated, a couple of hours ago, that some lands might be more valuable than others, and my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross), pointed out that some lands would be more valuable than others. Well, I think, that if it were reserved that by Order in Council—and I think it would be safe to confide in the fairness of the Government—a sum should be fixed at any given time, and in regard to any given lands, the difficulty would be got over. I see a great difficulty in fixing

far ahead a maximum sum, but an elastic system might be introduced by which, by Order in Council, a maximum sum should be fixed at which the railway would have to alienate its lands. As I said this afternoon, it would be to the advantage of the railway, and as the hon. member for Lisgar points out, nothing can be more to the advantage of a railway than to fill the country with population. Now, it is very important to do this, because, as the Minister of the Interior points out, we have 20,000,000 acres of land still left. If we gave 160 acres of land to each one of the settlers, 1,250,000 will take up that 20,000,000 acres, and if you give four to each family you would have about 5,000,000 of a population. Then, if the railway lands adjoining are reserved, you will have that 5,000,000 there, and yet a large amount of territory besides, still unoccupied, that will support five or six millions more people. I grant it is in the interest of the railway to fill up the country, but I do think it would not be unbecoming or unstatesmanlike to take guarantees that they would act in accordance with their interest ; for it may happen—it happens in regard to other matters than railways—that the greatest wisdom does not always prevail in their management, nor the most far-seeing views control. I would urge this upon the attention of the Government, if they entertain the proposal of putting into legislation what is undoubtedly the wish of the North-West people, and what would be a great advantage to the North-West. I think the difficulties that have been raised against the plan may be got over if, instead of fixing now, far ahead, a maximum sum at which the lands should be alienated, the Government reserved for themselves power by Order in Council to fix the sum at any given time in regard to any given lands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. How would the hon. gentleman propose to deal with the Long Lake Road, for instance, who have already got their land ?

Mr. DAVIN. That land grant has been given ; that is a finished job.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Then why did not the hon. gentleman say this last year ?

Mr. DAVIN. The reason why I did not say it last year was, that the thing did not come up.

Mr. WATSON. This point was discussed last year.

Mr. DAVIN. Perhaps, then, I may have got a little more enlightenment since then. I dare say my hon. friend the Minister of Interior thinks that because the Long Lake Railway goes north from Regina, I may have taken so deep an interest in it, that I was glad to see it go through, irrespective of these considerations ; but the fact is, this thing did not occur to me last year. It has been discussed in the Territories, and the necessity has been recognised of bringing as quickly as possible the railway lands into settlement, and I believe that if the Government will look into this matter they will see it is the interest of the railway, not less than in the interest of the country, or the Government, that some means should be devised whereby those lands will rapidly be brought into settlement. I believe the suggestion I make has not been made before in this House, but I think it would meet the views of the railway and the views of the country, if power was reserved by Order in Council at a given time, and in regard to any given land, taking their value, taking their situation, taking the settlement around them—taking all these things into consideration, and fixing at certain periods a maximum sum at which the land would have to be alienated. The moment the objection was pointed out I saw the difficulty. I see the strong objection against fixing now a maximum sum. What would be a reasonable sum now might be an unreasonable sum, and a most unjust sum, for the railway, ten years hence ; but if it is left to the Government by Order in Council to fix the sum, say, five, ten, or fifteen years hence, I think we may rely upon it the Government will not do any injustice in regard to the railway.

Mr. DALY. I certainly cannot agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because I think if we were to surround the land grants of any railway with restrictions such as he seeks to impose by Order in Council, it would be impossible for that railway company to sell its land grant bonds. It seems to be the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite that the land subsidies that are proposed to be given to these railways are along the line of these railways. None of the railways that are mentioned in these resolutions, with the exception of the Lac Seul Railway and the railway running from a point 17 miles south of Deloraine, to Deloraine, will receive any land whatever in the Province of Manitoba. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) complains that the Canadian Pacific Railway hold their land in Southern Manitoba at a greater price than they should have done. It should be remembered that these lands were at the time in the most thickly settled portion of the Province of Manitoba, and the line of railway ran through these lands, and consequently gave them a particular value. Now, in this case take the first line of railway upon the list, that is the Glenboro' branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a so-called extension of that branch. None of the lands will be given along that line of railway, because they are all taken up and sold long ago, and form part of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line subsidy, and the chances are that the 6,400 acres per mile given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for that branch will lay away up in the north-western portion of the North-West Territory. Now, I think it would be very unfair, those lands being situated in that western portion of the Territories, to fix now a price upon them. It may be, as was stated by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), that they might have an unusual value on account, as he remarked, of being coal lands, or having valuable timber limits, and it would be simply impossible at present, and until such time as these lands were selected, to put any value upon them. Now, it seems to me that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is opposed to building railways in the North-West Territories and Province of Manitoba. He takes issue with all his Reform friends and the whole Liberal party in the Province of Manitoba upon that question. It is only a short time ago that a contract was entered into between the Greenway Government of Manitoba and the Northern Pacific Railway by which they were to get an enormous subsidy, but so glaring were the

terms of that contract that, subsequently, they had to withdraw it. At all events, the people of Manitoba have contributed $750,000 out of their treasury towards building branch lines of the Northern Pacific into the Province of Manitoba, and that policy was inaugurated and carried out by the Liberal Government of Mr. Greenway. Therefore, the Liberals of Manitoba have a different view upon this matter from the hon. member for Norfolk, and I have no doubt that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who represents the Liberal party of Manitoba in this House, also differs from the hon. member for North Norfolk upon the question of giving aid to railways. It seems to me that that hon. gentleman is never himself unless he is inconsistent. He was in this House in 1888 when a resolution was introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Finance, in reference to granting $15,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the withdrawal of the monopoly clause. An amendment was made to that resolution, and the final clause of the amendment was to the effect that the principal moneys of the $15,000,000 should be applied to building branch lines in the Province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman voted in favor of that amendment. Having done so, his remarks to-night are very inconsistent, because the Glenboro' branch and the Souris branch are the very lines to which they sought to have these $15,000,000 applied, and it was through the instrumentality of myself and those who urged the granting of this land subsidy that the Minister has submitted this proposed land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and any other hon. gentleman who opposes this motion will not be thanked by members of the Liberal party in Manitoba for the action they have taken, because when I state that not one acre given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for either of these branches I have named will be in Manitoba, but will be in the north-west portion of the North-West Territories, it would be unfair for Parliament to declare that this railway should only hold lands at a certain fixed price per acre.

Mr. SPROULE. The object of giving lands is for the purpose of assisting the building of the railway, and is to create a basis of security on which the company can raise money. If the Government were to reserve for themselves the right to fix the price for the land, no capitalist would think of lending a dollar on such security. Suppose the proposal were made, the reply would at once be offered that they did not know the price for which the lands would sell; that the Government had the power to name the price, and after the company had spent money and thereby increased the value of the land for their own selfish purposes, the Government might afterwards fix the price so low as not to be sufficient to pay the interest on the investment. Such a policy would be a most unreasonable one. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), has said that this might be in the interest of the railway companies and the country. It might be so, provided the railway companies were able to secure money to build the roads, but even in such a case, it would be practically impossible for railway companies to go on the money market and raise loans with which to carry out their undertakings.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think there is any such difficulty in fixing the price as the hon. gentleman has indicated, nor do I think the land would be as valueless as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken would have the Committee suppose, if the price were fixed. The scheme for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway proposed in the first instance provided that the prices of the lands held should be from time to time agreed upon between the Government and the company. There was really no difficulty in agreeing on a price. What the Government desire in the construction of railways, I suppose, is to promote the public interest, and the reason why this House sanctions these appropriations is simply as a means to accomplish this end. We have in establishing railway companies and conferring benefits on them nothing to gain, except so far as these roads are capable of conferring benefits on the community. If the railway corporation created in this case was not going to assist the early settlement of the country, the very object for which aid is given would be frustrated. We have two questions before us that are of importance. There is the question as to whether the time has come when railways should be constructed in that district. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) spoke as though it were the immediate duty of Parliament to build all the railways required for all time in that country. The hon. gentleman argued that because certain parties who settled in Manitoba desired the early construction of railways in that Province, we would be inconsistent if we did not desire the immediate construction of a railway at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. It is not in the interests of the people that the population coming in should be scattered. There are a great many advantages in having early settlements as dense as possible, and the tens of thousands of people, if we can secure such numbers year by year, who go into the North-West had better settle as near Winnipeg as possible; and these settlements should extend gradually westward, and railways should be provided from time to time to meet the wants of the community as the country is settled. There is a very great advantage in adopting such a system. We have to consider whether the railway facilities, already offered at very great expense to this country, owing to the disposal of a very large portion of the public lands, have all been made use of? Have new settlers availed themselves of those facilities as they exist? I do not think the Government have made out their proposition, or submitted to the House anything that justifies this expenditure, and it is a very great waste of the public money and public resources to construct railways to different points when large sections much nearer are open to settlement, and the settlement of which, at an early day, ought to be secured. Passing from that point for the present, the next question is, how are we to give this aid to such railways so as not to impose an impediment in the way of settlement? An hon. member opposite urged that the lands in Southern Manitoba held by the Canadian Pacific Railway at from $4 to $10 per acre, were worth that price. If that was the real value of those lands, they would be settled more rapidly than they were settled. We know that that country is not being settled, that there is nothing like the population in that country which was supposed before the census

was taken two or three years ago; and any one who will fairly consider the appropriations of public lands made to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the railway facilities furnished, must be disappointed at the slow settlement of Southern Manitoba. There must be some reason for this. The climate is fairly good; the soil is excellent; the country is in its natural state inviting, and yet, notwithstanding these railway facilities, settlement does not go on as rapidly as it does in Dakota or Montana. We know that the settlement in Dakota, even of Canadians, has exceeded by a large majority the settlement in our North-West Territories. And the prices at which our lands are held is an explanation of the cause why settlement has not more rapidly developed in that section of the country. There are many ways in which the Government might meet the views expressed on this side of the House. Let me say this: Suppose the Government were to provide that the amount of money which the company should receive from these lands should be a fixed maximum sum, and that the Government should have the privilege of retaining the control and sale of these lands, if they thought proper, so long as the proceeds were paid to the railway until that sum was received; it seems to me that you would keep the country fairly open for settlement, that you would prevent the stockholders, for mere speculative purposes, seeking to make the most out of these lands at the expense of the settlers. It would be in the last degree a mistaken policy to hand over these lands without any restriction to railway corporations, and to depend wholly upon the interests of the companies for their immediate settlement. Why, Sir, experience has already shown that that is not a sufficient consideration upon which to rely, and that the public interest is not likely to be served by that course. Take, for instance, the increase of the value of real estate during the period of the boom in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, when it was supposed that a very large immigration was about to go in there. The Canadian Pacific Railway, looking at its immediate interests, acted upon the principle which everywhere governs the holders of real estate for the purpose of sale. They held on to the lands for a larger price, they put impediments in the way of settlement, and they turned away immigration from the country. No doubt, in the long run, they have suffered by that policy, but it is a policy which under like circumstances will be adopted again and again. It does seem to me that this Parliament is dealing altogether too loosely with the public domain in giving effect to these resolutions, and to the policy which has hitherto been pursued in respect to this matter. I think the Government ought to provide means to retain the control of these lands, and a voice in determining what the price should be, subject to the paramount consideration of Parliament. The more rapidly the lands are settled the better it will be in the public interest, and it is the public interest that we are here to consider.

Mr. DALY. I wish to draw the attention of the House to some figures which I gave in my address on the tariff question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has referred, as did another hon. gentleman before him, to the high prices at which the Canadian Pacific Railway held their lands in southern Manitoba. I said the other night that I took exception to the price at which these lands were held four or five years ago, and I stated that I believed the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway at that time was a very mistaken one. However, a great portion of the land sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Canada North-West Land Company, which has been mentioned here to-night, are in this very portion of Southern Manitoba which has been referred to. In the figures I have quoted, on another occasion, I pointed out, that for the six months ending the 30th June, 1889, the Canada North-West Land Company sold 32,320 acres as against 20,620 acres during the corresponding period of 1888, the value of the land they sold in 1889 was $191,402.65, as against $113,432.80 in 1888, an increased acreage sold of 11,700 acres in 1889, and an increase of $77,969.85 in value. Now, the great bulk of these lands are in Southern Manitoba, and the people must have thought the lands were worth the price they paid for them or they would not have bought them. I do not think that the price at which these lands are held in Southern Manitoba to-day, results in retarding settlement there, because that country is well and thickly settled, and the men who are living there are increasing their holdings year after year, and are willing and able to pay the prices asked. I would impress upon members on the other side of the House that in relation to the branch lines of railway in the Province of Manitoba, which it is now proposed to aid, there is not an acre of the land which it is intended to give these railways that is within a hundred miles of them, and I say it would be unfair to restrict the price at which these lands should be sold.

Mr. WATSON. From the arguments which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) has addressed to the House, it appears that it is unnecessary to give assistance to these railroads. He has told us the high price at which land was sold, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway are not building that road for the sake of the land grant, but for the sake of the traffic. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway have been promising to build this road for the last seven or eight years, and in consequence of their delay and neglect to do so, a large number of the settlers in south-western Manitoba have been deprived of railway communication up to the present time. I have no doubt, that had it not been for the move made by the Liberal Government of Manitoba, the Canadian Pacific Railway would not undertake to build that road even now. They are building it at this late period only because the Northern Pacific obtained a charter last Session, for the purpose of constructing a road without any assistance whatever from this Government. I may say that the Local Government has assisted us in securing the construction of some 250 miles of road, by building competing lines with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may also say that the Local Government have succeeded in securing the construction of a road at a less price, than this Parliament has ever secured the construction of a road for in the North-West. They secured the construction of that road for a cash bonus of $1,500 a mile or a portion of it, and $1,750 for the balance of the road. They have built that road without any other assistance than this; they obtained no land grant aid, and I am happy to say that that same company proposes extending their

road during the present year, without any assistance from this Parliament. The other argument which has been used by the hon. gentleman goes to show that the road to be built from Glenboro', west, and Brandon, south-west, will pay, without the assistance of a very large bonus from this Government. This, I think, is a very strong reason why we should limit the price which the railway companies should receive for their lands to actual settlers. I am under the impression that there is quite a large quantity of land in south-western Manitoba which will be available for these land grants. I may be mistaken, but I think I am right in saying so. It should be remembered by this House, that the land grant given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of their road, are not for alternate townships, but alternate sections, and they are lands fairly fit for settlement, and I venture to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not, to-day, for sale in the Province of Manitoba, one acre of land at a less price than $4.

Mr. ROSS. The average is less.

Mr. WATSON. I know it runs up as high as $10 an acre. I live in Manitoba, and I am in a position to know the prices of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands in Manitoba, at least, as well as the hon. gentleman who resides in British Columbia. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) states that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not know what he was talking about when he spoke of the price of land in Southern Manitoba. As I have said, I live in Manitoba, and I know that, up to the present, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not accepted lands from the Government unless they were fairly fit for settlement. I do not know of any lands in the Province of Manitoba, fairly fit for settlement and cultivation, which are not worth $4 an acre, and that being the case, I think it is our duty to guard these lands. I was rather amused at the remarks made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) in speaking of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) voting that the $15,000,000 granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway should be spent in the construction of railroads in Manitoba and the North-West. I find in the Votes and Proceedings of this House that the hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) actually voted against that. He is not in favor of money being spent to build railways in Manitoba and the North-West, but my hon. friend on this side of the House did favor that proposition. As a rule, railways are more cheaply constructed in that country than in any other portion of the Dominion. This Government have secured the construction of railways in other parts for a cash subsidy of $3,200 a mile, and they propose now granting 6,400 acres a mile, which means a valuation of 50 cents an acre. As an evidence of what I say, I have stated that the Government of Manitoba have secured the construction of 250 miles of railway in that Province for $1,500 a mile for a portion, and $1,750 a mile for the balance. That ought to be sufficient evidence that people can be got to build railways in that country where there is a necessity for them, for a much less sum than is granted by this Government.

On resolution 3,

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not less than six thousand four hundred acres per mile for the line of railway from a point in Township one, in either Range twenty-three or twenty-four, west of the First Principal Meridian, to Deloraine, a distance of about seventeen miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the parties concerned in this road? Is it at a complete road of seventeen miles, or is it an extension of a road now existing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This railway, the Brandon and South-Western Railway, is promoted by gentlemen of Winnipeg, who hold a charter from the Local Government to construct the line from Brandon to the Turtle Mountain District. They applied for a land grant for the whole of that distance, which was refused, and subsequently they applied for a grant from Deloraine to the coal district of Turtle Mountain, a distance of 17 miles; and the Government agreed to give them this land grant on their obtaining a charter from this House, which they have obtained this Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the corporators?

Mr. DEWDNEY. David Hyssop, George R. Crow, George H. Campbell, Horace Edgar Crawford, Wm. A. Macdonald and Colin H. Campbell.

Mr. MITCHELL. A question arose last night on the discussion of the Caraquet Railway, as to the manner in which railway aid is given by this Government. While I am in favor of acting liberally towards any railway corporation which undertakes *bonâ fide* to open up and develop some district of the country where railway accommodation is required, I must say that the Government, before granting assistance, should satisfy themselves of the ability of the parties to carry out what they undertake. We should see that we have no more of these Caraquet Railway scandals, by affording facilities to parties to engage in wildcat operations in the hope of selling their charters or bonuses. I must say for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they have done a great deal for this country, and there may be a justification for these grants; but, speaking generally, I say that before giving away the whole of that territory in the North-West, the Government should see that the persons who apply for grants are able to carry out what they undertake.

Mr. DALY. With regard to this Brandon and South-Western Railway, I may state that the object of the railway is to open up and develop the Turtle Mountain coal mines, and thereby afford cheap fuel to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one thing to be said with regard to this granting away of the whole of the North-West. I recollect that when we bought that country, and paid our money for it, certain expectations were held out to us of being recouped from the sale of lands. Now, we are practically granting away the whole of that territory without any definite statement being presented to this House as to any particular necessity for it. I can understand specific grants being made when reasons are given why they should be made; but I cannot understand giving away wholesale the country, which we have bought and paid for, and for the development of which the older Provinces are heavily taxed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In addition to what the hon. member for Selkirk has said, I may say that this railway is intended to supply coal to the people of

the south-western portion of Manitoba, where fuel is now very scarce and dear. I could show the hon. gentleman appeals from different parts of that country to the Government asking us to assist this road for that very purpose. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have offered to give it every assistance in distributing coal through that country. At present the people there get their coal from Winnipeg by the Manitoba South-Western Railway, and by the time it reaches them its price is very high indeed.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Government will not make this grant without seeing that a maximum rate is fixed at which this railway will carry the coal, because otherwise it will have a practical monopoly of the coal supply. We have had an experience of that sort of thing in connection with the Galt Railway, and many people in the North-West now regret that a maximum rate for carrying coal was not required in the case of that railway.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will see that if the railway is constructed for which we have just passed a resolution, the Souris coal fields will be opened up, and there will be competition which will keep down the price of coal.

Mr. WATSON. The Souris coal field will be operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. This branch line will be operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, to whom it practically will belong, and they will be able to control the price at which coal can be sold in that country. It is simply a question of competition. It will just be laid down as cheaply as the Galt Company can lay down their coal, because they have practically a monopoly of all the coal fields in their section, since they own the road and fix what rates of freight they choose. A man might have a coal mine close to the Galt Company's mine, and yet not be able to compete with them because they can charge him what rates they please to carry his coal to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I hope the hon. gentleman will see the point I take and guard against this company charging over a fixed rate, because I expect in that section there will be more coal mines opened and developed than the one owned by this company. If such be the case this company should not be allowed, as the Galt Company is, to charge arbitrary rates of freight.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister has chosen to give an illustration of the advantages to be afforded by getting cheap coal delivered over this road for which we are asked to give a subsidy. I recollect a very noticeable instance when a territory worth $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 was given away on similar pretences, and with about the same information furnished the House as is given to-night. I recollect when a proposition from the combinations with which the late Mr. Dunsmuir was connected, came before this House late in the Session, just as this has come, and we were asked to vote away, and we did vote away, properties worth hundreds of millions of dollars. That vote has been since deeply regretted by every man who has given the question any consideration. Take the people who control the Canadian Pacific Railway, take the people of British Columbia, take every statesman or gentleman connected with the legislation of this country—there is not one man of them who does not regret and condemn that action. The only coal mine of any extent on the Pacific coast of Canada was granted away on that occasion to a corporation largely controlled by Americans. It was an outrageous thing that an immense estate, one of those properties to which we look forward to recoup the eastern Provinces for the outlays they have made in that country, should have been granted away on so little information and with so little consideration; and we are asked to repeat the same outrage to-night. It is a disgrace that such a contract should have been made. Every man regrets it to-day. That coal mine alone is worth hundreds of millions of dollars—its value no man can calculate; and it is a disgrace to this country that the Dunsmuir transaction was passed on just as little information and in the same manner as we are asked to pass these votes to-night.

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Mr. DALY. I was going to say, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that I do not think the extent of this coal mine in question will ever reach the extent of the Dunsmuir mine.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope not.

Mr. DALY. It has been developed by local capitalists who have faith in being able to make money out of the scheme; and it is in order to get the coal from the mine to the Canadian Pacific Railway that this line is to be built. When the hon. member for Marquette talks about the hon. the Minister of the Interior incorporating in the grant restrictions as to freight rates, he talks most ridiculously. The idea of talking about restricting rates on seventeen miles of railway! All the distance this railway carries freight is from the mines to Deloraine, and in connection with this grant they cannot restrain the Canadian Pacific Railway from charging any rate they choose. As to the information which can be given, the hon. member for Halton probably knows as much about this grant as any person in the House, and I have no doubt he can give an opinion to the hon. gentleman as to the extent of the property owned by the incorporators of the company. All I can say is that I know coal is there, and that it is being developed and used, and that the people of Manitoba expect to get cheap bituminous coal, which they have not been able to get up to the present.

Mr. CHARLTON. The reference made to the Dunsmuir transaction on Vancouver Island brings to my recollection the fact that when the resolutions with regard to that transaction were before the House, there was scarcely a member of the House to protest against it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I protested against it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Half a dozen members protested against it possibly, and yet it was forced through by the Government, and when it was stated that connected with Mr. Dunsmuir were Mr. Huntingdon of San Francisco and Mr. Croker of San Francisco, two magnates of the Central Pacific Railway, and that it was an American transaction controlled by American capital, the statement was received with jeers and the taunt thrown out at me that I had always a leaning for the Americans and should be gratified. Since that time I have passed over the road from Vancouver to Nanaimo, a road right along the sea-coast, a road built ostensibly for the

purpose of developing the coal mines of Vancouver, and yet which has not afforded facilities for the development of those mines to any material extent. The property on that Island then granted away may in the future reach in value to some hundreds of millions of dollars; it was granted to keen, shrewd speculators, who appealed to the Government in that keen way in which speculators always know how to make their appeals; and their demand was secured through the supineness, the want of knowledge, and the want of care, on the part of the Government as to the interests they had in charge. We have had that thing repeated again and again. There are abundant instances of it in other countries, and we have to-night grants being made of precisely a similar character—grants made in the interests of a few individuals, against the interests of the future millions who are to people this country. I say the Dominion Government are deserving of all blame for their recklessness in this matter, they are doubly deserving of blame because they will not even put a limit to the price at which those lands are to be sold by the companies to whom they are granted. Surely the Government might at least so far, having squandered the heritage of the future, place some restraint on those corporations and secure to the people who are to settle on these lands, some measure of justice, by fixing for the protection of the settlers, a maximum price which will be amply sufficient to build the road. If they will not do that, they will sacrifice utterly and entirely the interests of the people to the interest of speculators and moneyed men.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Selkirk thinks it is ridiculous of me to ask this House to fix a maximum rate for the carrying of coal over this line. Now, I think the hon. gentleman ought to know by this time that my suggestion was not at all ridiculous. The same contention was made in the case of the Galt Company's road, and we have since found in Manitoba and the North-West that it was a pity the Government did not see fit to fix a maximum rate for the carrying of coal over that road. That company is in the position of making $4 per ton on its coal. It controls the output, and only sells the coal at the price at which it can afford to sell it and meet American competition. We suffer in that country from high rates on coal. This Government are carrying coal over the Intercolonial at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, and yet in Manitoba the rate is 1½ cents per ton per mile. Now, when we are suffering in that way, it is the duty of the representatives of Manitoba to guard against legislation of this kind, and see that fuel will be furnished to the people at the lowest possible rate. It is my duty on such occasions to rise and offer suggestions to the Government, and whether they accept them or not, I will have done my duty. I would not be doing my duty if I sat here silently when I saw the Government aiding a road for the benefit of a company owning a coal mine without asking that the public should obtain some of the benefits and that all the benefits should not go into the pockets of the company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it would be well for the Government to consider, in regard to the minerals in the North-West, whether they be precious metals or ordinary metals or petroleum beds, the propriety of not parting with the fee, but of retaining the proprietary interest in the Crown, in order to secure a royalty or a revenue for the community which may subsequently settle in those districts. I do not think it is much advantage to the man who purchases lands for the purpose of cultivating the soil to own the minerals underneath those lands, and it would be of advantage for the Crown to retain the property in them. It would be far better to deal with the Crown in a matter of that kind than with half a hundred ordinary proprietors. With regard to retaining control over the public lands, and not leaving it to the railway companies to fix a price, I would call the attention of the Minister to a Bill which I introduced not many years ago, the Colonisation Railway Bill, in which it was provided:

"Should the Government in Council deem it expedient, instead of conveying lands to the company, the company may be paid the moneys received from the sales of lands on the line of and within six miles of such railway from time to time until the company shall have received a sum not exceeding $10,000 per mile."

The Government may fix what they think a fair maximum value, and then it will be to the interest of the company to part with the land at a reasonable price. If the land proved to be of a higher value, the Government would have it in their power to say so, but they would not lose control of the price.

Mr. WATSON. As to the price of coal, I find, on enquiring from my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that the price of the Galt coal was $8 a ton at Regina while the same coal is delivered in Winnipeg for $7 a ton, with 370 miles longer haul. That is because of the American coal coming into competition with it in Winnipeg. It is, therefore, a question, not of the value of the coal, but of the freight rates.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Since presenting these resolutions, I find there is an error in the distances mentioned in regard to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company. The distance from Calgary to Edmonton is 190 miles, and from Calgary to the boundary 150 miles. I ask the Committee to allow the change to be made.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLY—ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want again to call the attention of the House to the statements which have been made by the Messrs. Anderson, which I alluded to last night, with respect to the correspondence that went on between the Government and themselves. I have already expressed my opinion that the Government are treating the House like a parcel of children in refusing to bring down that correspondence. They are now confronted with statements made by these gentlemen, whom they must have regarded as respectable and responsible persons, in which something like a contradiction in terms is given to the statements of the Minister of Finance and of the Prime Minister himself, as these hon. gentlemen can see in referring to the letter of the Messrs. Anderson, which I read last night. Now, I say we ought to be put in possession of that correspondence. The Government are not

acting with due regard to their own honor, under the circumstances, nor with regard to the honor of the people of Canada, in making statements on the floor of this House which are flatly denied in public newspapers of large circulation in England, by the other parties, and we ought to have that correspondence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no objection to bring down that part of the correspondence which relates to the surrender of the contract by the Messrs. Anderson. We object to bring down the whole of it, for this obvious reason: that there are a number of conditions and arrangements made with the Messrs. Anderson connected with the contract, which they had undertaken, and which they threw up two months after they had signed it. Those particulars may be important to us when the time comes for us to call again for tenders for the Atlantic service. That is the only reason why we declined. But as regards that portion of it which is concerned with the surrender of the contract, we have no objection to lay it before the House. It is simply a difference in terms, but not in substance. The Messrs. Anderson agreed to build the ships under a particular contract, and they asked for two months in order that they might go home to England and see whether they could make satisfactory arrangements to raise the money. They said, I think, the vessels would cost some £2,000,000 sterling, and that was not a sum that could be easily arranged for; therefore, they asked for two months in order that they might surrender the contract if they found they could not make satisfactory financial arrangements. We were aware that the two gentlemen who were named, Sir Donald Smith and Sir George Stephen, had agreed to invest a certain large sum of money in that undertaking, I suppose, subject to certain arrangements between them; but, Sir George Stephen, as Mr. Anderson mentioned, withdrew from that arrangement, and I suppose Sir Donald Smith did likewise. In consequence of those great names being withdrawn, they surrendered the contract. The fact of the matter is that they could not very well go on 'Change without having the important sanction of two such prominent capitalists so intimately connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is the reason—those gentlemen having withdrawn from the arrangement they were obliged to throw up the contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will that be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I may call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the language used by the Messrs. Anderson is this:

"We are able to say without hesitation that if the representations made to us when we undertook the business, and on the faith of which we alone embarked upon it, had been fulfilled, we should have had no difficulty whatever in finding the necessary capital."

They imply that representations had been made by the Government which were not fulfilled. That is the obvious meaning of their letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Anderson does not mean that, I am sure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have heard it rumored that after the Canadian chief men of the Canadian Pacific Railway had agreed to go into this operation, they did it under an arrangement which was rumored to have been made between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, in reference to giving them through means of communication, on the basis of that short line arrangement of last year, to Halifax. When the Government withdrew from that arrangement Sir George Stephen and Sir Donald Smith, not being able to see an advantage to the road, in failing to get the right of way over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax, as was agreed by this rumored arrangement, felt it necessary, in the interest of their company, to withdraw from it. I do not know how much truth there is in these rumors, but it is well that we should have information on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say, with reference to the letter which was read here last night, in which Mr. Anderson speaks of something that was said by myself, that he appears to have taken a rumor, or a statement made by me, as a fact, which was not a fact. I had no authority in stating, and certainly did not state, that I had counselled, or that the Government had counselled, that the contract with the Messrs. Anderson should be entered into provisionally. What I stated in the House was, as any persons can see by referring to it, that they surrendered their provisional contract, which was in accordance with the Act.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To complete additional Public Buildings, Wellington street, Ottawa.. $155,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total sum which has been spent on this building, and what is the total sum which will be spent in order to complete?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount that has been expended, up to the 1st of March, 1890, is $711,000, and the estimated additional expenditure up to the 1st of July, this year, will be $1,038.09 more. The vote asked for by this resolution is to cover the whole expenditure, according to the report of my chief architect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That makes a total expenditure of $867,000. What was the estimated cost of the building in the first instance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say that. We could hardly make an estimate at the beginning, because we did not know what the land would cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had an estimate of the cost of the building, outside of the cost of the land. My impression is that the statement made was that the building would cost half a million dollars, but it now appears it will cost $867,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site cost $96,566; drainage $6,348; various contracts for building iron roof, iron staircases, &c., $462,360; iron joists, $15,000; elevators, $38,000; heating apparatus, $24,000; electric bells, $1,555; or a total of $542,070. Smaller sums, including amounts for

granite, iron work, gas meters, mantles, hose racks, gratings, &c., $13,343; contingencies, &c., $11,000. All these items bring the total expenditure to $867,000. This vote of $155,000 may not all be expended, but we require it in order that when the final estimates are made all the claims may be paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it a fact that in the contract given out for this building the roof was accidentally omitted, and when the building was supposed to be completed a further demand was made for putting on a roof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. The contract was for the stone work without the roof, because the building roof was to be a metal roof, in order to make the buildings as far as possible fire-proof. The roof was a separate contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was it made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In September, 1886.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was a very long time after the original contract was given out. Is it the practice of the Department to give out a contract at two different periods? Were tenders invited for the roof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Tenders were called for from different parties for the roof.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were they advertised for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the practice to advertise for the construction of a building in 1882, and to again advertise for the construction of a roof for that building two or three years afterwards.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief architect recommended the adoption of that course at the time as this was the largest and most costly building we had under construction. He thought as this was to be a special roof, it should not be included in the ordinary tender for the building, because a contractor might be well able to do the masonry work and not be competent to put on an iron roof. He, therefore, thought we should have a contract for the building and separate contracts for different other works, such as the iron roof, the iron staircases, joists and steel girders, elevators, and so on.

Mr. WATSON. Was the roof mentioned in the specification of the original contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. WATSON. What was the total contract price, and what was the amount of the claim made for extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The claims for extras were very large. I think about $400,000.

Mr. WATSON. What was the amount of the original contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $460,000 or $470,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the contract for the roof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $60,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were many tenders sent in?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were several.

Mr. WATSON. Who was the contractor for the roof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor for the building itself.

Mr. WELSH. Do I understand that the first contract was for $500,000 and that there are extras for over $400,000? If this is the case, a change in the Department is very badly needed. You talk about the dead meat business—this is dead meat business.

Mr. LISTER. This matter requires some further explanation. The Minister of Public Works, in answer to a question submitted by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other day, stated as follows:—

"The buildings are completed. The entire sum paid on the building up to 1st March, 1890, is $608,096.70, exclusive of land purchase. In reply to the third question: Yes—Mr. Charlebois, the contractor for the building, has put in claims for extras amounting to $393,954.19. I understand that Mr. Charlebois is ready to reduce his claim to $200,000."

Either he has put in an excessive and exorbitant claim to which he has no right at all, or else there must be something wrong in the matter which induces the contractor to reduce his claim to $200,000. Will the Minister explain to the House how it is the contractor is willing to knock off $193,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor put in his claims after executing his contracts, and his claims for extras and additional works amounted to nearly $400,000 in round numbers, or about $396,000. The claim was examined by the Chief Architect, who told the contractor that there were some items which he could not entertain and which must disappear, because they could not be allowed at all.

Mr. LISTER. Were these extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They were claims for delaying his work, &c. It was pointed out to the contractor that if there was delay on one side, there was also delay on the other, and, therefore, the Chief Architect would not entertain the thing at all. These accounts of nearly $200,000 have been examined and are being examined by the Chief Architect, who has special instructions, as he should have: that he should report only on the claims that are included in the contract, and if there is any additional work which may have been ordered from time to time, as the work proceeded, these must be reported on specially. He is also instructed that if there is any doubt about the legality of any one of the items, they must be referred to the Minister of Justice, and that the other claims that cannot be decided according to the contract must be rejected. If the contractor is not then satisfied he will have his recourse by presenting a petition of right.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia..... $10,000

Mr. LAURIER. I see nothing here for public buildings in the town of Lunenburg. I find that some three or four years ago, at a period anterior to the last election, the Government had decided to erect public buildings at Lunenburg, and their determination was so well understood that they actually bought a site for these buildings. Am I correct in that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site was purchased. There is nothing in these Estimates to erect a building now.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is not the first time that a site has been purchased, and we did not go on with the building. For example, sites were purchased at St. Hyacinthe and Vancouver, and we did not go on with the buildings immediately, but will do so next summer. We cannot do everything at the same time.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the Government cannot do everything at the same time; but I understand further, that the Government had determined to erect buildings at Lunenburg, and they carried out their determination so far as to purchase the site. The logical consequence then would be to have the building erected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the intention.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot understand why the Government having purchased the site, should leave it unoccupied and unprofitable for four years. The reason given by the hon. gentleman, that this has been done elsewhere, is no reason whatever. I do know the circumstances of the Lunenburg case, because I have been informed of them, and I cannot conceive any reason for buildings not being erected there, unless it be that Lunenburg has returned a Reformer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Some years ago a site was purchased in Lunenburg, in Arichat, in Annapolis, in North Sydney and in New Glasgow and other places. The buildings in North Sydney and New Glasgow were completed. The building in Annapolis is still uncompleted, but as soon as the Government can provide the funds, the buildings, I hope, will be erected in both Arichat and Lunenburg; especially in Lunenburg which is a very thriving town. It has, during the last winter, been connected with the railway system of the Province, and I have no doubt that the Government will be perfectly willing, as soon as funds are available, to erect that building. Lunenburg is a town and a county which has fair claims to a public building of that kind. Unfortunately, however, the Government have not been able to provide in the Estimates this year for any buildings in the Province, except for the purchase of a site in Dartmouth, where a post office is very desirable, it being a town of more than 10,000 inhabitants and doing a large business, and for the completion of the building at Annapolis. I do not think the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) has fair reason to complain, or to think that this has not been done on account of his politics, for there are no buildings to be erected in the Province this year, although there are sites for that purpose in other places as well as in Lunenburg.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to hear that these buildings will be erected as soon as funds are available. We were told the other day by the Finance Minister that we would have a surplus of at least $1,000,000 next year. I hope the Government will be able to take out of that large sum the little amount required for these public buildings at Lunenburg.

Mr. LAURIER.

Charlottetown Dominion Buildings.... $2,000

Mr. WELSH. I am glad Prince Edward Island appears for something at last in the Estimates. It is a beginning at all events, and I hope it will not stop here. I will certainly not object to it.

Chatham, N.B., Post Office, Custom House, &c..... $1,500

Mr. MITCHELL. It is rare to find the County of Northumberland get anything, and it may seem singular that I should rise to make enquiries about this vote; but there is a post office and Custom house in Chatham now, and I think the least the hon. Minister of Public Works could have done was to have asked for information from some one who could give it to him, as to whether any repairs are necessary on this building or not. I should like to know on whose authority this amount is asked for.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for repairs to the present building. They are called for as absolutely necessary by the chief architect in my Department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask that this item stand uutil I am able to examine the basis on which it is put in the Estimates. I was in this public building last year, and I could see no necessity for any such amount of repairs. I do not want to see money expended even in my own county if it is not needed; I certainly have not asked for this, and I do not see on what principle the hon. Minister comes down here and asks for an expenditure of this kind when the representative of the county has not asked for it, and when I believe it is not needed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not necessary that we should ask the member for a county whether repairs are called for or not; these things are done, not by the members, but by the officers of my Department. They go and enquire, and then they report whether such repairs are necessary or not. Of course, if I thought the money was being squandered, I would ask that the vote be struck out; but I have a duty to perform, and I believe these repairs are required.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not object to the hon. gentleman sending his officers around, but I would like to ask, at whose instance the officer was sent to examine this building? I think it will be found that the request was made by a gentleman who has opposed me for years. There is a substantial stone building there, and there is no opportunity for spending $1,500 for improvements that I know of. What I want before the vote is passed, is the report of the hon. gentleman's officer, as to how he proposes to spend that money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Post Office Inspector has also reported that the building required repairs, and that is the reason for this vote. Of course, if the hon. gentleman will insist absolutely that my officers must not go into his county, I will have to consider whether the repairs should be made or not; but, I think, my hon. friend will see that he is on a false track in finding fault with me, or my Department, because we take care of a building in his county. It is not because it is in his county, but I am in duty bound to take care of that building as all others, and I

state on my responsibility, that the building requires these repairs.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have endeavored to find out what the repairs are, and I have not found out yet. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to give me some advice as to what my county wants ; but I may say to him, that not a single request that I have ever made in the last three years on behalf of my county has been granted, and here I find a vote, which so far as I know, is not required at all, simply because the gentleman who opposed me in the last election has, as I suppose, asked for it. The hon. gentleman may drop it or pass it just as he pleases, so far as I am concerned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not a matter for me to drop or pass just as I please. It is my duty to put it in the Estimates. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in saying that the gentleman he speaks of has asked for this vote. I do not know his name, and I have not had any information from him. If the hon. gentleman wants the information, I will give it to him. The Post Office Inspector says that the building is hardly fit for occupation, being deficient in light and out of repair, and destitute of the ordinary convenience for personal cleanliness, and the comfort of the employés. Then the Customs Department requires some repairs. The drainage requires to be attended to, and the flooring renewed, and a number of other repairs require to be made.

Mr. WELSH. I think the explanation of the hon. Minister ought to be quite satisfactory to my hon. friend from Northumberland. I see that the hon. Minister has put a sum in the Estimates, based on a report by the Government inspector. I am glad he laid down that platform because I have a report in my hand from the Government engineer, which, when the vote comes on, I will put to him and nail him pretty hard. I hope the hon. member for Northumberland will not say anything more, but allow this grant to pass, because I think the explanation very satisfactory—at all events to me.

Mr. MITCHELL. Since the hon. Minister has given information in detail which he ought to have given at the outset, I cannot resist the grant, but I must say, I am still not convinced of its necessity. If the hon. gentleman would take information and suggestions from the responsible representatives of the people as to what is wanted, he would place, I think, amounts in the Estimates which he has previously omitted. The hon. gentleman knows to what I refer. The hon. gentleman is a victim of a policy. There is no man in this House whom I respect more, and I am satisfied if he were permitted to perform the acts of common justice to representatives of the people, he would accept suggestions as to what the counties require, not from outside and irresponsible people, but from the people whom the constituents send here to represent their views. The hon. gentleman is a victim of a system. He would accept a suggestion from me, but he will not be allowed to do so. The policy of the Administration of which he is a member, is, as they stated in a correspondence to me some years ago: We cannot accept suggestions and views from people who oppose us, and the price of the consideration for your recommendations is the clearest support and the tamest following in everything we do.

Richmond Post Office, &c.....$ 4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the revenue of this office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The postal revenue last year was $1,991.45 ; Customs, $7,071.74 ; other revenues collected, $8.40.

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station.....$ 20,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a quarantine station for Quebec and Ontario. The architect has reported to the Department of Agriculture that a number of repairs are required, and that they ask for a new building to be erected.

Mr. LAURIER. I believe this work is necessary, but I am informed also that a pier is absolutely necessary, as it is impossible, in stormy weather, to land the patients from the ship to the hospital.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A pier would certainly be very useful, and the attention of the Department has been called to its necessity the past year and this year again, but the Government thought they could not afford this year a sum for that purpose. It is a wharf which will cost from $60,000 to $80,000.

St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Customs House, &c.....$2,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the third grant. The first grant was for the purpose of purchasing the site. Then we called for tenders, and we think this will be sufficient until we can obtain money at another Session. This is to continue the payment of the contract.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much is the contract ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is about $15,000. That is for the building itself, but it does not cover the fittings and matters of that kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it a port of entry also ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see the receipts for the post office were about $6,000. What were the receipts for the port of entry ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue from the post office was $6,059. The inland revenue amounted to $57,810, and the Customs revenue to $25,211.

Public Buildings, Ontario..... $78,900

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has been expended on the Peterborough Customs house, for which $7,000 is asked ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $3,900. That was for the land.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this vote intended for the post office also ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No ; this is for the Customs house.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This land was purchased for the post office, was it not ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was not the intention to purchase that lot for a post office, but for a public building. Afterwards we thought we should purchase a lot for the post office which would be useful, not only for the town of Peter-

borough, but also for the village of Ashburnham, which is adjacent to Peterborough, but on the other side of the bridge, which is an extension of the street on which the post office is built.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is customary to place the post office and the Customs house in one building, but the ordinary custom seems to have been departed from in this case, and we want to know the reason.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been explained several times. One lot is Protestant and the other lot is Catholic.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the post office completed, and what did it cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is completed, but I cannot now state what it cost, as I have not the particulars here.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the estimated cost of the Customs house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The building, with the fittings and heating, will cost about $16,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose the post office cost about $24,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think about that.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is $40,000. One building is placed on one side of the river and the other on the other side of the river. I believe there was a little row in that town in regard to this. There was a grant voted for a post office on one side of the river, to which some of the people objected, and the Government, in order to make it generally acceptable, decided to build the Customs house on the other side. Is that not so?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The river does not run through the town of Peterborough. The village of Ashburnham is on one side of the river and the town of Peterborough is on the other side. The post office is built on a proper site close to the bridge, so that it can serve the postal requirements of Peterborough and Ashburnham, but the Customs house is being built in another direction, towards the market place.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose this is a division to prevent division, or a division to secure union.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The lot upon which the Customs house is now being built was purchased originally for the post office. I saw the agreement. It was shown to me by Mr. Phelan, just before the election. They paid all Mr. Phelan asked for that lot, and they were to put up a post office upon it, but some other parties got hold of the other lot upon which the post office was put up, and they had more influence than Mr. Phelan. After the election, Mr. Phelan's usefulness was gone, but another election was coming on, and now they are building the Customs house on Mr. Phelan's lot. They are keeping up two staffs of officials instead of one, but they have a supporter from Peterborough here. I see him over there in his seat—and we should like to hear from him.

Mr. BARRON. I think we ought to hear from the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson). This is really a very serious matter. There is no doubt of the general opinion of the public with regard to it, and I think the hon. member for Peterborough should give some explanation with regard to it.

Kingston Military College—New dormitory..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to this, because I believe it is very much wanted. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman proposes a new building on the third side of the square?

Mr. KENNY. I would also like to ask the Minister if any portion of this building is to be used as an infirmary. In all well equipped educational establishments there is an infirmary, I visited the Military College the other day for the first time, and I was very much surprised to find that in the basement of the main building there are a few rooms which are allotted to the cadets who happen to be suffering from any sickness. The place is exceedingly damp—so damp in summer that when the dormitories were crowded, and the cadets were obliged to live in it, those who were there told me that when they cleaned their brass accoutrements in the morning, in the evening they were mouldy. I think the House will agree that that is hardly the place into which to put sick boys. These rooms are alongside of the boiler house, whence the building is heated, and the pipes pass over these rooms, and the temperature is not unusually up to eighty. Owing to the fact of these rooms being occupied by invalids, the windows cannot be opened, because that would create draughts. As the State is conducting that institution, it becomes our duty, if possible, to remedy that state of things, and, I think, some provision should be made for an hospital or an infirmary.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote, as stated in the resolution, is for a new dormitory. I do not know the location there, but I have a note stating that it is a new east block. This is for a dormitory to accommodate fifty cadets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $10,000 will not build a dormitory capable of accommodating fifty people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is going to be a plain building, but it is going to be calculated for fifty students. There will be a dispensary and some rooms for those who have slight illnesses. On full consideration, and on the recommendation, I think, of Colonel Hewitt in the first place, followed up by Senators, it was thought that serious cases of illness would be better attended to at the General Hospital at Kingston. I believe that is a very well conducted institution, with all the appliances of the hospital, and it has always been well managed—at least, it was when I lived in Kingston. It has been thought that for serious illnesses the patients would be much better cared for at the hospital where there would be more professional science and better attendance for the few boys who might be ill. I believe the rooms below are liable to the charge made by the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). That will be remedied and there will be comfortable rooms in the new dormitory for slight cases.

Brantford Battalion Drill Shed—Revote..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This item drops, as I find it was voted in the main Estimates.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister has made a mistake in simply adding the word "re-vote." I have no doubt that it was the intention of the Government to grant this extra $10,000, and the word " re-vote " has gone in by mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a mistake. It was the intention of the Government to vote $10,000 towards building a drill shed in Brantford, and that is already voted, as my hon. friend will see on looking at page 40 of the main Estimates.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The regiment are certainly under the impression that there was to be an additional amount. Plans were prepared by the Department for a drill shed last year, and the work was not gone on with, and the tenders have not been asked for. The estimate of the Department is, that the plans will cost much more than the amount voted, and the regiment confidently look for an additional grant this year. I trust that the Minister of Finance, now that the amount is in, and that it is provided for, will leave it there, and all that is requisite would be simply to strike out that word " re-vote " and let the $10,000 stand. The Minister need not expend it if he does not like. I would like the Finance Minister, and the First Minister, and the Government to understand the position. The city of Brantford voted $10,000 for a drill shed, and there was $10,000 put in the Estimates last year. The drill shed of Brantford has cost the Government for the past twenty-two years comparatively nothing. The town of Brantford, in the first place, put it up, and the Government contributed a very insignificant sum towards it. The town found the land and put it on one of the public squares; the lease expired a year or more ago, and the building stands there, and has all gone to decay. I have a letter from the colonel of the regiment in which he expresses the greatest regret that the work has not been gone on with. He says:

"It is really too bad that we should be flooded with rain for another year on our arms and clothing and accoutrements."

This has been kept up at large expense by the officers themselves, and it will be discouraging to them if they should be treated in this way. I do think when the city granted the land for the building, that the Government ought to help them in erecting the building. I have no desire to encourage, on the part of the Government, expenditures that I do not think are warranted, but the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice will themselves see the necessity for it, and I think they will consent simply to strike out the word " re-vote " and let the sum stand. It need not be spent if it is not wanted. The plans have been already prepared, and the chief architect of the Department reports that the grants are wholly insufficient. The regiment have seen these plans and they very much like them, they are in love with them, and if you alter this and cut them down to a plan that will require only the balance of the money left out of the $10,000 granted, you will utterly discourage the regiment. You must remember that this is a city regiment, all the companies are in the city, and I ask, as a matter of fairness on the part of the Government, who have been building drill sheds in other cities, that they do this simple justice to Brantford. What they have done for Brantford is nothing in comparison with what they have granted for drill sheds in other places. This regiment took part in the general inspection in Toronto, on which occasion the highest praise and credit were bestowed upon them. They are, however, without a drill shed; they are in an old building where their arms are constantly flooded, and, moreover, this building is only on sufferance, and if we do not pass an extra amount there will be delay in changing the plans, which will break the heart of the regiment, and the building cannot be erected this year. An amount of $10,000 was voted by the city of Brantford, and the people thought they would be fairly entitled to adequate Government assistance, and $6,200 have been expended in purchasing the lot, under instructions from the Militia Department. It cannot be denied, that even if the plans are altered, a suitable building for such a regiment cannot be erected for $13,200. The Minister of Public Works will admit this fact, and the Minister of Militia, taking an interest, as I trust he does, in the regiment, will notice that the present action will necessitate the postponement of a building for another year. I have stated the case, not in a pleading manner, for I do not desire to expend any more money than is required, but according to justice and the circumstances of the respective cases, and also in view of expenditures made in other cities, towards the erection of militia drill sheds. I do not find fault with these expenditures, but if any one looks at Hamilton, which I admit has a fine regiment, they will find the expense is not in comparison, but even that city does not possess a more efficient regiment of officers and men than the regiment in whose interests I now speak. I feel this is a serious matter in regard to the regiment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very much afraid that if the amount is there, we shall have to expend it. When I saw the hon. gentleman the other day, I stated that the plans prepared for the drill shed were too expensive, the estimate being $50,000. Under these circumstances, I mentioned that this vote had been placed there by mistake, and I found that this had been the case. A new plan must be made on a smaller scale, otherwise we cannot proceed with the work.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know Cabinet secrets, but I think the Minister of Militia must have submitted a request for an additional amount of money, and that fact accounts for the insertion of this amount in question. I submit this is an exceptional case, for the men are without a building of any kind, and even as regards the building which they are occupying on sufferance, it is constantly flooded and the accoutrements are damaged.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount in question was entered by a mistake. The Government were not to build a drill shed for Brantford, but were to give their contribution of $10,000, as was done in the case of Belleville.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course I am unaware as to what transpires in the Cabinet Council, and I can only make a supposition. The Minister of Finance is wrong in assuming that this building is in the same position as that which was erected at Belleville, as the Minister of Customs is well aware. The drill shed at Belleville had been commenced, if not completed, by the officers and men

and a grant was asked to finally complete the same. It was not so with the Brantford drill shed. There was a recommendation on the part of the Militia Department for a new drill shed, and towards the erection of this new drill shed, $10,000 was granted. The Minister of Finance will see that he is all wrong, because the Militia Department got out the plans and specifications of that building, and they are now in the hands of the Minister of Public Works, who states that the plans were so expensive that they could not go on with them.

Mr. BOWELL. The statement of the hon. gentleman with reference to the grant last year, was, I think, quite correct; but I never understood that the grant which was made to the Brantford drill shed was to be in any other position than that of the grant made to the Belleville drill shed, with this difference: that the officers of the 15th Battalion, and the citizens, had contributed largely to the construction of the drill shed, and that $10,000 was appropriated by the Government to assist them in that undertaking. As the city of Brantford had passed a vote granting $10,000 for the purpose, the Government was to supplement that, but I never understood that the Government was to build the drill shed. The Minister of Finance says that the word "revote," in the Supplementary Estimates, shows clearly it was not intended to be an addition to the $10,000 which was voted as a revote in the main Estimates, and therefore it is evident that this was inserted in error.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who prepared the plans and specifications for the drill shed at Belleville?

Mr. BOWELL. They were prepared by the Battalion and as I understand they were submitted to the Militia Department and received their approval. That is my recollection.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My impression was, as the Minister says, that these men went to work themselves with a very laudable spirit and having erected this drill shed, and involved themselves in debt, they properly came to the Government and asked for a grant. This work had been done by the city of Belleville in that way.

Mr. BOWELL. The city corporation did not give them a dollar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was done by the public spirit of the men themselves and the citizens, but in the case of Brantford there was a recommendation of the Minister for the erection of a drill shed by the Government. As a proof of that, the plans have been prepared for months, and are now in the hands of the Minister of Public Works. It was understood that it was the Government who were to build the drill shed. The battalion is now virtually without a drill shed. The building they occupy now is city property, the lease of which has expired. It is an unsightly building, in ruins almost, and as it is in a public park, the citizens are asking to have it removed. What are you going to do with your regiment, if they have no drill shed whatever? Are you going to allow this regiment, which has been a credit to the Province, to be disbanded? I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works what his intentions are, and whether we may expect the buildings will be erected? I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me, that a grant of $10,000 by the Government and $10,000 by the city is not sufficient, after the purchase money for the site is taken out of it, to erect a suitable building for this regiment.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The understanding arrived at between the Department and the gentlemen who represented the battalion whose headquarters are at Brantford, was that the city of Brantford should contribute $10,000 and the Government $10,000. The hon. gentleman will, I think, admit that that was the proposition that was made to the Department, and as I understand it, the question of who made the plans, does not in any way affect the undertaking of the Department which I have just explained. The same understanding was arrived at in reference to Belleville, with this difference: that the officers of the Belleville Battalion had a building which they had already erected, and which under the report of the officers of the Department of Militia, was considered to be quite equal to anything we could have built ourselves. Hence it was that the officers representing the force in Belleville offered to the Government the building for the same amount which had been expended upon it, and the $10,000 was granted and the building secured.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask the Minister of Militia if he is not in favor of a larger grant for the drill shed at Brantford? Does he not think that the requirements of the regiment, and the position they stand in with reference to accommodation, demand that there should be a drill shed erected there at once?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am in favor of having a drill shed, and the fact that there is $10,000 in the Estimates for this purpose, indicates that the Government is in favor of it. If the question is whether I am in favor of giving $20,000, when we only promised $10,000, I say no. As a member of the Government, I view it from the standpoint of the Government, and I say that the understanding was that we should contribute $10,000, and the city of Brantford $10,000. We have carried out our part of the undertaking, and I have no doubt that it will secure a drill shed adequate to the requirements of the force. It may not be as good and as handsome a building as the hon. gentleman would wish to see in his city, but that cannot be helped.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When is the work to go on?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was waiting to see what sum of money would be put in the Estimates before I would undertake that. When I know what I have at my disposal, then I will be in a position to have plans prepared; or we may say to the city of Brantford: You have contributed $10,000, go on with your drill shed, and when it is erected to the satisfaction of the Department, we will give you the $10,000 that have been voted by Parliament.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not the position the matter is in at all. The lot has been purchased under instructions from the Militia Department for $6,200. If that had been the plan proposed to the city or ever dreamed of, the city might not have gone into the enterprise at all, or bought a lot where it did; but the city has been acting under the direction of the Militia

Department all along. If the matter had been in the hands of the city, it would have taken some action long ago, but it has been in the hands of the Militia Department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to represent that the site was purchased under instructions from the Department of Militia. The Department never gave instructions to purchase the site ; but when the gentleman who took an interest in the purchase of the site submitted it to the Department of Militia for its approval, the Department said that if it suited the force at Brantford to have that site, the Department saw no objection to the selection. If the Department had been called on to express an opinion whether one site or the other was a good one, it would have said, "you must consult the local militia force, and if the site suits them, it will suit the Militia Department." This is a matter of understanding and agreement between the parties. The Government have agreed to contribute $10,000 and the city has agreed to contribute $10,000, and I think, instead of fighting over it, we should agree to put up as good a building as we can for the $20,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister sent up there and selected a site. If he is still determined, I want to know when the work will go on. I have explained that the regiment are without quarters, and the matter has been hanging fire, waiting for the Militia Department; the plans were prepared months ago, and the Department have never said anything as to whether they will be altered or departed from, and the force are virtually without a building for the protection of their arms and stores. It seems to me that this is a case which the Minister is vitally interested for the maintenance of an efficient militia force.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I admit all that. I admit the necessity of building a drill shed. But the city proposes to contribute $10,000 provided we contribute $10,000. We have contributed $10,000. The fact of plans being prepared for a building costing $25,000 does not at all imply that the Government are responsible for the expenditure of that amount of money. We have carried out our side of the undertaking. What I suggest to the hon. gentleman is that we have to cut our coat according to our cloth ; we shall have to build a drill shed according to the amount of money we have got. Beyond that I do not see that we can go.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I want to know when the building is going on. I want to know whether the regiment in the city of Brantford are to be told that $10,000 of public money is at their disposal, and they are expected to go on with the work, or whether the Department intend to go on with it, and if so, when it will be proceeded with, and when we may expect the building to be completed ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I had to wait until I saw what amount of money would be voted for that drill shed this Session. The $10,000 voted before would cease to be at my disposal on the 1st of July, and therefore I had to wait. Now that I know I have the $10,000 voted here and the balance of $3,800 from the city, I have to say that I have $13,800 for that drill hall, and I will cause one to be erected for the money put at my disposal. But if the city of Brantford prefer to say : "We will erect a building for ourselves, provided you will give us the $10,000," I have no doubt the Government will assent to that, provided the building is erected in conformity with a plan that will be approved by the chief architect.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think they prefer that the Department should go on with the work, as it is to be subject to the approval of and according to the plan made by the Department. I would like to know whether the work can go on this year, so that the regiment can expect to have a drill shed before the winter storms.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman had better leave it in my hands.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I only again urge immediate action on the part of the hon. gentleman, because the hon. Minister of Militia knows the urgency of the case.

Petrolea Public Building..... $4,000

Mr. LISTER. I hope the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) will succeed in getting this post office building sooner than the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) appears to have got his. So far as this vote is concerned, I have no objection at all to raise to the amount asked for the erection of a public building at Petrolea, for, on looking over the list of public buildings throughout this country, I find that Petrolea is as much entitled to one as nearly all the places that have received them, except the cities. When this matter was discussed during a previous Session, the hon. the Minister of Public Works laid down the principle that the buildings should be erected in places where the population and the revenue justified such public expenditure ; that the principle of their erection should be uniform ; and that these should be the only reasons guiding the Government in the erection of public buildings. Since then the hon. gentleman has falsified this statement distinctly and frankly. When he states to this House that any principle at all guides him in the erection of public buildings, he states what is not correct and takes a position he has never observed since he has been Minister of Public Works. I charge him distinctly and plainly with prostituting the position he occupies for the purpose of gaining public support. I charge him with having erected buildings in the most insignificant places for the purpose of securing support for this Government, ignoring entirely places large in population, giving large revenues to the Government, where the public interest and convenience require such buildings. The hon. gentleman prostituted his position for the purpose of bribing contituencies throughout the country to return members to support his Government. The return in the blue-books fully bear out my statement. The town of Petrolea is much more entitled to a public building than many of those places where public buildings have been erected ; but while I say that, I say that other places are entitled to those buildings before Petrolea. Woodstock, with a net revenue of $10,875, is entirely ignored by the Government, while they place public buildings in Cayuga, which only gives a net revenue of $918 ; in Strathroy, which has a net revenue of $3,180 ; in Trenton, which has a net revenue of $3,485 ; in

Almonte, which has a net revenue of $2,930; in Amherstburg, which has a net revenue of $1,176; and so you can go on though the list. There are public buildings in Alymer, Quebec, with only a revenue of $681; in Joliette, which has a revenue of $1,764; in Lachine, where the revenue is only $292; in Rivière du Loup, which has a revenue of $1,789; in Sorel, whose revenue is $1,863; in St. Jérôme, with a revenue of $890; in St. John's, with a revenue of $2,771; and Three Rivers, which is the largest outside the cities, which has a revenue of $4,416. Then going to Nova Scotia, I find a public building in Annapolis, where the revenue is $1,188; in Antigonish, the county which sends the Minister of Justice here, which has a revenue of $1,775; in Arichat, with a revenue of $434; in Barry, where the revenue is $776; in North Sidney, which has a revenue of $1,462; in Pictou, which has a revenue of $3,078; in South Sidney, the revenue of which is $1,582; in Windsor, which has a revenue of $3,018; in Yarmouth, which has a revenue of $537. Then coming to Prince Edward Island, I find public buildings in Montague, which yield a net revenue of $465; Summerside, which gives a revenue of $2,466. And coming to New Brunswick we find Bathurst having a public building, although its revenue is only $1,019; Carleton, St. John, whose revenue is $841; Chatham, where the revenue is $2,459; Dalhousie, which has a net revenue of $628; New Glasgow, which has a revenue of $1,374. Out of the total number of public buildings erected in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, 52 public buildings, not one is in a place which yields as much revenue as the town of Woodstock; a few of the places yield half the revenue it does, and there are only five that yield revenue equal to the post office revenue of the town of Sarnia. I do not object to the hon. gentleman getting his post office, or any other public building in the town of Petrolea, but I desire to say to the Government that the town of Sarnia is the county town of the county of Lambton; it is a port of entry and has a population of 7,200, while Petrolea has under 5,000. Sarnia is a port and gives a net revenue to this Government of $5,619 as against a net revenue from Petrolea of $3,997. About $30,000 are collected by Customs at Sarnia, and I have been unable to ascertain what is collected from Inland Revenue. So that if the Government had followed out the policy laid down by the Minister of Public Works, the first place in Lambton to have received a public building would have been Sarnia. But the Government have entirely ignored the position taken by the Minister of Public Works, and have put up buildings in places which they thought would give them support. As I have stated, there are 52 towns in the Dominion outside of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and the town of Woodstock has a greater revenue and a larger population that any one of those places; and in all those 52 there are only five which exceed in receipts and population the town of Sarnia. In addition to that, Sarnia is used as a distributing point for the mails of the county. The mails are made up there for the different sections of the county. I repeat, if the Minister of Public Works were sincere in the statement he made, Sarnia would have been given a public building before this. I know that it will be urged that the Inland Revenue have to look after the inspection of oils, but that does not require an office, because the inspector has to make his rounds to inspect. That is no reason for taking away from the principal town in the county the right it has to be first considered. I repeat that the Government must be held responsible for spending the public money in erecting public buildings in order to obtain political support for themselves, and I say that the intelligent electorate will take this as an insult and will see that it is an attempt on the part of the Government to buy up support for themselves at the expense of the country.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), with a great deal of interest, and I am astonished at the course which he has taken. To begin with, he generously concedes that the town of Petrolea requires facilities of the kind proposed by the Government, and I do not know that I would have troubled the House, if the hon. gentleman had not stated that the Minister of Public Works was prostituting his position in order to obtain political support for his Government. The closing remarks of the hon. gentleman were practically to the effect that this grant of public money to the town of Petrolea was intended to obtain a stronger political support than the Government now have. It was not public buildings or Government support that secured my return at the last elections. It was nothing else than the policy of the Opposition in this House, which was distasteful to the farmers in that constituency, and was particularly distasteful to the miners and refiners of oil. Before that, the constituency returned a Reform member by a majority of 160, but I was returned by a majority of 140, making a change of 300 votes. When the hon. gentleman says that this vote is given for the purpose of buying up votes, I desire to give that an unqualified and absolute denial. The hon. gentleman knows the town of Petrolea; he knows its peculiarities; he knows the immense amount of business it is doing, and also the rapid increase of business in that place. If he does not know that, I may give him a few figures to show the rapid increase in that town, and the absolute insufficiency of the offices which are there now. The Customs office is by itself in one building. The Inland Revenue has been in a small room about eight feet wide, but I believe they have had to move. We are now paying a large rent for a post office. Thus we have the Inland Revenue office in one place, the post office in another, and the Customs house in another block; and neither of these offices is sufficient for the service required. I desire to show the gross revenue from the sale of postage stamps in the last few years, in order to point out the rapid increase which has taken place, and consequently the prospective increase which the Government may look forward to:

Year.	Gross Revenue.	Year.	Gross Revenue.
1880	$2,788 06	1885	$4,163 03
1881	3,049 12	1886	4,857 85
1882	3,706 60	1887	5,167 41
1883	3,517 20	1888	5,701 24
1884	4,053 42	1889	5,960 49

Then take the Customs revenue:

Year.	Revenue.	Year.	Revenue.
1889	$20,376 29	1884	$16,541 86
1888	22,269 62	1883	25,209 53
1887	19,493 61	1882	19,976 34
1886	18,156 41	1881	14,162 81
1885	11,304 15	1880	5,043 52

Mr. LISTER. That is a dropping off.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. There is a difference of $2,000 in the last year; but it is evident that in ten years the amount has been quadrupled.

Mr. LISTER. That is not the point.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. If the business required to be done in such a place is not a guide as to the accommodation the officers require, I do not know what is. The hon. gentleman may have some different view on the subject.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The revenue in Woodstock is $15,000. How do you explain that?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. It is clear that nearly $30,000 were derived from these two branches. We know that the officers of the Inland Revenue Department require to use valuable instruments, and that they have valuable records, and that these have to be kept in safe places. The Canadian oil inspected in Canada for some years past—and I might almost say in Petrolea, because seven-eighths or perhaps nine-tenths of the Canadian oil was manufactured in that particular place—was as follows:—

1882	6,169,353	1886	8,341,203
1883	7,135,580	1887	8,436,938
1884	7,836,949	1888	9,769,265
1885	7,843,033	1889	9,684,336

That shows a rapid increase in about the same proportion as the other items. These inland revenue officers have to inspect all this oil in from five gallon cans to forty gallon barrels, and so on up to larger tanks. I shall not take up any more time except to give the House an idea of what the value of this oil really is. From 1882 to 1889, there were 65,216,557 gallons of oil of Canadian manufacture sold in this country. At an average price of 10 cents a gallon, which would be low, that would be worth $6,521,655. The other products from the oil would amount probably to a value of about $3,500,000, which would make a total of about $10,000,000. As I have already shown, the trade in Canadian refined oil was 9,684,336 gallons last year, which is equal to a revenue of about $5,000 a day.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much in Sarnia?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I feel that the Government in doing this, have done what is almost a necessity, for buildings of this kind are almost a necessity in that town. I would also suggest to the Minister that if he proceeds with the erection of these buildings, he would do well to consolidate the offices in one building, for the greater convenience of the public. Very many people have business at the same time with the Customs, the Inland Revenue office and the post office, and it would be more convenient to have these offices in one building. I think there is no vote that has been passed by this House which is more needed than this particular one.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has been beating the wind. Nobody said anything against Petrolea. I expressly said when I rose to speak that Petrolea was more entitled to public buildings than most places in which they had been built throughout the Dominion. I know that Petrolea is a prosperous place, I know that it is getting along. But that is not the point here. The question is as to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works, that the rule which should govern him in the construction of public buildings, would be population and the revenue received in the place. My hon. friend has not shown that in the town of Petrolea the receipts from Customs, or from post office, or from inland revenue are at all equal to those of the town of Sarnia. If the Minister's statement is to be taken as true, if it is a correct rule that is to be adopted by the Government, then I say that in this case he has violated the rule. If Petrolea is entitled to these public buildings, surely the town of Sarnia is equally entitled to them. Now, I charged that the Minister of Public Works and the Government were using these means for the purpose of bribing the constituencies. I did not refer to the town of Petrolea, but I referred to other constituencies throughout the country. Take, for instance, the town of Cayuga, with a net revenue of $910; I ask the hon. gentleman who has just spoken if that item itself does not show that the Government have deliberately put in that item for the purpose of buying support? Do they not know that before the election which was pending in the county of Haldimand, this was brought down and held up to the electors as a reason why they should elect the present hon. gentleman who represents that county, that is that the Government were going to build a post office there?—not because the public service required it, because the revenue received there is most insignificant, and the total amount of the revenue will barely more than pay the interest on the money it costs to erect this public building. Then take the town of Lachine, with a revenue of $293. The Government deliberately go to work and put up a public building in that town, while places like Woodstock and Sarnia are not given these advantages. I ask my hon. friends opposite if that is not the strongest possible evidence that the Government are not carrying out their policy of erecting public buildings where the revenue justifies it. Take St. Jérôme, with a revenue of $890; I ask the hon. gentleman and I ask the Minister of Customs how he reconciles the erection of public buildings in places that return such a revenue as that, with the statement he has made that he is always guided by the revenue derived, by population and by public convenience. The hon. Minister receives a great deal of praise often in this House for being a fair-minded man, but we have all heard the statement of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) who says he does not believe a word the Minister says. Sir, one is almost inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman does not always adhere to the truth, when you come to examine his statements. I never stated that this vote was held out to the town of Petrolea to help elect the hon. gentleman, I never made the statement that it was a bribe to the electors of the county of East Lambton. I stated over and over again that the town of Petrolea was more entitled to these public buildings than most places in the Province of Ontario, and more than all the places in the other Provinces that I mentioned. So the hon. gentleman must not

get off the track, he must not beat the wind or kick against nothing, because I made no charges of that kind. I did make the charge, based upon the returns laid before this House, that the statement made by the Minister of Public Works is not borne out by the facts, inasmuch as he has not considered population, he has not considered revenue, he has not considered any public interest which he stated guided him in the erection of public buildings; and there is but one conclusion to be drawn, and that is that the Minister of Public Works is prostituting his position by giving public buildings to places that are not entitled to them, for the purpose of securing support for himself.

Parliament and Departmental Buildings $3,200

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a complaint that has often been made this Session with regard to the cold draughts in this chamber. All this winter, since Parliament assembled, we have suffered very seriously from the cold; I have suffered myself, and I think I could refer to every member on this side of the House. I think there must be something wrong with the windows, and I earnestly beseech the Minister to see that something is done to remedy this inconvenience next winter. The members here, all along the centre benches, have suffered. I know that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has had to wear his overcoat in this chamber. There must really be some cause for this enormous draught that comes in at the top and goes out under our seats. There is a continuous flow of fresh air that brings the cold into the chamber.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in what he says. The complaint has been made repeatedly. I may say that we have a draught of cold air on this side also. The architect and the mechanical engineer who have made a special examination of the building say that we can hardly prevent that. The doors upstairs are constantly being opened, and that makes a draught. Then we have the doors below, and the upper part of these boxes, if I may so call them, quite open, and as soon as the doors open a very strong draught comes in.

Mr. AMYOT. Not only are there great draughts in the chamber, but the acoustic properties are very defective. I do not hear one-tenth part of what is said by hon. members; except those members on the front benches, members cannot hear anything unless some member speaks with a loud voice. The chamber is erected without regard to its acoustic properties, and the voice of the speaker is lost behind the columns in the recesses. Parliament must build another chamber, erected in accordance with acoustic principles. There are buildings in the United States where the acoustic properties are perfect in every particular, and I do not see why such a chamber should not be constructed here. Members suffer from not being able to listen to the discussions, and if there was a proper chamber as regards acoustic properties, there would not be such a repetition in *Hansard* of similar remarks made by members. In fact, there is no use in our sitting here unless we can hear what transpires, for in such an event we might as well go for a holiday and have our indemnity sent to us without our attending.

Mr. LISTER.

Smith's Falls Post Office, Customs House, &c $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Smith's Falls is no doubt a highly respectable town, but it cannot be compared with Woodstock or Sarnia. The Government a few weeks ago accepted a motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), declaring that they intended to be guided by the terms of that resolution, and they further declared that they have never violated its terms in their lives. Under what circumstances is this vote proposed?

Mr. HAGGART. Smith's Falls is one of the most important postal towns in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the postal revenue?

Mr. HAGGART. $6,285. It is largely in excess of most towns in Canada which have post offices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has about one-third the revenue of Woodstock and about one-half the population.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This subject should be fairly considered in view of the appropriation submitted. The resolution carried by the House was as follows:—

"Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, that in the expenditure of public money, the public interest and not party favoritism should control; and in the choice of places for the erection of public buildings for Post Office, Customs House and Inland Revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of revenue collected and of public business done."

A list of fifty-two different places where public buildings have been erected has been read, and a large majority of these places are very much below many of the towns and villages in my own county. Woodstock has, however, a population of 12,000, a large postal revenue, and a large Customs and inland revenue. Sarnia has a very much larger population than either Petrolea or Smith's Falls, and contributes very large sums to every department of the revenue; yet Sarnia is unprovided for, and the other two places I have named are provided for. That action is directly in the teeth of the resolution which the Government adopted as their future policy.

Mr. HAGGART. Taking the population of Smith's Falls and the receipts from the revenue, I do not think there are more than four or five places in the whole Dominion which have larger receipts and have not a public building.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why should there be any. What I contend is that there are larger towns unprovided for.

Mr. HAGGART. In regard to Woodstock, there is a satisfactory arrangement made by hiring a large building.

Mr. BARRON. Take Lindsay. Up to a recent time there was a suitable building rented, yet the Government erected a building. I justify the expenditure in the town of Lindsay, and I approve of it, but when they say that they are only doing these works because there are not sufficient buildings elsewhere, I say it is not a sincere reason.

Mr. LISTER. The net revenue from the town of Smith's Falls, is $4,375. I have reason to know that the people of Woodstock are not satisfied with the postal arrangements of the city. They think that a town of the importance of Woodstock, is entitled, as much as any other town in this

country is, to have public buildings. It gives a larger revenue than many of the cities, and it certainly gives the largest revenue of any of the towns of the Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before this item carries, would it not be well for the House to rescind the resolution passed at the beginning of the Session, which was proposed by the member for Bothwell? It certainly stultifies the House in passing this item while that resolution stands upon the records of the House. It is an insult to Parliament to proceed with this vote until that resolution is repealed; and it certainly should be repealed in keeping with the honor and integrity of this House. As long as that resolution remains on our records, this vote should not be allowed to pass, if we were to stay here all summer. This is the proper way in which to meet a thing like this. We should stand up for our honor and dignity even if we have to stay here all year. I think the people of the country will uphold us, and that they will condemn the Government for having violated a solemn pledge which they gave, which was unanimously carried by this House, and which they break on the very first occasion, when it is necessary to retain a supporter in the House, or to conciliate a constituency. It is an outrage on the people, and an outrage which this House should not assent to, and we should protest against it, and not allow it to pass, no matter how long it takes. Either do one thing or the other. Be fair or otherwise; but while you have that resolution on the Order paper, this vote should not pass, when there are other cities and towns of greater importance which are neglected by the Government. The towns of Woodstock and Sarnia have been neglected, the town of Bowmanville, the town of Whitby, the town of Durham, the town of Kincardine, the town of Hanover, the town of Mount Forest, and any number of other places of greater importance than Smith's Falls, which should deserve the consideration of the Government. So long as that resolution remains, and so long as the Government will defy the resolution they have assented to and boasted of that it was their policy, this vote should not pass, and this House should teach the Government the lesson that they cannot betray the principles they themselves have laid down. They should be taught that they cannot pass such a resolution as this, and on the very first occasion, depart from this resolution. We should show our constituents and the people of the country that they lied and deliberately lied, in the passage of this resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What? Is it withdraw the truth? No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask the hon. gentleman again to withdraw that expression.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, Sir. A resolution has been passed stating that those towns which have the most business——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows very well the course which has to be taken, and which I do not wish to take, if he does not withdraw the expression.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There has been a departure from the truth, I will say that. There has been a departure from the principle contained in this resolution. Call that departure what you like. I call it a falsehood, and I will not withdraw.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes; order. It is order to stand by the truth, and I will stand by it every time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw. I know he will do so.

Mr. LAURIER. If my hon. friend would say that the Government have betrayed their principles, he will state truth and fact as well.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If I said they departed from principles every day, and every week in their lives it would be truth.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentlemen to withdraw the expression, to preserve the dignity of the chamber.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They have departed from the principle which was laid down.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not fool with the House like that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not fooling with the House, and I won't be fooled with by the Deputy Speaker, the Finance Minister, or anybody else. While I have truth on my side, I will not take it back for the Minister, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, or any other power. I say they laid down the principle, and they have departed from that principle. Will anybody deny they have departed from that principle?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must again ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the obnoxious expression used by him, and which was wholly against parliamentary practice, which he, as an old parliamentarian, knows well.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will take back that word, but I will say they have departed from the principle they have laid down. They have departed from it once and twice in these Estimates to-night; and I say it is a burning shame and a disgrace to the country that we should allow it.

Government Printing Bureau—Additional amount required to complete. $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With this amount the total expenditure will be $248,647.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not include any of the plant?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I speak of the building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is well that the House should understand, because my impression is, taking all that has been expended, that this same Printing Bureau cost us for the plant and building a cool half a million dollars at least, and unless I am mistaken, you will find that the work will be more expensive and in some respects less satisfactorily executed than it was under the contract system.

Mr. DAWSON. While the votes for public buildings in Ontario are being passed, I take the opportunity to say that there are certain public buildings becoming a very great necessity in the district which I represent. A public building is needed at Port Arthur, which is a large place; yet the want of it is the fault of the people themselves to a great extent, because there was a grant made for a post office and Custom house, but they could not agree on the site, and the work did not go on. Another public building we want there is a drill shed. The people are making over a magnificent lot of land to the Government, and they are willing to contribute half the cost of a drill shed, so that before another year passes I think we ought to have that building erected. In that district the revenue is increasing very fast. Last year the Customs revenue in Western Algoma amounted to $80,000 and the Inland Revenue to $24,000, making in all a little over $100,000; the revenue derived in Eastern Algoma during the year ended the 30th of June last amounted to about as much more, so that the whole district of Algoma, I think, yields a yearly revenue of $200,000, apart from postal revenues. At Port Arthur we have a postal revenue running up some years to $6,000. Therefore, I warn the Government that by the time another year comes around we shall be down upon them for public buildings for Port Arthur and other towns in Algoma. We have a magnificent battalion in Algoma, the 96th, who take a great deal of interest in keeping up their drill. They have rifle ranges, and there is not a more spirited battalion in the whole of Canada; and we want to be up with the rest of the country in buildings and everything besides.

Manitoba—Public Buildings $6,250

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister if it his intention to go on with the immigration sheds in Winnipeg during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is.

Public Buildings, North-West Territories — Court house, lock-up and police accommodation $5,000

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that this sum is to go towards building small court houses at Moose Jaw and Maple Creek, and Medicine Hat. We have already voted $10,000 for this purpose, although the vote embraces court houses in Eastern Assiniboia also. The sum is small, but I hope we may count on these court houses being commenced this year at Moose Jaw and Maple Creek and Medicine Hat. I can assure the hon. Minister that the administration of justice is greatly hampered for the want of them at present. I spoke to the Minister of Justice about this item, and he told me it would be for those western towns. Last year there was a sum voted, and the people expected that they would get that accommodation. It is very necessary that it should be commenced this year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason they were not undertaken last year was, that the plan suggested for them was too expensive and on too large a scale, and I could not undertake them without going far beyond the amount voted by Parliament. Under the circumstances, I thought it was better to wait and ask for a new vote. Of course I will have to consult with the Minister of Justice, who is responsible for the administration of justice in the Territories.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Regina Industrial School..... $2,000

Mr. WATSON. What is the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not quite $40,000, including this vote.

Mr. WATSON. I do not object to this item, for I think it is important to have those schools, but I regret there is no vote for purchasing the school at Birtle. I understood the Minister of the Interior favored its purchase as an industrial school for the Indians. There is quite a band there, and since the school has been running, quite a number of them have attended it and made considerable progress.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The school was offered to the Government, and I took the opportunity of inspecting the building, as we had been assisting it by giving so much per head for a certain number of pupils. It appeared to be very well cared for. After my return I sent an expert and an inspector to examine and report on the building. It was found that the building itself was very substantial but it required a great deal of work to be done to it, to make it habitable; and as the cost of doing this would be considerable, we did not, with the many obligations we have, like to ask for an appropriation.

Mr. WATSON. What was the amount asked for the school?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it was offered for $8,000. An estimate was made by the parties who examined it, and they reported the price was not excessive, but the building would require so many alterations and additions that the whole expense would be about $15,000. Besides that, there is no land in the neighborhood at less than $15 or $20 per acre.

Mr. WATSON. If suitable land can be purchased around the school, will the Government favor the purchase another year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would not like to make that promise at present, but will see what land there is available in the immediate neighborhood at a reasonable price. None of our institutions have less than from 300 to 600 acres. I think we could do with 100 acres.

Residence of the Lieutenant Governor, $4,000

Mr. ELLIS. How much will this residence cost? This will make $35,500 voted for this residence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the figures here, but will give the information later on.

Port Maitland or Green Cove..... $1,000

Mr. LOVITT. Does this complete the amount to be voted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; with the vote in the ordinary Estimates.

Mr. LOVITT. Have the contractors started with that work at the wharf yet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say exactly.

Mr. LOVITT. This wharf was washed away four years ago. The result of its not having been repaired has been to drive most of the people away. Money was voted for it last year, but the Minister did not go on with the work, and I think there has been delay enough.

Digby—New pier at the Raquette—re-vote of lapsed amount..... $40,000

Mr. LOVITT. What is this vote for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That money was voted two years ago, but we thought that, with some repairs, we could keep the old wharf for four years more, and avoid expending the money at the time. However, the pier is now in such a state that we think we should build a new pier.

Mr. LOVITT. Are you going to build an entirely new pier, or are you going to have two piers?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The old pier will disappear.

Tidnish—Re-vote..... ..... $2,000

Mr. WELSH. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) represents that district, and I think there are some other items required in his constituency. I have been applied to and asked to see that something was done for the harbor of Port Elgin, which would make connection with his railroad. I think it would do his people a great deal of good if a larger amount were put in the estimates for that district, and with the influence he has and the open ears of the Minister of Public Works, I should have thought he would have obtained some further amount for the benefit of Tidnish Harbor.

Mr. LOVITT. How long before the Minister will put the contractors to work on the breakwater at Port Maitland?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought I told the hon. gentleman that we would go on with that work at once.

Harbors and Rivers, P.E.I..... $16,200

Mr. WELSH. We had a principle laid down to-night by the Minister of Public Works that certain repairs to some buildings to which my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) called attention, were caused to be made on a report by the Government surveyor or engineer. I see here a vote put down for New London of $1,000. I want to know on what principle the Minister has inserted that amount, because I have here a return to an Order of the House in reference to the survey of New London, dated the 20th January, 1890. I will read the report of the Government surveyor of what is required for that harbor, and if the Minister of Public Works will cause these works to be made according to the report of the Government surveyor, he will hear no more about it:

"The harbor of New London is situated on the northern coast of Prince Edward Island, about ten miles south-east from Richmond Bay. The entrance is about 1,200 feet in width, and the bay, on an average, three miles wide. Several rivers and the South-West River, the French River, and the Stanley and the Hope Rivers, empty into it, the two former being navigable by vessels drawing ten feet of water, for a distance of five or six miles. New London harbor is a convenient fishing port, and also an important shipping point for the producers of a large and fertile farming district. The works constructed by the Department for the improvement of the entrance into the harbor of New London, consist of: First, a breakwater 1,050 feet in length on the sand beach at the eastern side of the entrance, built partly of piling, brush and stone, and partly of crib work. Second, a breakwater 460 feet in length on the depth at the western side of the entrance, consisting of pile work, brush and stone, with a squared timber block at the outer end. Third, a dam 1,600 feet in length off Campbell Point. The breakwaters were constructed with the intention of confining the ebb current, and are erected on the bar outside the harbor, as well as to prevent the stream from washing the sand into the navigable channel. The results of piling have been so far very satisfactory, the depth of water on the bar having increased from six to fourteen feet in a channel about 400 feet in width, thus making of the harbor of New London one of the best on that coast of the island. The dam at Campbell's Point was constructed with a view to increase the force of the ebb current out of the South-West River, and thus deepen the shoal obstructing its mouth, but so far the desired object has not been obtained. In file No. 96,123 it is asked: First, that repairs be made to the eastern breakwater. This has been made the subject of a special report, dated 20th January. Second, that the eastern breakwater be extended further seawardly. A small channel is forming past the end of the eastern breakwater, running in an easterly direction, which channel may assume larger proportions to the detriment of the main channel, which runs in a north-easterly direction, by dividing the volume of the ebb current, and therefore diminishing its beneficial effect on the bar. To remedy this possible occurrence, it will be necessary to extend the eastern breakwater in a northerly direction, a distance of 200 feet. The cost of this proposed extension I estimate at $3,500, made of pile work, with brush and stone, and a stone slope on the seaward side."

Will the Minister please take note of that, and not let it be a dead letter.—

"In the autumn of 1888 the depth over the bar had decreased to six feet, but owing to the construction of the breakwater, the depth is now from 10 to 14 feet, and as this depth is as much as the depth at the shipping wharves, no survey was made. Dredging on the bar would only be of temporary benefit, as it would undoubtedly fill in again with the first heavy easterly gale. Any improvement in the depth of water over this bar can only be obtained by further contracting the entrance of the mouth or harbor. Fourth, that some dredging be done to the approaches to the Bay View pier in the Hope River. This will make the subject of a special report.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"LOUIS COSTE."

Now, Mr. Chairman, here we have the report of the Government engineer; the date is not given upon which he held this survey, but I fancy it was held somewhere about the month of June last, so that the Minister of Public Works has had all the information before him, of what is required for the improvement of this harbor, before these Estimates were made up. Now I want to know from the Minister of Public Works what is the meaning of putting $1,000 into these Estimates to do the work that his engineer says will require $3,500 to accomplish. Another thing I want to mention is this: The dredge employed about the Island harbors is at present engaged in dredging Rustico harbor. Well, I am very glad she is engaged there and I hope she will do good work. I would recommend that after the dredge completes that work she be ordered to New London harbor, as it will cost only a trifling item to move the dredge and the scows there to complete New London harbor; whereas if, after Rustico harbor is completed, the dredge is moved round to the southern side of the Island, at an expense of $1,500 for towage, and then move her back a year or two after to complete New London harbor, it will be a very costly work. After the dredging is done at Rustico harbor, if she is moved five or six miles to New London harbor to complete the work as advised by his own surveyor, it will be a saving to this country, I will be bound to say, of at least $15,000 or $20,000. I am honest about it. I tell the Minister of Public Works that if he has the public interest at heart, it is his duty, as soon as the dredging is complete at Rustico, which is only four or five miles from the entrance to New London harbor, to move her into that harbor and

do the dredging as required by this report, and to expend this $3,500 to complete the work. On the north side of the Island they have not many good shipping ports. New London is about one of the best, Cascumpec is something similar, and there has been a large amount of money laid out there. But this $1,000 is not going to be of any benefit to New London harbor. I tell you I would sooner put it in the dead meat business.

An hon. MEMBER. Strike it out.

Mr. WELSH. Yes ; I tell you honestly, strike it out, or else do the work as it ought to be done. If the Government will only go by the report of their own engineer, which is a creditable report—and it is a credit to the Government that they have a man who can make such a clear and distinct report as that—it will be more creditable to the Government to see that his report is attended to. That is about all that I want to say. I would like to say a good deal more, but I do not think that will do any good. I would dearly love to see something done there. I do not expect much from the Minister of Public Works. He and I are not chums, but if he will do what his engineer recommends, I will let him off very easily.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount is placed in the Estimates for repairs on the wharf. The report which the hon. gentleman has read is perfectly correct in regard to the amount of $3,500. But that amount was not placed at my disposal by my colleagues. and, therefore, I cannot ask it to be voted by this Committee, and that is the reason why it does not appear in the Estimates. The hon. gentleman stated that the $1,000 placed in the Estimates is not required.

Mr. LAURIER. Was not sufficient.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman alludes to his position towards me. That is none of my doing. The hon. gentleman says he intends to forgive me and so on. In so far as forgiveness is concerned, I have forgiven him long ago.

Mr. WELSH. I have nothing to forgive. The boot is on the other leg. The hon. gentleman has deceived me, he has broken his word to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WELSH. It can be seen in *Hansard*, and the hon. gentleman does not deny it. I am honest about this matter. Of this $1,000 how much will go on that breakwater? About $500 will go to political hacks, to some old fossils such as he has in his Department. Why could not the hon. gentleman get the $3,500, which the engineer said was required for the work? Why did he put $1,000 here? It is no good, it is no use. If it is expended it will go to dead heads, and political fossils will get hold of it for supervising, overseeing and travelling and all sorts of things. The hon. gentleman might as well take the $1,000, and rub it out of the Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move that this item for $1,000 be struck out.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit there is force in the contention of my hon. friend, and that this motion is now warranted. The explanation given by the Government is a most childish one. An officer of the Government is sent down to ascertain the necessary expenditure requisite on a certain work, reports that it will cost $3,500, and in answer to that report $1,000 is placed in the Estimates. What is the reason given? The reason given is that the amount is not placed at his disposal by the hon. Minister's colleagues. If the country were short of money, I could understand this explanation ; but when the surplus is so large as at present, what is the reason that the colleagues of the hon. gentleman would not place at the Minister's disposal the amount which, according to the report of the engineer, is required to carry out the work? It has been manifested for some time in the House and in the Committees of the House that no justice can be had except it is done for political partisans of the Government, that no county represented here by a member of the Opposition can hope to have justice done, and only those counties whose representatives are ready to support on every occasion the Government will receive, not to say favors but that justice to which they are entitled. Under such circumstances the Government may strike out the amount, I do not care ; but the people of Prince Edward Island will understand the measure of justice they have to receive at the hands of the Government of this country.

Motion agreed to ; yeas 23, nays 16.

Souris East—Breakwater, &c., at Knight's Point..... $3,700

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears that on account of a remark made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) the Government considered it to be their duty to strike an item out of the Estimates.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing an item that has already been disposed of.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion before us is : "Souris East Breakwater, &c., at Knight's Point, $3,700." The remarks of the hon. gentleman thus far led me to believe that he is going to make a motion to strike this item out.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not think I am obliged to move to strike the item out. The Minister of Justice must feel keenly the vote he has just given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing a past debate, and he has already disavowed his intention of moving an amendment, on which understanding he was allowed to refer to a past debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will now submit a motion he will be in order.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I move that the Committee rise. If there has been anything to cause regret to members supporting the Government it is their action in voting to strike out the last item of $1,000. This amount was thought to be necessary for repairs made in the locality, and if after due deliberation and consideration the Government have come to the conclusion that the expenditure was necessary, and if owing to an expression made use of by an hon. member of this House the item has been struck out, it is an unfair act to the people of Prince Edward Island. Why have they acted in this manner? It is because the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) opposes the Government? There can be no other

reason, and the Minister of Justice as well as the other members of the Government know full well that they have not acted in any spirit of fair play or justice to the Province. They know, on the contrary, that they have struck out this item on account of pure spite towards the representative of that locality. It is another proof of the arguments which have been time and again presented to this House, that the Government intend only to give work to counties represented by their supporters. If my hon. friend (Mr. Welsh) had been a supporter of the Government he would have had $3,500 granted for this work. We have in these estimates evidence of a deliberate violation of the resolution that was passed in this House a few weeks ago, in which the Government announced to the country that in future, if not in the past, they were going to act on the same principles of justice to the various constituencies, regardless whether they received the support of the members of these constituencies or not. To-night we see them violate their promises deliberately, by striking out a paltry item for $1,000, when the engineer stated it should be $3,500, and they did this to punish a constituency for not sending here a supporter of the Government. The action of the Government to-night is devoid of principle, and I feel we are justified in asking the committee to rise, so that the Government may try to repent of the evil they have done to-night. Perhaps they have a little conscience left and they may reconsider their action, which I maintain was outrageous.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When any hon. gentleman on either side of the House takes counsel of his passion, he is not likely to judge very correctly. I think my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island used pretty strong language towards the Minister of Public Works, and I think the Government have made even a greater mistake in striking out the small sum of $1,000. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) felt very strongly because the amount was so very much less than the engineer recommended. It does seem to me that the Government have not acted upon the advice of the hon. member. The Government have acted upon the advice of their engineer. They did not put this sum in the Estimates to please my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island and if the item were not put in the Estimates, with a view of promoting the public interest, there is no justification for it. If this money was for a proper object and in the public interest then it seems to me it is a most improper proceeding to strike the estimate out, simply because my hon. friend, at one o'clock in the morning, used language that was not conciliatory to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. WELSH. Your hon. friend is not going to take one word back. He is going to add a lot more to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the committee ought to restore this item in the Estimates, and then pass on to the next item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the matter which is engaging the attention of the House, I must point out this fact. By the terms of our arrangement with Prince Edward Island, we undertook the charge of a great number of these harbors and breakwaters ; whether that was wise or not, we have done it. Now, I believe that this harbor of New London is one of the most important harbors in the Province of Prince Edward Island. It is tolerably certain that if this money was required for necessary repairs, and if it is not now expended, this country will shortly be put to a greater expense to put that harbor in order. Everyone who knows anything at all about these matters is aware that the worst possible policy is to allow wind and tide and sea to work their will on these harbors, and that it has generally resulted in inflicting four or five times as great a cost on the whole community. Now, we have the question as to whether my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) or the hon. Minister of Public Works may or may not have possessed their souls in patience in this discussion ; but there can be no doubt that the Government do not occupy a very creditable position in this matter. They brought down this item of $1,000 which my hon. friend (Mr. Welsh) says is too small, and his opinion is entitled to weight, as being that of a man who knows the country, and who is a professional expert in these matters. His opinion is backed up in the strongest manner by the engineer of the Department. There is no doubt that the Government adopted the responsibility of introducing a vote of $1,000, when their own engineer recommended nearly four times as much, and there is no doubt that they did not act in a very dignified fashion in abandoning the vote, because one hon. gentleman had a quarrel with another. My reason for interfering is this—and I shall take occasion later on, if not this Session, to call the attention of the House to what I say—that it is almost certain, that if you neglect to make the requisite repairs to this harbor now, we will be compelled within one or two years to spend eight or nine times as much as is now asked.

Motion, that the committee rise, withdrawn.

Repairs to breakwater at Negro Point, St. John harbor..... $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has this breakwater cost us ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $436,000. As the hon. gentleman knows, that is for the protection of the harbor of St. John.

Berthier (en bas)—Repairs to pier..... $500

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I think something should be given for the wharf at Berthier. This sum is not for the planking of the wharf nor for a building to be used as a beacon. When the works were commenced last year, I believe that a certain sum was voted for that purpose, but it was inadequate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for a new slip.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It is for a pier that has been damaged.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The railing has been carried away during a storm, and we must replace it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The wharf, I believe, has been damaged.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, if any repairs are required, they can be made out of the general grant.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have considered the engineer's report recommending that $3,000 be given for works on the Rivière du Sud. Is the Government aware of it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have noticed that report, and it is now before the Council; perhaps this will satisfy the hon. member.

McGregor's Creek—To complete.....$1,500

Mr. CAMPBELL. Could the Minister of Public Works inform us where and for what purpose this money is to be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is required for a length of 250 feet opposite Taylor's warehouse, to prevent damage to the foundation of the building by undermining.

Thornbury—Dredging.....$3,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what he proposes to do about the dredging of the bar at the River Thames?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will be better able to answer the hon. gentleman on Tuesday.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At the early part of the Session a deputation was sent down to interview the Minister of Public Works in reference to this matter, and upon that occasion the Minister promised the deputation that a sum would be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to complete this work. I fully expected it would appear in the Estimates for that purpose. This work has been promised for a number of years. It was promised in 1887 and 1888, and last year there was a vote of $4,000 in the Estimates. That $4,000 was spent during the summer; and the moment it was exceeded, although the work was two-thirds done and the bar had a cut dredged two-thirds of the way, the Minister of Public Works telegraphed to stop the work at once. The Board of Trade immediately met, the Town Council immediately met, everybody interested met, and petitioned the Minister of Public Works to allow the dredging to go on a few days more, so as to complete the channel through this bar. The reply was that it was contrary to the law, and he regretted that he could not spend any money in this work until it was voted by Parliament. But every single dollar expended last summer was spent contrary to the rules of Parliament, as the amount voted had run out on the 30th June, and this work was not completed until the 4th of September. Consequently the $4,000 was spent without warrant from this House at all, but was afterwards covered by the Governor General's warrant. The people consider that the work having been promised so often and being of so much importance, it was only reasonable the Government should have gone on and spent a little more to complete it. Unless the cut, which has been carried two-thirds through the bar, be finished, every dollar spent will have been thrown away. What has been done will be of no use, because until the cut is finished vessels drawing over 7½ feet of water cannot get in. If, however, a little more money were spent to finish the work, we would have a channel there for a number of years, and the Government would not be required to spend any more. The hon. Minister has had his attention drawn to this over and over again. I presented a petition last year signed by over 1,000 residents of the county, Conservatives and Reformers, praying that this work should be completed, and I do not think it is treating the county right when the work is so important and can be completed for so little, that there should be any hesitation in the hon. Minister saying what the Government intend to do. For 25 miles, after you cross the bar, you have from 18 to 20 feet of water. The largest vessels can come in and sail up the river for 25 miles after they get across the bar. From 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 feet of lumber come to Chatham every year from Georgian Bay and parts north. It is not treating the county right to neglect so long carrying on this work, especially after it was promised so often and partly done. A couple of thousand dollars more will carry the cut through and give us 12 feet of water, so that vessels can come in without having to unload. If the hon. Minister cannot give me an answer to-night, I trust he will the first opportunity, and before the last moment; and I will be much pleased if he would make up his mind to expend a small amount more and finish the work.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman is entitled to an answer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If I do not answer, it is not through want of courtesy, but because I cannot. I told the hon. gentleman that I could not give him an answer to-day, but would give him one on Tuesday. The hon. gentleman, however, thought he would make a speech, and he has made it, and I will give him the answer on Tuesday.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In making the remarks I did, I merely wish further to impress upon the hon. Minister the necessity for this work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has already on many occasions impressed its importance on me, and I am fully aware of all the arguments he has to bring in its favor. I have had no report or information as to what is likely to be done.

Goderich Harbor.....$2,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About Port Stanley, I promised the information to the hon. gentleman, but I also told him that the question was before Council. It has now come out of Council, an Order in Council has been passed, and I am trying now to see whether I cannot bring the company to put the harbor in proper repair. If that cannot be done, we will have to take other measures necessary for the purpose, either to resume possession of the harbor altogether, or compel the company to do what I think they are bound to do by their contract with the Government.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am quite satisfied with that reply. It is all that I desire in reference to the matter.

Harbors and Rivers, B. C.....$8,500

Mr. GORDON. I would ask if the Minister of Public Works remembers receiving a petition from the people of Cowichan for the improvement of the navigation from Cowichan River to Somenos

Lake, also an application presented by myself to the Department for the improvement of Kokisalah River ; also an application from residents of Comox for the protection of the banks at the junction of the Courtenay and Tso-lon Rivers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We could not put in these Estimates every work that was petitioned for. I assure my hon. friend that, if these works are not in the Estimates they are in very good company, probably two or three hundred other applications which are not put in. We could not do all that was asked this year, and we will not be able to do it all next year. I am under the impression that two or three of the matters of which the hon. gentleman spoke require examination and report. There was one of those rivers, with a very nice name, which I never saw before in my Department, and I think I must have an examination made in regard to that. I intend to take up the matter during recess, though I do not promise what will be done next Session.

Mr. GORDON. I would remind the hon. gentleman that two years ago he very kindly granted $500 towards the improvement of the River Kokisalah. If that is the river with the nice name, to which the hon. Minister refers, his Department cannot be unfamiliar with it. That is quite as important a river as the McGregor Creek, which I knew very well in the days of my youth ; and many of these rivers in each of the older Provinces which are improved by the Government are of much less importance than those for which I have asked the favorable consideration of the hon. gentleman's Department.

Dredging..... ..... $29,300

Mr. ELLIS. What is to be done with the amount of $16,700 for the new dredging plant in the Maritime Provinces ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is for new plant in the dredges and for repairs to the scows.

Mr. ELLIS. I had hoped that the Minister was going to provide a new dredge. None of the dredges are fit for use in the Bay of Fundy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is quite right. We should have a new dredge for the Maritime Provinces, and one for Ontario, but these cost a great deal of money, and we could not afford to provide them this year.

Mr. GORDON. Referring to the item of $5,000 for British Columbia, I desire to ask if it is the intention to dredge the entrance to the Nanaimo Harbor to a greater depth. I made an application to that effect three years ago. This is only important in regard to the large sea-going ships. The silt from the Nanaimo River is driven across the harbor, and sometimes ships that draw more than 32 feet strike on the deposit. That seems a large draught to hon. gentlemen from the East, but last year 383 ships entered the harbor of Nanaimo and Departure Bay, and they were entered outwards for sea with 463,966 tons of coal and 5,000 tons measurement of other products.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows that we have had considerable difficulty in the Nanaimo Harbor because of the Nichol Rock, and we have put an amount in the Estimates to enable us to remove that rock. It was the great obstacle to the entrance to the harbor. Vessels were constantly in danger of striking that rock, and they did strike it, and perhaps some were lost. When that is done we will be in a better position to see to what extent we can go with the improvement of the harbor. Of course, this will not be forgotten.

Resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The railway subsidies, where are they?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think notice has been given by the First Minister, and they will appear on the Notice paper on Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the railway subsidies, of which notice has been given, comprise all that are to be brought down, or are there further ones to be brought down ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say positively. At all events, if there are any others, they will come down immediately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They ought to be down, in all conscience, on Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. We shall expect on Monday to have all the papers in connection with applications for railway subsidies, and the usual information in regard to them.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 12th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE EX-MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. GIROUARD moved the adoption of the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. He said: As Chairman of this Committee, it is my painful duty to-day to move the adoption of this report with regard to certain charges which have been made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) against Mr. Rykert, the late member for Lincoln and Niagara. The report contains an exhaustive review of the whole case, and is the unanimous finding of the Committee, after a great deal of consideration and deliberation ; and I believe it is not necessary for me to offer any remarks. I will, therefore, simply invite the House to adopt the report by a silent, but unanimous vote.

Mr. MULOCK. If I am to understand that there is to be no discussion on the report, I will confine my observations to two matters, which, though not coming within the main subject-matter of the enquiry, are incidental to it. When the correspondence, out of which this enquiry grew, appeared in the public press, there was a prominent reference in it by name to a Minister of the Crown, the hon. Minister of Customs. The charge made,

or apparently made, against him in that correspondence, thus incidentally formed part of the enquiry; and it may be said to be completely disposed of by the general statement in the report that there had been no corrupt advance made to any Minister of the Crown, either directly or through any other person; the report finds, and correctly finds, that there is no foundation for any such suggestion. Although in this general way the report acquits all Ministers of the Crown of any charge of wrongdoing, yet I desire to emphasise the finding of the report by expressing, at all events, my individual gratification, not only at the complete exoneration of the Government, but of the individual member who happened to be mentioned by name in the course of the correspondence. It is not only with regard to the Minister of Customs that I desire to express my gratification at the finding of the Committee, but with regard to those who, not being members of this House, have not the same opportunities to defend themselves that public men have. In the course of that correspondence, it was alleged that corrupt advances were being made through sons of two gentlemen, one the present Premier, the other a former Minister; and now that the Committee have discharged their duties, I desire publicly to offer my testimony in regard to their finding, more especially in the case of Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald. I did not express my individual opinion before the Committee, not desiring to bias the members in any respect; but as the Committee have now thoroughly discharged their duty, and come to a unanimous finding, I desire to express my gratification at their conclusion, which was the only one that could be arrived at, that Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald was not guilty of what was suggested; and I wish to add, from my own knowledge of his character, that he is utterly incapable of having done what was suggested in that correspondence. I have had the advantage of knowing him ever since his boyhood, not only as a university undergraduate, but as an undergraduate in law, and during the time he lived as a practitioner in Toronto; also, socially and privately, I knew him; and from my knowledge of him, I can say, that of all my acquaintances, I know no man less capable of resorting to dishonorable methods, less amenable to sordid influences, or more completely protected by his nature from yielding to corrupt influences, than Hugh J. Macdonald. Therefore, however desirable it might be to allow this report to pass in silence, I cannot refrain from expressing my gratification at the two gentlemen to whom I have especially referred being relieved completely of all suspicion of wrong-doing by the unanimous report of the Committee—a committee composed of members of this House having the most widely diverse political views.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before the motion is adopted, I desire to say a few words, not so much with regard to the member who is particularly concerned, but from a different point of view. However much the conduct of this member may be blameable, I think we ought to go further and deprive members of Parliament, for the future, of any temptation to do what this member has done. I believe that this House ought to take this opportunity of stating firmly, once for all, that no member of Parliament should receive, directly or indirectly, any favor from the Government; or if he wants to go into any kind of speculation, either lands, limits, or railway charters, he ought to withdraw from Parliament, and take his chances like anybody else. I say this, and I say it openly, that a member of Parliament cannot serve two masters at the same time. He cannot do his duty as a member of Parliament, and be, at the same time, in receipt from the Government of part of the public domain. If I may be allowed to refer to what has appeared in the public papers, the late member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in his address to his constituents, asks: "Why should I be selected alone, whilst there are other members like myself, who are reaping from the Government of the day, advantages they should not reap; who are living by the votes they give in Parliament?" As long as the honor of the House is left in the hands of such men, this House ought to be ashamed of its course. For my part, if I could command sufficient support to carry a resolution of mine, I would move the following:—

That the source of all the evil in this case is derived from the practice of allowing members of Parliament to ask and obtain for themselves advantages out of public property.

That such practice is contrary to the well understood rules of Parliament, for the obvious reasons that a member cannot at the same time serve his private interest and the public interest at the same time.

That the position of a member of Parliament is one of trust, that he is a trustee of the public domain, and he ought not to derive any personal benefit from the property confided to his care.

I do not move this amendment, but merely suggest it. At the beginning of the Session, I introduced a Bill which had for its object the securing of greater independence on the part of members of Parliament. Of course, being on this side of the House, and not having that influence necessary to carry a measure of the kind, I could not hope to succeed in having it adopted, and it was sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where of course it died a natural death. There are many modes of killing a dog without choking him with butter. I am doing what I believe to be my duty in suggesting to the House that we should try to prevent for the future a recurrence of the facts disclosed in this matter.

Mr. GIROUARD. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will remind him that the other day, when we got through this investigation, his Bill was called before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and we were sorry he was not there to promote it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Though I was not there at the time, and it may have been my fault, I knew beforehand, and every hon. member knows, that there was not the remotest chance of my carrying the measure through this Session.

Report concurred in.

THE BREMNER FURS.

Mr. McNEILL moved the adoption of the report of the Committee appointed to enquire into statements made with reference to furs taken from one Charles Bremner.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that there are some very serious questions involved in this affair, and that it ought not to pass without some discussion. In the first place, I wish to call the attention of the

House to the fact that the matter which forms the subject of this report is not new to this House at all; that it was not new this Session, or last Session, or the Session before; that for several years it has been brought up; that for several years statements have been made which have turned out to be substantially true; and that some time ago, the very letter of Mr. Hayter Reed, which forms the essence of the whole question, was read in this House—not the revised letter, but something which purported to be the original letter, and which was substantially the same as the revised letter. I wish, in the second place, to draw attention to the fact that the Government was called upon, from this side of the House, by hon. gentlemen who brought the question up, to act; that the Government had an obvious duty to enquire and to act; that the Government, upon one occasion at least, if not on more than one, acknowledged that duty and undertook to act; and that up to this hour we have not had the slightest indication of the Government having taken the first step towards enquiry into the matters, so circumstantially stated, and so largely proved, as they were, by the letter of Mr. Hayter Reed. I think the Government are called upon to state to the House what steps they took. I think they are called upon to state whether they called upon the General commanding, who was inculpated by these statements, and by that letter, to give any report to them. I think they are called upon to state whether they instituted any enquiry into his conduct, and that of Mr. Hayter Reed and of Mr. Bedson; and if they did, when they did it, how they did it, and with what results. They should state to the House how it happens that this disgraceful matter—for so I call it—was brought to their attention so long ago without their taking any action, if no action was taken; or if action was taken, to what extent it was operative. A serious question arises upon this letter, which, at some time or another, appears to have got into the possession of the Department itself, because, as well as I can gather from the report of the proceedings, the revised letter of Mr. Hayter Reed was ultimately produced from the custody of the Department. When it got there, how it got there, what was done upon its getting there, we know not. But that letter, as revised, read thus:—

"FORT PITT, July, 1885.

"To the officer in charge of the property taken from Rebel:

"The General having decided to confiscate the furs now in your care and taken from rebel, desires that you should make up a select bundle of beaver and fisher for him, and a selection also for those of his staff. Have them properly packed and addressed, and keep a memorandum of what is packed.

"HAYTER REED."

It appears that the instruction in the original letter was that the General commanding was to have a double portion—two boxes for himself, and one each for the staff. It appears also that the language used in Mr. Hayter Reed's revised letter, "make up a select bundle," was still stronger in the original letter, in which the words used were "select beaver and fisher"—the two, however, meaning pretty much the same thing. It appears further that the original letter contained instructions to the person to whom it was addressed to keep it private, not to let it be known, and that the fact that this direction became known was the reason why it was withdrawn and replaced by the letter I have just read. It was found, it seems, that in the interval the party to whom this direction was addressed, one Warden did not keep it private, and it became known; and the object of the direction having become thus thwarted, the fact of the direction, and the impropriety of the direction were at once made manifest, I suppose, and so the direction was withdrawn, as its purpose had not been served. Now, in this whole matter there has been a grievous course of misconduct and impropriety on the part of an official of the Canadian Government. There has been a grievous wrong done to a Canadian subject. It has been a subject of enquiry and discussion here for many Sessions without effective result; and I very well remember that in the end, after the debate had been, at the request of the Government adjourned, when the First Minister announced that the great inquest of the nation should be allowed to make enquiry, it turned out that it was because the General commanding had signified his good-will and pleasure that an enquiry should be made, that an enquiry was vouchsafed. It almost sounded as if the General was still in the North-West, as if he was still monarch of all he surveyed, as if he was still the dictator of the country, the arbiter of the lives and fortunes and property of the people; because Parliament was carefully told that, as the General has been kind enough to say you may enquire, we will grant an enquiry. It was rumored—I know not with what foundation—at an early stage of these proceedings, before the Committee had met, that this matter could be accommodated in some way, and I think $3,500 was suggested as a sum which would satisfy Mr. Bremner; and I think that it was suggested that somebody—no, rather, that everybody—should pay it, so that the matter might be hushed up. My opinion is that this is a matter which should be settled by those who have done the wrong, and not by the Canadian people, who are not responsible for the wrong which has been done; and I believe that we ought not to indemnify, either in reputation or in purse, the man who did the wrong, but I believe that he should bear the consequences of the wrong he did. He has had honors and rewards enough, and he should now pay for his misconduct, and should receive the censure which is his due. I have had some little opportunity of judging of the rules of morality which have been generally applied to the conduct and the honor of British officers; and having some vague idea of what British military conduct and British military honor were, I was overwhelmed with astonishment when I saw the letter which was sent by the General, and, if possible, I was still more astonished when I saw the evidence of the General as to what he considered his rights and his powers, and the doctrines of ethics and morals which he applied to this matter. Thinking that the information available in regard to military duties and military regulations, in what may be said to be analogous cases, might afford in some way a justification for the General's view, if I looked into them a little, I took that trouble, but all I have been able to find or to read of seems to be entirely in condemnation of the course which has been here pursued. The authorities to which we generally look, fortunately, cannot bring before our view cases of civil war. They are not

cases of disturbance on British soil, but they are almost always cases of conflict with a foreign foe and on foreign soil. This case was, of course, entirely different. It was not a conflict on foreign soil or with a foreign foe. It was a conflict on British soil with British subjects—misguided, it is true, in rebellion it is true; but British subjects still—and in this case there could not be any question of prize of war or booty at all. In a case of this kind, different principles are to be applied from those which apply in the ordinary cases of military operations. But, restricted as this case thus was, it was restricted still further by the circumstance that, even when the difficulty was at the extreme height, the Administration—and I commended them at that time, and I renew the commendation now—announced that there was never an idea of proclaiming martial law in that country. The Government asserted that there was no intention to proclaim martial law, and the Government, as I shall show later on, acted upon the view and announced it from the earliest period, that the Queen's civil and criminal courts of justice were open and should remain open, and that the Queen's subjects, whether they were concerned in the rebellion or were actually in the field, should be dealt with by them alone; so that we had no proclamation of martial law in that country. It seems, I think, to be clear that there was not the shadow of a claim to confiscate, and if there was even a shadow of a claim for confiscation, or if the incident of prize of war could have arisen, it seems to be perfectly clear that there was not the shade of the shadow of a claim to appropriate on the part of the confiscator; and that appropriation and that confiscation are each of them unlawful and criminal acts, the appropriation being only more improper than the confiscation. In the case of the Monmouth rebellion, it appears that articles of war were for the first time put forth introducing powers for the destruction of rebels' property on the order of the general commanding. That was in connection with the case of what was considered to be a very dangerous revolt. We know that, whether in the case of domestic or foreign war, one painful necessity is to distress the enemy by the destruction of property. In fact, that may be a humane thing to do, as causing others to desist from warfare, and so earlier terminating the war. It was for that purpose alone that this authority was introduced into the Articles of War on that occasion; and accordingly, though the provision was made applicable to the property of civilians engaged in rebellion during the rebellion, the Secretary of War of the day directed Colonel Kirke no longer to use it after the rebellion ceased. It was a war measure in order to distress the rebels and cause the rebellion to cease. It was a measure for the destruction of property in order to terminate the war. These articles are continued in the general articles of 1872, and, if you take those articles of war in their whole scope, in all the provisions bearing in any way on the conduct of officers and soldiers engaged in military operations, you will find that they are all alike condemnatory of such conduct or of such an action as this. They show a power to take useful stores from the enemy for the service of the State. They show that there is no right to hurt the subject in person or property. They show that plunder and pillage and destruction of private property are high military crimes. They show rigorous provisions for prevention and punishment of such offences. Many of them are not applicable in terms to this case, but they are most valuable as teaching the road to be followed and as indicating to any man in the position of General Middleton, with very great plainness, how far he was departing from that road in the course he took. In the Articles of War of 1872, the 11th regulation is this:

"All public stores taken from the enemy, whether of artillery, ammunition, engineer stores, clothing, forage or provisions shall be secured for our service, and the officers commanding in chief are to be answerable to us for any neglect in this respect."

Then the 17th article, which refers to the proceedings on the commission of offences, is:

"Whenever any officer or soldier shall be accused of a capital crime or of violence or any offence against the persons or property of our subjects punishable by the known laws of the land, the commanding officer or officers of his corps are, upon application duly made in behalf of the party injured, to use their utmost endeavors to deliver over such accused person to the civil magistrate, and assist the officers of justice in apprehending and securing him."

The commanding officer is not himself to become the culprit; he is not himself to take the goods. No; he is to see that those below him who do that shameful and criminal act shall be delivered over to the civil magistrate for punishment. Then article 51, and the following articles deal with "any officer or soldier who shall leave his commanding officer or his post to go in search of plunder, or who being employed in foreign parts shall do violence to any person bringing provisions or other necessaries to the quarters of our forces, or break into any storehouse or cell for plunder." It was not indeed necessary for General Middleton to break into this storehouse, because he could command the storehouse to be opened; so he did not break in, but he commanded the storehouse to be opened in order that he might plunder; and he ordered the plunder to be packed up and delivered to him and his staff. But the Article of War goes on: "Shall on conviction suffer death or penal servitude for not less than five years, or such other punishment as a General Court Martial shall award." Then, under the heading "Disgraceful Conduct," in article 80:

"Any officer or soldier, or other person employed in the War Department, or in any way concerned in the care and distribution of any money, provisions, forage, arms, ammunition, clothing or other stores belonging to our army or for our use——"

And I shall show you before I sit down, that if this could be considered prize of war, it was for Her Majesty's use, it was the property of the Crown and not of the individual.—

—"or who shall embezzle, fraudulently misapply, wilfully damage, steal or receive the same, knowing the same to have been stolen, or shall be concerned therein, on conviction before court-martial, shall be sentenced to five years' penal servitude."

And article 81 says:

"Any soldier who shall steal or embezzle Government moneys or property, or shall receive the same, knowing them to have been stolen or embezzled, may be sentenced to such punishment other than death, or penal servitude, as the court may award."

Then article 103, which is one of those, I fancy, introduced upon the occasion of the Monmouth Rebellion to which I have adverted, says:

"Any officer or soldier who shall commit any waste or spoil, either in walks of trees, parks, warrens, fish ponds, houses or gardens, vineyards, olive groves, cornfields, enclosures or meadows—or shall maliciously destroy any property—whether belonging to our own subjects or to inhabitants of other countries, unless the destruction of property shall be ordered by the commander in chief of our forces, to annoy rebels or other enemies in arms against us, shall, if an officer, on conviction, be cashiered or suffer such other punishment: &c."

And Article 130 says:

"In addition to any other punishment which the court may award, a court martial may further sentence any offender to be put under stoppage of pay until he shall have made good any loss or destruction of, or damage or injury to, any property whatsoever, occasioned by his wilful or negligent misconduct."

So far with reference to the articles of war, the whole tenor and spirit of which go to show to any man who has read them but for the first time, and much more to a man like the General with whom they ought to be familiar next to his bible—show, I say, to any one familiar or unfamiliar with them, how far this course was a departure from the spirit and doctrine and practice of the British army as so prescribed. Then, Sir, if you look at the Wellington Despatches and General Orders you will find numerous instances of the severest possible course being taken with reference to those who engage in plunder and pillage. I have looked out many of them, and I cite only one that is the most familiar, because it happens to be quoted in the authority upon these subjects. In October, 1810, the Duke of Wellington announced by general order that:

"He was concerned to have been under the necessity of carrying into execution the determination which he has so long announced, of directing the immediate execution of any soldiers caught plundering, and that a British and Portuguese soldier have consequently been hanged this day for plundering in the town of Leiria where they were, contrary to orders, and for other criminal purposes. He trusts this example will deter others from these disgraceful practices in future, and that the troops may depend upon it that no instance of this kind will be passed over."

Then I looked to our great neighbors who were engaged in a gigantic struggle some years ago, to see what course they pursued when they were engaged in that struggle which added to all the horrors of war, the further horror that it was a domestic war upon the most tremendous scale; and the instructions that were given by them in cases where martial law was proclaimed—a class to which this case does not belong—are of importance. The instructions which governed their armies, issued in 1863, are stated in Clode's book as follows:—

"Martial law in a hostile country consists in the suspension by the occupying military authority, of the civil and of the criminal and domestic administration and government in the occupied place, and in the substitution of military rule and courts for the same, as well as in the dictation of general laws as far as military necessity requires this suspension, substitution or dictation."

There is the rule of war—if martial law be proclaimed it is to abrogate all ordinary conditions so far as, and no further than, military necessity requires:

"As martial law is exercised by military force, it is incumbent on those who administer it to be strictly guided by the principles of justice, honor and humanity; virtues adorning a soldier even more than other men, for the very reason that he possesses the power of his arms against the unarmed. * * * 5. Martial law should be less stringent in places and countries fully occupied and fairly conquered, * * * 6. All civil and penal law shall continue to take its usual course in the enemy's places under martial law, unless interrupted or stopped by order of the occupying military power."

These rules are founded on just principles which must commend themselves to every man, they are based upon no technical treatment, but upon the obvious principles of justice and mercy. You find a man made a dictator over the country, and entitled to make laws for the people; and the fundamental principle stated is that he is to act "upon the grounds of justice, honor and humanity," and that all the more strictly because he is all powerful for the moment against the people, who are unarmed. So, in the case of the Canadian rebellion of 1837, a case which comes closer to ourselves, the opinion of Lord Campbell and Lord Cranworth upon the subject of martial law was this:

"For the reason *quod necessitas cogit defendit*, we are of opinion that the prerogative (of creating martial law) does not extend beyond the cases of persons taken in open resistance, and with whom, by reason of the suspension of the ordinary tribunals, it is impossible to deal according to regular course of justice. Where the courts are open so that criminals might be delivered over to them to be dealt with according to law, there is not, as we conceive, any right in the Crown to adopt any other course of proceedings. Such a power can only be conferred by the Legislature."

Once again, I apply that rule and I say, here was no martial law nor any occasion for it. The Administration would have been morally criminal if they had attempted to proclaim it; but they did not proclaim it. The courts of justice were open, the courts of justice were about to be applied, as I shall show presently, to this aggrieved subject; and yet you find martial law—no, not martial law at all; but something quite beyond the rigors of martial law unjustly exercised, beyond the extremest abuse which could be committed under the guise of martial law. The rule is stated by Lord Hale as follows:

"In time of peace the exercise of martial law in poin of death is declared murder."

That is still law.

"A military officer having prisoners taken in the riot, should hand them over to the civil power, if existing; but if not existing, then his responsibility is to execute justice in the best manner that circumstances afford him the opportunity of doing; by civil tribunals if they can be convened, or by courts martial, if those courts only can be summoned."

Then Clode goes on to say:

"Such necessity arising for the trial of civilians by court-martial, the commanding officer will be careful to compose those courts of men (civil or military) whose experience and character afford to the criminal the best security for the exercise of a sound judgment and discretion in the most solemn functions of judicial administration which they, as judges, are thus unexpectedly called upon to discharge. * * * The jurisdiction of the court is to be upheld by the supreme power of the executive Government to administer justice at all times."

I call attention to the fundamental principle that justice is to be administered, and this, if possible, by the civil courts, if not, then by courts erected for the occasion, but still erected to administer justice; and I need only ask the House to apply these principles to the transaction which took place and which forms the subject of this report, and to say whether they have not been, so far as possible, violated instead of observed. Then Clode says, on page 168:

"*The result of exceeding powers.* Those charged with wrong in the civil or criminal courts are to meet the indictment or suit, upon their own responsibility, either alone, if Governors, or with the aid of the public department, if military officers. * * * They must be prepared to know that martial law was not only esta-

blished *de facto* but *de jure*; for otherwise, indeed, any usurpation might be tolerated."

"This done his act must be justified as coming within the limits of his authority.

I cite this because it alludes to the principle of British rule, the constitutional principle, which is that the Crown can do no wrong; but that the subject must not be aggrieved without remedy; and, in order that the subject may not be so aggrieved, no person appointed to power by the Crown who exerts that power can go beyond what the Crown can give or the Legislature has given, without personal responsibility to the subject for wrongs done. Upon this topic of martial law and the principles of its administration in those cases in which a commander in chief is clothed with the power and does assume it, no less a person than the Duke of Wellington in April, 1851, in a very important discussion in the House of Lords, which involved some of these questions—I refer to the discussion on the disturbances in the Island of Ceylon—made this statement:

"Martial law was neither more nor less than the will of the General who commanded the army."

That is what General Middleton seems to have supposed he was invested with, and that he had power to do anything he pleased.

—"In fact, martial law meant no law at all. Therefore——"

What is the sequitur? That you may rob the subject? That you may order and do just what you like? No.

—"Therefore, the general who declared martial law and commanded that it should be carried out into order was bound to lay down distinctly the rules and regulations and limits according to which his will was to be carried out. Now, he (the Duke), in another country, carried out martial law: that was to say, he had governed a large proportion of the people of a country by his own will. But then, what did he do? He declared that the country should be governed according to its own national laws, and he carried into effect that will. He governed the country strictly by the laws of the country, and he governed it with such moderation that political servants and judges who had at first fled or been expelled, afterwards consented to act under his direction. The judges sat in the courts of law conducting their judicial business, and administering the law under his direction."

All this shows that with whatever power you are invested, under the great exigency which makes *salus rei publicæ suprema lex*, you are bound to use it as little as you can; and that, in what use you do make of it, your action must be founded on the general principles of eternal and immutable justice. You are to be just, you are not to interfere beyond what is necessary, and your interference is to be based on the principle of justice. And this, when in a foreign country, when martial law has been proclaimed. How much more so when the country is our own, and when there martial law has not been proclaimed. I said the question of prize of war does not ever arise in case of a rebellion. A British subject can be deprived of his property only by judicial or legislative action. By judicial action, based upon the existence of the general law of the land, which gives the result of an escheat of the property of an individual convicted of treason, or by *ex post facto* legislation by a bill of attainder, in each case corrupting his blood. In these two ways only can a British subject, or his heirs, be deprived of his property, and that is a distinction, a characteristic belonging to the British subject which we ought to sacredly preserve and maintain. You may declare martial law; you may try a man and execute a man as a rebel taken in arms, by a court-martial, and yet his property is not alienated but it goes to his children. You cannot deprive him or them of his property by that course. In order that forfeiture may result he must be found to be a traitor by the courts, the ordinary courts of the country, in the ordinary course of the administration of justice. He may have fallen in the field itself, he may have fallen by your own artillery in battle against you, and the same result happens. There is no corruption of his blood, and his property cannot be forfeited. Now to turn to another feature. With respect to the case of the spoils of war, when that principle is at all applicable, if this were such a case, it is perfectly plain that no personal right arises to the property in favor of the commander in chief or other person who may happen manually to obtain possession of prize or booty of war. The statement of Clode, "Military Forces of the Crown," is this:

"When the expenses of war were borne by the Crown (possibly before William III) the spoils of war belonged to the Crown as part of the personal rather than the public revenue. Thus the disposition of the prize was made by the articles of war; and Parliament did not interfere."

By the 25th section, Articles of War, 1672, there is this provision made:

"In what place soever it shall please God that the enemy shall be subdued and overcome all the ordnance, ammunition and victuals that shall be there found shall be secured for our use, and for the better relief of the army, and one tenth part of the spoil shall be laid apart towards the relief of the sick and lame soldiers."

But after the appropriation Acts, when the expenses of war were provided by Parliament, the Crown dealt with prize as a trustee for the public. The House of Commons appointed Commissioners of prize and, aided by statutory power, the sanction of Parliament was thus given to the distribution. But the sole right of the Crown has always been allowed. That right was conferred—

"Not for private purposes or personal splendour, but for the public service to answer the great exigencies of the public interest and the claims of public justice."

These were the words of Sir William Scott, afterward Lord Stowell. That authority further says:

"Prize is altogether a creation of the Crown: no man has or can have any interest beyond what he takes as the mere gift of the Crown; beyond the extent of that gift he has nothing. *Bello parta cedant reipublicæ.*"

Lord Brougham said:

"The Crown has property in prize and can deal at its pleasure with it. The title of a party claiming prize must therefore in all cases be the act of the Crown, by which the Royal pleasure to grant it is signified."

It is a matter of pure bounty. Again:

"A grant made to the army by the Royal warrant is in certain definite shares and proportions, and it is the only authority given to the Secretary of State to decide these questions."

By the statute of prize, 2nd William IV, chapter 53, it is provided that the officer in chief in command is to appoint agents for the collection and realisation of booty by rule, and within one month afterwards the agents are to transmit the amounts to the Chelsea Hospital. One of the most important cases—having reference to the special conditions of the question which exist in India, where we know the tenure of the land is peculiar, where a condition of the native states and populations existed, from semi-dependence merging into servitude on the one hand, and rising into independence on the other—was that connected with the Banda-Kirwee booty, in which Dr. Lushington

gives valuable information on the general question. He said :

"As to grants of booty made by the authority of the Crown, and grants of money through Parliament made, although no booty or none of the same value has been captured—all booty belongs to the Crown; the Crown disposes of it among the troops engaged as the advisers of the Crown may think fit to recommend. It seems this was always the case and is now regulated by the 2nd William IV, chapter 53, regulating the payment of army prize money, which apparently dealing with the East Indies provides that in all captures of any fortress or possession of Her Majesty's enemies, or any ship or vessel in any road or haven of such fortress; and in all captures, expeditions or actions from which prize money, or bounty money, or grants shall arise, the commanders and other officers and soldiers therein engaged, shall have such right to act as Her Majesty shall think fit to order in all the arms, ammunition, stores of war goods, merchandise, booty prize and treasure belonging to the State or to any public trading company of such enemies which shall be found in such quarter, or possession, or captured, or granted for such expedition or action, to be divided in such proportions and according to such general rule of this division for the army as Her Majesty shall establish, or in default thereof as Her Majesty by sign manual shall direct."

"That decision is arrived at on the advice of the law officers. The proposition is clear, that all prize taken in war belongs absolutely to the Crown, and for one and a half centuries the Crown has been in the habit of granting the prize, after condemnation, to the takers."

Another result of the cession of prize, and that by no means unimportant, is, that it restrains pillage, as you will find stated repeatedly. The result of any other course would be to recognise some right in the actual taker by the fact of his taking, and so to have pillage indiscriminately, instead of the first idea being the defeat of the foe and victory for the army. That property captured at sea should be kept intact is to the interests of all parties, of neutral and friendly powers, that if not prize, it may be restored to the captor, and if prize it may be legally distributed. I have said that the Ceylon case was one of great importance. It was the case of a rebellion. It was a case in which martial law was proclaimed ; and Colonel Drought, who was commanding the forces, issued a proclamation threatening confiscation or attachment of the land or goods of the disaffected. Lord Torrington, the Governor, later on, threatened further measures of that kind against those who did not within twenty days return to their homes. Now what was done in that case ? I tell you what was done in order that you may see, in a case in which exceptional measures were taken, the course that was pursued, though even that course received a rebuke which I shall show you. Martial law, as I say, was proclaimed ; then first warnings were given to the people ; then second, to a certain extent, they were acted upon ; and what was done ? The property was sequestrated by the military authorities, taken to the store house, we will say at Battleford, to keep it safe, being so sequestrated. The perishable articles were sold, an account was kept of the receipts, and the goods were ear-marked so that it might be known whose goods they were and what price they fetched. The articles which were lasting were kept intact ; and of course the land was left untouched ; and in the end what was done was this. The value of the goods which had been sold, and the property *in specie* which was not sold, were restored to all those who had not been found guilty of high treason by the ordinary courts. Even the goods and property of those who were hanged by court-martial, were restored to the heirs and next of kin. In the case of those shot to death in arms, the same rule was pursued. There was no attempt to plunder as there was here. A bill of indemnity was brought in by the legal authorities after peace had been restored, and that Bill was very wide in its terms. It was considered by the Colonial Secretary, Lord Grey, and in his report he points out :

"That the measures taken——"

Those which I have described—

—"did not fall within the ordinary course of martial law"—

The ordinary course even of martial law did not justify the sequestration of the property of the subject, it did not justify the sale of the perishable articles, and did not justify the taking possession of these which were unsold ; but Lord Grey adds, that it may have been necessary, and competent for indemnification. The sequestration, the selling of the perishable goods, the keeping of the accounts and the restoring of the property may have been necessary, but it was competent for indemnification. But what does he add ?

"If the property of persons sentenced by court-martial for insurrection, but who had in no legal way incurred forfeiture, had been seized and sold for the benefit of the Government, nay, if persons suspected of rebellion had been thus despoiled——"

That is the phrase the Colonial Secretary used with reference to a transaction which was not one of taking and pocketing property by a commander, but one of seizing it and selling it for the use of the Government—

—"had been thus despoiled, the words of the law seem large enough to cover even such arbitrary proceedings. This goes much further even than necessity or justice could warrant."

That is his criticism upon the proceedings on the Ceylon rebellion. Therefore, Sir, if martial law had been proclaimed in the North-West ; if the goods of Bremner, suspected of being a rebel, had been seized ; if, being perishable goods,—which they were not, for they say that some of them are as good as new, now, and shining upon other backs —if they had been seized and sold for the benefit of the Government, the act would not have been suffered to be the subject of indemnification at all. But in this case there was no martial law, the courts were open, Bremner was at the very time being sent by his confiscator for trial, to ascertain whether he was a rebel or not. The confiscator had himself taken the goods for safe-keeping ; the rebellion was over ; the General was on his way back, victorious, to be laurelled by the authorities at home, and to be enriched by us, and at that time—yes, at that time—he appropriates the goods to himself. He does not say "they are perishable goods, which will be lost if they are not sold, and I sell them for Government." He does not say "they are lasting goods which will be lost if I do not keep them, and I keep them for Government." But he says : "I take them for myself." The rule then is : that the State has no right to touch the goods of a British subject by the military power or otherwise than by the course of law, and that when, acting through the military power, the State engaged in a foreign war, does take prize or booty, it is for the State and not for the individual, and the State afterwards grants what it pleases to grant, and as it pleases to grant it ; and one of the reasons of that rule is to deter as far as possible from pillage and plunder, and to keep within the limits of

honor, justice, humanity and legality as far as may be, those who have the power of the armed over the unarmed, as a military force has over the civilian population of a country, whether the war be foreign or domestic. Now, Sir, I want to apply these general principles to the case in hand, and to ascertain what the general course of the Government, and of the Commander himself was, as to the persons and as to the property of those who were engaged in this rebellion; and also the result of General Middleton's course, in the particular case of Bremner and his furs. Now, Sir, I have nothing but words of commendation on my own part, for the course which the Government pursued—so far as it has been communicated to us—during the rebellion, with reference to the instructions they gave as to dealing with persons and with property. First as to persons, I will read what was stated across the floor of this House at the time, and seems to me, as I say, to merit nothing but words of commendation. Very early in the rebellion, Colonel Crozier, in command of a detachment of the Mounted Police, issued the following proclamation:—

"PROCLAMATION.

"All persons found to take part in the rebellion against Our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, or those retained by the rebels against their will, will receive protection on presenting themselves to the Commanding Officer at Carleton and Prince Albert.

"*God Save the Queen.*

"L. N. F. CROZIER,
"*Com't N. W. M. P.*"

Immediately after Batoche, General Middleton's diarized report as to what he was doing, under date of 13th May, reads as follows:—

"The rebels were continually coming in with white flags to give themselves and their arms up. * * * I have a list of the worst of the rebels, and I dismiss those not in it, with a caution to return to their homes, and a warning that if hereafter any charge is brought against them they are liable to be arrested. I have now three prisoners, two of them being members of Riel's council."

On the 28th May, 1885, I made this enquiry of the Government:

"Whether Government has given any instructions to, or communicated with General Middleton as to the disposition of any of the insurgents who have surrendered?"

To which the Minister of Militia replied:"

"No instructions were issued to General Middleton, except in so far as instructing him to send to Regina the persons whom he considered should be committed for trial."

The House will remember that about that time, or before, a proclamation was issued by General Middleton, with the praiseworthy view of causing those on whom he might prevail, to desist from further rebellion, and to come in and surrender, but this proclamation I do not happen to find in the midst of the voluminous papers. Such a proclamation, the hon. Minister of Militia will agree, was issued, and it was a proper proclamation to issue. On the 16th July the hon. Minister of Public Works, on a question being raised as to the disposition of the arrested men, said this:

"The question is how to distinguish these men—who is a leader, who is not a leader, who has committed an act against the peace of the country, who has committed murder or any other offence, and who have not committed such offences?"

And then I condense his words thus:

"Of the men who were battling, all are not under arrest at Regina ready to stand their trials. A large number were placed at liberty at once, and are now at their homes: others fell on the field; others were wounded, and a number of those wounded are in our hospitals. But the question of deciding who is the leader in these troubles, who has committed a grievous offence, the offence of murder for example, and the question whether a man was guilty or not—these are questions which it is not for us to try; it is for the tribunals of the country to decide the question. That is the reason why you did not see the men tried by martial law. The men are to be tried by the civil authorities and under the laws of the country. I do not think it is in the interest of those men who are to be placed on their trial, or in the interest of the peace of the country, or in the interest of anyone, that we should interfere in a matter of this kind. The only interference we should make is this: to see that the men have a fair and impartial trial. That is their right, and it is what the Government intend to secure for them, and what they have intended from the beginning, to see that these men, beginning with Riel down to the last man in custody, have a fair and impartial trial."

Again the hon. gentleman says:

"The court will first decide whether these men are guilty or not."

Again:

"It is not for the interests of these poor people that such a course should be pursued. I say poor people, for those people, whether guilty or not, are always pitied when they are called upon to stand their trial."

The hon. First Minister, a little later, said this:

"The General discharged at once, on his own responsibility, the great mass of those who were taken, whose offence was rising in arms, who were not leaders or supposed to induce others into the rising, or to have been guilty of special acts of atrocity. We have exercised that discretion very largely; of course, the Government very readily entrusted that discretion to a man——"

That is, General Middleton—

—"who is equally remarkable for his personal courage, great caution and great humanity."

Again the Minister says:

"Only those in whom there is found decided criminality, on the *primâ facie* evidence laid before the Crown prosecutors, will be put on trial."

Well, Sir, you remember the circumstances—to which I shall have to allude later on—under which General Middleton exercised that high power with which he was at that time entrusted. He was the grand jury; he was to determine who should be sent to be tried for their life, and who should not be; but having exercised that power, in the case of Bremner, and having decided that he and those with him should be sent for trial, what happened? The Sessional papers report what happened. The information was on two counts: first, conspiracy to make war on Her Majesty—the high treason count; and, secondly, conspiracy to seize and take possession by force of goods and merchandise of the Queen, then being carried from Swift Current to Battleford for Her Majesty. When Bremner and the others who were charged with him, were brought before the court, the Crown prosecutor, Mr. Osler, after some prefatory remarks, made this statement:

"The prisoners were in a very difficult position. They were brought into camp (Poundmaker's) probably without their consent, by a large body of armed Indians; and having got into that camp, they may have been led into the acts complained of without knowing the serious position they were placing themselves in in so doing. We have considered that originally the desire probably of all the prisoners was to stay in their settlement. We have considered also that they had their families and their property to protect against some uncontrollable violence——"

Not of the Commander-in-chief, Sir.—

—"of the Indians surrounding them. They were in a very difficult position. The Crown, considering these things, and not being able to bring home acts of personal violence against any of them, and learning that they were all men of good character before the trouble came out, we have considered that perhaps the ends of justice would be

obtained by allowing them to be discharged on their own recognisances to appear."

Further on he said :

"Unless evidence implicating them with acts of personal violence appears, they will not be called on—not called on for the offence against allegiance."

I need only refer you to that charitable and careful statement of the Crown officer, acting on the proper and lenient general instructions indicated by the First Minister and the Minister of Public Works, and acting deliberately, I think in the month of September, after having collected all the evidence. I need only refer you, in addition, to the sworn evidence of themen themselves and of Father Cochin, which, I think was the name of the priest, and of others belonging to the country. Such was the situation when the trial came on ; the men were without trial discharged. So much with reference to the general course as to persons, and the result as to Bremner individually. Now, let me turn to the discussion on the method of dealing with property by the force. On the 28th of May my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) asked this question :

"Whether it is true that on the 8th of May soldiers pillaged the houses of Half-breeds, destroyed a quantity of articles belonging to them; demolished Madame Tourand's house, broke her furniture, etc., at Fish Bay; destroyed windows of Vandal's house at Gabriel's Crossing, broke up furniture, and set the house on fire; and whether the Government intend to instruct its commanding officers to take the necessary steps to prevent a repetition of such excesses and to punish those who have been guilty of them?"

The hon. Minister of Militia replied :

"It is not true. Strict orders were given by General Middleton to the force not to enter any house or touch any property, under pain of severe punishment."

Is the Commander-in-chief the only person who was exempt from those orders? Could he honestly tell the common soldiers not to do, in the height of battle, with their passions roused against the men with whom they had just been fighting, that which he felt justified in doing himself, in cold blood, for filthy lucre, after the rebellion had ended? He stands self-condemned. The Minister's reply continues :

"Official despatches received mentioned nothing about the details asked for. The intention of the Government is to allow the Commanding officer, who knows his duty as a soldier, to look after the troops under his command."

I quite agree, that having given these instructions, and assuming that they were to be carried out by the Commanding Officer, the Government were right in the position they took. On the 2nd of July, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) read from a correspondence in the *Mail* newspaper of the 19th of June, the effect of which was, that the soldiers destroyed much and took away a great deal at St. Laurent and Fish Creek from the Half-breeds' houses, of whom many were loyal, and others were dragged into the insurrection against their will, and that in spite of the strict orders given by General Middleton, the soldiers had robbed and destroyed everything they could lay their hands on ; and the hon. member for Hochelaga asked for some report on this statement. The hon. Minister of Militia replied :

"As to that part which speaks of the most stringent orders being given by General Middleton to prevent such disorders as those complained of, I have received a communication direct from the General stating that he had given the most absolute orders to that effect. I have even called his attention to the facts mentioned, and the General has answered that so far as he had been able to judge of the facts, he did not believe in these reports."

I have read from the hon. Minister's reply only an abstract of that which is material to this part of the case. Now, Sir, there you find rules laid down—rules consistent with military practice, and consistent with the honor of the Canadian militia—rules specially applicable to this case, in which these few unfortunate, misguided men, but, after all, fellow British subjects, were the persons and whose was the property in question. Now I turn to the General's own action, as stated in his evidence before the Committee. He was enquired of with reference to what took place at Batoche, and he said, on the 19th page of the report of the Committee :

"In the middle of hard fighting the men found these things, but the private houses and property of loyal people anywhere near the place was not touched. But I did not consider it was my duty to protect the property of the rebels we had just been fighting hard with."

I ask whether that is in comformity with the statement I have read. Who was to decide? The rebels did not carry their furs on their backs, or deposit them in their rifle pits. They left them in their houses. Who was to decide at that moment whose property any particular furs where, or was the process of confiscation to be performed by the common soldier, with the prize before him, by awarding to himself the property which he confiscated? We were told that strict orders had been given to prevent pillage and destruction of property ; but we find General Middleton saying :

"But I did not consider it was my duty to protect the property of the rebels that we had just been fighting with."

He grossly mistook his duty.

At page 20, with reference to the Batoche furs, the General stated that he did not himself take the furs, but was fortunate enough to obtain furs through some one unknown :

"My aide-de-camp told me that somebody had put a box on board the steamer and said it was for me. I asked him what it was, and he said it was furs. I said : Who put it on board ; and he said : I have not the slightest idea."

The General was asked who put them up for him, and he replied :

"I have not the slightest idea who put them up for me. I have not the slightest doubt it was done by some men of the force who got them, and they thought it was a nice compliment to pay me, so they put them on board. I did not want to ask about it.

This spontaneous and anonymous present of a bale of furs, known by the General to have been the result of pillage, was placed on board the steamer. He knew, he was satisfied that the men of the force had taken the furs, and he thought they were paying him a nice compliment by making him a present of some of them and putting them on board for him. They put them on board unknown to him. So much virtue must blush unseen; and he himself did not want to ask who should get the credit for it. That is the condition of things with reference to the Batoche furs. As to the Bremner furs, General Middleton was not invested with any power whatever ; he was not attempted to be invested by the Government with any power ; the instructions of the Government merely were to prevent all pillage and destruction of property ; and that was his plain and obvious and sole duty. He was invested with this power only, that of deciding whom he would send down to Regina for trial.

At page 13 of the report, his own evidence shows that, after Poundmaker had been taken, some half-breeds came from the camp. The General was told that there was some reason to believe some of the men had been rebels, as some of them had been recognised as having been at Cut Knife ; and it was reported to him that people were carrying off some of Bremner's furs, and upon that report he ordered these furs to be taken and put in the police barracks for safe keeping. These furs, I think, would have been there safely kept, if he, himself, had not later on ordered them to be taken out from the place where he had ordered them to be put by. But after ordering them to be put in the barracks for safe-keeping, he ordered them to be packed up for himself. But he says that, later on, he got further information that a rifle belonging to one of the men killed at Cut Knife had been found in Bremner's possession. That in itself, was of course, susceptible of satisfactory explanation as to Bremner's innocence, but without seeking such explanation, he ordered all these men, Bremner included, to be sent down to Regina to be tried ; and at this same time, when he was reaching this conclusion, Mr. Hayter Reed reminded him of Bremner's furs, and thereupon he ordered them to be confiscated and divided, himself taking the best. The revised letter reads :

"The General having decided to confiscate the furs now in your care and taken from rebel, desires that you should make up a select bundle of beaver and fisher for him and a selection also for those of his staff."

Now, what was this man's situation ? He was, he thought, a dictator. He had the awful power of deciding who should be sent for trial and who should be left in peace. He says :

"I thought I was the ruling power up there, owing to the state of war, that I could do pretty much as I liked as long as it was in reason."

He knew, however, that he had no power to try Bremner or to determine his guilt. He determined, therefore, to send him on for trial, as to his person ; but, at the same time, he determined to condemn and appropriate his property. He determined that there was sufficient evidence against Bremner to warrant his being tried, and he sent him to Regina for that purpose. But as regards the property, the question of innocence or guilt he put in a train of immediate adjudication by himself, and at the same instant that he was ordering the man to be tried by competent authorities as to whether he was innocent or guilty, so far as his person and life were concerned, he judged, without the slightest warrant of authority to be found anywhere, that he was guilty, so far as his property was concerned, and, so judging, he, by one single operation, confiscated and appropriated his goods for himself. He said he fully believed that having directed the confiscation of the furs belonging to a rebel, he was not exceeding his powers in ordering some for himself and some for his staff, his excuses being : "I did not think it was unreasonable to allow a few of those furs to be taken ; and again : "I might as well have some too." He directed that Bremner be sent to trial to find out whether he was guilty of being a rebel or not ; but, as regards the furs, he tried him in his own mind and adjudged him guilty, and confiscated his property. He could not confiscate Bremner himself, he could not take an eye, or a leg, or a tooth for his share of the booty, and so he sent him to Regina to take his chance. But he thought he could confiscate his furs ; and that he did without trial or proof or anything else. While he could not find Bremner guilty of being a rebel, so far as his person was concerned, he decided him to be a rebel to the extent of confiscation, and at the same instant decided to divide the spoil, and to take the lion's, or rather the wolf's share. That seems to me utterly disgraceful. I cannot, I confess, understand how it is possible that any man in the position of General Middleton could, for an instant, have allowed his moral sense to become so far blunted and confused as to have been guilty of the act he has committed. It is said that the plunderer has been plundered—that what he took from Bremner was taken from himself on the boat. I suppose whoever took it, thought he had as good a right to take it as had General Middleton. But that makes no difference. It is the disgraceful course which was taken by the General which has given rise to the whole loss. I am glad the loss has been ascertained ; and I hope the Government will see fit to take steps to see that the General makes good the loss and withdraws from our service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has, in the most interesting manner, given us a treatise upon martial law, and the important questions cognate to that subject, which the hon. gentleman has treated with that knowledge he always displays in discussions of any nature. The question, as I understand it, is perfectly stated in the report which has been submitted to the House. The report goes into the facts proven before the Committee appointed for the purpose of investigating this case. In that report it is stated, and the General, in fact, admits it in his own evidence, that the furs, which had at first been put up for safe-keeping in the police barracks at Battleford, were, upon subsequent orders sent by the General and written by Mr. Hayter Reed, distributed, two packages having been made up for the General's use and the other packages for some of the members of his staff. Now, I wish, in the very few remarks which I mean to make, to state in the most frank and open way possible that I consider the action of General Middleton is the result of a most unfortunate error of judgment on his part. It is stated in the report, and I know that when the General himself, Sir Frederick Middleton, after obtaining the information which, unfortunately for himself, he did not possess at the time, discovered that, through his error of judgment, he had committed an act which he himself to-day admits to be an illegal one, no one more than himself regretted what had been done. I state that because, in the position which I occupy in relation to that gentleman, I had occasion to hear him express the deep regret he experienced at having given the order which was given, and is known to have been given by him. It is right to be just ; it is right to be impartial, but, in dealing with a question of this kind, in dealing with a question affecting the position of a man who has rendered services to Canada, I think it is only right and proper that we should consider the attenuating circumstances—if I may so express myself—that can be brought forward. I have admitted that it was due to an unfortunate error of judgment on the part of the General that that order

was given; but, at that time, it must be remembered, the General was in the midst of preoccupations which might to a certain extent explain the want of prudence which he showed. It was on his return from Fort Pitt that this took place, and I consider that the circumstances of that time had a bearing on the case when the General himself admits that he had forgotten the circumstance—and I claim that his word must be taken on that point—that he had completely forgotten that the order had been given and that the furs had been addressed to him. But, after the order was given, it is perfectly admitted that the General saw nothing more of the furs, that he knew nothing more of them and did not receive them, and, when he returned to Ottawa, I can say, as far as my information goes, and so far as the enquiries which I thought it my duty to make, when hon. gentlemen opposite questioned me in regard to these matters, from the General himself, that he stated to me that from his memory he knew nothing about the furs, and knew nothing of what became of them, to what point they had been addressed, and had not seen them on the boat or after they got there. I admit that this is an unfortunate matter, but the General has tried, so far as he is concerned, to make up for that want of judgment or that error of judgment on his part, and has expressed his willingness to indemnify whoever is entitled to be indemnified. But, before this question is settled, I have no doubt that it will be admitted that it is important for the General to investigate the matter more fully in order to know the value of the furs which are known to have been removed by his order, and to ascertain whether these furs belonged to Mr. Bremner or not. However, I repeat that I cannot forget that the General rendered to Canada important services, and that these services were recognised by both sides of the House, and, if, in considering this matter, we can arrive at the conclusion that this was an error of judgment, and not an intentional wrong, I think we would show all the leniency, which, I consider, under the circumstances, the General would be entitled to. I repeat, from what the General has told me, that he is prepared, after a proper valuation of the furs is arrived at, to indemnify the persons who may be shown to be entitled to that portion of them which he is supposed to have removed, or which is supposed to have been removed on his order.

Mr. LISTER. Having taken upon myself the responsibility of bringing before this House the charges made against General Middleton, upon which charges the report now before the House is made, I feel it incumbent upon me to say a few words in this debate. The Minister of Militia has told the House that General Middleton is now willing to settle. When he first used these words, I took it for granted that he was willing to indemnify Bremner for the total loss he had sustained, because whatever loss he sustained there he sustained on account of the action of General Middleton. Whether General Middleton received one-eighth of the furs, or the whole of the furs, he must be held responsible for the value of the whole of them, because, if he had observed the duty he owed to himself as a General, the duty which he owed to himself as a gentleman and an honest man, he would not have been the first man to despoil Bremner of these furs and to give implied permission to the men in charge to scatter them about among the members of his staff and others who might apply for them. It is no excuse for General Middleton to come here now, and say, through the mouth of the Minister of Militia, that he is to be excused because he is willing to pay for one-eighth of the furs which were taken. My hon. friend tells us that General Middleton is now willing to settle. How is it that he has waited for five long years before saying that he is willing to settle for any portion of the furs which were taken there? For five long years, General Middleton has denied over and over again that he ever took any furs, that he ever authorised the taking of any furs, or that he knew anything of their disposition; and it is only now, when this matter has been investigated by a Committee of the House, that General Middleton is convinced that he does know something about the matter of which he has denied all knowledge for five years past. Within a few months of the close of that rebellion, the attention of the Government was called to the fact that General Middleton had taken possession of some of those furs. Again, in 1886, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) called attention to the fact that General Middleton had taken possession of those furs; and General Middleton must be taken to have known, and I have no hesitation in saying he must have known, that he was charged with this Bremner fur business. Attention was again called to it in 1887, but nothing was done because General Middleton denied that he had any knowledge of this transaction, and the Government remained inactive and took no steps to investigate the charge. Then, in 1888, this matter was brought fully before the attention of the House by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who went fully into the whole facts. He gave the letters which Hayter Reed had written under the direction of General Middleton; and from that time up to the present, no further steps were taken for the purpose of ascertaining the truth of the allegations made by him. The Government, I believe, accepted the statements made by General Middleton, that he knew nothing about the transaction. As for the report itself, it is the unanimous finding of the Committee; but I desire to say that in that report, for the purpose of having it unanimous, General Middleton has been treated with the utmost consideration. The report is mildness and gentleness in itself, and I have no hesitation in saying that, in the light of the evidence given before that Committee, the report might have been much more severe than it is. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia tells us that General Middleton acted through an error of judgment. I need only to recall the fact that the letter written by Mr. Reed contained the words "Do not make this public." Mr. Reed swears that in the letter written by order of General Middleton, he ordered the furs to be put up in cases, of which two were to be for General Middleton, one for Bedson and one for Reed, and the last words of that letter were "Do not make this public." That is sworn to by Reed distinctly and positively, as will be seen by this extract from his evidence:

"Q. The original letter contained the statement that this was not to be made public?—A. Yes.
"Q. You got the original back?—A. Yes.

"Q. Was the original torn up?—A. The original was torn up, and the formal part re-written and given back to Warden.

"Q. Why was it destroyed?—A. Because he had shown this about, apparently, and owing to this private part in it."

Then he goes on :

"Q. Did he give instructions that it should be kept private, and that that should be inserted?—A. Yes."

This is the answer of Hayter Reed. Then he goes on again, in answer to Mr. Weldon (St. John), and says :

"Q. There was nothing in that letter except what you were ordered to write?—A. No."

Then again :

"Q. Do you think the General intended it should be part of the order?—A. He desired me to send that."

So that so far as Reed was concerned he swears positively that the words, "Do not make this public," were in the original order sent to the warden. Now, General Middleton partially denied the statement, and if you take General Middleton's whole evidence you will find it is given in an uncertain way, he appears to have lost his memory entirely as to the transactions which took place. He does not make a positive denial, but he says that he has no recollection of it, and he does not believe that such words were in the order. However, we have the statement of Reed, and if that letter is correct, then I say that General Middleton knew he was guilty of a wrongful act in authorising that order to be given. If it were not so, there was no necessity to put the words in the order, "Do not make this public," because if he thought he had a right to confiscate the property, or to appropriate it, there was no necessity for taking the precaution to have the matter kept from the public, and the fact of these words being in, is proof conclusive to my mind that General Middleton felt that he was doing a wrongful act, an act which he did not wish to see the light of day. Well, Sir, when Reed went down to the Fort he found, as the member for West Durham has stated, that Warden had been making it public, and then for the purpose of protecting themselves, and for the purpose of showing the public that they did not care whether it was public or not, because they had a right to do it, he destroys the letter, and gives him another without those words in it, and in other respects somewhat changed. Now, if this evidence is to be relied upon, there can be no question that General Middleton, when he gave that order, knew that he was doing an illegal act. It is absurd for the Minister of Militia to get up here and say that a gentleman who has served in the British army for over 40 years, can be so ignorant of the regulations of that army as to pretend, for one moment, that he did not know he was violating the army regulations when he appropriated any portion of the property. General Middleton's evidence was not at all evidence that can be relied upon, and he merely says that he thought he had a right to confiscate the property, meaning that he had a right to appropriate the property of a Canadian citizen. Sir, General Middleton now admits, and he has only recently acquired the knowledge, that he had no right to confiscate, much less to appropriate, the property of this man Bremner. For five years Bremner has been pressing for the payment of this claim, for five years he has been asking the country, or some person, to pay for the property of which he was despoiled. His property was taken, and he was sent to prison and kept there for two months ; he was discharged without a trial, and he is now broken in health and living in poverty, and the Minister of Militia asks this House and this country to excuse General Middleton upon that ground. When this matter was brought to his notice, would it not have been becoming on his part to have investigated this matter, and have the wrong done to this wretched man righted, so far as it was possible for him to do ? But for five long years, General Middleton has denied all knowledge of this man Bremner, he has denied having taken these furs, and in that way he has kept the Government from acting. In 1885 this claim was presented to the Government. In 1886 the attention of the Government was called to it by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) ; in 1888 the attention of the Government was again called to it by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), upon which occasion the Minister of Justice used these words :

"I do not, for a moment, put against the claim for furs which may have been deposited with officers of the Government, the mere fact that they belonged to persons who were implicated in the rebellion."

He further says :

"I ask the House, therefore, to understand that as regards that claim the enquiry has not been concluded and will be pursued."

The Minister of Justice used these words in the Session of 1888, on the motion of my hon. friend from West Ontario. Since 1888, up to the present Session of Parliament, I am not in a position to know what, if anything, the Government did towards having this claim investigated. I do know, however, that this claim has not been paid, that Bremner has never received any satisfaction from the Government ; I do know that in consequence of the want of action on the part of the Government I was induced to take this matter up for this unfortunate man, and present it to this House, and ask that a committee of enquiry be appointed. Sir, I am bound to say that when this matter was first submitted to me, it seemed incredible that a gentleman occupying the high position of General Middleton in the British army, a gentleman occupying the position of Commander of the Canadian forces, could so far have forgotten the Queen's Regulations, could have been so destitute of that ordinary feeling of humanity which animates almost every man, as to have despoiled that miserable individual named Bremner of his property ; I am bound to say I felt an hesitation in taking this matter up. I knew well the great responsibility I was assuming in making a charge of that kind against a gentleman in his exalted position. But when the truths were told me, when I had the evidence before me, when I had the opportunity to investigate the matter I found that a great and grievous wrong had been done to a citizen of my country ; and I deemed I owed it to myself and to the people at large that I should not hesitate a single moment in laying this matter before Parliament, let the consequences to myself be what they may. I well remember the Montreal *Gazette* coming out and saying that the charge I made against General Middleton was a serious one, but it was no more serious than the one against a member of Parliament who dared to make it, unless he was able to prove the truth of his charge. I regret, on General Middleton's account, that he should have

been guilty of such conduct as this; I rejoice on account of the unfortunate man whose cause I have advocated that he is now within a measurable distance, at all events, of receiving some compensation for the gross wrong done him. He has maintained from the very outset that he was an innocent man, and he contended that he was never guilty of an act of rebellion against the Dominion of Canada; and he has told me that not only did he lose these valuable furs, but at the time of the rebellion he was practically a wealthy man, being the owner of cattle, horses and so on, and yet to-day he is living in a condition of abject poverty, his health broken down, and if an immediate settlement of this matter is not insisted on by the Government they will not be doing what we have a right to expect them to do under the circumstances. I charged General Middleton with taking from Bremner a large quantity of furs placed in store at Battleford, with having appropriated and used the furs for his own use; and in making that statement I read the following letter:—

"DEAR WARDEN,—General Middleton has instructed and authorised me to send you the present letter desiring that you put up bales of furs for the undermentioned: two bales for General Middleton, one for S. L. Bedson, and one for myself. Please select the best and pack them at once, as we will be down there to-morrow by boat.

"HAYTER REED,
"*Assistant Commissioner of Indians.*"

Upon the strength of that letter, which I satisfied myself was reasonably correct, I made the charge which I did make against General Middleton, and upon the trial of this case it was admitted that the copy of the letter was substantially a copy of the original. General Middleton, on that investigation being made, put in the plea, which he now submits to the House through the Minister of Militia, that he had confiscated the furs, that he believed he had a right to do it, and that it was only recently he learned he had no right. The General admits that he had not, and never had a right to confiscate the furs. The General did not believe, however, that he had the right to confiscate the furs at the time he did so. The letter written by Mr. Hayter Reed, by direction of General Middleton, the contents of which were known to General Middleton, as was sworn to by Mr. Reed, makes it clear that the General knew that at the time that letter was written he had no right to appropriate the furs which belonged to Bremner. Mr. Reed's conduct was not as frank as we had a right to expect from him, because all through the investigation he never gave the Committee to understand that a letter had been substituted for the original letter, the fact being that Mr. Reed wrote a letter containing the words "not to be made public," but that afterwards he got the letter back from Warden and gave Warden an ordinary order as a voucher. This did not come out voluntarily on the part of Mr. Reed. This was forced out in the course of cross-examination, and this fact, sworn to by Mr. Reed, an unwilling witness, one desirous of protecting himself as well as General Middleton, and not distinctly and positively contradicted by General Middleton, must be accepted as a fact; and if we are to accept it, then General Middleton knew as well as Mr. Reed that what they were doing was an illegal act. I say, therefore, that in the report we might well have found that General Middleton, at the time he confiscated those furs, knew he was guilty of an illegal act; and it is inconceivable that an officer of 40 years' service in the British army, one occupying one of the highest positions in the force, should pretend that he was without knowledge as to one of the first army regulations. It is inconceivable and certainly difficult to believe that an officer in the position of General Middleton could have been stating exactly the reverse of what he believed to be true. Taking his large experience, his great knowledge of military matters, and with these letters before the Committee, they might well have found that General Middleton, at the time he appropriated those furs, knew he had no right either to confiscate them or to appropriate them. This transaction from the beginning to the end is a discreditable one in the extreme. It is a discreditable one on the part of General Middleton. It is scarcely to be understood that a man occupying a high official position as he did, should have taken advantage of his position, knowing the wretched, poverty stricken condition of the men whom he was sent to the North-West to put down; it is almost incredible that an officer occupying so high a position should have forgotten the duty he owed to himself, the duty he owed to the Government that employed him, the duty he owed to the people of the country in which he lived, as to have appropriated and looted property from a citizen of this country under such circumstances as I have described. So far as General Middleton is concerned, his usefulness in this country is gone. It is the duty of the Government to intimate to him that his services are no longer required. It cannot be said that in this country that a public officer will be retained in his position after having been guilty of such an act; and no matter what the consequences to him may be, we have our rights to maintain, and absolute and full justice must be meted out to him.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not rise to say one word in justification of General Middleton's conduct in respect of this transaction. I entirely endorse what I must say I conceive to be the very severe strictures expressed in the report in regard to his conduct, that his conduct was unwarrantable, illegal and highly improper. But I must say that I do not like to kick a man when he is down, and I think it would have been better if the hon. gentleman who has just spoken had to-day pursued in this House the same course he pursued during the investigation, which I must say was worthy of all praise. The hon. gentleman has allowed his feelings rather to get the better of him on this occasion, and he has pushed a little too hardly a man who is in a certain sense, *in extremis*. The statement that has been made with respect to this portion of the letter in which Mr. Hayter Reed stated that it would be well that this matter should be kept secret or quiet—the statement made by the hon. member in regard to that, while it may be perfectly true so far as Mr. Reed is concerned, is scarcely true in so far as the General is concerned. This is what General Middleton said in reference to that. He said:

"I would like to say that I perfectly agree with all Mr. Reed has said, with the exception of that part where he intimated that I directed him to say it should be kept quiet. I certainly never directed him to put that in the letter, to the best of my belief; neither did I think it necessary."

Then he goes on to say :

"Had I seen the thing, I certainly should not have let it go."

He was asked by Mr. Kirkpatrick, again :

"Was it not an ordinary tent?"

To which he replies :

"The Adjutant had a tent there; however, I dare say he did write the letter in my tent."

Mr. Wood asks him :

"The part you would object to would be the private part?—A. I did not instruct him to keep it quiet.

Mr. Wood asks :

"You would not have let it go?—A. No, not that part."

There is no question at all that the General's mind seems to have been confused from first to last, with regard to the whole of this transaction. He has not a clear recollection of any part of the matter, so far as we could discover, and he is very cautious in what he says, lest he makes a statement which is not correct. However, General Middleton, when he is brought up to the point, declares more than once, in the most emphatic manner, that if he had known this clause was in the letter, he would not have allowed the letter to go. I think my hon. friend should have given the General credit for that statement, and it was hardly fair, I think, to put it in the way in which he did. We ought also to recollect that orders were given that there should be receipts given for, or a memorandum made, of all the furs that were disposed of. That, at all events, of itself, should go a long way to show that there could be no intention on the part of the General to keep this secret, because he ordered that receipts should be taken and a memorandum made of the furs which were so disposed of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He could not have got them otherwise.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not quite understand what my hon. friend means by that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I mean to say that he could not have got them from Warden without giving a receipt.

Mr. McNEILL. I think if Warden had got the order he would have handed the furs over, whether there was a receipt or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The order itself would have been a receipt.

Mr. McNEILL. In point of fact, the receipts were not given in all cases, but in this case the order was given that receipts should be taken.

Mr. LISTER. Look at page 17 of the evidence, as to what he says :

"Q. Did you authorise anybody to give a receipt for them?—A. I do not know. I think when I told them they could take the furs, I rather think I told them also they would have to give a receipt."

Mr. McNEILL. Look at page 23 and you will find Mr. Reed says :

"I further requested Warden to take a receipt, or to make a memorandum of who got the furs and the quantity."

If the General is to be held responsible for what Mr. Reed did in the one case, it is only fair he should be held responsible for what he does in the other. Fair play is a jewel. I think the action of the General, on this occasion, was just as we described it, to be highly improper and quite unjustifiable—but I do think we ought to endeavor not to strain too far the case which is brought against him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) would have exercised a wiser discretion if he left the matter in the hands of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). That hon. gentlemen took great care to express his views on the matter, and certainly he did so in a spirit of justice, not with any desire to shield General Middleton, and therefore the hon. member for Lambton might well have left the case in his hands. The hon. member for Lambton brought the matter before this House. He had a perfect right to do so, and he was perfectly justified in doing so. He was present at the meetings of the Committee, which was composed of gentlemen in every way competent to deal with a case of this kind, and who went very carefully into the matter. They were unanimous in their finding, and the report therefore comes before this House as a judgment given without regard to political considerations, by gentlemen sitting on both sides of this House, who were animated with the spirit of doing justice to the wronged party, Mr. Bremner, and the accused, Sir Frederick Middleton. I do not think, therefore, the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) was justified in making the statement that the report ought to have been more severe ; that it was a judgment of compromise, and was not, therefore, a just judgment.

Mr. LISTER. I did not say that. I said the report might have been more severe.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said the report was a matter of compromise and might have been more severe, but if it was a matter of compromise, and not the deliberate conviction of every hon. member who agreed to that report, it would not be a report to be relied upon. I think that statement of the hon. member is an aspersion on the Committee. With respect to the case itself, I am inclined to think that the want of judgment as to the confiscation has more weight than would be ordinarily given to it. It is quite true that Sir Frederick Middleton is an officer of great experience, but if you consider the experience that he has had both in China and in India, perhaps looking at the facts as they occurred, and the incidents in these two wars, you will find that there was a good deal of practical confiscation. However, in this case, the General was decidedly in the wrong. My hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) has proved beyond a doubt, if proof were required, that Sir Frederick Middleton's conduct deserves the verdict which has been passed upon it, and passed upon it, I think, in as strong language as could well be used. It is quite clear that the General acted wrongly and illegally and that the strong language of the Committee was perfectly justified. Still, I would be charitable enough to believe that the confiscation of the goods was an error of judgment ; but as to the appropriation of the goods, it seems to me, that was not an error of judgment. That was an illegal and improper act, and it cannot be defended. Upon these grounds, I think that the report ought to be unanimously adopted by this House. The whole tenor of the argument of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) was to the effect that the report did not go far enough, and that it should be amended. I think it is very fortunate,

in order to give great weight to the judgment of the Committee, that it should be accepted by the House almost without debate.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before this discussion closes, I desire to say one word. I entirely concur in the last remarks made by the hon. First Minister. I think there was a desire on the part of the Committee, not to put the General in a worse position than he occupied, but rather to see that justice was done on both sides. We have to consider not only the General, but Bremner. I am glad to see that there is a disposition on the part of the General to indemnify Bremner for part of his loss; but suppose General Middleton indemnifies him for one-eighth of his loss, what is to become of the balance? I contend that the Government are responsible for the acts of their officers, and should, therefore, be primarily responsible for the loss; and if they can recover one-eighth of the value of the furs from General Middleton, they would be saving so much. The Committee have found that the value of the furs lost was $4,374.66, and taking the statement that was made on behalf of Bremner, they have agreed that $4,500 is a fair valuation of his total loss. Therefore, I conclude that the Government should be bound to reimburse Bremner his loss above the portion which General Middleton is willing to make good. As a matter of equity, I think Bremner ought to be indemnified at once without delay, and the General ought to find means to reimburse him as soon as possible for the furs which he took for himself. If he had come before the Committee and had acknowledged at the beginning that he had done wrong, and was willing to repair the loss, it would have been better; that was the time for him to do so. On the contrary, he did not do it; but he comes now at the last moment and offers to do it. But it is better late than never. On the whole, I think the House and the Government ought to see that Bremner is indemnified as soon as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened to the statements made on this subject with a great deal of interest, because I think this is a question that demands the closest scrutiny and attention, and the decided action of Parliament. It is a question in which the honor of the country, the honor of Parliament, and the honor of the Government particularly, is involved. The right hon. First Minister, as well as the hon. Minister of Militia have endeavored to palliate the conduct of General Middleton. It is all very well to say that General Middleton expropriated or looted these furs in ignorance of what his powers and rights were; and the hon. gentleman who has endeavored to make an excuse for him says that he performed very distinguished services in India, where, I understood him to say, the practice of looting prevailed at one time. My hon. friend says that he served his country with honor and credit in India, and that he is a very brave man. The bravery of General Middleton has never been disputed. We do know, however, that the storming of the rifle pits was not done by General Middleton, but that a man who was a member of this House had the honor of storming those pits after General Middleton had lain inactive before them for several days. In this matter I do not think we should make any difference between General Middleton and the meanest private, except in this respect: that if if we admit any extenuating circumstances, they would apply rather to an uneducated, ignorant private in the army than to a General who ought to know the Articles of War, who ought to know what his powers and duties are, who ought to know, at any rate, what an honest man should do. It is said that General Middleton did not know of that paragraph in the letter which has been referred to. Well, we have the evidence of Mr. Hayter Reed, whatever his evidence is worth, who was *particeps criminis* in the taking of these furs, but who afterwards, believing he had done wrong, returned them. He says he received instructions from the General that silence should be kept in the matter, and that subsequently the General altered the order when he found that silence was not being kept. What is the meaning of that? Why should he ask that silence should be kept? The fact is that a General commanding the force of this country deliberately appropriated, in defiance of law and the practice of war, the property of a poor unfortunate man, who may or may not have been guilty of rebellion. The fact came out in the evidence, that this man Bremner, instead of having engaged in the rebellion, was forced by the Indian Chief Poundmaker into his camp. One thing is clear, the General got those furs.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say yes. He ordered them to be put on board the steamer on which he himself travelled, and they were put on board. The only evidence we have that he did not get the furs was his simple statement that he did not; and what other evidence have we before us that warrants us in concluding that he did not get them? If a man commits a burglary, and while taking the swag to his own place, finds a policeman in the way, and drops his bag and makes off, is that any excuse for him? No. The General got those furs; they were put on the steamer by his orders. Whether they arrived in Ottawa and were put into the hands of a furrier here, as alleged, is not for us to enquire. The simple fact is that General Middleton gave orders to Mr. Hayter Reed to take charge of these furs, and that was the crime. There is no evidence but the authority of the General's own statement, which may, under the circumstances, go for what it is worth, that the furs were not in his possession, and that he did not receive the proceeds and the benefits arising from their sale or use. It is no ordinary question. The right hon. the First Minister says that he adopts the report. Yes, that is an absolute necessity. But I go further, and I place upon the responsibility of the Government their positive duty to tell this House what action they are going to take. It is their duty to compel the General to refund the money and to dismiss him from the command of the military force of Canada—to report him to the Horse Guards; and if the latter do not give him his dismissal, they will not be doing what is incumbent on them as the guardians of the honor and public faith of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to misrepresent me as he does, when he says that I have endeavored to extenuate the conduct of General Middleton. On the contrary, I have stated in the most explicit terms that

I thought the report, which is a severe condemnation of his conduct, should be adopted. That is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman's allegation. It is true I stated I was charitable enough to believe that General Middleton might have supposed he had the right, as an act of war, to confiscate these goods, but that there could be no defence for their appropriation, even if they were legally confiscated, for his own use. Therefore the hon. gentleman did not truly state what I said. The hon. gentleman now wishes to hold the Government responsible for not stating what action will be taken in this matter. The Government could not take any action until this report was passed upon by the House of Commons, and when the House has passed upon it, it will then be the duty of the Government to consider what it is their duty to do.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has said that I did not truly state his attitude, when I alleged that he extenuated the conduct of the General. The hon. gentleman's own explanation, in answer to my remarks, is an extenuation of General Middleton's conduct. I admitted that he said the report should be adopted by this House unanimously ; but has he not just now, as well as before, endeavored to extenuate the conduct of the General ? He further has said that I have put upon him the responsibility of saying how General Middleton would be dealt with. Well, I hold that it is the duty of the Government, in so grave a case, when the report is being adopted, to come down at once and state the opinion of the Administration upon it, and the action they intend to take ; and in not doing so, they have failed in their duty.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not desire to add to what has been said on this subject, were it not for the statement just made by the Minister of Militia with regard to the intention of the Government. I am quite prepared to believe that General Middleton acted on an error of judgment ; but if he is going to do what is suggested by the Minister of Militia, it seems to me he is going to commit another error of judgment. He is answerable for the full measure of the wrong that has been inflicted on Charles Bremner. No other compensation than this will satisfy the end of justice ; but I understood the Minister of Militia to state that General Middleton was to hold a sort of enquiry to ascertain what had been packed for him, and when he had found that out, he would tender the money to Bremner. This would be no palliation at all of the offence ; it would be no compensation for the great wrong done. The only satisfaction that Bremner can and must have, is that he shall be restored all the furs taken from him or compensated in money for those which are not returned. I do not intend to press this matter further, but I hope that full justice will be done ; and if it be not, I intend to bring the matter up again in another session.

Mr. GIROUARD. I may be allowed, as one of the members of the Committee, to offer a few remarks. The Committee did not at all go into the question as to what course the Government are going to pursue, and I am not going to trouble myself about that question just now. We were instructed to enquire into the facts, and we did so, and reported on them to the best of our knowledge and belief. The only difference of opinion was as to whether General Middleton knew that the few words "Do not make this public" were put in the first letter. Mr. Hayter Reed says he was directed by the General to put those words in the first order. General Middleton says not. Considering the two contradictory statements, the Committee unanimously came to the conclusion that they could not report that the General had given instructions to put these words in the first order. It is possible Mr. Reed got the first order back, in order to excuse himself, as he had put words in without the knowledge of the General. Having the statement of Mr. Reed on the one side and that of General Middleton on the other, we could not pronounce upon it. I believe it is quite unfair to reject the statement of the General. The hon. member for Northumberland said that General Middleton got the furs, that they were put on the steamer that was going down to Winnipeg, on board of which General Middleton was. There is no proof whatever that General Middleton knew that the furs were on board. Mr. Reed does not say he knew it, and General Middleton says he did not know it. Upon those points I wish to call the attention of the House to the statement of General Middleton :

"I perfectly agree with all that Mr. Reed has said with the exception of that part where he intimated that I directed him to say that it should be kept quiet. * * I did not hear or see what he had written * * Had I seen the thing, I certainly would not have let it go."

In another passage of his statement, he says that the furs were put on board the steamer without his knowledge.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see that it makes any difference whether General Middleton did get the furs or not. His own statement is, that he did get furs, but he does not know if they were the same or not. However, I do not see that it makes any difference, since the fact is proven, by the General's own admission, that he ordered the furs to be sent to him. And whether he got them or not it does not matter. I cannot help saying, that the conduct of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and different members of the Government, in trying to make out that General Middleton's crime is something less than it really is—something less than violent theft—is not creditable to them, to this House or to the country. This is not a case at all comparable to a case of private wrong committed by one man against another. The wrong was not done to Bremner merely. The wrong was of such a kind that, if a disturbance unfortunately should arise again in that country, it might be committed over again. The only way to prevent crimes of this nature is to apply sharp and severe punishment in the first instance, and, when the Minister of Militia and the leader of the Government attempt to palliate this conduct by saying that it is only an error of judgment as to the powers of confiscation which he thought he possessed, the criminal is only encouraged in his action. It is an absurd suggestion in regard to a general commanding an army. Either General Middleton did know the articles of war, as probably he did; either he did know that he was committing an illegal act, as probably he did, from his experience in the army ; or, if he did not, it is absurd that he should fill the position he does, and it would be worse, it would make the Government *particeps criminis* with him, to endeavor to say

that he is to go unpunished. I agree with my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in saying that the man ought not only to be dismissed from his position, but ought to be reported to the Horse Guards and disgraced in every possible way, in the same manner as any other criminal. The House will remember the case of General Luard, another commander-in-chief, who, simply on account of some unfortunate utterances at a mess dinner, when he was inspecting one of our battalions, had steps taken against him which led to his leaving the country practically in disgrace. That General's successor has now done what we have been talking about, and it is the duty of the Government to see that a measure of actual punishment suitable to his crime shall be applied to him. The leader of the Government claimed that the Government could do nothing until the House had taken action upon this matter. The House took action as far back as the 31st March, 1886, when it ordered a return of "all horses, ponies, cattle, furs, waggons, carts and other property seized by the Mounted Police or Expeditionary Force, while on service in the North-West, between 27th March and 1st August, with the disposition made of the same, the names of persons from whom such seizures were made, and the amount (if any) paid, received, or now payable or receivable, on account of such property." I call the attention of the House to the meagre answer which was given to that return. The Minister of Militia brought down in answer one letter from General Middleton, directed to the officers commanding the North-West Mounted Police, Battleford:

"It would be advisable to take in charge all the property of all those half-breeds now at Battleford, who lately delivered themselves up from rebel camp, until their innocence is proved, there being strong doubts on the loyalty of the whole of them."

He directed the confiscation of all the property of all the Half-breeds until their innocence was proved, instead of taking measures to see that their guilt was proved. That is an inversion of English law which is remarkable. That is the only return the Minister of Militia brought down in response to the Order of the House four years ago, and he has not had the ordinary courtesy to answer the Order of the House so far as to bring down what was ordered, or to give any subsequent explanations. The Government knew that there was a feeling for the last four years in regard to the stealing of this property, but it was not until an investigation was forced upon the Government that they took any action in the matter, and they are to blame, first, for appointing this man, and secondly, for not taking action before this, and for their neglect in these respects they will be held responsible by the country.

Mr. McNEILL. On behalf of the Committee, I do not wish the House to suppose that any member of the Committee supposed that the accidental fact that the furs were not received by General Middleton made any difference at all. We found that the appropriation had been made, and we condemned the appropriation.

Report concurred in.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 154) respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Foster.)

TELEGRAPH LINE ON THE NORTH SHORE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether the Government are aware of the importance to our fishermen of extending, as soon as may be, to Natashquan the telegraph line now being constructed on the north shore of the St. Lawrence? If so, is it their intention to push on the work this year to that point?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the hon. member, I will say that the Government are aware of the importance of extending the telegraph line in that direction; but they have not the intention to push on the work this year.

IMPERIAL PENNY POSTAGE.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, Whether the Postmaster General has received any communications from the Imperial Federation League in Canada, from the Boards of Trade of Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, St. Thomas, St. John, N. B., Vancouver, and other corporations, urging the necessity of the adoption of a penny postage system for the British Empire, and what action, if any, has been taken or is contemplated thereon?

Mr. HAGGART. The Postmaster General has received communications from these bodies, and the matter is at present under the consideration of the Government.

MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that, tomorrow, the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, on the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from the western end of the 30 miles subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, towards Ottawa, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Waterloo Junction Railway Company, for 11 miles of their railway, from Waterloo to Elmira, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $35,200.

To the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company, for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Act 45 Victoria, chapter 14, and 46 Victoria, chapter 25, not exceeding in the whole $600.

For a railway from Woodstock *via* London to Chatham, in the Province of Ontario, 80 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 10, for a railway from Ingersoll *viâ* London to Chatham, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $256,000.

To the St. Catharines and Niagara Railway Company, for 14 miles of their railway, from the eastern end of the 20 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, to Hamilton, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $44,800.

To a railway from Ottawa to Morrisburg, 52 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $166,400.

To the Erie and Huron Railway Company, for 22 miles of their railway, from Petrolea *viâ* Oil Spring to Dresden, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for a railway from Brockville to Westport, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, not exceeding in the whole $83,000.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Little Current to the Algoma Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a

subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company, for 5 miles of their railway, being a branch from the main line of railway to the Kakabeka Falls, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $16,000.

To the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, for 50 miles of their railway, on a line to be fixed by the Governor General in Council, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000.

To the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company, for 16 miles of their railway, from Bobcaygeon to the Midland Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 36 miles of their railway, from the north-east end of the 20 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, to Smith's Falls, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $115,200.

To the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Egansville to Barry's Bay, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Bay of Quinté and Lake Nipissing Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Belleville to Bridgewater, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company, for 3½ miles of their railway, from the town of St. Stephen to the town of Milltown, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $11,200.

To the Woodstock and Centreville Railway Company, for 6 miles of their railway, from the western end of the 20 miles subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, to the International Boundary between the Province of New Brunswick and the State of Maine, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $19,200.

For a railway from a point at or near Fredericton, to a point on the New Brunswick Railway west of Westfield Station, 30 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

To the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, for 4½ miles of their railway, the distance which the previous subsidy granted is short of covering, from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $14,400.

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for 70 miles of their railway, from St. Jérôme, northwesterly towards Désert, in the Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 10, a subsidy not exceeding $5,161 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $361,270.

Provided, that the subsidy hereby granted to the Montreal and Western Railway Company may be paid by instalments on the completion of each section of the railway, as follows, that is to say:

SECTIONS.	Approximate length in Miles.
St. Jérôme to Shawbridge	8
Shawbridge to St. Sauveur	4
St. Sauveur to Ste. Adèle	6
St. Adèle to Lac à la Fourche	6
Lac à la Fourche to Ste. Agathe	6½
Ste. Agathe to St. Faustin	14
St. Faustin to St. Jovite	7½
St. Jovite to Summit Lake	8
Summit Lake to La Chute aux Iroquois	7
La Chute aux Iroquois towards Désert	3

Such instalments to be proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established as aforesaid.

For 75 miles of the railway from Shelburne, in the County of Shelburne, and from Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, to Annapolis, in the Province of Nova Scotia, to be so contracted for as to secure the construction to both Shelburne and Liverpool, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $240,000.

To the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, for 50 miles of their railway, from Port Hawkesbury to Broad Cove, a subsidy not exceeding $1,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $50,000.

To the International Railway Company, for a railway from Sherbrooke to the International Boundary, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 46 Victoria, chapter 25, not exceeding in the whole $3,840.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

For completing the Montreal and Sorel Railway from St. Lambert to Sorel, $40,000.

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for 7½ miles of their railway, from Hull to Aylmer, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $24,000.

To the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company, for 3½ miles of their railway, the distance which the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 10, is short of covering from St. Félix to Lake Maskinongé, in the Parish of St. Gabriel, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $10,200.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for a bridge over the Nicolet River, and also a bridge on the St. Francis River, a subsidy of 15 per cent. on the value of the structures, not to exceed $37,500.

To the Drummond County Railway Company, for 24 miles of their railway, from Drummondville to St. Rosaire, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $76,800.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from at or near Montcalm to the Canadian Pacific Railway between Joliette and St. Félix de Valois, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Lake Temiscamingue Colonisation Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from the northern end of the 15 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, to the Long Sault, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

To the Mount Oxford Railway Company, for 21 miles of their railway, between Lawrenceville and Kingsbury, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $67,200.

To the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from the northern end of the 15 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, towards the point of St. Michel des Saints, on the River Mattawa, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from the Canadian Pacific Railway, on a line to be fixed by the Governor General in Council, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company, for 18 miles of their railway, from Valleyfield to Huntingdon, on the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $57,600.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for 90 miles of their railway, from St. Francis Station on the Quebec Central Railway to a point on the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, near Moose River, or from a point on the Quebec Central Railway between the Chaudière River and King Station, to a point on the International Railway at or near Lake Megantic, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $21,191.54 per annum for twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period, as interest on the bonds of the company, such annual subsidy for twenty years representing a grant in cash of $288,000.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for a railway bridge over the St. Charles River, to give access to the City of Quebec, a subsidy not to exceed in the whole $30,000; also for 12 miles of their railway from Lorette *viâ* Charlesbourg, to Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $68,400.

For a railway from Summerside to Richmond Bay, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, 3 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $9,600.

To the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Company, for 35 miles of their railway, from the outlet of Kootenay Lake to a point on the Columbia River, as near as practicable to the junction of the Kootenay and Columbia Rivers, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor to exceed in the whole $112,000.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway through the Stewiacke Valley, on a line which will afford facilities of communication with the iron mines, Springside, Upper Stewiacke, and Mosquodoboit settlements, 25 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 10, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $80,000.

For a railway from Fredericton to the Village of Prince William, in the Province of New Brunswick, 22 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria,

chapter 10, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for 22 miles of their railway from the Village of Prince William towards the Town of Woodstock, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

2. *Resolved*, The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies respectively: the other subsidies, including subsidies granted for railways over a line extending beyond a point to which any company hereinbefore mentioned by name is authorised to construct their railway, shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of July next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, except the Erie and Huron Railway, which shall be completed within two years from the first day of July next; and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications, and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specifying an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed, in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidised, except as regards the Erie and Huron Railway Company upon which payment shall be made only upon the completion of the work, except, also, as regards the subsidies to the Inverness and Richmond Railway, which shall be paid on the completion of each 10 mile section, in accordance, as nearly as practicable, with the agreement between the company and the Municipality of Inverness, and with section four of the Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, 1890, intituled: "An Act to enable the County of Inverness to borrow money;" except, also, as regards the subsidies to the Great Eastern Railway Company for bridges over the Nicolet and St. Francis Rivers, and to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company for the bridge over the St. Charles River, upon which shall be paid fifteen per cent. of the value of work done, on monthly progress estimates certified by the Chief Engineer, and upon the approval of the Minister of Railways and Canals; and excepting also the subsidy granted to the Quebec Central Railway Company, the first annual payment upon which shall be made at the end of twelve months from the date of the Chief Engineer's certificate of the completion of the work, and each subsequent payment at the end of each twelve months thereafter, for the term of twenty years.

3. *Resolved*, The granting of such subsidies to the companies mentioned respectively shall be subject to such condition for securing running powers or traffic arrangement or other rights, as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those subsidised, as the Governor in Council determines.

He said: There are mistakes in two of the items here, therefore I have given notice of a separate motion in which the mistakes will be corrected.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman state to which resolutions he refers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Instead of the Oxford Railway Company, for 21 miles between Lawrenceville and Kingsbury, in Quebec, it should be the Orford Mountain Railway Company, 31 miles, from Eastman to Kingsbury. Then there is the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from the Canadian Pacific Railway; it should be the Grand Trunk Railway. Then there are two more resolutions which do not appear in this list—from Edmundston to St. Francis River, and the Tobique Valley Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. Are these two additional grants the whole that are to be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Roads and Bridges—Iron bridge over the Grand River at York..... $20,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By reason of certain works in connection with the Welland Canal, the water has increased in height and has extended on both sides of the river, increasing the width to such a degree as to compel the municipality to build much wider bridges than otherwise would have been necessary. The municipality has at different times petitioned the Government, stating that they had been obliged to build a bridge at double the cost which would otherwise have been necessary. Besides that, it was represented that inasmuch as a new bridge was to be built at another place, the municipality stated, after some correspondence, that they would abandon their claim for the half of the bridge they were building and their claim for damages, if the Government would build a new bridge. An estimate was made on both sides, and it was found that by building a new bridge, the Government would lose nothing, and that, as the municipality was really abandoning a portion of their claim, it was better to build one bridge than to pay half of one bridge and half of another. Under these circumstances, this amount of $20,000 has been put in the Estimates, and it will cover the cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long since this claim was first presented to the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was in June, 1887. There may have been demands made upon the Government before that time, but that is the information I have.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Welland Canal was constructed a long time ago, and did this backing up of water on the Grand River take place when that canal was first built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This has been a standing grievance to the people, who have complained bitterly about it. A commission was appointed by my Department three years ago, and they reported that evidence showed that since the destruction of the last bridge, population had decreased 50 per cent. for the reason that business had fallen off in the same proportion, that the value of real estate had become merely nominal, and for about three months in the year it was impossible to cross the river, that half the population used to live on the south side of the river at times when it was impossible to carry their mail matter to them without great danger to life. It is impossible to cross the river, and residents must drive seventeen miles to get to York. In

the spring time, owing to the water backing up, the people were obliged to make a detour of eleven miles, instead of going five miles of the ordinary road. This bridge would enable the people to cross to the south side, where the land is higher and unaffected by the rise of the water, and the distance would be the regular five miles.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long have the people been affected by the rise of the water?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Several years.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is in the County of Haldimand?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it, that after the people have been in that position several years, this matter has been taken up lately?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The people felt they must have a bridge. They built a bridge two or three years ago, but it was not adequate for the requirements, and another was required for a different part of the municipality.

Mr. McMULLEN. How far above the Welland Canal has the bridge been erected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The dam is built at Dunnville.

Mr. McMULLEN. Other parts of the county, no doubt, suffered for lack of bridge accommodation. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do in the case of those people?

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that this bridge is to make an easier communication between Dunnville and Ottawa.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If another case of this kind was well founded, I suppose it would have to be decided in the same way; but each case must be decided on its own merits.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has not told us what he proposes to do in these other cases. He says complaints have been made for a number of years; we have not heard of those complaints.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The municipality was obliged to build a bridge at Cayuga. An extra cost on account of the water being raised by the dam was necessary, amounting to $18,000. Other claims were made on account of the banks being flooded, and the Government decided to build a bridge, the municipality abandoning all further claims against the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a most improvident action on the part of the Government. It is simply asking all the people along the Grand River to apply to the Government to have bridges built, and the Government will be unable to refuse those applications. This principle has been virtually admitted. And the people will secure those bridges provided they elect supporters of the Government. If this particular place had not sent a Government representative, it would still be without a Government bridge. That is the action of the Public Works Department in regard to building bridges, post offices and other works. Are other people suffering by the backing up of water as well as the people of Haldimand?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not heard of others suffering.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The necessity for the building of the bridge has arisen quite recently. The dam thrown across Grand River is at the entrance to the feeder, and this was necessary in order to throw more water into the feeder; and the water not only at Dunnville but all along the line of the river has risen, and claims have been made and settled by the Government for submerged lands. This dam is not at the Welland Canal, but it is built, as I have said, at the entrance to the feeder.

Mr. McMULLEN. How far does it back up?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I cannot say, as I never was up the river, but the dam is several miles up.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears on account of the dam that the bridge becomes a necessity, and it seems to be more of necessity because the constituency has sent a supporter of the Government here. The water backed up, and then the constituency backed up the Government, and sent them a supporter here, which I suppose accounts for the bridge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter came up some two or three years ago, and it was discussed last year when the member for Haldimand was Mr. Colter. At that time he presented the matter very strongly, and he called for the papers which were laid before the House. If I am well informed, Mr. Colter being a lawyer, gave his opinion that these people had a right to claim an indemnity from the Government or to have a bridge built, on account of the damage done to the municipality.

Mr. MITCHELL. I might suggest to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who has been always friendly inclined to myself, that the fact is, because Mr. Colter was opposed to the Government, he could not get the bridge built, but now that a man of the right stripe is in for the constituency, he can have the bridge built. While I am on my feet, I would like to make a few remarks about my own county, On account of the friendship which the hon. Minister of Public Works has shown me, and the friendship I have always felt for him, I have indulged in the vain hope for the last four years that some improvements would be attended to in my county. I asked for a wharf at Baie du Vin, which my hon. friend promised me for three successive years, but I believe he cannot get it, owing to the policy which I indicated the other night: that the Government will not do anything at the request of a man who is opposed to them, and who does not vote for them through thick and thin, right or wrong, on all occasions. Notwithstanding the good intentions of the hon. gentleman to myself, and to the loyal county which I represent, I cannot get this necessary work done. The hon. Minister was sound enough in lip promises, but he failed me entirely when it came to the Estimates. I also asked for an appropriation to improve a very important section of the river called Neguac, and my hon. friend was kind enough to say that he would have the matter considered and brought before his colleagues, but when it comes to the Estimates the appropriation is not there. For the last three years, also, I have made a very pressing request to get dredged the bar of the Miramichi River, the

second greatest river in our Province. When I supported the Government in old days—as I was about to say I regret I did—I got that bar dredged, but owing to the larger class of steamers which come in there now, we require additional depth of water. My hon. friend has expressed the best intentions in the world towards getting this work done, but we know there is a certain place paved with good intentions. The hon. gentleman always meets me with the courtesy characteristic of the heroic race to which he and I belong at election time, and tells me he believes the work is necessary and that he will get a report from the engineers and lay it before Council. It comes before the Council, but when we get the Estimates I find that Miramichi is left out. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman would carry out these necessary works if it were left to his own action, but he has got so many colleagues adverse to me, who have laid down the principle that they will not vote money for any county which does not support the Government, that his opinion is probably overruled by them. I find that it is an almost hopeless task to get these improvements until we get a change of Government, and I am looking forward to that occurring at an early date. Unless the hon. Minister gives me a public pledge here that these works will be carried out, I have very little hope of getting them until there is a change of Government, which I shall do all in my power to bring about.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the House should be informed why this work, which is said to be so necessary at the present time, was not carried out when there was an appropriation asked for it three years ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government wanted the necessary information before carrying out the work. We had negotiations with the municipality, and finally they stated that they would abandon their claims, and the claims of the people for the flooding of the lands, provided the Government would build the bridge. The matter was under consideration last year, when Mr. Colter was member, and this year as well. I did not know that the then member for Haldimand would not be the member this year, and therefore my good intentions which my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has referred to just now, were put into execution just after the hon. gentleman had left. That was not my fault. It was the fault of the courts and of the election. Besides that, our engineers have reported that it was necessary to carry on this work under the circumstances, and we cannot avoid it. I will reply to the remarks of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) when he is in the House, as I see he is absent just now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a little unfortunate that this item did not appear in the main Estimates. Then the disinterestedness and the impartiality of the hon. gentleman would have shone in a much clearer light.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will remember that we do not put new works in the main Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that when I was Minister of Finance they did appear in the main Estimates. I was under the impression, that in the hon. gentleman's own Estimates this year, there were some votes for new works. The hon. gentleman appears in the present instance to be correct, but my recollection does not accord with his, that the practice has been invariable.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was there not a vote of $10,000 for this bridge some years ago?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was for the first bridge, but we did not expend a cent of it, because in the condition of the banks it could not go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the bridge been built for which the first $10,000 was granted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where is it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Cayuga.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There was a vote of $10,000 for the construction of a bridge at York.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; at Cayuga.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to ask the Minister whether the backing of the water extends as far as where this bridge is to be built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am credibly informed by one who has had every opportunity of knowing, that at no time does the water back up to within two or three miles of the point where this bridge is to be constructed. Perhaps my hon. friend from Welland is aware whether the water backs up that far or not?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). No; I am not.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It strikes me that, as this item was in the Estimates before, if the hon. Minister really wishes to carry out the work in good faith, and there is no question behind it as to who should be elected, a portion of it ought to appear as a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. The vote has lapsed a year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). And why? Because our friend Mr. Colter represented that constituency instead of Mr. Montague. The facts will out if you give them room, and they will state the truth. Last year, when the county was represented by an opponent of the Government, no vote appeared. If it is necessary now, it was equally necessary then. It proves what has been time and again stated here, that we need not expect the Government to vote any money for a county represented by an opponent of the Government, and their statement that they will expend the public money where it is required without regard to the representative, is all a farce; they do not mean it.

Bridge over the Rideau Canal, Maria St., Ottawa city..... $15,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the city of Ottawa contributed anything towards the construction of this bridge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is one of the three bridges taken over by the Government, and the chief engineer tells me that it is in a dangerous condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. What kind of a bridge do you intend to build?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An iron bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will this complete the cost ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the hon. Minister tell me what is proposed to be done with regard to the bridge over the River Thames, at Chatham ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot. I think I shall be able to tell to-morrow.

Bridge across the River Ottawa, at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue : the Governments of Ontario and Quebec contributing each $4,000..... $4,000

Mr. BRYSON. Before this item passes I would like to say one word. I regret exceedingly that the Government have not seen fit to provide a larger sum for this bridge, as I fear the small sum of $4,000 will be insufficient to secure its construction. A year ago a survey was made at this point, and it was found that $16,000 would be required for this work. There is no bridge across that part of the Ottawa River for a distance of ninety miles, and there is great danger in crossing in the spring and the fall, and many serious accidents have occurred. The Governments of Ontario and Quebec have each voted $4,000 on the condition that the Federal Government would vote $8,000, and I hope that the hon. Minister of Finance or the Minister of Public Works will be able to give us some intimation that, in the event of $12,000 not being found sufficient to complete the bridge, another sum will be forthcoming next year.

Bridge over the Old Man's River at Fort Macleod, revote of lapsed amount, $10,000..... $15,000

Mr. McMULLEN. When was this $10,000 voted ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was not sufficient, and we did not begin the work until Parliament would say whether it would give us the difference.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will this fully cover the cost of this bridge ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am told that it will.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When was this sum of $10,000 first voted ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it was voted the year before last.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). And again last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it was revoted this year with $5,000 additional, because we had not money enough voted to do the work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not understand why this vote should appear in this manner.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must not find fault with me or the Government. If we have an amount of money voted by Parliament and find it is not enough for the work, we do not expend it without first informing Parliament that it was not enough and asking for the further amount necessary. If it was a work of great and immediate necessity, we would take the responsibility of going on with it and asking Parliament to indemnify us.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am not complaining because the hon. gentleman did not expend the money. I was merely making a comparison between this and some other items. I would have been better pleased if the Government would not spend quite so much.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At all events, this vote will be sufficient, I hope. With reference to the question of the hon. member for Pontiac, who wished to have $4,000 more voted for the bridge across the Ottawa, the Government thought they would ask Parliament to vote this $4,000, the Governments of Ontario and Quebec contributing each $4,000, making $12,000 altogether. Of course, if it is found that is not sufficient, and that a little additional is required, we will have to come to Parliament and say so, but we thought, perhaps, this might be enough, and, therefore, do not ask for more.

Mr. McMULLEN. When are you going to build the bridge ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The plans will be made, and we will then go on with the work.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who will make the plans when three Governments are interested ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As a rule we make the plans and communicate them to the other Governments, and if they are satisfactory to them, we call on them for their contribution.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the Government draw a plan which will cost more than $12,000, say $20,000, are we to take it for granted that the Government will furnish the extra amount ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We try to conform to the order of Parliament, and cut our coat according to our cloth.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite plain the hon. gentleman has stated to the member for Pontiac : Go on, try and get what you can from Ontario and Quebec, and if you have not enough to build the work we will say to you : We do not like to be discourteous ; come back and we will see what we can do. The hon. Minister has virtually held out the temptation to the hon. gentleman to go to his constituency and tell his people : I have the word of the Minister of Public Works that if the money from the Provinces and the money from the Dominion Parliament is not sufficient, I am encouraged to come back.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Pontiac is above temptation, so that there will be no danger of his doing what the hon. gentleman suggests.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT There is no guarantee for that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will try to build the work out of the money we have, but if we really find we cannot do it, we will ask Parliament for an additional $2,000, $3,000 or $4,000.

To connect Whitehead Island with Grand Manan Island, Bay of Fundy..... $3,000

Mr. LOVITT. What is the object of connecting Whitehead Island with Grand Manan Island ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) can explain that. This is to provide for the establishment of telegraphic communication between Grand Manan Island and

Whitehead Island, across Rose and Chain Islands, as proposed by the superintendent of Government telegraphs in his report. It will entail the construction of four and a-half miles of land lines and one and a-half knots of heavy submarine cables, called for on the 8th March, 1889, by the member for Charlotte. The matter was investigated in order to see whether we could and should do it, and we found that we should do it. We cannot do anything else for the people of Grand Manan.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is the continuation of the submarine cable to Grand Manan, where there is a population who require it, and to extend it to Whitehead Island.

Reconstruction of line between Ashcroft and Barkerville, B.C.... ....$13,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the line known as the Cariboo line in British Columbia. It is one of the conditions of the Union between that Province and Canada, that that line should be kept up. The line is worn out and requires to be reconstructed from one end to the other. The whole thing will cost $26,000 or $27,000, but we thought we would divide the work in two and ask only $16,000 this year. The line is in operation now, but it is so often broken and requires such constant repairs that it is really necessary to replace it with a new line.

Amount required to pay for the conveyance of the mails between Canada and the United Kingdom, under contract with Mr. Andrew Allan, at the rate of $125,000 per annum.....$ 125,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the first place I desire to enquire of the First Minister, whether, according to promise, he has laid upon the Table the correspondence between himself and the Messrs. Anderson which he was to have done today?

Mr. FOSTER. That is my fault. The First Minister asked me to get the letters prepared and have them brought down. I had them prepared, but unfortunately forgot to lay them on the Table this afternoon. They will be laid upon the Table to-morrow. This vote is in pursuance of the explanation made by the Postmaster General some time ago. It is the temporary arrangement for one year made with Mr. Andrew Allan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want to understand something more than that. We should understand what service the hon. gentleman expects to get for this, what the present position of the matter is, and what is the policy of the Government in regard to it? Have they abandoned their 21-knot or 20-knot service, or whatever it is? Are we to have vessels which will take, as one of my hon. friends said, 20 days between Halifax and Liverpool, or what have the Messrs. Allan pledged themselves to with respect to the speed of the vessels they are going to employ during the year?

Mr. FOSTER. When that matter was brought up a few days ago, the Postmaster General gave a full explanation. He also gave the names of the vessels to be employed, and some conversation took place as to their speed and quality. The best vessels on the line are to be used, and, in case of their being disabled, Mr. Allan has the choice of a few other vessels which are specified. As to the other service, as soon as the season closes, the Government intend to take the matter up and pursue it to the end with all possible speed, so that we may have a first-class, well-equipped service between Canada and the British ports. Whether that will be a 20-knot or a 21-knot service, I cannot now say.

Mr. LAURIER. We knew all this before, and the statement is very vague. What we are interested in now, is to know whether the great project of the Government, for a speedy service, equalling the best service on the ocean, has been abandoned or is still maintained. The hon. gentleman gave us at one time very large promises, but, though the authority of his name was coupled with these promises, still they were not altogether implicitly believed in. Now, we want to know whether the hon. gentleman believes in that scheme himself yet. We want to know what is the present policy of the Government in that matter. He says this is only a temporary arrangement. Is it to remain temporary, or is it to become permanent, and, if the arrangement is to be a finality, what is the arrangement to be?

Mr. FOSTER. This temporary arrangement is not to be for a permanent service. It will last for the year for which it has been undertaken.

Mr. LAURIER. And will be replaced by what?

Mr. FOSTER. As I have stated before, we propose, as soon as the Session is over, to take up again the negotiations where we left them in regard to the fast Atlantic service. The hon. member will say that I am giving information which is already in the possession of the House, but $500,000 has been voted for this purpose, and it is the intention of the Government to use that in obtaining a highly equipped service with as high a speed as possible, and the Government hope to obtain a service not less efficient than those between the large seaports of the United States and Great Britain. Further than that I cannot go.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is perfectly clear that the project of the hon. gentleman—as he was told from this side of the House it would—has fallen through, as I suppose it has fallen through in consequence of its inherent absurdity. I say that no more foolish proposal was ever made than that to obtain a fast line to touch at a port on the south of England and at a French port, with any hope of making that line self-sustained. Anything of that kind cannot be done except on the most outrageous terms, and even then I do not believe it would be successful. We ought to know more in reference to this. We ought to know whether the Government have made up their minds to adhere to this foolish proposal. If they have, let them say so like men, and we will understand it; but, if they see now that this is a foolish proposal, they should be prepared to submit to the House an alternative scheme. Everyone who is conversant with the St. Lawrence will agree with me that it is impracticable to suppose that steamers can run twenty knots up the St. Lawrence. It might possibly be done in one voyage out of four, but certainly not more than that, and the hon. gentlemen have committed themselves to a scheme which they must know to be impracticable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that this scheme is impracticable. I do not know of any scheme, or project, or measure, which emanates from this side of the House, which the hon. gentleman does not compliment by using the same language. The hon. gentleman says this foolish proposition to have a connection with a a French port is the reason why the scheme broke down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One of the reasons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why; the Messrs. Anderson made it one of the conditions that they should have the opportunity of having that connection with Cherbourg, or some French port in addition to the English port, so that, in addition to the first class emigration to Canada from England, they would have all Europe as well to supply their ships. It was one of the main features which the Messrs. Anderson thought favorable to the arrangement. The contract was signed. It was agreed that, for the sum of $500,000, this line should be established, but it was said by Mr. Anderson, who was here, that it was a very large scheme, and that it would cost two millions of pounds to build the vessels which were to be built under the contract. Therefore, while he believed they would be able to make the necessary arrangements, he wanted a *locum penitentiæ* for two months, and that would bring it up to about the 1st of December, within which time he would be allowed to cancel the arrangement. He went to England, and he wrote before the expiry of the two months that he was sorry to say he would have to surrender the contract. I regret that, in consequence of the culpable negligence of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, the document is not on the Table of the House giving the *ipsissima verba* of the communication from the Messrs. Anderson. Then we were about to advertise for tenders *de novo*, or to see if we could find others more plucky than the Messrs. Anderson. At that time, as the hon. gentleman knows, large contracts were given by the Admiralty of the British Government to build ships of war, and there was besides a great rise in the price of building iron ships, so that those who were best advised on the subject, said it was useless for us to go into the market at that time, that we could not get for half a million anybody to contract; the shipyards were busy building ships for the navy, heavy contracts were given. In consequence of the employment of the ships by Her Majesty's Government, the price of building iron ships rose to such an extent that we were advised, and advised by persons strongly interested in seeing a fast line built, that it would be useless to go into the market. Now the contracts have all been made, and are in considerable progress, and the price of ship-building is falling very fast and we intend to try *de novo* to get a fast line of ships for the $500,000. The hon. gentleman says it would be folly to suppose that a vessel of twenty knots would run twenty knots in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. That is not the proposal. It may or may not be in the power of ships to risk a twenty-knot speed in the Gulf, but we want ships capable of running twenty knots, whether to Halifax or to Quebec. We want to get the highest speed, equal to that of ships going into New York, and we hope to succeed.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not well understand the Minister of Finance, whether this temporary arrangement is to be exclusively with vessels of the Allan Line, or whether the best ships of the Dominion Line were also to be engaged in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Allans will employ, during the coming year as they have during the past year, the *Vancouver*, which is the best of the Dominion Line.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be extremely unsatisfactory if the temporary service were to be less efficient than it was a while ago under the arrangement by which, I think, the *Vancouver* and another ship alternated with the faster ships of the Allan Line, so that we really got the benefit of the best ships that were on this particular voyage. Everybody knows that the Allan ships are getting more and more out of date, and slower, and we would be worse off than ever unless such an arrangement as that was made. My own impression is that there may be a great danger of our sacrificing the substance for the shadow in attempting to carry out the proposals of the hon. gentleman. I do not see any great advantage in obtaining ships capable of traversing the ocean at the rate of 20 knots, which is quite a different thing from doing a measured mile in the harbor, and unless we are able to utilise these 20-knot ocean liners at something approximating that speed for the whole voyage, there is great disadvantage in a 20-knot ship. Such a ship requires an enormous expenditure of engine power and fuel, she is very expensive to engine, she is very expensive to run, relatively, and she has but very little relative capacity for freight carrying, because her model and her requirements for storage of coal are such as disables her from extensive freight carrying. She is, therefore, an expensive ship to build, expensive to engine, expensive to run, and not profitable to carry freight. She derives her profits in carrying passengers of the highest class, at the best rate, and from carrying a certain high class of expensive freight up to a limited tonnage. Now, if you cannot take the speed out of her, it is unprofitable to engage in the service a ship of that description. There are two reasons why I fear we cannot expect to take the speed out of the ship. One is the climatic difficulty. I spoke a year or two ago with one of the principal owners of the Dominion Line, and he told me that the fast ship *Vancouver*, of which the Finance Minister has just spoken, had been two consecutive whole years running, during which she never had one chance, on either the inward or outward voyage, of making her speed. Fog or something else had intervened, and that ship had never been able to make her mark on her voyage. I suppose it is unpatriotic in me to say so, but it is nevertheless true, that our climate presents a difficulty in this respect. The other difficulty is that to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has alluded. I must confess that although not very nervous, I would not feel particularly happy in trusting my bones in a twenty-knot ship running up the gulf. She is too near the land for that speed. You can do it, of course, in a bright day, but in a great deal of weather it would be utterly unsafe to do it.

For these reasons I am afraid that it is practically out of the question to expect it. Then you have to enter upon the business of endeavoring to secure—not to keep what we have got, but to secure a high class passenger trade, and you would have to do that with the alternative difficulty, during a large portion of the year, of landing the passengers at Halifax for a long rail journey, through a country exposed to somewhat inclement weather, which circumstance will not attract a high class passenger traffic. These are the difficulties which a twenty-knot service will have to meet. Now, what would be really useful for Canada is a service of somewhere of about seventeen knots. You will get it at much less rate for ships built largely for freight carrying, ships that would be run more economically and which would retain, at any rate, our freight business which we are in danger of losing as years go on. We have given half a million on the statement that we were going to get a twenty-knot service. I hope the result will not be that we shall be asked at some future Session to sanction, or be told that we have sanctioned in advance, a grant of half a million for something entirely different from a twenty-knot service. My opinion is that a seventeen-knot service is something that we could get for much less money, and it will be relatively more advantageous to us. There is no object in telling us that our ships are capable of travelling twenty knots, unless we are going to get something like that speed out of them. I would like to see this contract prescribe, not merely that the vessel should be capable of steaming twenty knots, but what are the limits of the voyage, and what is the length of time that you prescribe from port to port. How many days and hours are to be spent from the point of departure till you reach Quebec?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not wish the Committee to understand that we are limiting ourselves to 20 knots. That was the proposition in the contract, and when it was made, it was with the understanding that the vessel should be capable of steaming 20 knots. We understand that a vessel fit to do 20 knots on the measured mile in calm water, could not maintain that average speed across the Atlantic. The steamers running to New York making that average time, are running far under their capability, and, if we succeed in obtaining from a 20-knot vessel an average speed across the Atlantic of 18 knots, or something less, that is what we expect to obtain. All we desire is to have a steam line across the Atlantic so fast that the mails and passengers will not avoid the line and go to New York, but that we will have a first-class line, which, both as regards passengers and mails, will be sought by the people going across the Atlantic, and a line which will fairly compete with the steamers going to New York, in such a way that it may be considered we are fighting the battle of transportation across the Atlantic on equal terms.

Mr. BLAKE. With the advantages the New York lines now have, and the enormous competition, and the magnificent vessels that have come out within the last two years, if the hon. gentleman proposes to enter into competition for the passenger travel with the New York steamers, the proposition is something wilder than any scheme I have ever heard him propose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I have judged the hon. gentleman too harshly as to the character of this proposal and some other proposals, I may remind him that he has made over and over again promises to the House of a very extravagant character, to the non-fulfilment of which we have adverted more than once. It does not lie within the mouth of the hon. gentleman who made the statement as to the population he would throw into the North-West, as to the results of his land policy in the North-West and a good many other matters I could cite, to become very indignant because we hesitate to believe that his sanguine temperament has not again misled him in the matter of the ocean service. All who have crossed the Atlantic a good many times know very well there are very considerable practical difficulties and a most enormous increase of expense in attempting such a fast line as the hon. gentleman has described. I know I am within the mark in saying that in order to get a vessel capable of steaming twenty knots as against seventeen knots if not eighteen knots, you have practically to pay twice as much. I may remark to the hon. gentleman that the New York craft, with which he expects to compete, do maintain over a great part of the voyage an average speed of over twenty knots, as an examination of their records will show. So if he proposes to compete with them, he must not merely obtain vessels capable of doing twenty knots, but vessels capable of maintaining that speed during an ordinary Atlantic passage, at all events during the summer season.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) if his remarks have reference to a seventeen-knot line? He did not state whether his attention at that time was directed to a vessel or a line of vessels of seventeen-knots capacity, or whether he proposed an average voyage of seventeen knots from port to port?

Mr. BLAKE. I think a seventeen-knot voyage is the highest you can talk of on your line.

Mr. McNEILL. I think there is perhaps some little misapprehension on the part of the Committee as to the freight which is carried by these ocean greyhounds. When the subject was up for discussion before, there were a good many conflicting statements made as to this matter. I took occasion to ask the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) early this Session to ascertain for me what was the freight capacity of these vessels. The hon. gentleman wrote to the agents of some of the companies, and he supplied me with the information. I find that in place of those ocean greyhounds not being able to carry more freight than 600 or 700 tons as suggested, the *Majestic* and *Teutonic* are capable of carrying something like 2,000 tons of freight.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly; they are vessels of 8,000 or 9,000 tons.

Mr. McNEILL. The impression in the House last Session was that the ocean greyhounds were capable of carrying not more than 500 or 600 tons of freight. It was so stated broadly.

Mr. BLAKE. It depends on the length of your ship.

Mr. McNEILL. There are no other vessels except these two which can carry more than 1,000

tons of freight, but in regard to these two vessels a great advance has been made, so that they are able to carry twice that quantity. And no doubt still greater advances will be made. With respect to the question of steaming at from 17 to 20 knots an hour, I must say for my own part that having been accustomed to the salt water the greater part of my life, and knowing a little for a landsman about the matter, there are very few seamen who will consider it a matter of much difference whether a vessel is steaming 17 or 20 knots if she comes across an iceberg or a rock. If we are going to have good vessels at all, if we are going to have a first-class line—and, for my part, I do not see why Canada, as well as any other country, should not have a first-class line—let us have a first-class line from every point of view. The vessels crossing between England and Ireland, and Scotland and Ireland, have as intricate a piece of navigation to perform as our Canadian vessels, considering the number of crafts of all kinds that are drifting about in the channel, including colliers, that in calm weather have no steerage way on them; and yet the steamers, running from Holyhead to Ireland, steam 22 knots an hour. These vessels do not decrease their speed in sight of land. I do not see any reason why we should not have a 20-knot service, and I think we are in a position to make good use of such service.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last Session the House was asked to vote $500,000 for the purpose of securing a fast service. Although the hon. Minister intimated that a 20-knot service should be given, we shall do very well if a 17 or 18-knot service is given. I want to know if this amount will be expended in any case. The country will certainly expect that if the amount is expended, we will obtain a 20-knot service, and for a less speed a proportionately less amount will be expended.

To provide for a new steamer to replace the *Sir James Douglas*, employed in the lighthouse, buoy, and coast service of British Columbia, which vessel is no longer suitable for service..... $70,000

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if it is the intention of the Government to have this steamer built in British Columbia?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is the intention of the Government to have the steamer built in British Columbia. The *Sir James Douglas* is barely able to do the work at this season, and the new vessel is required there just as soon as it can possibly be got. Although the Minister is not here, I may say that I think it is the intention of the Department to buy a suitable vessel in the market.

To meet increased expenses of guardianship, owing to proposed changes in system of protection.. $25,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the change?

Mr. COLBY. This grows out of the change in the substitution of paying officers per diem for actual work, instead of having a large number of under-paid officers. It is to give greater efficiency to the service, without to any considerable extent increasing the expense.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is this remark applied to the Atlantic coast or to the inland waters, or to both?

Mr. COLBY. It is for all the Provinces.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the fisheries on the great lakes are not to be destroyed, as they now are rapidly being destroyed, a larger expenditure than hitherto is necessary for their protection. Whether it is done by means of a per diem salary or otherwise, everyone who knows anything about the condition of these fisheries, knows that the present expenditure is altogether inadequate for the service required. Either the Government must incur the necessary expense to protect the fisheries, or these fisheries will be destroyed. At present there is a great deal of money spent, but the object in view is not attained. I do think that the Fishery Department does not realise the service required to protect the fisheries on the inland waters. It is at present altogether insufficient for the protection of these fisheries, which are just as valuable to the country as those in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. McNEILL. I agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman that our inland water fisheries should be sufficiently protected. The revenue derived from the fisheries on the lakes is more than equal to the revenue derived from all the other fisheries in the Dominion added together.

Mr. MASSON. I quite agree with the remarks which fell from the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that the importance of the upper lakes fisheries is greatly under-estimated by the Department, and it is to be expected that it should be so. They have been led from year to year to look on the fisheries of the Atlantic coast as the all important fisheries, and it is only within the last few years that any attention whatever has been paid to the fisheries on the upper lakes. A few years ago, I was pleased to see that an effort was made to protect these fisheries by the purchase of a small yacht known as the *Cruiser* which is now to be found on the lakes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. She is to be found in the harbor most of the time; she cannot go out.

Mr. MASSON. As my hon. friend says: she is to be found in the harbor principally. She is no doubt a very good yacht of her kind, but she is entirely unsuited for running on the Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, or Lake Superior. She is no more fit to ply on these waters than she is to go out on the Atlantic Ocean. The consequence is that during the close season, in the month of November, when these waters are often very rough, that vessel is generally to be found, not only in the harbor, but in the more secure harbor in the neighborhood, chiefly at Owen Sound. The result is that during the close season, while she should be visiting the various fishing grounds, she dare not, to use a slang expression, poke her nose outside the harbor. In that neighborhood, a great deal is said about the unseaworthiness of the vessel, and perhaps a little more about the timidity of the captain. It has been urged by many that the steamer could do a great deal more than she does, and perhaps that might be admitted, but I for one am frank to say that if I intended to cross the Georgian Bay or Lake Huron, in rough weather, I would not like to let my wife and family know that I would cross in the *Cruiser*. I think the captain is perhaps only displaying reasonable forethought when he remains inside the harbor. When an officer of the Department came up from Ottawa last

fall, the yacht went out on the 21st November, and several miles of net were seized then, which showed that during the close season the fishermen were plying their avocation as if there were no such thing as a close season. It is hard for us to estimate the importance of these fishing grounds on the inland waters. The Trade and Navigation Returns show, it is true, that $394,000 worth of fish was exported from Ontario, and I presume the greater part of that was from the lakes. That, however, is no criterion of the value of fish actually exported, and for which we have no means of obtaining data. Right in the centre of the Georgian Bay are vessels plying to the United States, and I know myself that these vessels load from the fishing smacks without giving any reports. It is the same in Lake Huron and Lake Superior, where we have hundreds of miles of coast visited by this same class of American vessels. Therefore, while we have a return of $394,000 worth of fish taken from our Canadian waters, we cannot from that statement place any reliable estimate as to the extent of these fisheries. I think that instead of $3,000 being voted to protect the fisheries of our great lakes, a very much larger sum should be appropriated, and efficient seamen should be appointed to take charge of that service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state what particular vessel he was referring to?

Mr. MASSON. The *Cruiser*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the vessel that was formerly Mr. Gilmore's yacht. It was probably not intended to encounter navigation on so great a body of water as Lake Superior. It was a very nice yacht for the purpose for which Mr. Gilmore used it, of going to the salmon rivers, but it appears to be a very unsuitable craft for the service to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. DAWSON. With regard to the fisheries of the great lakes, I concur with the remarks of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson). The fisheries of those lakes are becoming depleted very fast, and unless some system is adopted by which fishing with pound nets shall be in some measure restrained, in the course of a few years there will be no fish left in the lakes to dispute about. What I would like to draw the special attention of the Government to is the condition of the fisheries in the small inland lakes and in the waters of Rainy River, which latter are international waters. On the banks of that river we have some 4,000 Indians, who at present receive very little aid from the Government—in fact, only $5 a head of treaty money, besides some little presents in the way of nets, &c. That is all they require at present; but unless fishing in those waters is in some way regulated, in the course of a few years these Indians will be coming down to the Government for the means of subsistence. Fishing is all, or nearly all, they have to depend on, now that the game is disappearing, for a living. In the little inland lakes, especially those near the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, people from the United States and elsewhere come and set out pound nets and take out the fish by the ton and send them to the United States markets. These little sheets of water cannot stand fishing of that sort, and the consequence is, that the fish are being swept away and the Indians are becoming deprived of the means of sustenance. Therefore, I would suggest that some strict measures be adopted for the protection of these fisheries, because otherwise the Indians who depend upon them will unquestionably make a demand on the Government for the means of subsistence. They will say: "You promised by treaty to leave to us these fisheries, and you have not done so; the fish have been destroyed by the white man, our means of subsistence are gone, and to the white man we must look for relief."

General LAURIE. I would like to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the very valuable service rendered last year by an organisation established by Capt. Gordon—a Fishermen's Intelligence Bureau, by which information relating to the fisheries was collected through the various Collectors of Customs and other gentlemen at various points along the coast, and collated and published by Mr. McLennan under Capt. Gordon's direction. I notice in the Supplementary Estimates for 1889-90 a vote of $125 for Mr. McLennan for his work; but I do not see any amount placed in the Estimates this year for prosecuting it still further. I believe that the intelligence should be sent by telegraph, and not by post card, because when sent by mail it arrives too late to be of value. I hope the Department will, this year, take into consideration the question of improving this service, which is of great value to the fishermen in enabling them to find the fish they are in search of, and thereby to return with fares full instead of empty.

Mr. COLBY. I would call the attention of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to the fact that this appropriation is not the only appropriation made this Session. We have already voted $20,000 for this service, and this vote only implies that we are going a step futher in the direction he desires. We expect that increased efficiency will result from the employment of men practically fitted for the service, instead of the thirty-four men we have hitherto employed in Ontario at $50 a year, who seem to have felt that they had no responsibility whatever, and were not paid enough to give proper attention to the service. We expect that this new system will give us a greatly improved service in those waters.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Do you propose to superannuate them?

Mr. COLBY. No; we do not. With regard to the *Cruiser*, she was purchased at a very reasonable price, which was said to be considerably below her actual value, and it was thought that she would be adequate to the important service for which she was detailed. It is true she has not been able, in all weathers, to prove herself entirely adequate, although when Capt. Gordon was in charge of her last autumn she did some excellent work. I believe it is the intention of the Minister, at an early day, to exchange her for a boat of larger capacity, and fortunately there will be no loss from the purchase of the *Cruiser*, for I am told that the Department has already been offered for her a larger amount than she cost the Department. But I can assure hon. gentlemen who take such an interest in fishery protection in that locality, that the Department feel equally interested in the matter, and the Minister will be able, with the means with which Parliament provides him, to afford greater protection than has been accorded hitherto.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister state what depth of water the *Cruiser* draws?

Mr. COLBY. I think about seven feet.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask the Minister if his scheme includes the transfer of men from one part of the country to the other. It seems to me that it is quite impossible to get men living along the banks of rivers to inform on or prosecute their neighbors for breaches of the fishery laws.

Mr. COLBY. The Department has experienced the very difficulty the hon. gentleman mentions. It has been found that these low paid officers receiving only $50 per annum, are quite unwilling to enforce the law against their friends and neighbors. That is one reason why they are being dispensed with, and why men are being employed who will be compelled to keep a diary and report to the Department precisely where they were and what they were doing every day, in order that the Department may judge by the results of their work, and whether they were actually attending to their duties or not.

Mr. SHANLY. Does this apply to the rivers as well as to the lakes?

Mr. COLBY. Yes.

Mr. SHANLY. I would ask the hon. Minister if the greater vigilance promised for protecting the lake fisheries is to be extended to the rivers. The poaching carried on close by here, on the St. Lawrence, is notoriously audacious, and the system of inspection entirely insufficient to prevent it. Along the frontier in my own riding the poaching in our waters from the other side of the river is a standing grievance with my people. I took occasion to draw the attention of the Minister to it last year—not here in Parliament but in his office. Representations were made to me from the county that systematic night-poaching was being carried on by marauders from the American shore, who use dynamite to destroy the fish. This sort of thing is carried on from Kingston down, and I trust that effective measures will be taken to protect the river fisheries, and put an end to this foreign poaching more particularly.

Mr. COLBY. I believe greater vigilance is exercised this year than formerly.

Mr. TEMPLE. I am glad to see that the Government have adopted during the past couple of years in our Province the plan they are now advocating for the other Provinces, namely, that of hiring men by the day to look after the fisheries, and dispensing with the services of the wardens, who draw their fifty or sixty dollars per year and stayed at home most of the time. The new system has worked very well in the Province of New Brunswick. There is an overseer who keeps continually moving about in order to see that the men attend to their work, and as a consequence poaching is much less practiced than formerly.

To aid the Agricultural Society of the Oneida Indians of the Thames, to enable the society to give prizes at the annual exhibition..... $60

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this a new departure?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think this amount was got last year. That was the first year, and it was given at the request of parties who took an interest in these exhibitions. Applications were made for a further vote this year by the Indian bands, and I considered it desirable to comply with their request. It is very desirable that the Indians should take an interest in these agricultural shows. The Indians in question are very poor, but I believe they are good farmers and take a great interest in their farms, and it is at the special request of themselves and their friends that this vote is asked.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I agree with the hon. Minister that it is very desirable to give the Indians encouragement, whether out of public funds or not. I think the people living in their neighborhood ought to encourage them any way. But if we are going to give grants of public funds to one band, can we refuse it to others without doing an injustice? The Six Nations, as the hon. Minister knows, have a very creditable exhibition in my county. Would they not be equally entitled to a grant, if the system of giving grants be adopted?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Six Nations are much better off. This band have only $120 to their credit.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Capital?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they have virtually no funds.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who made the application?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was made by letter and personally by the hon. member for West Middlesex.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was going to ask whether, in making those grants, the Department would specify in what way and for what objects the prizes shall be given, or will it be left wholly in their discretion?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the past the Department has left it entirely to the agricultural society. I believe there is a society in this band similar to the one I saw last summer in the Six Nations, who appear to manage their affairs vey well.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Six Nations have no grant from the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. Minister not think it would be a good plan, in giving these moneys, the object being to encourage and to develop agriculture, to specify, not in detail, but in classes, what they shall be given for, such as agricultural products, women's work, and so on, so that none of these outside matters, which take place at these shows, such as speeding horses, and which are not really pertinent to agriculture, will not have a share. Would it not be wise to stipulate that so much will be given for agricultural productions, so much for women's work and dairy work, and cattle and horses, and so forth.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I agree with the hon. gentleman in that regard. I do not recollect receiving any reports of the proceeds for the last year. I think we ought to give instructions that the money be devoted for the purposes mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and certainly not for horse-racing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the action of the Government in this matter is very creditable. In no way can you better encourage industry and enterprise among the Indians than by means such as this. I have some knowledge of these bands on the Thames. I have never been on the property of the Moravians which is in the County of Elgin, but I have met the chief at agricultural meetings and he is a very intelligent man, who has a good idea of what is necessary for an agricultural society. As far as trusting the money to them is concerned, I say, with knowledge of the subject, that the Government may very safely entrust them with the expenditure of this money. In my own riding there are three bands, the Oneidas, the Chippewas, and the Munceys. The Government have acted on a judicious plan in assisting the band which is most in need of assistance. The Oneidas are rather wealthier than the others. They have show grounds with a high board fence and a big building for their exhibits, and they charge an entry fee to their agricultural show, which is a very good one. In fact, those who were at the Western Fair in 1888 know that there was a department there for the Indians, and that it was very hard to tell whether the samples shown by the Indians or those shown by the white men were the best. They do not need anything, and the Government have not given them anything. Then there are the Chippewas. I do not know whether the Government have given them anything or not, but I understand that they have sufficient means to carry on their own show. The Munceys are in a different position. They have no funds worth mentioning of their own. They commenced only about two years ago. They have had exhibitions and they are making progress. They have purchased a piece of land on which they have their school and council house, and they hold their exhibition there, but they wish to enclose their ground so that they may be able to charge a fee for entrance to their show. I think in this matter the Government have done a judicious thing, and I am glad that the Minister of the Interior has seen fit to put this sum in the Estimates.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) makes out that these Indians are in a deplorable condition, but I should like to ask him if they have not expended a sum of money in building an Orange lodge-room there. If that is the case, I should think they might be able to expend money on their own show.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If individual Indians who are Orangemen choose to give their own money to build an Orange lodge, they have a right to do so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In that case, they cannot be in such deplorable circumstances, and I think, by a little effort, they would be able to raise a little fund to establish prizes for their agricultural shows.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No one has hinted that they were in a deplorable condition, but the tribe has no fund at its command for this purpose. The hon. gentleman ought to know that an Orange lodge-room is not built out of the tribal fund. The Munceys are not in a deplorable condition, but they are only children compared with the advanced whites. They have started these shows only two years, they are doing well, and they should have encouragement.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the fairs on the Six Nation Reserve are becoming self-sustaining. As to the Munceys, if they have a fair ground, which is not fenced, they will not be very successful as a society. Gradually these societies among the Indians become self-sustaining, and I think the one on the Six Nation Reserve, by the public spirit which has been displayed by those concerned, and by the manner in which it has been managed, have prospered so far that it has funds in hand. Of course this is apart from the funds of the tribe altogether, and I suppose the Minister thinks himself justified in these grants in the hope that the shows will become self-sustaining afterwards.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes ; and they are not only making a very good showing in their own exhibitions, but are making a very good exhibit in comparison with their white neighbors at the shows of the latter. I visited the Six Nations last year in company with my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), and certainly they had a most creditable show, which would equal anything I saw during the year at any of the agricultural shows. They exhibited the products of their farms, their pickles, their fruits, and products of every kind. I received a letter from the leader of the band of Indians who made this application asking me to visit them this summer. I hope to be able to do so, and then I shall be in a position to give more particulars in relation to this matter if I have to ask for another vote.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not think my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) should be so touchy. I understand that these shows are supported largely by voluntary subscriptions, and I think that if these Indians can give voluntary subscriptions for other purposes, they should be able to raise $90 for this purpose. It is a new departure for these shows to be kept up by the Dominion Government instead of by the Indians, and I agree with my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), that, if it is reasonable to grant this amount to this tribe, it is equally fair to make a grant to the Six Nations, though it appears that they have made their society self-sustaining, by private contributions and collecting fees at the gate. The Indians represented by my hon. friend from South Middlesex get assistance from the Dominion Government for this purpose, while those represented by my hon. friend from Brant get none. That is hardly fair ; because my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) has the ear of the Government, he gets aid for his Indians, while the Indians in the constituency of my hon. friend from Brant have to support themselves by their own unaided efforts. As I said, if these Indians can give private contributions to build Orange halls, which are good schools to make Tories out of, I think they should be able to give something to keep up their agricultural societies.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see that one of these grants is made for a band of Indians in the County of Kent. I think the Government have taken the correct way to deal with this matter, and that is, aid only those who need aid. The Six Nations are a wealthy people who can run their own show. Further, all the bands in my riding are not getting help. It is only one. The Oneidas are not getting

any, because they are able to manage their own show, and the chief of the Chippewas told me that they did not want any assistance. As I have said, the Munceys are in poor circumstances, but they are making a beginning and are doing well. All they want is to have their ground fenced in. I have no doubt that, in a year or two, they will be self-sustaining.

To assist schools for Protestant Indian children at White Fish Lake, and Chapleau, Ontario..... $400

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). By whom was application made for this grant?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was made last year, and again this spring, by a reverend gentleman whose name I forget at the moment. He was in company with Rev. Mr. Carson, who was then in charge of the Dominion Church, Ottawa. Subsequently Rev. Mr. Carson came again to see me, and asked whether I had forgotten the promise made by my predecessor, Mr. White. I agreed to fulfil the promise, and the same amount was voted last year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman is unable to remember who accompanied the Rev. Mr. Carson?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) were here, I dare say he would be able to give the clergyman's name. He is a well known clergyman who has been there for years. I think it was a Rev. Mr. Macpherson, or Mr. Macdonald, or some such name.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Here is a grant for denominational purposes. I believe the "Equal Righters" ought to protest against any such thing, and I am surprised at the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) sitting quietly by and allowing grants for sectarian purposes, for denominational schools, Methodist schools, to pass through. It is certainly a fearful outrage. Some hon. gentlemen have been going from one end of the Province of Ontario to the other, protesting against Quebec using her own money for educational purposes, and yet we have a deliberate grant for Protestant schools. I think it is hardly fair that these "Equal Righters" should allow an item of this kind to pass.

Muncey Indians Agricultural Society.... $90

Mr. LANDERKIN. Last session there was an amount voted for building a barn, or something of that kind, at Mount Elgin, for the Muncey Indians. Who made the application for that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If I recollect aright that was made by the Rev. Mr. Sutherland, on behalf of this society. The barn was burnt down, and the sum of $600 was asked and granted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was it by letter?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did some other clergyman make an application likewise?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not recollect.

To pay John Grant, squatter on the Gibson Reserve, as damages for improvements he was obliged to abandon..... $50

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where is the Gibson Reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In Algoma. This case was brought to my notice last year by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt). I enquired into the matter and agreed to give the vote.

Subdividing the Indian Reserves in Ontario and Quebec..... $1,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the intention of the Minister to carry on the work on an Indian reserve unless the Indians themselves ask for it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Manitoba and North-West Territories, to pay a school teacher at Lac la Rouge, $300; at Lake Montreal, $300; to assist in the construction of a school house at each place, $200, total..... $800

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). To what denomination do these schools belong?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These schools are to be built in the new country that was ceded to us last year, north of Prince Albert. We took 1,100 square miles of territory, and got a surrender of it two years ago. The Indians, although living so far north, are well advanced, and at the first treaty made in the North-West they signed their own names to it. The schools belong to the Church of England. They have had schools there before, and I think the Rev. Mr. McKay had been amongst them for some little time.

To repair the Industrial School at High River..... $4,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These are denominational schools, I suppose, also?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These will be Government schools, but the school teachers will be of the Church of England persuasion.

To provide a salary for a teacher for third day school, on the Indian Reserve at Fort Alexander, in Treaty No. 1, Manitoba..... $300

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What is the meaning of a third day school in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are already two schools in the reserve. This school is needed, as there are fifty-five other children who are not able to reach these schools already in operation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are all the schools under some religious auspices or some religious body?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This school we propose to establish is a Church of England school. The large industrial school is Roman Catholic; it has been in operation three or four years. It is a wooden building, and we propose to veneer it, as the building has become cracked and is not weather proof.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that all schools are maintained by or operated by the Government, and that these are simply supplementary grants to schools managed under the different denominations?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are two that may come under the category of being maintained wholly by the Government, and they are these two we are proposing to establish in the Montreal colony. The others are wholly assisted schools.

Metlakahtla Industrial School $1,360

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does the hon. Minister expect to accomplish by this expenditure? How is the school to be operated? Is it proposed to teach the Indians trades, and to educate them at the same time?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the previous Estimates there was an amount voted of $1,500 for the erection of an establishment. This amount has been applied for by the agent of the district, who thinks that by erecting an establishment such as is proposed, a great many Indian children may be taught. It is proposed to undertake this work as an experiment, and not to enter upon a very large expenditure. The Indians there are very ingenious and are very good workmen, and we consider that by employing two or three machinists at the institution much good can be accomplished. We do not propose, I repeat, to enter on a large expenditure, but we intend to ascertain if the Indians take up the work or not. We provide for twenty boys to learn trades.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these all denominational schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The schools at Kootenay and Kamloops are Roman Catholic schools; the school at Metlakahtla is an undenominational one. It is under the eye of the Bishop of the English Church, but it is under a Presbyterian principal, and the institution is really undenominational.

To enable the Department to pay Rev. J. D. Cummane, missionary, for services to the Indians of Colchester and Hants County, Nova Scotia..... $100

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What services have been rendered by this missioner?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He has given great personal attention to the Indians, and has been a friend to them. His case has been recommended by the hon. member for Colchester. It has been the practice to grant these small amounts to the missionaries for the Indians.

To pay Mr. James Fletcher for services in connection with the entomological collections in the Geological and Natural History Museum..... $100

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is this gentleman not now connected with the agricultural farm?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; Mr. Fletcher was formerly assistant librarian of this Parliament. During the time he was librarian he made these collections. He was paid specially for it. $100 was considered fair remuneration for the work he did. This is proposed to be the last payment of this kind.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Unfortunately, we hear that word "last" very often.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You never heard it from me before.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I heard it from you now, and I will probably hear the same thing next year again.

Expenses in connection with Artesian Borings..... $10,000

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is for the purpose of demonstrating, if possible, where artesian water can be obtained. The director of the Survey has not yet decided the exact locality where the operations will be carried on. I am in hopes that the results obtained from this small amount will induce Parliament to give a larger vote in other years. If we can get artesian water it will be of great benefit to the country, and these borings will also assist us in demonstrating the different strata we penetrate, and may develop riches we are at present ignorant of.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister has no idea of where he is going to expend this money, it shows that his Department is very backward. At this period of the year the Department should know where operations are to be carried on.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are boring at Deloraine now, and we expect the results of that boring will guide us with regard to future borings. I should like to sink those wells in a large district of 200 miles square, about six or eight miles from Regina, where, in dry weather, water is scarce.

Mr. CASEY. This is to be expended in Manitoba and the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Purchase of traps for destruction of gophers in the N.W.T..... $1,000

Mr. DEWDNEY. I explained the other night that the settlers complained that the gophers breed on the unoccupied Government lands, and these traps are to kill the gophers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does each trap cost?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have had several samples of traps sent me since this was mentioned in Parliament, and yesterday I nearly lost my finger experimenting on one of them. I think the most useful is the ordinary muskrat trap.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) should be here to look after the Government for cruelty to animals.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The gophers go for the wheat, the settlers go for the Government, and then the Government go for the treasury.

Mr. WATSON. I think something should be provided to destroy the gophers on the Government lands in Manitoba, as well as in the North-West Territories. The gophers come from the vacant lands which are held by the Canadian Pacific Railway without paying any taxes, and destroy wheat fields in some parts of the country which are not generally cultivated. I have seen myself a large field of wheat destroyed by the gophers in two or three days.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was not aware that Manitoba was inflicted with gophers to any great extent, but no doubt there are some in very dry places. I may say that this is specially voted at the request of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories.

Mr. WATSON. I believe that in some parts of the North-West gophers' tails have been used as a sort of currency, valued at two cents each, and the Indians have made a good deal of money catching the gophers and depriving them of their tails, and letting them go again. But the people became afraid that they would multiply too rapidly, and now I believe they demand their heads instead of their tails.

Collection and classification of old records of Canada in the Privy Council Office..... $1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is charged with this work?

Mr. COLBY. It is done under the superintendence of the Deputy. He has found that there are some seventy boxes of records in the Privy Council vaults, some of which are, in his judgment, very valuable, and this vote is for their collation and classification.

Mr. CASEY. Is it to be done by officials of the Department already receiving pay?

Mr. COLBY. The work is in excess of that done by the ordinary staff, and that is the reason why we ask for a special vote.

Rouleau's Debates of Legislative Council of Quebec for 1888, 1889 and 1890—20 copies each, at $3..... $180

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will any member of the Ministry venture to say that he will read these if we buy them?

Mr. FOSTER. No; but I will say this, that this is the last of this kind of vote that will be asked for. The Library Committee will be supposed to buy what books they require for the Library and as exchanges for this House, and the duty of discriminating will be thrown upon them.

"Le Vieux Lachine," published by the Gebhart-Berthiaume Co., 50 copies at $1..... $50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a historical sketch of the history of Lachine.

Mr. LAURIER. I have not read the debates of the Legislative Council, but I have read an account of this work, which I am informed has been prepared by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and is a valuable work.

"Les Bourgeois du Nord-Ouest," 25 copies at $2 each..... $50

Mr. LAURIER. This book I have had the pleasure of reading through and through, and it is a most valuable contribution to our history.

To provide for an increase of salary to the manager of the methylated spirit warehouse..... $150

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What salary has he already?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The present salary is the ordinary salary of an excise officer. This officer was brought from another position to take charge of the wood naphtha establishment here. He was granted the usual allowance paid to officers who change their positions; and he has now become a permanent officer. The position is worth about $1,200, which he will eventually receive, but instead of paying him an allowance out of contingencies, on consultation with the Auditor General, I propose to give him this increase. The change will result in a saving to the country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who is the officer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. His name is Flynn.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What was the salary he was receiving before?

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under $1,000, I think; but I know that he will be receiving now less salary than he was receiving as an excise officer if the extra amount from contingencies be considered.

To compensate Collector Nash, of Charlottetown, for extra services performed for three months during the absence of Exciseman Moore from the division..... $125

Mr. COSTIGAN. For that division there are two officers. Exciseman Moore is absent from his office for three months getting information in one of the larger divisions with regard to distilleries and breweries, and under ordinary circumstances we employ an extra officer to assist the other exciseman who is left in charge. But the exciseman has volunteered to do the work for three months, and I have thought it reasonable to ask for this amount to pay him instead of employing an extra man at the rate of at least $600 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is a most objectionable item. If that servant is in the employ of the Department and his time will permit him to perform this extra duty, he ought to perform it without any extra pay whatever. It is most objectionable that we should grant double pay in this way, when in reality they are paid for full time in the service of the Department in which they are engaged.

To increase the salary of A. C. Patterson, assistant inspector of weights and measures at Qu'Appelle..... $100

Mr. COSTIGAN. This increase is because that branch of the service, for many reasons, is the poorest paid of any branch. The excise men start at $600 and increase at the rate of $30 a year, and have besides great chances of promotion through the grades of third and second class and collectors. The assistant inspectors of weights and measures cannot go beyond $800, though they may spend all their lives in the service. Where there is a report of the inspector that the officer discharges his duty faithfully, his year's salary should reach $600.

To increase the salary of M. Kelly, assistant inspector of weights and measures, Quebec..... $100

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I have called the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to the circumstances with reference to an individual by the name of Geo. W. Bogg. I have been informed that he has made formal application for a refund of the amount voted and paid into the Government during the term he was acting assistant inspector of weights and measures. He made that application, feeling he was entitled to the amount that he paid into the fund, plus the interest up to the present. I also have the statement of one of the inspectors of weights and measures who had been appointed by the previous Government and was dismissed by this Government. His name is John Campbell, and he was assistant inspector in the county of Elgin. It appears that he was dismissed for no fault of his own, but on account of the change in the Act, and he considers it is only fair that the amount he had paid into the superannuation fund should be refunded to him with interest. It is only fair that the amount of $4 or $5 a year that the Government took out of

his salary for the superannuation fund should be returned to him, plus the interest. For what reason he was dismissed he does not know, because he is a good Conservative and did his duty well, and his family need all the assistance he can give them. I hope the Minister will look into the matter during recess and deal fairly by this man, and if he does not do him justice I will have to refer to the matter again at another session.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have told the hon. gentleman that the case of Mr. Boggs would receive my attention. With regard to the assistant inspectors of weights and measures who were not dismissed, but displaced through the repeal of the law and the reduction of the number of districts, in all cases, I think, they did receive the refund of the amounts they paid in. If any one has not received that amount, it must be because he was dismissed for cause, in which case, of course, he would not be entitled to it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I can inform the hon. gentleman, that, as a matter of fact, this man was not dismissed for cause, but was dismissed on account of the repeal of the Act. I have his statement here in which he states the amount he paid in.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Will the hon. gentleman send me the information and I will look into it?

To additional pay to persons permanently employed "in the Public Service" and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for or in connection with passing vessels through the canals between Lake Erie and Montreal from midnight on Saturdays to 6 a.m. Sundays, and from 9 p.m. Sundays to midnight, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.	$6,350

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the arrangement, which this vote indicates, with regard to the canal, during the season of navigation, of keeping it open a portion of the Sabbath?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it is the intention of the Government to keep the canal closed from six in the morning until nine in the evening. Between those hours the crews and passengers can have an opportunity of attending divine service. This is absolutely necessary for the usefulness of the canal. There is no restriction of this kind on the Erie Canal or any of the canals in the United States. Only this week, I received a strong remonstrance from the Ogdensburg Transport and Shipping Company who have a large fleet on the lakes, and they pressed especially that the traffic on the Welland Canal should not be interrupted on Sunday, as it is a great injury to their traffic not to have the canal open. However, it was thought that it would be better that the canal should be closed during the hours of public service.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then they are closed from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m.?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are closed from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m.

Mr. AMYOT. While we are upon this item, I would ask if the Minister of Railways has come to any conclusion in regard to the debentures of the North Shore Railway, as it was called—the debentures which the Government hold against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? The question was asked before by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not come to any conclusion as yet.

Mr. AMYOT. Do the Government expect to come to any conclusion during this Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They expect to discuss it.

Mr. AMYOT. I suppose I would get the same answer as to the assistance to the Quebec bridge?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That matter stands.

Post Office Department.....	$3,900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the officer in charge of the post office at Rockport, in the county of Leeds, has been dismissed, or has been informed that he would be dismissed. I should be glad if the Postmaster General will state why he is to be dismissed? I understand that this gentleman has been in the service for over 30 years, and, unless there are strong grounds for dismissing him, it would appear to be a rather arbitrary exercise of power.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember the facts, but there must have been very strong grounds or certainly he would not have been dismissed. I think there was an enquiry made by the Inspector, and that the evidence was such that the Department recommended his dismissal to me. I will bring down the papers to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this $1,200 for an additional first-class clerk in the office of the Inspector at Stratford for?

Mr. HAGGART. It is to promote Mr. Yorrick, who has been over 30 years in the service, from a second to a first-class clerkship.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you have to put another officer in Mr. Yorrick's place?

Mr. HAGGART. The grades move up, and I suppose there will be an additional third-class clerk.

Mr. LOVITT. Why is the item of $200 put in every year to increase Mr. Sydenham Howe's salary to $600? Why is his salary not made $600 at once.

Mr. HAGGART. He is a superannuated civil service employé, and the Auditor General requires this to be put in every year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. His office, I think, was abolished. He was receiving about $2,400 a year, but on the superannuation allowance, got only about $1,200. What I want to know is what work he is doing, because it would be very peculiar for a man who was very nearly at the head of a department to be put to very inferior work for the sake of increasing his superannuation allowance. It would be better to appoint him to some definite office and allow his superannuation allowance to be suspended. I see grave inconveniences in the present course.

Mr. HAGGART. I made enquiries into this case, and ordered the information to be forwarded to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not quite certain whether some memorandum was not sent to me, but it did not add to the information I received from the Auditor General's Report. I want to ascertain exactly what sort of place Mr. Howe fills, because apparently he is now doing duty as a third-class clerk, and that is an eccentric disposition of a man who has occupied a high place in the service, and would not commend itself to my mind as being a good thing in the interest of the service generally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Howe was the agent of the Receiver General. The office was abolished. He was employed in the Post Office Inspector's office to do certain clerical work. He is satisfied to do that work, and I do not think his health is such as to allow him to undertake anything like the duties he performed before when he had the more responsible position. I think he was only able to do clerical work of this kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not press the point just now, but the position is a queer one for a man of Mr. Howe's former status to occupy.

Increase of salary to two first class clerks in the post office at St. John, N.B., $100 each $200

Mr. ELLIS. Might I enquire why this sum was also in the ordinary Estimates of the year? It has appeared twice.

Mr. HAGGART. If so, it is a mistake to put it in again. It was intended to increase the salaries of Messrs. Potter and Reid, first class clerks, from $1,200 to $1,300. Mr. Potter is reported as efficient, and has been in the service 27 years. Mr. Reed is also reported very efficient, and has been in the service over 20 years.

Mr. ELLIS. I have no objection to the increase, I think it is deserved, but it appears in both columns.

Mr. HAGGART. It must be a mistake, then. Strike it out.

Further amount required for Central Experimental Farm..... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Agriculture being absent, the explanation of this item has been given to me. It is to erect a dairy building and a piggery. The use of the dairy building is outlined here by the professor of dairying. Its purpose is to promote live-stock experiments, for the care and treatment of the milk of the different animals, to afford conveniences for carrying on a number of scientific investigations in butter and cheese making, and to demonstrate the suitability of Canadian salt for dairying purposes. For these purposes a building is required which will cost $2,500. Then another building, estimated to cost $1,500, is required for the piggery. The importance of economical methods of swine-feeding is very great to Canadian farmers, and reliable information is necessary bearing upon food experiments, relating to the quantities of different sorts of grain required to produce a pound of pork, the most economical combinations and preparations of grain for swine-feeding, the influence of the different kinds of food upon the quality of the meat, the ages at which swine give the largest return, &c

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). What is the number of hogs to be kept?—because I think this is a very large amount. I know one or two institutions that have put up pig-pens on improved principles, capable of accommodating over 100 pigs, for $600 or $700.

Mr. FOSTER. The idea is to have at least 20 different lots of swine, each pen is to be constructed to accommodate six hogs.

G. L. Macdonald for exhibit of Nova Scotia building stone at Philadelphia Exhibition..... $300

Mr. FOSTER. This is an old claim. It appears that Mr. Macdonald was authorised to get an exhibit of Nova Scotia building stone to be taken to the Philadelphia Exhibition, and this is certified by Mr. Perreault who had charge of the exhibit. Mr. Pelletier was the responsible Minister, and in settling the accounts Mr. Macdonald's claim does not appear to have been paid. Time ran on, and the claim was not made for several years owing to Mr. Macdonald's illness.

To aid in a Canadian representation at Jamaica Exhibition in 1891..... $5,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is this aid to be given?

Mr. FOSTER. This exhibition is to commence on 22nd January next, at Jamaica. It is an exhibition of products, manufactures, works of art and so on, not only from Jamaica and the other West Indian Islands, but also from Great Britain and her colonies, and in that way it is a sort of International Exhibition. It will remain open not less than three months. The Department of Agriculture asks for this vote in order to assist in paying the freight of Canadian exhibits sent there, and the return freight of such articles as will not be sold. Ample space has been applied for, and that already asked reaches 5,000 superficial feet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the Government defray entire freights of the exhibits?

Mr. FOSTER. No. This amount will be expended in that direction.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it intended to send a representative there?

Mr. FOSTER. That has not been settled.

Montreal and European Short Line Railway..... $101,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This item is necessary to meet a judgment of the Court of Exchequer. The company made a claim and secured a judgment for $241,866, subject to a deduction of the amount paid by the Government for wages on account of the company, $148,079, leaving a balance of $100,777.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this road now in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a further amount for the Oxford and New Glasgow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There appears to be no limit to the way in which this unfortunate country is mulcted for this road. First we were told that it was in the hands of a first class company, and on this assurance we voted a subsidy.

Then we had to take it off their hands and build it ourselves. Then we were assured that a mileage of 45 miles would be saved, but the saving effected turned out to be 7 miles. I suppose we must pay the claim, as it is a judgment of the Court of Exchequer; otherwise I would oppose it entirely.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this the last time application will be made on behalf of this road?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope and believe so.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will be remembered that Sir Charles Tupper first stated that the saving would be 45 miles, afterwards 19 miles, still later 15 miles, and the First Minister at length told us the fact that the saving was only 7 miles. What is the total length of the line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report of the Railway Department shows the length of the line. The information furnished to me by the Department was that the reduction will be 7 miles, and I submitted that to Parliament. With respect to the statement as to the 45 miles, Mr. Schreiber informs me that Sir Charles Tupper received the most explicit assurances again and again that 45 miles would be saved.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sir Charles Tupper gave the house his positive assurance that 45 miles would be saved, and he, moreover, assured the House that this was a gigantic scheme which would unite the different Provinces, enable coal to be sent from Nova Scotia to Toronto, Hamilton and western points, and that the light grades on the line would enable the traffic to avoid the heavy grades on the Intercolonial. It, however, appears that the reduction in the length of the line is only 7 miles, and that the grades are up to 110 feet on this line as against 85 or 90 to the mile on the Intercolonial.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I could understand and make allowance, if the length of the road had been considerable, for a very serious percentage of error, but the total length of the road is only 80 miles. To make a mistake in a road of 80 miles to the extent of 45 miles is a too heavy percentage of error for which any Minister of Railways should be responsible.

Further amount required for Immigration. $150,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the Ministry received new light from any source as to the necessity for this vote for immigration? We have been told that they had determined to keep down the expenses for immigration and to abandon the assisted passages, and all the rest of it. This item looks like a new departure and we would like to hear something about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is confined to his house, by a serious indisposition, or he would be able to enter into this question fully. The Government have, to a certain extent, enlarged their immigration policy. The North-West has now been fully supplied with railway accommodation, and large tracts of country are open there for settlers and waiting for settlement. Emigration from the mother country is drawn everywhere by the large aids which are given. All the Australian colonies are granting this aid, and there is a large flow of emigration to the United States, drawn, principally, by the relatives of the emigrants, who are settled and are prosperous there. Even the Argentine Republic is bidding largely, in England, and in Europe generally, for settlers. Now, there was a very considerable objection, and with a good show of reason, although it was exaggerated, taken in the cities and towns and in older Canada, that artisans were brought out here, perhaps in a season of the year when work was scanty and when the resident artisans were quite sufficient to do the work, and that the residents were, at very inconvenient seasons of the year, pushed off their stools by immigrant artisans, who, from necessity, worked for lower wages. That complaint, as the hon. gentlemen opposite know, has a great appearance of justice, and I think there is a good deal of substance in the complaint, but there can be no objection to assist, in a moderate way, settlers, especially of the agricultural classes, who come from Europe, and go to the North-West Territories and Manitoba and settle there. It is the intention of the Department only to invite and to assist agricultural laborers, and any aid given to them is only to be given after they arrive in the North-West Territories and settle there. In such a case, of course, every one knows that this immigration instead of being an injury to the eastern mechanics, manufacturers and workmen, will be an assistance to them, because these agricultural laborers will be wanting supplies of all kinds, and they will be adding to the purchasers of Canadian goods. As I have already said, assistance is only to be given to farmers and farm laborers. They are not to get their money in England, or at Quebec, or at Montreal, or at Toronto, or at any other place where they may linger, but it will be given to them by a system to be worked out by the Department, after they have really arrived in the North-West and assumed the position of settlers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it by assisted passages?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be promise of assistance, to be realised only when they arrive in the North-West and Manitoba, and settle there. I am unable to enter fully upon the details of the scheme, and I am sorry to say the Minister of Agriculture is very much indisposed and may not be able to be out for some little time. The Government think it expedient to increase the vote for this purpose, and all safeguards will be used for the purpose of preventing persons who are so aided going to the United States, or lingering in the older Provinces.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand, the hon. gentleman proposes to assist immigrants coming to this country, of a particular class, only upon their reaching the North-West Territories and Manitoba.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And British Columbia.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that whether they settle on the Dominion lands of British Columbia, or anywhere in the Province?

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. Anywhere in the Province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why would not that rule apply to any of the territories up to the Ottawa, and north of the lakes, as well as to Manitoba, the North-West, and British Columbia? If the hon. gentleman proposes to confine the aid to those who occupy Dominion territories, of course

that is an intelligent proposition. But if he says that the immigrants may go where they please in British Columbia, but they cannot go where they please in any of the Provinces east of Manitoba I do not think that would be an intelligible course. If there is to be a general policy of aiding immigration to Canada, it does seem to me that no matter where the immigrants settle within the Dominion, they would be entitled to the same aid. If the Government proposes that they shall be aided simply for the occupation and settlement of the Dominion lands, of course that would exclude compensation to those who settle in Ontario, and in British Columbia as well, except they would settle within the belt that was granted to the Dominion Government, as compensation for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If this vote is to be used for the payment of officials and for printing, and advertising, and distributing pamphlets, as it has been largely used heretofore, then I am afraid the greater portion of it will go to other purposes than to aid the immigrants. If it were not so late in the Session, I would like to call the right hon. gentleman's attention to the story of Ginx's baby. The hon. gentleman no doubt remembers how Ginx's baby got into a nunnery, and how the windows in the establishment were broken, and the baby taken out, and how the case came before a magistrate, and ultimately before a meeting at Exeter Hall, where upwards of £1,300 were raised at the Protestant meeting for the purpose of maintaining that Protestant child. He remembers how that money was spent. I sent to the Library a few moments ago, and I find that the money which was subscribed for Ginx's baby, was spent as follows :—Payment for rent of committee rooms, £45 ; two secretaries, £120 ; agents, canvassing, &c., £88 6s. 3d.; paid for books, "Daily Bulletin of Health," "Life of Ginx's Baby," "Protestant Babyhood," "The Cradle of an Infant Martyr," "A Snatched Brand," &c., £596 13s. 5d. ; advertisements of meetings, sermons, &c., £261 1s. 1d. ; legal expenses, £77 ; stationery, £35 10s.; postage, &c., £27 19s. 2d. So that there were £1,251 and upwards paid for these various amounts, out of the £1,300 that were subscribed for the maintenance of Ginx's baby, and there was only something like £100 left for the support of the infant. In a very short time that fund was exhausted, and so Ginx's baby was afterwards found on a common on the boundary between two parishes, and there was a tremendous law-suit as to which parish should maintain the child, because its head was in one parish and its heels in the other. The money voted by Parliament for the promotion of immigration has heretofore been spent in very much the same way. I remember the last time we were discussing this question, a few years ago, when I think some $600 was paid for the purchase of the right to publish a certain valuable pamphlet prepared by one Captain Allen for the promotion of immigration to the North-West Territories, a further sum to some one living near the frontier for printing a certain pamphlet in German, and other sums to newspapers ; and the amount paid for printing, I think, was somewhat more than the amount actually received by immigrants in the way of assistance in the payment of their passage. I would like to know from the hon. First Minister whether any portion of this $150,000 is to be applied again for the appointment of officials, and the publication of advertisements and pamphlets, for the purpose of inciting people to immigrate to this country, or whether the Government are going to be content with the more modest method of actually paying money to those who undertake to immigrate to this country, exercising a careful supervision over the payment, so as to see that the money does not go to parties who are simply on their way to the United States. I think that is a most desirable precaution. I would not like to see the payment restricted to those who go westward beyond Ontario. There are in the older Provinces large quantities of land to be settled, and laborers are more likely to obtain employment in those Provinces than in the newer districts of the west, which are rather for the settler than the laborer. I think that the House, when asked for this appropriation, is entitled to a fuller and more minute statement as to the way in which the money is to be employed. If the Government do not propose to expend money for other purposes than for assisted passages, there will be little reason for complaining ; but if it is to go for these various other enterprises, as the money went for Ginx's baby, I think we ought to know it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has far too good a memory, both as regards Ginx's baby and some of the ways in which immigration money has been expended. I can tell him, however, so far as this $150,000 is concerned, that it is not to be expended in any other way than in furnishing, metaphorically, a feeding bottle for Ginx's baby, for it will only be expended in aiding settlers. The reason why I mention that it is for the purpose of encouraging immigration to the North-West is, in the first place, that the expense of going there is much greater than the expense of going to the older Provinces ; and, in the next place, the hon. gentleman will remember that there was a very strong opposition offered by the artisans, the trades unions, the Knights of Labor, and the working classes generally, to the expenditure of any money in bringing immigrants into their midst in the older Provinces ; and there is no use of our trying to fight against that feeling, although the danger of their being supplanted by foreign labor is in my opinion much exaggerated. Still, that is a fixed feeling in all the towns of the older Provinces, and you cannot resist it. On the other hand, it will please everybody to have the North-West speedily filled up by a class of agriculturists who will be the consumers of our manufactures and the products of the labor of our artisans. Therefore, I can give the most positive pledge that this sum will not be expended either on pamphlets or in appointing agents to go to England and lecture, and all that sort of thing. At the same time I must say that the hon. gentleman under-rates the advantage of pamphlets and the means of information that were scattered over the mother country and the continent of Europe. Canada is better and more favorably known in the older countries than it could otherwise have been, in consequence of the lectures which were delivered by men well acquainted with the country, and still more in consequence of the pamphlets which were distributed. The money, let me repeat once more, will be expended in assisting immigrants to go to Manitoba and the North-West and British Columbia. The recipients of aid will not receive anything until it is known

that they have arrived in the North-West and have taken up their land, and have, in fact, become settlers in the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is a large vote, and in asking for it the Government are entering upon a new policy, apparently, if we may judge from what the hon. First Minister says. The policy of encouraging immigration has been the policy of the Government of Canada for many years; but this money is to be devoted especially, if I judge from the hon. First Minister's remarks, to the promotion of immigration to the North-West Territories. Well, that whole matter has been so disappointing to the country that it would have been well, I think, if the hon. Minister of Agriculture could have been here—I regret that he is unwell—to have given us an idea of what results he expected from this proposed expenditure. In the first place, I think the hon. First Minister must feel that it is rather hard upon him and upon the House to ask us to vote this money; for I cannot help remembering that, when we were making grants of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to open up that country, one of the statements the right hon. gentleman made to the House was that one of the benefits to be derived from those grants would be that we should be relieved from immigration expenditure altogether —that the railway company would become the means by which the fertile plains of the North-West would be settled. Some years after that promise was made and after the moneys had been expended, I asked for a return showing what the expenditure of the company had been for the promotion of immigration, and to the best of my recollection at present, the report which came down showed that the company had expended in that direction simply nothing at all. The hon. Minister of Public Works, at the same time as the hon. First Minister, dwelt strongly on the same point, holding that one of the greatest benefits to be derived from the construction of this road was that it would lift the burden of immigration expenditure from the country, and that self-interest would compel the company to assume the responsibility of doing that work. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) took the same ground. It was the burden of the song of the Ministry and their supporters at that time. Now, what is the result? The road has been completed, but completed by greater exertions being made on the part of Canada—by further advances being made to that company in order that the road might be thoroughly completed; and yet, after Parliament has voted millions of acres of land more to that company by way of aiding branches and giving them even a greater and more direct interest in the North-West than the vast interest they had before, we hear nothing said about their duty with reference to this matter. We find, however, that the same Ministers who told us that it would be the company's interest, as well as their duty, to make large expenditures for the purpose of immigration and relieve us of that necessity, we find the Government coming down with a proposition to spend $150,000 per annum to bring people to the North-West. We have heard representatives of the North-West urge this policy; we have heard them urge that $1,000,000 should be granted; and there are such conflicting statements made that one does not know how to reconcile them. Sitting, as I do, on a Committee which has to do with this matter, I hear, what I am rejoiced to hear, that we have in the North-West, better lands, better soil, better climate than you can find in the North-Western States. We are told, besides, that there are many Canadians settled in Dakota who desire to leave that State and settle in our North-West; that there is a large immigration expected from there, and that it is already begun. These people would no doubt be the very best class of settlers we could have in the North-West. They are the sons of Ontario, and the other Canadian Provinces, who have located, according to these statements, in the North-Western States only to be disappointed, and who desire to leave there to take up their residence in Canada. With all that, we find the Government coming down with a proposition of this kind in order to bring out people from the old country to settle our lands. It would be well to defer entering on this new policy until next year, when the census will be taken, and we will be able to ascertain what have been the real pratical results of our expenditure in the past. We do not forget that, in 1885, when the last census was taken, the result was most disappointing and disheartening; and when the census is taken in 1891, it is to be hoped better results will be shown by it. But, after all, the promises which were made that the Canadian Pacific Railway would bring settlement to the country, that the company would make every effort, as it was their interest to do, to promote settlement, it was most disappointing to find the Government coming down now and proposing to add $150,000 a year to our expenditure, over and above the millions of acres of land we have voted away every succeeding session including the present. We find the members of the North-West pressing this matter on the Government; we find them calling for an expenditure of $1,000,000, which proves that the immigration to that country has been bitterly disappointing to them as it has been to the rest of the members of this House. It is the duty of the Government to urge upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, when giving them additional grants of land, that they should be more active in promoting immigration. The Government should urge upon them their duty to assume, in a large measure, the expenditure of peopling the North-West from the surplus population of the old country. Certainly they have as great an interest in that country as any one can possibly have, and the arguments used when these railway grants were being given was that the interests of this company would impel them to take this course. I think the Government ought to be in a position to come to the House and say what the Canadian Pacific Railway have done in the way of encouraging immigration, and what expenditure they have made in reference to that matter? When, a few years ago, I asked for a return of the expenditure they had thus made, I received one which amounted to stating, in so many words, that there was no expenditure. I think it is the duty of the Government to take steps in the direction that I have pointed out, before asking us, after all the expenses we have made, to start upon this policy of spending $150,000 a year in order that we may bring over immigrants to settle upon lands that belong to us and the Canadian Pacific Railway as well, and by the location of these immigrants

upon which this corporation shall greatly benefit. If we are to enter upon this scheme of expenditure and if it be true, as it has been reported in the Committee on Immigration, that there are a large number of Ontario farmers settled in Dakota and other North-Western States who are anxious to leave and come to our North-West, I submit that possibly there we might find a field from which we could, with much less expense, draw a more suitable class of settlers for our North-West, than we can get even from the old country. Then, with reference to the assisting of passengers, I would like to know whether the Government have had a conference with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and whether, if this scheme be gone into and we grant assisted passages to immigrants across the ocean, the Canadian Pacific Railway will on their part agree to carry these immigrants to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and give them free passages to where they may settle. What do they propose to do in the matter? Do they propose to help, and to what extent? I think it is the duty of the Committee to ascertain something with reference to these matters before giving this grant of money, and I do think the time has come when the Government ought to urge, if they have not already done so, the Canadian Pacific Railway to take more active steps and expend more money in promoting immigration to the North-West. We were promised by the First Minister and by the Minister of Public Works, when that scheme was gone into, and by their supporters, that in course of time the Canadian Pacific Railway would relieve us entirely of expenditure upon immigration, and would become the instrument by which these lands would be settled. Well, things have gone on in the past ten years; and certainly the duty devolving upon them and their interests as well, have increased, instead of being minimised, by the extra grants of lands we have given them each succeeding Session, including the present. Yet we have no information from the Government as to what expenditure they have made. I am aware the First Minister is not thoroughly posted in this matter; and I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is unable to be present; but perhaps some member of the Government is in possession of the information I desire; and if so the Committee ought to be favored with it before adopting this, which is, in a measure, a new policy, as explained by the First Minister—not a measure of assisting immigrants to settle in the older Provinces but to bring only those who intend to settle in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway have done a very great deal in the way of assisting immigrants to get to the North-West. Besides spending large sums of money in distributing information in England, they carry in their immigrant trains immigrants at the lowest possible rate. The ordinary rate from Quebec and Montreal to Winnipeg is upwards of $30, and they carry the immigrants from Quebec to Winnipeg for $12. They have, during the summer, weekly or fortnightly immigrant trains. The hon. gentleman will see that it is a substantial advantage to the immigrants; and besides the mode of applying this vote—if it be granted, and I hope it will be—in the case of individual families, will depend upon the arrangement which the Department of Agriculture will make with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The mode of applying it in each individual case, or rather in the case of each individual family, will depend upon the arrangements that the Government or the Department of Agriculture will make with the railways. We shall enter into negotiations, I think—and I have no doubt successfully—to carry the immigrant at the cheapest possible rate over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other western railways, so that there may be a minimum of expenditure and a maximum of comfort for the intending settler.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to call attention to the necessity and desirability of getting up something of an immigration scheme in connection with the older Provinces. While it may be well to vote $150,000 for immigration to the North-West, I do not think the interests of the old Provinces should be completely overlooked. In the Province of Ontario I know there is a large amount of land which could be bought very reasonably, and those who have been in the North-West would say that the people who go from the Province of Ontario, or the Province of Quebec, are better adapted to the requirements of the North-West than immigrants from the old country. I do not think we should devote our whole attention to immigration to the North-West. An hon. gentleman to-night has given us an account of Ginx's baby. It seems to me that the North-West is going to be a Ginx's baby on our hands. Unfortunately, our experience has been that an enormous number of immigrants have entered that country, and when the last census was taken we found that a great many who were supposed to have gone there were not there, but had left the country. I think it would be a prudent act on the part of the hon. gentleman to erect a wire fence 150 feet high from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains, and keep the settlers there when he gets them. While I would be glad to see the North-West filled up with immigrants and to see a large influx of settlers there, still, if you would bring a class of settlers who could spend a few hundred pounds on lands in good agricultural districts in Ontario or Quebec—and the price is now low—and let the present owners of those lands go to the North-West, I think it would be a better system than to get these poor immigrants to go in there and settle. Perhaps one object of the hon. gentleman is to get people in there with a view to the census which is to be taken in 1891. My hon. friend in front has been predicting that the census will not show all the population which we should have, and this vote may be used to hunt up the people in the highways and hedges, and bring in the blind, the lame, the halt and the dumb, so that it may be shown that we are increasing. I hope the money will not be used in that way, and I also earnestly hope that arrangements will be made that, when these immigrants get to the North-West, we will keep them there. I would be glad to endorse the suggestion of my hon. friend from Brant as to some of those who have gone to Dakota, Minnesota and other American States. I believe it would be very desirable that they should be induced to come back. I believe that, if we can fill up the North-West by the sons of Ontario farmers, or by farmers from the older Provinces who have large

families and are anxious to go to the North-West to get more land, and can bring here those people who have a few hundred pounds to buy out those Ontario farmers, we will secure the success of the North-West far more than by bringing in these poor, miserable, inexperienced immigrants who will not understand the country to which they go, and will report unfavorably of the North-West, as they have in many cases in the past, and as they have also in regard to the United States, where their experience has been the same as in our own North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find great difficulty in understanding what the First Minister intends to do. I understood at first that he did not intend to use this money for assisted passages, but that he intended to apply it to people who had actually settled in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now I understand him to say that he is willing to pay the expenses of immigrants on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the exact mode of aiding the immigrants I am not able to point out with sufficient particularity, but whether it be to aid the immigrants in crossing the Atlantic or when they arrive on our shores in passing over our railways, in either case the money must first be raised and advanced in England; the immigrant must be taken to the North-West and settled on his homestead before the party who advances the money to enable the immigrant to cross the Atlantic or to pass along the railway can be recouped. The money must be advanced in some way, and the party advancing it will be recouped after the settlement has been actually made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The problem is a difficult one, and therefore I am not disposed to raise captious objections. For my part, I would be disposed to consider any fair scheme for bringing here a proper class of settlers, though I am certainly of the opinion that our own farmers from Ontario are far better suited to the North-West than any other class that we can put in there, and I would rather see a sum of money voted to divert from the United States to our North-West the tide of emigration from Ontario. I think we should have some memorandum from the Department showing how this sum is to be expended: $150,000 is a considerable sum of money, but it would not go very far towards supplying a number of families with tools or implements, or oxen, or anything else for the purpose of cultivating the soil, that is, if the hon. gentleman intends to do anything of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it can be only in the way of supplementing what is done from other sources.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The schemes which we have had suggested from the other side of the Atlantic, from time to time, have been very plausible, but, as the cant phrase goes, they have not materialised. There is a great deal of danger of our having men of an inferior class dumped down here, whom the landlords want to get rid of. Now, I could understand that if it were possible for us to plant little colonies in various places, of a superior class of farmers, we might possibly see our way to advance money to these, and our immigration agents might bring a considerable number of such people to this country. But we have very little light from the First Minister as to how this money is to be used. If he is going to pay to a family here, and a family there, all over a territory of 300,000 or 400,000 square miles, I should say there would be very great difficulty indeed in superintending the operation, or in ensuring any good results from it. Now, I am not at all certain that, so far as Manitoba is concerned, seeing that the Manitoba Government have got an immigration service of their own, and understand the thing tolerably well, it would not be better—as the hon. gentleman is now making a new departure, it is on his responsibility, not on ours—that a portion of this sum should be put, under proper provisions and with proper restrictions, at the disposal of the Manitoba Government. That plan was tried on the part of the older Provinces a good many years ago, but it was not successful; it was abolished, and I think wisely. But, in the very peculiar circumstances of the North-West, I am much disposed to think that we would get better results if the hon. gentleman's immigration service could make some arrangement with the immigration service of Manitoba, than by undertaking to expend it with the agencies at his disposal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are open to consider that plan, and we are also open to the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) to assist Canadian families in Dakota or elsewhere to come into our own country. I am glad to say they are now coming in; such is the information we get. Beyond a doubt they are coming in to our North-West from the North-Western States—but to what extent, I do not know.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If they do they will be likely to remain?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will. If they come into our North-West it is because they are not satisfied where they are. A good many will come if they are able. They have got little properties there, perhaps invested all they brought with them from the East, and they find difficulty in making the change. These would be the very best kind of settlers we could get. The Government is quite open to assist them to a considerable extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are giving the hon. gentleman a blank cheque to a very great extent. He has not given us much information as to his *modus operandi*.

Mr. TROW. I do not expect any great influx of population from Dakota or Minnesota. You may occasionally get a family, because they are a migrating class of people. Many in Minnesota and Dakota have friends and relatives in Manitoba, and some of them may possibly be induced to cross the boundary into our own country. But to expect any considerable immigration from Dakota is entirely out of the question. In the first place their land is equally as good as ours, in the case of Dakota.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. TROW. I say yes; I have travelled through it, and you have not. For a hundred miles from the boundary it is equally as good as ours, I know it, but I know that in southern Dakota there are

very large tracts, particularly along the Northern Pacific, not adapted for successful settlement. You may induce people from that section to go north, but to expect those along the boundary to emigrate is perfectly absurd. In order properly to expend this $150,000 I would suggest that some inducements be given to Icelanders, for various reasons. They are an educated class of people, they are exceedingly thrifty, they are workers. When they were induced to come to Manitoba quite a number of them were placed in a wrong position—I do not know by what means or by whose fault—on the western shore of Lake Winnipeg. They were afflicted with small-pox after they arrived there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They chose their location themselves, so as to have fishing.

Mr. TROW. They are now scattered in various parts of Manitoba and the North-West. If you can get Icelanders to remove to that country by giving them some assistance towards expenses out, I believe they would make the best class of settlers you could get there. They are very poor in Iceland, and they are all anxious to remove—the whole settlement is anxious to remove from Iceland, I understand, and if some means were taken to get them out here I believe we could secure a considerable number of the best class of immigrants. As for getting immigrants from Ontario, you are merely robbing Peter to pay Paul, in a manner. Such a change does not enhance the population of our country. It is very desirable that you should induce tenant farmers to come out from the old country, but you will have to offer them some inducements. They are in just as good circumstances as our own farmers, and probably better just now. They are doing well in the old country, and it would be almost out of the question to try to expect them to remove from the old country, from England, Scotland and Ireland, into Ontario, without offering them some inducements. Could the tenant farmers of England be induced to emigrate, they would better their condition, because they are paying more rent in many parts of the old country, particularly in Wales, than the freehold of their property would cost them here. One could scarcely expect them to remove. Themselves and their forefathers have been tenants on the same farm, probably for a hundred years back, and they are likely to remain there, unless we offer them some inducements, and present to them the superior advantages of our own country. I think the Government would do well to circulate among them information concerning the different farms we have in Ontario and other Provinces for sale, telling them at what figures those farms could be sold per acre, and in this way we might persuade many of those tenant farmers to come out here and purchase, because a great many of our farmers in Ontario are anxious to sell, for the reason that they are heavily encumbered, and it would be better for them to sell and remove to the North-West. I do not disapprove of this grant by any means, for the reason that that country is vacant, and every settler that you can plant there will grow up with his family, and will at once begin to contribute to the revenue ; he becomes a consumer immediately, and in a few years becomes a producer. If the Government adopted my plan they would do much greater service to the country at large than by expending the public money on such works as the Trent Valley Canal, and a scheme for lifting vessels out of the sea and carrying them across the land. The thing is perfectly absurd. You could easily save $150,000 in some of these lavish expenditures and use it for immigration purposes. For instance, the Franchise Act costs us $400,000 or $500,000 a year, and with that money you could bring out an immense number of immigrants. I approve of immigration ; I always did approve of immigration. A country that is vacant and not inhabited like our North-West is of no use unless you plant settlers there who will improve the lands. I consider this grant a proper and legitimate one, and I shall support it.

Mr. MULOCK. I also agree with my hon. friend that it is most desirable that we should judiciously expend money for the purpose of promoting the settlement of the North-West. That country has been part of Canada over 20 years, at least ever since we took it over. There are many ways in which settlement could be promoted. One way is to make the lot of the settler a satisfactory one to himself. Now, during the past year I observed in the public press various criticisms in regard to the tariff rates in the North-West. I am not prepared to say whether those criticisms were correct or not, but they were stated in such positive language that one can hardly doubt their accuracy. Their general trend was to show that the freight rates from the North-West were higher than the freight rates from the Western States—in other words, among the disadvantages that our western settlers labor under, is that they are handicapped in respect to railway rates. I do not accept that statement as correct, not knowing whether it is correct or not. The effect as announced operates prejudicially to our own interests. The Government might perhaps exercise a beneficial influence in that direction. While having no real power they might exercise their influence to see that no inequalities of that kind happened in the early settlement of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is deeply interested in the extension of settlement, and it is unwise in its own interests to kill the hen that will lay the golden egg, by checking settlement in its infancy ; rather they might, if they can afford it, and it would be to their own advantage to do so, carry the outgoing freight at almost cost, trusting to the development of settlement as a source of profit. When the last general spurt in immigration was made, a large portion of the money voted by Parliament was expended in salaries, printing, and so on. We established agencies in various parts of Great Britain and spent a vast sum of money in spreading pamphlets broadcast throughout the country, with little or no advantage. We had extravagant agents, we had agents unfit for the business, men who had no experience but who were appointed simply because they stood well with the Government, and were good party men. That is not the principle upon which agents should be selected ; and I trust, inasmuch as the Government is taking this vote without any limitation, not having laid before the Committee any scheme of expenditure—having, in fact, a blank cheque—they will be especially careful in exercising the utmost economy in regard to the proper expenditure of the money. With respect to whether immigration can be expected from the

United States or not, that is a debatable question. There are many reasons why the chances are against any movement of immigrants from the United States into Canada. Nevertheless, we must take the country as we find it, and even the institutions as we find them, and we must see to overcome our difficulties as much as possible. When the United States opened the territory of Oklohama for free grant settlement the surplus population of the United States flowed in there by myriads, and before nightfall every acre of available land had been taken up. Statistics show that the free grant lands of the United States are about exhausted, and we may reasonably expect that the surplus population of the United States will flow into our country, provided the life of the settler in Canada is not an unhappy one. The people of the United States are made up of the very same classes we are seeking to attract here—those who have left the old land; and although they may temporarily remain in the United States, there is no reason why, by a wise exercise of policy, we cannot attract them across the border. I would not, therefore, despair of getting settlers even from the United States. It is all fish that comes to our net, whether from Iceland or from other countries of Europe, or from our enterprising cousins to the south. I hope good results will follow from this expenditure, although we cannot reasonably expect much additional immigration this year, owing to the lateness of the vote, but we may expect considerable additional immigration subsequently.

Mr. WATSON. As the Government have not submitted any scheme by which the money is to be expended, the subject should be discussed in Committee, as some light may be thrown on matters in this connection. When a similar policy was adopted a few years ago, the results were only partially satisfactory. I am glad to see the Government disposed to place in the Estimates this increased amount for immigration purposes, and it is very necessary that the Government should devise some scheme for the more rapid settlement of the North-West. Our country has railways, and an abundance of vacant land, and our country must be settled if it is going to amount to anything. There are several ways in which this money may be used. I would approve of the policy suggested by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that a portion of it should be given to the Local Legislature of Manitoba, and I will add to the North-West Council. More good can be done by money controlled by the local authorities for local purposes than by the Dominion Government. The result of spending a few thousand dollars by Manitoba has been to secure a very large number of settlers from Eastern Ontario. Last year the vote was only $10,000, but a great deal of work was done for that sum. This year the vote was only $12,000, and yet their agents throughout Ontario, who are very energetic, are spreading literature, advertising and lecturing to the farmers' institutes and giving information. If reliable information is given to the people who leave Ontario and other Provinces for the United States, they will migrate to our Canadian North-West. There is no doubt we can induce a number of Canadians who are settled in the Western States also to go to Manitoba and the North-West. We have heard distressing reports from sections of Minnesota and Dakota. The country next to ours is similar to our own; but there are large settlements of Canadians who could be induced to go to the Canadian North-West. Instead of the Government employing favorites as agents, they should employ men acquainted with the country, and good and reliable agents can be secured in Manitoba and the North-West, and if reliable information can be given to intending immigrants living in the old country they will no doubt move to the North-West. The hon. gentleman who is practically the head of the Department of Agriculture is not a suitable person to carry on an immigration scheme. His day is passed. In order to induce immigrants to come to Canada and settle here we must have a good live man at the head of the Agricultural Department. Speaking of the local authorities, I may say that the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company has done considerable to induce the people to come to the country and settle on the company's lands. They have assisted the people, in a measure, by furnishing them with necessaries after they arrived in the country and settled on their lands, and their agent, Mr. Eadon, who is a very active man, who has studied this immigration scheme very thoroughly, has been the means of inducing a number of people to come from the old country, particularly the Crofters, to settle on the lands of the railway company. Speaking as to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I do not know that they are doing much outside of giving cheap rates to immigrants coming into the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. They are publishing splendid literature.

Mr. WATSON. So far as their lands are concerned, instead of trying to induce the people to settle on them, I think they are rather trying to bring people to settle on the Dominion lands, with a view of increasing the value of the lands of the company. As I pointed out the other night, they hold their lands at too high a price, as a rule, for any immigrant to purchase. The best way you can encourage the settlement of our Canadian North-West—and it is better than any scheme you can devise, or any amount of money you may spend for immigration—is to make Manitoba and the North-West a cheap country to live in. I regret that the Government, instead of doing that, have, this Session, increased the expenses of living in that country. Any gentleman who is acquainted with the subject will find on making a comparison that it will cost the settler $240 more in Manitoba for the necessaries required to take out his first crop than it will in Dakota or Minnesota. That is a great drawback, for $240 is a large sum to a poor man settling in the country. When you consider the farming implements, the lumber, the canned goods, the green fruits, the fencing wire, and the binding twines he requires, you will find that he has to pay a great deal more for them here than he would have to pay across the line.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is the old story.

Mr. WATSON. That is the story which is keeping the people away from that country, and that is what I am here to tell you, and to try and remedy.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I do not believe it.

Mr. WATSON. I do, and I know it.

Mr. SPROULE. If you can make the people believe that, you would succeed in keeping them out.

Mr. WATSON. If I could make this House believe that, it would be all the better for the settlement of that country.

Mr. DALY. Prove it.

Mr. WATSON. I have proved it, but I do not hope to convince the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly).

Mr. DALY. No; nor anybody else.

Mr. WATSON. Not even his own Tory paper in Manitoba can convince him. I have quoted the prices of the articles needed by the farmers in the two countries, and no gentleman on the other side of the House has attempted to dispute them. They have told us that implements were cheaper before the 35 per cent. duty was imposed, but I ask them to compare the prices in Dakota and in Manitoba to-day. I have compared them, and I have given figures which have been supplied me by reliable settlers in Dakota; the prices in Manitoba I know myself. I will give you one instance: a binder costs $120 in Dakota, and $160 in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) quoted here the other night, figures to show that the farmers in Manitoba were paying 3½ cents on binding twine. That information he got from Mr. Massey in Toronto, and it was stated that binding twine in Chicago was sold at 15 cents per pound, whereas in the letter, it was stated that binding twines in Manitoba last year were sold at from 18 to 19 cents per pound, which left a difference of 15 per cent. in favor of Chicago, with a fair profit for Mr. Massey, besides. I do not hope to convince the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly).

Mr. DALY. Nor nobody else.

Mr. WATSON. I do not suppose anybody else could convince the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DALY. You could not convince me, nor you could not convince anyone else.

Mr. WATSON. I shall never attempt it; but when he returns to his electors I think they will convince him that he is wrong. I would suggest to the hon. the First Minister that the Government should employ men to deliver lectures in the old country, so that in any portion you expect to receive immigrants from you could employ these men who are actually acquainted with the country, and with the locality to which they wish to induce settlers to go. I think the member for Selkirk will agree with me that the great trouble in the past has been the lack of reliable information for settlers. Mr. McMillan, who gave some reliable information before the Agricultural Committee, is doing good work for immigration, under the Local Government in Manitoba. He is a clever young man, who has been engaged in farming in Manitoba, and he is in a position to tell the people exactly how they will find things in that country. Through his work, aided by one assistant, he has induced a number of persons to go from Ontario into Manitoba. Some gentlemen may think that is not of benefit to the country at large, but I believe to the contrary, because a large number of the very best settlers we could get, who went there, were induced to go in preference to going to the United States. I hope that good results will be derived from the expenditure of this money, for it is very necessary that we should have some means adopted for the purpose of settling up our Canadian North-West. I repeat to the Government again, that they will have to make the North-West a cheap country to live in before they can expect people to go there in preference to a country where living is cheaper.

Mr. DALY. I did not intend to occupy the time of the House at this late hour in speaking on this matter, but the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has made some statements which I cannot allow to pass without contradiction. He says that it will cost the farmer $240 more to get out his first crop in Manitoba than it will in Dakota. I say that is not so, and the hon. gentleman cannot prove it, nor can he quote any figures to the House which will bear out that assertion.

Mr. WATSON. I quoted the figures last year.

Mr. DALY. I say your figures are misleading, and are quoted for the purpose of misleading this House.

Mr. WATSON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to impute motives. My figures are not misleading.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please withdraw.

Mr. DALY. If the remark I made is unparliamentary I withdraw it, but I have my own views on the matter, and I will state them. I quoted figures to the House, the other evening, which will prove conclusively that binding twine was being sold cheaper in Manitoba than in the United States. I gave a statement of the Massey Manufacturing Company to that effect, and yet the hon. gentleman for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has the hardihood and the cheek to dispute these facts. More than that I showed that the figures he gave as regards the price of binders in Dakota were not correct, and that you can buy a binder cheaper in Manitoba than you can in Dakota. Let us take the article of canned goods which he mentioned. You can buy canned fruit at present just as cheaply as you can buy it on the other side, though you could not do so in 1883, and you can get better weight in Canadian canned goods than you can in American goods. We can buy lumber as cheaply in Manitoba as they can in Dakota.

Mr. WATSON. We import American lumber.

Mr. DALY. The bulk of the lumber used in Manitoba is Canadian lumber, and comes from the Rat Portage district, while almost all the shingles used come from British Columbia. I do not understand why the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) should continually rise in this House to decry the country which he his sent here to represent. When we, by our influence — not by his influence — have induced the Government to come down with this increased estimate for immigration, which we think is necessary for the development of our country, it is a most astonishing thing that a representative from that great North-West should make the speech the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has made to-night. It is little encouragement to us to hope for the future of that country, when one of its members

should speak in that fashion, and when we should have the unanimous support of all the members of Manitoba and the North-West for this vote which we believe will be so much to the advantage of our country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In other words, this vote is given for the purpose of securing votes for the hon. gentleman in Manitoba. That is about the English of it, according to the hon. gentleman's statement. If there is one particle of correctness in the statements made by him, we can see the absurdity of placing a tariff on these agricultural implements. What an outrageous absurdity it is to impose a tariff of 35 per cent. on agricultural implements, if you can buy them as cheaply in Manitoba as you can in the United States. The thing is utterly preposterous. It is because you cannot get them as cheaply in Manitoba, because the Canadian manufacturers would be undersold if the market were thrown open, that this outrageous tariff is kept up.

Mr. DALY. We can buy Canadian implements in Manitoba at the same rate as you can buy American implements in Dakota, and the prices of American implements have been reduced in Manitoba since the duty of 35 per cent. was put on, because the American manufacturer, in competing with the Canadian, has been obliged to reduce his price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all. The prices have been reduced because there have been great improvements made in these machines and in the process of their manufacture; and it is preposterous nonsense to keep up this duty of 35 per cent. if the hon. gentleman's statements are correct. But we know that they are not correct; we know that the farmers of Manitoba would get their implements for much less than they do if the country were thrown open to the American market; and the hon. gentleman knows that too.

Mr. WATSON. I am not surprised at the speech of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly); but I expect nothing else from the hon. gentleman, who gets off some very flash ideas, and who does not generally speak until I have spoken, and then finds it necessary to throw out some insinuations across the floor of the House, which he is compelled to withdraw because they are unparliamentary. It does not hurt me, if it does not hurt him. It is only because of improper conduct, I suppose, that an hon. member is called to order by the Chairman. I have said nothing against this vote; I have said that I approve of it, and I have tried to state to the Government my ideas as to the best means of spending a portion of the money. I think the result of the expenditure will be good, and some of the arguments I have used in this House may have had something to do with showing the Government the necessity of spending some money for immigration purposes. The hon. gentleman tells us that implements are just as cheap in Manitoba as they are in the United States. I have shown that they are not—that we are actually paying more money on agricultural implements imported into Manitoba than the total amount spent on immigration. I gave the figures the other day from the Trade and Navigation Returns; and yet the hon. gentleman gets up and tells us that they are as cheap as they would be without the high tariff upon them. It is absurd to compare the price of binders ten years ago, when they cost $340, with their price at the present time, when they cost $160. Since that time there have been many improvements on them, patents have run out, and the mode of manufacturing is better, so that they have been greatly reduced in price, both in Canada and the United States. But a self-binder which costs $160 in Manitoba can be got in Dakota for $130 by a Dakota farmer. I got my figures from a Dakota farmer, and I will give his name—Mr. Matthewson, who sat in this press gallery for years as a reporter of the Toronto *Mail*. It is a McCormack binder, which is equal to any binder made in Canada. I am not going to decry Canadian machines; they are, I believe, as good as the machines made in the United States, but they cost more money, and it is absurd to suppose that they would not cost more. Does the hon. gentleman tell us that we get our fruit as cheap as they do in the United States?

Mr. DALY. Yes; you can get canned fruit as cheap from Ontario as California fruits are sold in the United States.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman, but I would ask whether California canned fruit is not much better than Ontario canned fruit.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WATSON. Hon. gentlemen know that it is, and that all who can afford to buy California canned fruit buy it in preference. Apples cost us 40 cents a barrel more than they cost in the United States; and it is natural that it should be so, because we are placed at the disavantage of heavy freight rates owing to the long haul from Ontario. That being the case, the Government should give us some compensating advantage by reducing the tariff to the earlier settler in the country. This would tend to make the people more happy and contended; it would make them active immigration agents, and would do more to promote immigration than all the money you can spend to induce people to go there. The great object is to keep them after you get them. It has been, I regret, too clearly shown to this House that a great many people who went to the country have left it. The report of the Agriculture Department itself shows that 100,000 settlers have been lost to the country. There is no use of bringing them there unless you can keep them, and you can do that more effectually by reducing the tariff on the goods they consume than you can in any other way.

Further amount required for Plant for Printing Bureau..... $26,380

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should have some explanation of this.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for necessary plant for the Printing Bureau, in addition to what is already there. It consists in part of a number of linotypes, as certain printing machines are called, by the introduction of which a large saving will no doubt be effected. Probably some hon. gentlemen opposite are acquainted with this new invention, for largely doing the work of type-setters. It can be used with great advantage in some departments of printing, particularly in connection with the voters' lists. It is proposed to put in, I think, half-a-dozen of these machines. Then, a portion of this vote is for folding and stitching machines.

I have not a complete list of the plant required, but I will see that it is obtained and laid before the House to-morrow before concurrence.

Preparation of Report upon Labor Congress in Paris..... $2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this intended for ?

Mr. FOSTER. This is a report of the great Labor Congress held in Paris last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Had we any delegate there ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, Mr. Helbronner was there and prepared this report. I believe it is very valuable. He was one of the Labor Commissioners and is now in Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of what earthly value is a report of the Labor Congress ? We can obtain for a few dollars a full report of all that passed. If I understand rightly, this is a sort of a report on a report. What is the use of our paying $2,500 for the preparation of a report, when already a very long and detailed report of the proceedings of the Labor Congress has been published, and can be placed in the library for a small sum.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the report of a man who attended and had cognisance of the proceedings, and embodied in his report what was particularly adapted to our country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot see what this gentleman could do that would warrant you in paying him $2,500. He has not written a book on the Labor Congress, and if he had it would not be as valuable as the proceedings published for the world. It might be worth while to place on the library shelves some copies of the report, or circulate some of them, but I do not see that we should pay this man so much money for a report on a report. Where is the thing ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is being prepared.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who gave him leave to incur the expense without the authority of Parliament ? Apparently what has been done is to give this man the commission, and then come to Parliament for the money to pay him.

Mr. FOSTER. I will let this item stand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it proposed to restore the item of $1,000 to the harbors of Prince Edward Island ? The First Minister was not here when the discussion took place. The Government recommended His Excellency to ask an appropriation ; it was asked for and the House in Committee was disposed to give it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, who knows more about the wants of the Island than we can possibly know, has convinced my friend (Sir Hector Langevin) that he was wrong. I did not hear what he said, but I understand he spoke in a very strong way, and said it was a job and something like criminality for the Government to bring down such an absurd item. Well, in this case we are repentant sinners.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 150) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company (Sir John A. Macdonald) was read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

ACT RESPECTING RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 151) respecting railways. He said: The first section is to amend the ninetieth clause by adding two paragraphs. The first is that :

"Any company operating a railway from any point in Canada to any point on the International boundary line, may exercise beyond such boundary the powers which it may exercise in Canada, in so far as they are permitted by the laws in force there."

A number of our Canadian railways have formed connections with the railways of the United States. The desire is that as far as we can give them powers, any arrangements that are made by them in that way they shall have power to make.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. The first part of the second sub-section, which declares that a company has, and from the time of obtaining its right from the Crown has had, authority to acquire, &c., appears to have been inserted with reference to some particular case, because it has a retroactive effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It cannot possibly do any harm.

Mr. MULOCK. The second part of this clause is objectionable. I can understand Parliament granting land on certain conditions to one company which it would not grant to another company, but by this provision the company to which the grant is made may sell out to its rival.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The company which holds the land can only convey what it possesses. If it has an absolute title in fee simple, this will give it power to sell the lands in fee simple. If it holds the lands under certain conditions, it can only sell subject to those conditions. So it is with the second part of the clause. If one company makes an arrangement with another for the construction of a branch or a portion of a common line, they can convey whatever title they may have in any land, whether it is in fee simple or other wholesale title, they can convey that to the company undertaking the work. It simply enables the company to work as individuals.

Mr. MULOCK. Has not this legislation in view some particular case ? It is quite clear it cannot be suggested by any general requirement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it was suggested by the counsel and solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is quite clear that the object of that company is equally useful for all railways.

Mr. MULOCK. That is just what I object to. Under this clause it may happen that every railway in Canada which is fortunate enough to have

a grant, can transfer that grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so long as the Canadian Pacific Railway is willing to undertake to build the road the grant was set apart for. The first company can assign that grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The grant thus becomes "a chose in action," assignable by the first guarantee to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that under cover of granting to an independent railway, we are granting through that medium to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It may be right or wrong to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in either case the House ought to know what it is doing when we put on the Statute-book a general power of attorney like this, to enable a company, without further question of Parliament, to assign an interest in a subsidy to another railway. I think we are adopting a very dangerous and objectionable kind of legislation, and if the Government has not fully considered this they would do well to throw in some safeguards. I submit to the First Minister whether it would not be right that before an assignment took effect Parliament should be consulted about it. Say, if you like, that they shall be at liberty to assign it with the sanction of Parliament. I think it is due to Parliament that there should be further sanction by way of approval of the assignee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we can show that the approval of Parliament has been given in every case before this proceeding will operate. I will take a case that has lately occurred, the Regina and Long Lake Railway Company, that received a year ago a land subsidy for the construction of a railway from Regina to Long Lake, and to operate it. Let us suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway is willing to assume the obligation of so constructing and operating the road. It can only do so by virtue of power which this Parliament has given to it. This Parliament has then already passed upon the question whether the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be entitled to build and operate that line of railway. If it assumes that obligation, this Parliament enables the Company to receive a portion of these lands. Here Parliament has passed upon three questions. First of all, we gave the land in aid of the construction and operation of that line of railway; in the second place, it has enabled the Regina and Long Lake Railway Company to sell to any person on earth who is able to receive any part of the land; and, in the third place, it has conferred upon the Canadian Pacific Railway power to construct or operate that railway. The effect of this clause is simply to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to take the land which is so earned. It seems to me that Parliament has fully considered the whole policy before it has reached the stage of enabling the railway company to receive this land.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a difference between Parliament aiding in the construction of a railway, and considering the operation of the railway afterwards. The public are interested in the operation of a railway, and that is an interest wholly different from the interest of the Government in seeing the road constructed. Now, we have not yet lost all hope of a certain system of competition in railways, and under the scheme now before us any grant that may for the time being be supposed to be a subsidy to an independent road, may, by the consent of the two railways, be transferred to one of these railways. Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that we are giving a grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, direct in land or money, for the construction of a road, and they choose to make a bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway whereby the Grand Trunk Railway agrees, for the subsidy, to construct and operate the proposed road. If this proposition becomes law the grant is transferred to the Grand Trunk Railway, and, I presume, the Grand Trunk Railway having undertaken the construction and operation, is authorised to do so by some other legislation. Now, the object of Parliament may be defeated; the object of Parliament in making that grant may have been to secure a branch from the Canadian Pacific Railway to a particular point, which would be a branch in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway. If the Grand Trunk Railway chooses to take the place of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have not benefited the people in that point at all, we have simply enabled the Grand Trunk Railway to control both roads.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The cure for that is not to authorise the Grand Trunk Railway to construct that railway or to operate it. But if Parliament has decided upon that question, and decided that the Grand Trunk Railway can operate that railway, what harm can be done by allowing it to receive the land grant?

Mr. MULOCK. Why not throw in a safeguard? Is it not prudent that we should have an opportunity to be satisfied that this benefit goes to the proper parties? We should know what use is to be made of it, and endeavor to see that the intention of Parliament is carried out and not defeated. I see no objection to placing a safeguard, such as a provision that a resolution of this House must be adopted before a transfer can be made.

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to point out to the right hon. the Premier that this section will not do the least good to the North-West, that it would not apply to the North-West at all; and I am doubtful if it would apply to a large part of Manitoba or even to British Columbia. I am now confining my remarks to the North-West. Section 194 says:

"When the municipal corporation of any township has been organised wholly, or any portion of such township has been surveyed and sub-divided for the purposes of settlement, fences shall be erected," and so on.

Then comes sub-section 2. Then sub-section 3 provides that "if the company omits to erect or complete fences as aforesaid," or if "as aforesaid," and so on. I think the right hon. gentleman will see that this section would not at all apply to the North-West Territories, because the railway passes through large tracts that are settled, and yet there is no municipal corporation for the township. It could only apply to those townships that had municipal corporations. I suggest that it be changed in this way: "if the company omits in any part of any Province or a territory to erect and complete as aforesaid;" and in the third line after "aforesaid" "up to the standard as aforesaid;" I think that will make the section operative in the North-West Territories.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite appreciates the reason of the change proposed here. I do not think the intention was to make the section as wide as he seems

to understand it to be. The hon. gentleman seems to understand that this is a change to compel the railway companies to fence throughout the North-West Territories. That was not the intention. The intention was simply to substitute an amendment for the present clause, which provides the circumstances under which the company shall be liable for claims for cattle on the line of railway; and the whole difficulty has arisen from the judicial interpretation of the words in the old section with respect to animals killed on the railway. When the clause was placed in the Act of 1888, there was considerable discussion about the fencing sections, and the section was adopted in view of the series of Ontario decisions, with respect to the relative rights of property owners who had their cattle on property adjoining the railway, and cattle owners who had no property on the line of railway, but had a mere right to pasturage on the railway. It was intended by that provision not to give a remedy for cattle that had no right there at all, either by ownership of the proprietors of the land adjoining the railway, or by reason of the rights of pasturage near the railway. Following in the light of the decisions this clause appeared to be clear; but the courts appear to have misunderstood the intention of the provision, and in two decisions given in the Province of Quebec the clause has been entirely misunderstood. The conclusion arrived at there was that the company was not liable for the destruction of any cattle, as no cattle could have a right to be in the place where killed. It thus became necessary to indicate the circumstances under which the company would be liable, and for that reason the words have been changed.

Mr. DAVIN. If the clause were made to apply to the Territories, it would not injure the railway companies, because it would not impose on them an obligation to build fences along the whole line of the railway, but only in those places where the township was inhabited, where cattle did go at large, and where injury was, therefore, likely to happen. There is a large tract of country where there are no cattle whatever. The railway need not fence there; but it would give an advantage to the North-West, and would not press the railway much if the clause was so framed as to apply to the Territories, and it would not impose on them an obligation to build fences along the whole line, but only where the liability to accidents existed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is merely to alter the old section, and make it clear, and it is in no way intended to provide for any liability, real or supposed, as regards the railway. I know the hon. gentleman is taking a great deal of interest in the subject of having fire-guards across the prairie, and he knows that the Government took that subject up, but the difficulties of the case have been laid before the Government strongly by the railway companies, especially by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they have made a very reasonable request, that there shall be an examination of the provisions in force for the protection of the people along the lines of the railway in the different Northern and Western States of the Union, that this matter will be postponed. There is a variety of legislation across the border. In some cases the provisions are almost entirely in favor of the railway companies, and others are unreasonably harsh on the companies, and so the Government have made up their minds to allow this subject on which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has a notice of motion on the paper, to wait over till next Session, and we are to make enquiries in the meantime.

Mr. WATSON. I hope this clause will be framed so as to form a protection to the people whose cattle are killed on the line of railways. In addition to the two decisions in Quebec, a decision has been given in Manitoba against the person whose cattle were destroyed, and as a result of the decision the party could not recover against railway companies. The main question at issue was: whether the cattle were properly on the railway track or not? A few of us met together with Judge Clarke of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and got this clause amended. He assures us that we will be all right in Manitoba. I hope we will be all right. I believe that this will protect us in Manitoba, what ever it may be in the North-West, where there are few municipalities.

Mr. ELLIS. I think the affirmative expression in line 35, sub-section 2, of section 194, which says:

"And no animal allowed by law to run at large, shall be held to be improperly on a place adjoining the railway."

should be in the negative, and should say:

"And no animal not prevented by law from running at large."

If the object is to favor the railway companies, there is no doubt that the words there are to that effect, but if it is to protect the public it should be the way I suggest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In all the Provinces there are statutes against cattle running at large, except under by-laws of municipalities which would permit them.

Mr. DAVIN. I had a clause to move to this Bill, with reference to providing against prairie fires. But after the explanation given by the right hon. gentleman that the clause was struck out in the Senate, on account of an understanding with the Government, I suppose there is no use in moving it. If the Government are going to enquire into this matter in the western territories of the United States, there is no use taking the time of the House in moving this clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; we are going to enquire.

Mr. WATSON. I think there is a good deal in the argument of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), and that the words used in the Bill should be "and any animal not prevented by law from running at large." I think that would be better than the words at present in the clause.

Mr. MASSON. I did not think that would make much difference. Whatever way you put it, it would be on the party making the claim to prove they were running at large. In Ontario the law is that they have no right to run at large, unless there is a by-law of the municipality allowing them. In that case the party making the claim would produce the by-law to show they were allowed to run at large.

Mr. WATSON. The chances are that in new municipalities, where the cattle all run at large, there would be no by-law to produce.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the law of a Province allows all the cattle of a Province to run at large, the railway company should not be liable for killing cattle astray. To say that the company is liable for cattle, which should be ten miles distant from the railway, is to make them liable for all the cattle in the country.

Mr. WATSON. The railway companies are supposed to fence the railway track, and if they do not do so they have to take the risk.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) took a great deal of pains about this section. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether the clause, as it stands in the Bill, is the same as that suggested by the member for Renfrew?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman for Renfrew took a great deal of trouble about it, and this is the clause he agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 13th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. DALY moved:

That all rules, orders and regulations be suspended in relation to the Bill respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway, and that leave be given to bring in said Bill.

He said: According to the charter, which was amended in 1887, the time for the completion of the main line of railway expires on the 1st June, 1891, and the financial arrangements for the building of the line were made upon the expectation that certain assistance would be given by the Government during this Session. That assistance has not been given, and it is therefore necessary, in order to make new financial arrangements, that the time should be extended for five years from the 1st June, 1891.

Mr. LAURIER. This is an unusual application, and the House would be interested in learning from the First Minister what view he takes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no objection to it. The charter expires in June of next year, and, no doubt, if this company had applied for a renewal earlier in the Session, they would have obtained it. No arrangements can be made for building the road if the investors are told that the charter expires in 1891.

Mr. LAURIER. The weak point about this is that it comes very late and no reason has been given why the application had not been given at an earlier date; but, no doubt, if it had been, as the right hon. gentleman has said, it would have been granted. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman is satisfied, he must take the responsibility.

Mr. LISTER. As a member of the Railway Committee, I have this to say about this Bill: that during this Session application was made for a charter which would, to a certain extent, parallel this line, and that application was made by substantial men, but it was refused because, as the right hon. gentleman said in the Committee, we would be granting a charter for a road to come into competition in some sense with the Hudson Bay Railway, and thus embarrass the latter in their financial operations. If this charter is to be extended for five years, is the House to understand that during all that time all applications for other charters must stand in abeyance until it will be seen if financial assistance can be obtained for the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway? If that be the case, it will be hard on others who wish to open up railways in that country in sections where there are none at present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say what Parliament may do.

Mr. LAURIER. You can say pretty well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this railway does not show any signs of advancing pretty soon, the Committee, being supported by the strong influence of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, may pass another application.

Mr. BLAKE. That part can be easily guarded to some extent by combining with the provision for the extension of the time, very stringent conditions as regard the early commencement and progress of the work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been commenced.

Mr. BLAKE. And stopped.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no more money.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DALY introduced Bill (No. 155) to amend the Act respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Bill read the first and second times.

WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY.

Mr. HESSON moved:

That all rules, orders and regulations of the House be suspended so far as regards the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway, and that leave be granted to bring in a Bill concerning the said railway.

He said: The object is simply to extend the charter for three years. The charter expires next August. This is in consequence of some expectations with regard to subsidies which have not been realised, but as the company has started under good auspices, and the Government have made the grant of the necessary lands, there seems to be a fair prospect of carrying out the work successfully.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not know anything of the merits of either of these particular cases, but from my personal experience, both on the Standing Orders and Railway Committees, it does seem to me we are inaugurating a system we would do better to refuse to countenance. It seems extraordinary that these gentlemen should now ask the House to suspend all the rules after we have been four months in Session, when they knew that their charter expired next season, and when the

public have had no notice of their intention. I remember, that at previous sittings of the Railway Committee, this Session, after a very animated discussion, two charters were withdrawn which covered a portion of this territory, on the ground that it would interfere with the negotiations which the Hudson Bay Railway Company had entered into for the building of their road; and now, without notice to the public, we are coolly asked to extend one charter for five years and another for three years, when substantial persons were offering to give that country the opportunity of obtaining railway facilities at once. Now it is proposed that those settlers who have gone in there shall be buttoned up for this length of time to enable these parties to see whether they can get better terms or secure greater advantages. I think it is time that the House called a halt in this mode of doing business, and I, for one, protest against our inaugurating a system which will bear bitter fruits for the settlers in the North-West in the future. Only last night the First Minister asked us to vote $150,000 to get immigrants to fill up the lands in the North-West, and now we are asked to enable speculators to lock up the lands in that territory for three years, or five years, as their convenience may be suited. I am speaking without any knowledge of these particular cases, but I say that nothing has been shown to justify us in setting aside our rules, because these promoters knew the time when the charters terminated, and there is no reason why they should not have given proper notice under the provisions of our regulations and so let the public know, three or four months ago, that they intended to make this application.

Mr. HESSON. The memorandum which was placed in my hands four or five minutes ago, states that:

"The only change is in the words 1890 to 1892. A substantial beginning has been made on this section by grading a heavy portion of the line. The extension is asked in order to complete financial arrangements which are now well advanced, of which the hon. the Minister of the Interior is aware. We did not apply in the regular way, because we were confident of being able to complete within the time, but a hitch has occurred within the last few days which must suspend operations for a short period. Without the extension asked our charter rights lapse, and we have already spent a large sum on surveys, explorations, &c."

Mr. LISTER. Have they built any portion of the road?

Mr. HESSON. I believe that four miles are practically graded.

Mr. LISTER. The truth of these statements is an important factor in the matter, and would have to be investigated by the Railway Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says he makes this proposition on a statement which he received only four or five minutes ago. Therefore, what he said would not have the same weight with the House as if he had had time to look into the matter, and the reasons do not seem to me to be satisfactory, and I, therefore, raise the point of order, and object to the passage of the resolution.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HESSON introduced Bill (No. 156) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

Bill read the first and second times on a division.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Regularly, I should move that the four items of which I have given notice should be referred to Committee of the Whole to-morrow, but, as these should have been in the original notice, perhaps I may move that they should be referred to the Committee at once. Two of them are already on the list, but are erroneous, and this is to correct them. The other two are not on the present list. They were originally on that list, but were postponed in consequence of certain errors. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will consent to allow them to be attached to the other subsidies.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the hon. gentleman brought down the papers he promised to bring in relation to these subsidies?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Here they are.

Mr. LAURIER. In view of the bulk of those returns, I think, if we said to-morrow we would not have had too much time to examine them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well. I will say to-morrow. I move that the House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the Railway Companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Temiscouata Railway Company, for 16 miles of their railway, from the west end of the 20 miles of their branch railway from Edmundston, subsidised by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, towards the St. Francis River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

For a railway from the north end of the 14 miles for which a subsidy was granted by the Act 50 and 51 Victoria, chapter 24, to the Tobique Valley Railway Company, from Perth Centre towards Plaister Rock Island, 11 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $35,200.

To the Orford Mountain Railway Company, for 31 miles of their railway, between Eastman and Kingsbury, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $99,200.

For a railway from Dorval Station, on the line of the Grand Trunk Railway, to a point at or near Rivière des Prairies, a distance of 15 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000.

2. *Resolved*, The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies respectively; the other subsidies, including subsidies granted for railways over a line extending beyond a point which any company hereinbefore mentioned by name is authorised to construct their railway, shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, shall also be commenced within two years from the first day of July next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall be constructed according to descriptions and specifications, and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specifying an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed, in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidised.

3. *Resolved*, The granting of such subsidies to the companies mentioned respectively shall be subject to such condition for securing running powers or traffic

arrangement or other rights, as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those subsidised, as the Governor in Council determines.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolutions :—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres per mile for a line of railway from Portage la Prairie to Lake Winnipegosis, at or near Meadow Portage, a distance of about 125 miles.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Manitoba South-Eastern Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres per mile for a line of railway from Winnipeg southerly or south-easterly to a point on the west side of the Lake of the Woods, a distance of about 110 miles.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that the said grants and each of them may be made in aid of the construction of the said railways respectively; in the proportion and upon the conditions fixed by the Orders in Council made in respect thereof, and except as to such conditions the said grants shall be free grants, subject only to the payment by the grantees respectively, of the costs of survey of the lands and incidental expenses at the rate of 10 cents per acre cash, on the issue of the patents therefor.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. BARRON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I think it my duty to bring before the attention of the House, before the attention of the Government, and particularly, before the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, an editorial article appearing in a newspaper in the city of Quebec, *Le Canadien*, of the 9th May, relating somewhat to an hon. gentleman who occupies a seat in this House. In that newspaper, on the editorial page, I find the following :—

"We have in our possession the absolute, complete and irrefutable proof of this statement. Does Mr. McGreevy——"

Referring, I believe, to the hon. member for Quebec West—

"Does Mr. McGreevy remember having written from Ottawa to someone on the 5th May, 1883, a letter in which he said :

"'The tenders for cross-wall only arrived here yesterday and are locked up until Monday, when he will commence his calculations. I will write you Tuesday and let you know the result.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these words purport to have been written, and I believe them to have been written, by the hon. member for Quebec West to his brother, and if so, they certainly bear a most extraordinary construction.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to conclude with a motion? Otherwise his proceeding is irregular.

Mr. BARRON. I merely ask, as a matter of privilege, to be allowed to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this letter, because it seems to me that it bears a most extraordinary construction, and the public have a right to know what it means. I desire to bring the letter before the attention of the Minister of Public Works, because it puts some of the officers of his Department in a position which they ought not to be in.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the irregularity of raising such a discussion, in such a way, without a motion. I do not think it is a question of privilege.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order that the hon. gentleman may make his statement, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. BARRON. It is perfectly clear from that letter that an hon. member of this House had apparently the *entrée* to the office of the Minister of Public Works, to get information which a member of this House ought not to possess. He says : "The tenders for the cross-wall only arrived here yesterday "—that was on a Saturday—"and are locked up until Monday." He was in a position to get the information from the office of the Minister of Public Works that the tenders were "locked up until Monday, when he will commence his calculations." Now, I may ask the question, Who is the individual "he" referred to? Evidently the member to whom I have alluded, must have had some conversation with an officer in the Department of Public Works. Why should the hon. gentleman be aware of the fact that an officer of the Department of Public Works would commence his calculations on the following Monday? Then the hon. gentleman goes on to state : "I will write you Tuesday and let you know the result." It is very apparent from these words that the member for Quebec West was put in possession of information regarding the tenders, the result of which he himself would let his brother know. Further on the article goes on to say :

"Mr. McGreevy wrote this letter with his own hand, and he wrote it to his brother, Mr. Robert McGreevy."

Then it goes on to say :

"Does Mr. McGreevy remember having written two days afterwards, on the 7th May, again from Ottawa, the following lines :—

"'I hope to let you know to-morrow about the cross-wall tenders. Have your arrangements right with Beaucage before result is known.'"

He seems to have been put in possession of facts regarding the tenders, the result of which he would let his brother know. Then he says: "Have your arrangements right with Beaucage before the result is known." How did he know anything about Beaucage? The fact is, I believe, that Beaucage had also tendered regarding these cross-walls, and he seems to have got that information before the tenders were open from the Public Works Department, the result of which he was prepared to state in this letter to his brother. The article goes on to say, regarding that particular letter :

"This was in Mr. McGreevy's own handwriting, and he wrote the letter to his brother, Mr. Robert McGreevy."

Still further on the article says :

"Does Mr. McGreevy remember having written, on the 17th May, still from Ottawa, what we here place before him?"

Then follows the letter of the 17th May, a few days later :

"As I told you yesterday——"

So he must have seen his brother and conversed with him the day before—

"As I told you yesterday to try and get a good plan and as quick as possible in answer to letters that Gallagher & Beaucage will receive about their tenders to bring them over Larkin & Connolly so as their tenders will be the lowest."

Now, Sir, he was in a position to suggest to his brother, who was in the firm of Larkin & Connolly, "to get a good plan and as quick as possible in answer to letters" which he had been told, apparently—that is the only construction to be put upon

these letters—which he had been told, apparently by an officer in the Public Works Department, would be written to Gallagher & Beaucage regarding their tender, and next he suggests to his brother to adopt some good plan and as quick as possible. Therefore Gallagher & Beaucage allowed something in regard to their tender to get into the letters from the Department, whereby their tender would be increased from being the lowest to the highest, in order that Larkin & Connolly's tender might appear to be the lowest. Then the article finishes by saying :

"This was in Mr. McGreevy's own handwriting, and he wrote this letter to his brother, Mr. Robert McGreevy."

Now, I think these letters show clearly that somebody, and apparently it was the hon. gentleman himself, the member for Quebec West, was enabled to get out of the Public Works Department certain information, and converse with some of the officers, thereby acquiring this information by which he was in a position to know what a certain tender was, and by which, apparently, he was enabled to bring influence to bear upon some officer to write certain letters to these two gentlemen, Gallagher & Beaucage, requiring them to alter their tender so that the tender put in by Connolly & Larkin would be the lowest, although in point of fact it was higher than either of these two tenders when they were originally put in. Now, Sir, these letters have gone broadcast throughout the country, and have created a very unfortunate impression in the minds of people throughout the country, and I think I am justified in bringing the matter before the attention of the Government and asking them for some satisfactory explanation, in order that these unfortunate letters, if they have any explanation, may receive such.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have followed what the hon. gentleman has stated, and what he read from a telegram published in a newspaper, and I must say this, that I know nothing about it, nothing whatever.

Mr. LAURIER. I will avail myself of the present occasion, also, to refer to a statement which has appeared on two different occasions in *Le Canadien* in connection with this same matter. I am speaking within the knowledge of every member of this House when I say that a number of articles have appeared of late in the newspaper *Le Canadien*, directly tending to incriminate the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy). This matter has already been brought once before the House. In connection with this matter, on 6th May, in the course of an article, *Le Canadien* says :

"The Opposition is held through some of its members in the toils of Mr. McGreevy, and cannot budge."

On 10th May, it says :

"As we have already said, Mr. McGreevy holds in his hands, directly or indirectly, a certain number of members and newspapers in the ranks of the Liberal party, as well as in the Conservative party at Ottawa."

I rise to say that, so far as I am personally concerned, and so far as the statements affect the Liberal party, they are altogether without foundation. Moreover, if it is believed there is any foundation in them as regards the Liberal party, I am here to say that the amplest investigation will be met, and that every member of the party, so far as I know, is prepared to meet it. The impression is here conveyed that upon those allegations which have appeared from time to time in the press, and as to which there is matter for enquiry —the Opposition is not disposed to have such enquiry—there are certain matters for enquiry in the disclosures which have been made, and, if we were not in the dying hours of the Session, I would consider the propriety of calling on the House to further look into these disclosures. But I must say that there appeared in the newspaper, *Le Canadien*, on 30th April last, a statement signed by O. E. Murphy, purporting to be a member of the firm of Larkin, Connelly & Co., which statement was reprinted on 5th May, in our Votes and Proceedings, and appears at page 600. Some ten days before this statement appeared in *Le Canadien*, it was placed in my hand with a view to ascertain whether I would act on it. The paper was then more complete than it is now, because it appears from the context that two paragraphs, paragraphs 5 and 7, have been omitted. Paragraph 7, as it was signed and placed in my hand, directly alleged that a large sum of money had been paid by Mr. McGreevy for improper purposes to a person whose name was left in blank. I asked the person who placed the paper in my hands to have the blank filled in with the name of the party who was alleged to have received that money. Though the name was given to me, yet the party refused to put it in writing and to endorse it with his signature, and I said under such circumstances I thought it to be my duty not to have anything further to do with the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Public Works some time ago had his attention called by way of a question to the earlier portion of the interesting revelations which are from time to time enlivening the pages of *Le Canadien*. On that occasion the hon. Minister acquiesced in the suggestion that it was proper to bring before the House such information as existed in the archives of the Department in respect to the matters which are touched upon and alluded to in these earlier publications. They become more interesting as they proceed, and this last batch of three letters, themselves obviously left incomplete, themselves obviously, from their context, only parts of other correspondence, do afford ample warrant for that view of their meaning attached to them, by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). They do not indeed implicate the Minister, and the Minister has told us, as we might expect and hope a Canadian Minister would always be able to tell a Canadian Parliament, that he knew nothing whatever about it. But they have been public property for several days, and I know not whether any kind friend may not have anticipated the efforts of my hon. friend the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), to put the Minister in possession of the fact that such letters had been published, at an earlier date. Although the Minister knew nothing about the matter, I should have been glad to know from him distinctly if the reading of those letters by my hon. friend the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) happened to be the first communication of the fact that such letters had been published that was received by the hon. Minister. Ill news, it is said, generally travels fast. I am surprised if this information has not reached the hon. Minister earlier than the time at which

he received it from the lips of my hon. friend this day. If the information had been received, I hold it was the Minister's duty at once, for the honor of his Department, to have made a thorough enquiry into the matter which lies obviously at the source of that correspondence. I hold it to be his duty, now that it is called to his attention, to pledge himself to make that enquiry, and moreover, to indicate the results to this House. It is perfectly plain that, if the correspondence be genuine, this colleague of ours, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy), was in attendance here at the time that tenders were to be considered for a great public work to be carried on in his own city; that he was here in attendance, not with the view of protecting the public interest by seeing that the lowest tenderer should get the contract, but with the view of acquiring by illegitimate means, through some untrustworthy and corrupt officer of the Department, early information, even in anticipation of the hon. Minister's own information as to the results of the calculations with respect to the different tenders, in order that a job might be put up on the Department and the public, and that some hocus-pocus work might be accomplished with the tenders. It is clear that in pursuance of that scheme, an arrangement was made whereby the moment the calculations were run through, Mr. McGreevy was to have access to them, or information as to the results. It is clear that he acquired, somehow or other, in advance, information of the fact as to who were the lowest tenderers. It is clear that he indicated to those with whom he was conspiring against the public interest, and for the private gain of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., of which his brother appears to have been a member, and in whose business the hon. member is reported to have been interested, the propriety of entering into some arrangement with a person named Beaucage, to whom it was supposed the tender would be allotted, because his tender was believed to be the lowest, and this before Mr. Beaucage could know his position as a tenderer, whereby his position should be secured for Larkin & Connolly. It is clear by the final letter that, just upon the eve of the allotment of the tender, when notice was about to be given to Mr. Beaucage and Mr. Gallagher that they were the lowest tenderers, an arrangement was directed to find out some plan whereby—what? That Larkin & Connolly might be substituted in place of Mr. Beaucage, who was the lowest tenderer? No. But that Mr. Beaucage and Mr. Gallagher, who were the lowest tenderers, might withdraw in some way, might indicate that some mistake had been made by themselves or by the Department with respect to their tenders, so that the higher tender of Larkin & Connolly might become the lowest and so they might be awarded the contract. Such a condition of things could have been effective only by means of the complicity of some officer of the hon. Minister's Department. That it was so seems to be very fairly indicated by the correspondence, and, therefore, even in these last hours of the Session, I call on the hon. Minister to do again with respect to this new development, as he agreed to do with respect to the other development, to repeat at the earliest moment his pledge that he will make an enquiry, and give us the result, so that we may not close this Session with such an apparent stain resting on the hon. gentleman's Department as exists to-day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to these three letters, I think, two days ago, and I gave orders at once to examine and enquire about the contents of these letters; in so far as my Department is concerned, I intend to take measures to see whether there has been any indiscretion in the Department, if there was any indiscretion.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

PUBLIC WORKS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. WELSH (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask a question of the right hon. the leader of the Government. I hold in my hand the report of the Government Engineer on the harbors of New London, Pinette, and Wood Island, and I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman whether it is the intention of the Government to act on this report. It is very important for the people of Prince Edward Island, that some action should be taken with regard to the breakwater at New London. That is a very important place; perhaps the oldest settlement in Prince Edward Island, and it is very thickly populated. The harbor of New London is the entrance to a large bay and several rivers, and it is very necessary that the Government should proceed with the work there. The small sum of $3,500 only, is required for that, and I think it might be expended at once. I wish the right hon. gentleman to give me an answer. Then there is the harbor of Wood Island, on which a large amount was expended by the Local Government before Confederation, and by the Dominion Government after Confederation, but it is like Mahomet's coffin, between heaven and earth. It has been commenced but never completed. We are about to vote a large amount for railway subsidies now, and I do hope the right hon. gentleman will be able to give me a favorable answer to this request. I believe the right hon. gentleman stated to the House, last evening, that I knew something about these works, and that my opinion has some weight. If my opinion has any weight, I would like to state that that opinion is, that the work should be proceeded with at once, and that the hon. gentleman should accede to this request.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know why the hon. gentleman calls on me particularly. All I can say is, that, as the Estimates have already shown, it is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to vote a sum of money for the purpose mentioned, this Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that if you neglect repairs which the Government's own engineers have recommended, and grievous damage happens to these works, as is frequently the case, the Government will incur a very serious responsibility. I understand that this is a sort of harbor of refuge for a large portion of that coast, and if it be the case that vessels are unable to use it, and that, wrecks and loss of life occur in consequence of the negligence of the Government, all I can say is, that I think their feelings would be certainly unenviable if mischief occurs on account of their refusing to make the requisite repairs.

THE LATE MR. HUDSPETH, M.P.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to ask the attention of the House to another grave loss which we have sustained this Session. The hand of death has been heavy upon the House this year, and in the decease of our colleague, the hon. member for South Victoria, we suffer a real loss. Mr. Hudspeth was not long in Parliament; not long enough to take the position that his great abilities would entitle him to, and would have gained for him had he been spared. Those who knew the deceased had sincere esteem and affection for him. He was one of the most lovable of men; a high-minded, honorable man, possessing as kind a heart as ever beat in a human bosom. All those who met him, and had the pleasure of knowing him, will join me in that opinion of our late colleague. As a public man, I believe that if he had lived, he would have taken a very considerable, and indeed perhaps a high position in the Government of this country. All we can do now is to regret his early demise. To me personally he is a great loss. I knew Mr. Hudspeth very well for a good many years, and as I have already stated, I do not know that I have ever met in my long experience, a man more worthy of respect and esteem than was Adam Hudspeth.

Mr. BLAKE. In the absence of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, who has been called out of the House for a moment, I may say that, on this side of the House, we cordially concur in every word that has fallen from the right hon. gentleman. I knew Mr. Hudspeth for a great many years. He was a warm personal friend of mine from his youth; he was, as the right hon. gentleman has said, one of the kindliest and most lovable souls that ever breathed, and a man of the very highest instincts of honor. He was one of those those who, in his personal career, his professional career, and his political career, never, I believe, made an enemy, and who made friends both among his adversaries and supporters wherever he went. He was one of those who very largely conduced to soften the asperities, often too great, which occur in the course of our political antagonisms, and serious as his loss is to us in his other capacities, it is most serious to us in the other element to which I have referred, and in which he stood very high indeed in the ranks of this Parliament.

Mr. BARRON. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this sad occasion, to which reference has been made in such feeling terms, both by the Premier and by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), should be allowed to pass without some remarks from myself. The late member for South Victoria was my colleague. Although he and I were opposed politically, I am bound to say that never since I have known him, and since we have been opposed in politics, has he ever allowed his political feelings to interfere to the least extent with that warm friendship which he has always shown me. I was his junior, of course, by many years in our profession and in political life, but still he always acted my friend, although, as I have said, he was politically opposed to me. The circumstances of his death, as we all know, have been most sad. In a letter, which I received from my home to-day, I am informed that on Sunday evening he was as cheerful, as happy and as lovable as he always has been in the midst of and surrounded by his family. I can assure this House and the country that his loss will be felt most keenly, not only by his family, but by everyone in the County of Victoria and the surrounding counties, wherein he was well known and highly respected. In the town of Lindsay, we have all lost a warm personal friend. He was a valued citizen, good and kind to the poor, and to one and all with whom he came in contact; and I feel confident that for many and many a long day the name of Adam Hudspeth will be warmly remembered in the hearts of the people who live after him.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 150) respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved:

That the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolutions granting subsidies in land to certain railway companies in Manitoba and the North-West Territories be now read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. WATSON. Before these resolutions are concurred in, I beg leave to move in amendment:

That the said resolutions be not now read a second time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to provide as a condition of the free grants authorised to be made to railways, that the ordinary agricultural lands to be so granted shall be open for sale in suitable areas on condition of actual settlement, at prices not exceeding a fixed maximum.

It will not be necessary for me to occupy much of the time of the House in support of this motion, as I gave my reasons for the principle it embodies the other night. I may say, however, that I can cite precedents for such a motion. Such a condition has been attached to similar grants to railways in the United States. I find that there was an Act of Congress in 1862 to aid in the construction of a railway and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, which provided for a grant of land with the following condition:—

"And all such lands, so granted by this section, which shall not be sold or disposed of by said company within three years after the entire road shall have been completed, shall be subject to settlement and pre-emption, like other lands, at a price not exceeding one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, to be paid to said company."

The Act of 1869, being an amendment to the Act granting aid in the construction of a railroad from the Central Pacific Railroad, in California, to Portland, in Oregon, contains this provision:

"And provided further, that the lands granted by the Act aforesaid shall be sold to actual settlers only, in quantities not greater than one quarter section to one purchaser, and for a price not exceeding two dollars and fifty cents per acre."

The Act of 4th May, 1870, of the Oregon Central Railroad Company, chap. lxix, reads as follows:—

"And be it further enacted, that the said alternate sections of land granted by this Act, excepting only such as are necessary for the company to reserve as depots, stations, side tracks, wood yards, standing ground, and other needful uses in operating the road, shall be sold by the company only to actual settlers, in quantities not exceeding 160 acres, or a quarter section, to any one settler, and at a price not exceeding two dollars and fifty cents per acre."

There was also an Act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Company in 1871, which reads as follows:—

"And provided further, that such lands so granted by this section to said company, which shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of, as provided in this Act, within three years after the completion of the entire road, shall be subjected to settlement and pre-emption like other lands, at a price to be fixed by and paid to said company, not exceeding an average of two dollars and fifty cents per acre for all the lands herein granted."

Now, these are precedents for the motion I am about to make. These lands were held by railway companies for railway purposes. The official hand-book published by this Government clearly, shows that the contention I made in the previous debate was absolutely correct, namely: that these lands were held by railway companies for speculative purposes and were held exempt from taxes, and improved in value by the industry of surrounding settlers. Speaking of Southern Manitoba lands, that being the particular portion of Manitoba to which I referred the other night, I find it stated in this hand-book, which was published about three months ago:

"For those desirous of purchasing, the land grant of the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company, only now placed on the market, offers special attractions. It consists of over one million acres of choicest land in America, well adapted for grain-growing and mixed farms, in a belt 21 miles wide, immediately north of the international boundary, and from range 13 westward. That portion of the grant lying between range 13 and the western limit of Manitoba is well settled, the homesteads having been long taken up. Purchasers will at once have all the advantages of this early settlement such as schools, churches, and municipal organisations."

That should be sufficient evidence to show that these railways, which have received these land grants, instead of offering them to intending settlers at low prices, have held them for speculative purposes, and now see fit to offer them for sale when they have derived increased value from the improvements made by the early settlers. As regards the prices of the land, I find in this hand-book that the regulations for the sale of lands for the Manitoba North-Western Railway are as follows:—

"The price of land may be obtained from the land commissioner at Winnipeg, Mr. A. F. Eaden. It varies from $2.60 to $6 per acre, the price being regulated by its location and the quality of the soil."

It is in the interests of the settlement of Manitoba and the North-West that a maximum price should be placed on the land owned by those railways. To my personal knowledge, the Canadian Pacific Railway hold, in south-western Manitoba, over a million of acres, and these lands have been enhanced in value by the schools, churches, and municipal organisations established. It is unfair that these lands should be exempt from taxes, while they derive all the benefits to be gained from the industry of the people who have settled in the country, who pay the taxes, and to whose labor and expenditure alone are due the increased value of the lands. For all reasonable construction in the North-West, these subsidies are a very reasonable bonus; for it should not be supposed that we are to give sufficient lands to construct the whole road, or, in other words, make a gift to a company of a railway built out of the public lands of the country. I think I have shown that this motion of mine is not without precedent. Similar motions have been made in the United States with regard to several railways in that country, and I have given abundant evidence to show that these land grants are held by the railway company for speculative purposes. It is undoubtedly in the best interest of the settlement of the country that settlers should obtain lands at the lowest possible prices. We voted money last night for the purpose of bringing in settlers, and we have the right to see that they shall be able to secure the lands they intend to cultivate at the lowest possible prices. I do not fix the price, but leave to the House, should my motion be adopted, to decide upon that point. I think a fair maximum valuation would be $3 per acre. That should be the maximum price; and I know of no lands in Manitoba fit for settlement, especially those owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that would not fairly be worth that amount.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Watson:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lang,
Barron,	Laurier,
Béchard,	Livingston,
Bernier,	Lovitt,
Blake,	Mackenzie,
Bourassa,	McMullen,
Brien,	Meigs,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mitchell,
Casey,	Neveu,
Casgrain,	Paterson (Brant),
Charlton,	Rinfret,
Couture,	Rowand,
Dessaint,	Ste. Marie,
Ellis,	Scriver,
Fiset,	Semple,
Fisher,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Trow,
Godbout,	Turcot,
Guay,	Watson,
Holton,	Welsh,
Innes,	Wilson (Elgin).—48.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Haggart,
Audet,	Hall,
Bain (Soulanges),	Hesson,
Bell,	Hickey,
Bergeron,	Joncas,
Bergin,	Jones (Digby),
Boisvert,	Labrosse,
Bowell,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Boyle,	LaRivière,
Brown,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Bryson,	Lépine,
Burns,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Cargill,	McCulla,
Carling,	McKay,
Carpenter,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Chapleau,	Madill,
Cimon,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Moncrieff,
Cockburn,	Montague,
Colby,	Montplaisir,
Corby,	Patterson (Essex),
Costigan,	Porter,
Coughlin,	Robillard,
Coulombe,	Roome,
Curran,	Ross,
Daly,	Shanly,
Daoust,	Small,
Davis,	Smith (Ontario),
Dawson,	Taylor,
Denison,	Temple,
Desaulniers,	Thérien,
Desjardins,	Thompson (Sir John),
Dewdney,	Tyrwhitt,
Dupont,	Wallace,
Earle,	Ward,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Weldon (Albert),

Foster, Wilmot,
Gigault, Wilson (Lennox),
Girouard, Wood (Brockville),
Grandbois, Wood (Westmoreland).—83.
Guillet,

Amendment negatived and resolutions concurred in.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for North Victoria has voted, and I will just read the paper placed in my hand :

"9th May, 1890.

"We, the undersigned, agree to pair during the remainder of the Session.

"ADAM HUDSPETH.
"JNO. A. BARRON."

Mr. BARRON. Before voting, I asked the question whether my pair was off by reason of the sad death of Mr. Hudspeth, and I was told it was.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Lambton did not vote.

Mr. LISTER. I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen), or I would have voted for the amendment.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 152) to amend the Acts respecting the Harbor of Pictou.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 149) to provide for the payment of a Bounty on Pig Iron made from Canadian ore.—(Mr. Foster.)

LABOR STATISTICS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 148) to provide for the collection and publishing of labor statistics. He said : This Bill speaks for itself. It is to establish a Bureau or Department of special statistics relating to labor. It is an institution which exists in the neighboring country, in Europe, and in all the large centres, and which has for a long time been asked for here by the different trades and labor organisations. The question of labor and capital is one which has attracted the attention of statesmen of every country ; and, more effectually to carry out the different measures which may affect the laboring classes and their relations to capital, it is intended to collect and publish statistics which will enable Parliament better to understand these measures when they are presented. An appropriation of a small sum of money is asked for in order to provide the means of collecting and publishing these statistics, by yearly reports to Parliament, and by quarterly bulletins to be issued by the Bureau of Statistics. It is understood that the Department of Agriculture, to which that bureau will be attached, will have one of its officers specially charged with that duty. That officer will have under his control a certain number of persons, and will communicate with the different provincial and municipal institutions, so as to get the necessary statistics for the preparation of the reports required by the Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does not the Act in relation to the Department of Agriculture give power to the Minister to establish branches for the collection of statistics ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not specially provided for ; but as the measure has been asked for by a very important class of the community, the laboring class, we thought it was well to appropriate a certain sum of money for the purpose and charge the Department especially with the duty of collecting these statistics. There is no doubt that the Government could collect those statistics with the organisations now existing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That being so, what is the use of the Bill ?—because it appears to me there is no need to encumber our Statute-book with an Act giving us power to do what we have already taken power to do. My own impression is the same as that of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that we have full power to do all the hon. gentleman proposes to take in this Bill. If he were asking for new powers altogether I could understand it, but I am rather inclined to think—I have not the Acts before me—that we have full power to do exactly what he now proposes to do.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No doubt everybody can collect statistics. There is no need to have a statute for that purpose ; but the Government intend to create especially a branch in the Department for that special work.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My point is, that I do not think any additional legislation is necessary for that purpose. It may be quite necessary that the Government should ask for an additional appropriation especially for this purpose, but I do not understand how we require new legislation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The scope of that special branch is more especially mentioned in this Act, and that alone, I suppose, would not disgrace a page of the Statute-book.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the sum of $10,000 per annum be appropriated for the expenses in connection with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand the hon. gentleman's explanation, he is going to request the Labor Committees, or the Labor Unions, to furnish him with information. That might be as well gained by a clause in the *Gazette*, for all that I can see.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Even then it would not be useless.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman, in asking for this $10,000, ought to explain to the House what scheme he has for appropriating it.

Mr. BLAKE. Probably he will ask for "another ten thousand" before long.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Following the good example that has been set elsewhere, I am trying to escape the danger which has been found to exist elsewhere. We have asked for a sum of $10,000, which will be used for the payment of the salary of the Assistant Commissioner of Labor Statistics, to pay the expenses of certain officers whose services will be required, as I have stated before, pro-

vincial officers and municipal officers, and to pay the printing of these bulletins and reports. I cannot give any other explanation. Everybody knows what is meant by the collection of statistics. We know that the provincial officers, who have already provided means for obtaining statistics, cannot be expected to furnish us information for nothing; then the municipal officers also can give to the officer charged with the duty of collecting these statistics, information which cannot be expected to be obtained for nothing. The publication of these bulletins cannot be made gratis, and the publication of the reports will also require some expenditure. I must say, that, perhaps, the sum of $10,000 may not be adequate to the requirements of this Act. I know that, in the United States, the Labor Bureau of Statistics has cost a large sum of money; but, as I said before, availing ourselves of the experience of others, and of the information and assistance which a good officer can obtain from the other organisations in this country, we expect this sum will be sufficient to enable us to make the experiment of establishing that bureau.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object to the devotion of a small sum to the purpose of obtaining labor statistics. The object is good; whether the administration will be equally good or not, time will show. But still it is desirable to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do. Now, I understand him to say that he is going to defray all the expenses for the printing required out of this vote, as well as the salaries of the officers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with my hon. friend beside me that this is the first ten thousand, and that we shall see another call upon us.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman decided what the duties of the assistant commissioner are to be, what his rank and services, and his salary?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We expect that the officer already in charge in the Department of Agriculture, will be able to devote sufficient time to do this work. There is no doubt that a small addition to his salary might be required. Possibly a special officer may be needed to be appointed, whose salary would be that of a chief clerk. The Government has taken special care that it shall not be the deputy head of a Department, but an officer in one of the Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some portion of these matters might be very well obtained in the course of collecting the materials and information for the census. When we get into Committee on the measure I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to that matter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We rely very much on the good offices of the different Provincial Governments. Reciprocity of good feeling, good understanding, will co-operate, I think, largely in rendering the proposed bureau successful and useful to the whole Dominion.

Resolution reported and referred to Committee on Bill (No. 148.)

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 148) to provide for the collection and publishing of Labor Statistics.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. If you add to the high dignity of the Minister of Agriculture by making him also Commissioner of Labor Statistics, and you provide a second commissioner, he will not long serve as a first or second class clerk.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the officer were one who came under my Department, I could give a pledge. It is the intention of the Government that the assistant commissioner shall be no more than he is described in this Bill. We had to use the name, assistant commissioner, for we could not get a better one.

On section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg to insert the words: "quarterly bulletins and yearly reports to Parliament."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take this opportunity to renew the suggestion I made to the Minister that he should ascertain the size and number of rooms in each dwelling occupied by a human being in the Dominion, when the census is taken. This subject appears to be covered by one of the schedules. It is a very important matter. Nothing shows the real position of civilisation in a country so much as the number of rooms at the disposal of every family, particularly in the cities; and I commend this subject to the hon. gentleman, in taking the census. This information is obtained in almost every other census taken, and no doubt it is a most valuable item, and one that we ought to secure at the earliest time possible.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The suggestion is worthy not only of consideration but of adoption.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under the present law the Government has the power to acquire the fullest information with respect to labor statistics, as well as any other kind of statistics that may contribute to more intelligent legislation in Parliament. Already power is conferred on the Minister of Agriculture to take the census, and secure statistics and the registration of statistics. So, under the statute as it now stands, all the information which is now proposed to acquire by the organisation of this new branch of the Department of Agriculture can be acquired under the present law. We are at present obtaining statistics with respect to capital in various forms, statistics with respect to railways and their operations, with respect to persons employed in various pursuits, and I do not know any reason why there should be a special department for this purpose, important as it is, any more than there should be a special department for any other particular branch of statistical information. As to whether there should be a sub-department or not, that is a matter of departmental convenience. It does not improve the position of labor, and it does not supply to the Government any additional information; it is a mere re-arrangement of the Department on which these special duties devolve. That being the case, I confess that, notwithstanding the statements of the Secretary of State, I consider this Bill should be postponed. Why should Parliament give the Minister of Agriculture an additional title? It is true that the Minister of the Interior is called also the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, which I always

thought was an unnecessary title, as the duties indicated come within the Department, but the reason the First Minister gave for that title being added was that power was retained to separate that branch of the Department of the Interior and make it a separate and distinct branch if it were thought fit. The Secretary of State does not propose to do this under the present Bill; he does not propose to separate the functions of Commissioner of Labor Statistics from those of Minister of Agriculture. It is, in fact, expressly declared in the Bill that those duties shall devolve on the Minister of Agriculture, and there is no possibility, by Order in Council or otherwise, of separating those particular duties from that, a special Department. So, there is no need that the Minister of Agriculture shall be called the Commissioner of Labor, or of Labor Statistics. This name seems to be given to him for the sole purpose of enabling him to appoint a subordinate officer with the title of assistant commissioner. I do not think this House ought to be troubled as to the question of how a particular Department shall be organised, and what the name of the officers in that Department shall be. It is for the Minister to organise the Department, as his experience of the actual working of the Department shows to be most necessary. I do not think that this is intended merely to give to some officer of the Department a particular rank, which he might not otherwise get, and a salary beyond that which, perhaps, the duties of this particular branch may warrant by these provisions of the Bill. I certainly think that this is unnecessary legislation for the most part, because it will not enable the Minister to do anything that he cannot do at the present time, or anything it is not his duty to do. The fifth clause of the Bill, which authorises the Minister to obtain a particular sum of money, for the purpose of discharging the duties which he proposes now to undertake with more care than before, is the only clause of real importance in the Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have stated before, and I wish to repeat again, that the Government did not think it was showing too much consideration for the important class of the community, in favor of which we are legislating now, in giving to the organisation of that Bureau of Statistics, the solemnity, I might say, of an Act of Parliament. It will be signalised throughout the country, and public attention will be drawn to it, by the importance of a statutory enactment. We know very well that the Department of Finance, or the Department of Customs, or of the Secretary of State, could collect statistics, but we thought it was better to do what has been done in other countries, where they had the same power, without a special enactment, to create that branch of the Department. We thought it better to secure the responsibility of the head of a Department, to control that Bureau of Statistics, and to ask the necessary sum to meet the expenditure for that purpose. That is enough, I think, to justify our legislation in this direction. We can collect statistics now, but we cannot do so without the money we are asking, and I think it is necessary, useful, and proper to make known the establishment of this Bureau of Statistics by a solemn statutory enactment. That has been done in other countries, and has been found useful. I believe it will also be found useful here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The explanation of the hon. Minister has shown that he aims at two things: one, to make a special provision to give some officers of the Department a more high-sounding title, and, perhaps, a better salary than he at present has; and the second is, to humbug the laboring classes by persuading them that the Government is really doing something for them which it was not doing before.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are doing for the laboring classes now, what has been asked for a long time in this country, and what has been asked and done in other countries. We intend not only to give a salary to the officer, but we intend to give him also a great deal of work, and a great deal of useful work too.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I was glad to hear the Minister state that he was only doing what had been asked by the labor organisations in connection with this matter. I was pleased to know that his desire was to carry this Bill through, because the labor organisations were desirous that it should be placed upon the Statute-book. The labor organisations, according to his view, do not consider that the law, as at present, embraces all the requirements necessary. Now, the question arises with me is, that this measure has been introduced so late in this Session, that the hon. Minister could hardly have had an opportunity of presenting this Bill to the various branches of the labor organisations throughout the Dominion, so as to ascertain whether the leading members of this organisation are in unison with its provisions; or that they should have an opportunity of carefully examining the Bill and giving their views on it to the hon. Minister. I am inclined to think that if the Secretary of State would stop to consider a little he would find that, perhaps, not all of the labor organisations are desirous that the Bill should be pushed through this Session. He will find that they even desire that the Bill should stand over, until they have an opportunity of meeting together and examining its contents fully, to see whether it will meet their requirements or not. I think my hon. friend the Secretary of State has had representations made to him to this effect; and that he will find, if he desires to meet the views of the labor organisations, that it is better to allow the Bill to remain over for another Session. I hold in my hand a communication from D. J. O'Donoghue, secretary of the Legislative Committee of the Toronto Trades and Labor Council, addressed to the President of the Dominion Trades and Labor Council, in which it is stated by the secretary of one of the most important branches of the Labor Council and Knights of Labor in the Dominion of Canada, that it would be better to allow this Bill to remain over. I have no doubt that the Secretary of State is acquainted with the contents of this communication, and I would ask him whether, taking into consideration the representations made by those interested, he should not allow the measure to stand for this Session? If it be the hon. gentleman's intention to push the Bill through, the labor organisations request that some very important amendments should be made to it. Let me read from a portion of this letter what is stated by the labor organisations in Toronto, with reference to the passing of this Bill during the present Session:

"I am instructed to write you, as labor representative at Ottawa, to press upon the Government the advisability of leaving the Bill to stand for further consideration, and its passing into law, until next Session of Parliament. This request has no hostility to a measure of the intent of the Bill just quoted, but is made with the object of allowing organised labor, through its labor congress, to pass upon its merits or offer such amendments as their experience, knowledge and necessities may determine essential to the end aimed at. Organised labor has a right to, and expects as much consideration in respect of the business of this character as has been by the Government afforded to bankers and others immediately interested in legislation affecting banking and banks."

They say that the Government allowed a long opportunity for the Banking Bill to be considered by those interested in it, and they claim that they have a right to ask that this Bill should remain over until next Session, so that they may have an opportunity of making known to the Government all the needs and requirements of the labor organisations. My hon. friend says there is reciprocity in the matter between the various local Parliaments and this Parliament. I believe there will be no difficulty in this respect; I have no doubt that the local authorities will render every assistance they possibly can in order to have labor statistics efficiently collected. In Ontario we have an important branch for the collection of labor statistics, which is serving a good purpose. At first the various labor organisations were reluctant to supply the information desired, fearing that it might affect their taxation; but that difficulty has been to a great extent removed. However, my object was to read what I have read, showing that this organisation would be better pleased if the Bill were allowed to remain over till next Session. If, however, the hon. Secretary of State is determined to proceed with the Bill, I have some amendments which they consider to be important, which I shall feel it my duty to press upon the Committee.

Mr. LÉPINE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that the stand taken in reference to this matter by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) is quite strange. Some weeks ago the hon. gentleman charged the Government with paying very little attention to the report of the Labor Commission. Now, when complaint was laid against the Government for not considering the report of the Labor Commission, why should he now ask that the consideration of this report be postponed to next year? The Bill now before the House was, of course, based on the report made by the Labor Commission. I cannot see any necessity for postponing the consideration of this Bill until next Session. One must not put off to the morrow what one can do on the very day. I am somewhat puzzled by the letter from Mr. O'Donoghue, just read by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson). Mr. O'Donoghue is one of the most ardent advocates of the organisation of a Labor Bureau, and, last year, at the meeting of the Dominion Trades and Labor Congress, he strongly urged the organisation of these Statistical Bureaus. Why should he now wish to see the carrying of the Bill delayed? For several years past the labor organisations of this country have been asking for a Statistical Bureau, and, if it was not granted sooner, it is, no doubt, owing to the fact that the Government, in 1885, appointed a Labor Commission for ascertaining the condition of the workingmen of the whole Dominion. The Government keep their promise by now asking the House to affirm this Bill organising a Labor Statistical Bureau, and that they be granted a sum of $10,000 to cover the expenses of management of the same. In every country there are institutions of this kind, and they have been very greatly beneficial to the laboring classes. The laboring classes in this Dominion expect to be paid the same attention, and I congratulate the Government for having taken the initiative. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of the members of this House, fully appreciating the importance of the establishment of such a Statistical Bureau and actuated by the best intentions towards the laboring classes, will unanimously adopt this Bill, and later on they will only have to congratulate themselves for having done so. Mr. Chairman, I do not see of what use it would be to put off this Bill until next year, for it has been brought to the notice of the labor organisations. Moreover, the labor organisations of the Dominion were represented here during the whole winter by delegates whom they trust, and who are certainly the best informed men as to labor matters they could send here. So that what these delegates have done was well done. Mr. Carey, who represents here the Dominion Congress, received from the Hon. Mr. Chapleau a copy of the Bill, and having found it perfectly acceptable, did not deem it his duty to ask for any change in it. Therefore, I might as well trust Mr. Carey, who was here the delegate of the organisations, than trust Mr. O'Donoghue, who must be moved by political considerations. Thus, Mr. Chairman, I conclude by hoping that the House will adopt this Bill creating a Labor Statistical Bureau. The Bill will be well appreciated by the workingmen, for it will enable them, in a few years, to ascertain the improvements made, by a comparison between the wages now paid and those that will then be paid; moreover, it will enable them to compare the prices of commodities, food, &c., and ascertain whether they have truly improved their social condition.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At this late hour of the Session I have avoided entering into a long dissertation on this most important subject, which might have otherwise enlisted the attention of the House in hours of fruitful discussion. I do not want to do it, for the reason the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has mentioned. I have given to the cause of the laboring classes, to their condition and their demands, the closest study and attention. The subject has enlisted my sympathy for many years. I had prepared for this Session two or three different measures—only projects of law, it is true; and I have received in some cases, in a spirit which was perhaps too suspicious, recommendations and advice and demands, and I have been asked to postpone those measures, and the Government have yielded to that request of the labor organisations. I must tell my hon. friend from Elgin that he is mistaken if he believes that the trade and labor organisations are opposed to the passage of the Bill for the creation of a Bureau of Labor Statistics. Not later than about half an hour ago, I was in communication with the President of the Legislative Committee of the Trades and Labor Council of Toronto, Mr. Carey, who suggested to me some modifications and amendments which I am going to ask the House to embody in this Bill. But I know that it is not only good, but necessary, that a Labor

Bureau should be organised now. The preparation of the census will coincide with the organisation of this bureau, and I am sure that I am not saying anything contrary to the wishes of the labor organisations when I say that this Labor Bureau should be organised at once. It is not a novelty. I had prepared an insurance measure for workingmen, containing dispositions of detail which it was necessary to study for a certain time, and I have been asked to postpone that measure, and the Government have postponed it. Another measure was prepared to protect workingmen against what is commonly called the truck system. I have been asked to postpone that measure for further study of the different objects it embraced; and I have agreed to do so. This measure, however, is not only opportune, but necessary at the present time. I think it right that we should study these labor questions, and the organisation of a Labor Bureau is only the preparation for the study of all labor questions involving such great and important interests in the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am in favor of such a Bill as that now before the House, but I think it is too late in the Session to bring forward a measure of such importance. The House has been in Session for nearly four months, and now, in the closing days of the Session, the hon. Minister asks us to carry through this very important Bill. I think it would be in the interest of all, if this Bill, having been introduced and read the second time, were allowed to remain over until next Session.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It will take nearly a year to organise it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Bill ought to have been introduced in the early part of the Session. We cannot, at this time, give it the consideration it requires, and I do not see that any great harm will be done if it is allowed to remain over until next Session, so that, in the meantime, the labor organisations all over the country, who are specially interested in it, will have a full opportunity to consider it, and next Session we shall be able to put on the Statute-book a more perfect measure than we can possibly do now.

Mr. CURRAN. If the Bill were one of great complication, and if the subject had not already occupied the attention of those most interested and the general public, and if it had not been discussed as it has been by the press, there would be more force in what the hon. gentleman says than there really is. This Bill is one of great simplicity; it is one that has been evolved from the discussions which have taken place in the interest of the laboring classes. Although it has not been introduced earlier in the Session, the hon. gentleman has not shown there is any vicious principle in the Bill, or that there is any particular point to which he takes any special exception; and, therefore, his observations are not of a character to warrant the hon. gentleman in adopting the suggestion that the Bill should stand over until next Session. If the Bill should become law, and it is shown between this and next Session to be defective in any respect, we will be in a position next Session to make such amendments as experience will show to be necessary. But, in the meantime, it is well that this measure, which has received the attention of those most deeply interested, should be now placed in our statutes, and we can later introduce such amendments to it as time and circumstances may indicate to be necessary. I hope the hon. gentleman will press his measure through, and thus prove to those who have been for sometime asking for such a law, that the Parliament of Canada is anxious to do what it can to meet their just demands. By obtaining the statistics, and the other information for the obtaining of which this Bill provides, we will be enabled to adopt such measures as will be conducive to the interests of both labor and capital.

Mr. McKAY. I cannot see that any good reason has been given why this Bill should be left over for another Session. It is not a Bill which legislates in any way against the workingmen, but will operate to their benefit. It is for the purpose of obtaining data on which Parliament may act next Session. The information, which may be gathered by the Bureau of Statistics, may prove to be data for legislation to be brought forward at a later date, and I do not see, therefore, why it should be held over. It is a step in the direction of progress. I hope the Secretary of State will press this Bill and put us in a position to, at a future time, legislate in the interests of labor organisations. Although representing a constituency where there are many workingmen, I have heard of no protest against this Bill. If they had anything against it, I am sure my colleague and myself would have heard of their protests, but they seem to be well satisfied.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not wish to be understood as opposing the Bill at all. I am just as anxious as the Secretary of State that a Bill meeting the desires of the various labor organisations in the Dominion should be passed. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. McKay) says he has had no protest against this measure and has heard of no complaint in reference to it. I might ask if any representations have been made to pass the Bill this Session?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; and very strong and very pressing representations.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, I have had representations equally as strong and pressing to have it held over. The Secretary of State says he has prepared several other measures. I am aware of that. I had an opportunity of looking at one of them, not very much in the interest of organised labor. This is better than that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend cannot know that. If he takes his conclusion from information obtained in the press, he obtained wrong information. My hon. friend does not know what the measure was which I intended to propose to the House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). All I know is that a Bill purporting to be the measure of my hon. friend was given a limited circulation. A few copies were obtained by some individuals, and, judging from those copies, the measure was not in the interest of organised labor to the extent this one is, and I would, therefore, approve of this as being an improvement upon the previous Bill. My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has expressed his surprise that such a letter should come from Mr. O'Donoghue. If he considers the matter carefully, he will not be at all surprised. It is only a few days ago this Bill was introduced and received

its first reading, and was then printed and circulated; and it is only through the care and watchfulness of Mr. Carey in forwarding this Bill to Toronto, that the labor organisations there had an opportunity of seeing it at all. It may be that my hon. friend, being behind the scenes, had an opportunity of seeing the Bill before it was printed, and of handing it to his friends before it was made generally public; but I am satisfied that the organisation in St. Thomas have not had any opportunity of reporting their views in reference to this subject.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. All the labor organisations know it, and know it better than we do in this House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is a very surprising statement. Did they have an opportunity of reading the Bill before it was printed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is very strange, indeed. I thought this measure was the fruit of the fertile brain of the Secretary of State; yet he tells us that the organisations all knew of this Bill a long time ago. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, if they did, they have never made known any desire for the passage of this measure to me, and I must, therefore, hold they have not had that opportunity. However, my hon. friend tells me he has received suggestions from Mr. Carey, and has incorporated them in the Bill. If that is so, I am quite satisfied to allow the Bill to pass through this Session, but, certainly, unless it is protected in the direction the organisations require, it would be a mistake to allow it to go through this Session.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When I stated that the labor organisations knew this Bill better than we, I said so because this Bill has been passed and proclaimed and acted upon in at least twenty or thirty States of the American Union. It is known, word for word, by every workingmen's association, and nobody can say that it is taking the labor organisations by surprise. I do not mean to say that they have read this Bill, but they have read a Bill designed exactly in the way that this is. My hon. friend does not take the responsibility of delaying this measure, and he is right, because the census will be taken concurrently with the statistics required by this Bill.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not intend to have any reflection passed upon me that I am trying to delay the Bill. If the Bill had been introduced earlier in the Session, there would have been no difficulty about it, and I stated that I was willing to withdraw any opposition if the representations made to me by the different organisations were adopted. I have been in favor of this Bill, and I am just as ardent a supporter of it as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I do not intend opposing this Bill; I wish, on the contrary, to congratulate the Government for having decided to bring it up. I cannot see on what ground this Bill could be objected to. We cannot too much favor any legislation having for its object to improve the condition of the laboring classes. But this latter must be known in all its details if the end in view is to be attained. My object, presently, is to call the attention of the hon. Secretary of State to one important point. It is most desirable that he should direct this Bureau, which is about to be organised, to specially examine the condition of the particular laboring class of Quebec known as the ship laborers. The transatlantic companies are gradually leaving the port of Quebec, and they give as their reason for coming no more to Quebec and even transferring their trade to another country, that the ship laborers of that town are requiring so high wages that it is impossible for them to have their ships loaded or unloaded without incurring losses, instead of making profits out of their trade. It is most desirable that this Bureau should enquire as to the rules of these societies, the number of persons employed in the loading and unloading of ships, their salaries, and also the number of persons who are not employed, in order that this House should be fully informed, and that we might know whether these ship laborers' societies are truly a benefit, or whether they should not rather be considered as a public calamity and nuisance. I hope the hon. Secretary of State will give this matter his earnest consideration. It is a well known fact that, on account of the ship laborers, the river police had to be maintained in Quebec, and the Government felt compelled to impose a tax on the ships so as to cover this expenditure. The United States, in order to retaliate, are charging a duty on the ships coming from any port of the Province of Quebec. Such is not the case for Ontario, whose ships are admitted free in the United States. Some time ago—some two years ago, I think—I brought up a Bill providing that the ship laborers, who should try to prevent other laborers from loading ships, should be liable under the criminal law. I did not succeed in having the Bill passed; the Government thought there was no necessity for it; and I did not then receive sufficient support to have the Bill become law. But here is a case where the Government will have an opportunity of ascertaining whether the rules and tariffs of the ship laborers' society are really in the interests of the laborers, or whether they are not a source of ruin for themselves as well as for the trade of the city of Quebec, and a considerable impediment to the prosperity of an important section of our country.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RAILWAY.

Mr. HESSON. I renew the motion which I made earlier in the day for the suspension of the rules in regard to the Bill in reference to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. What have the Government to say in regard to this? It is a very unusual application, and some reason must be given for it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The notice was given very late, and the time would be up before next Session. Under these circumstances, I think there should be no objection to allowing the Bill to be read the first and second times and referred to the Railway Committee, which will meet to-morrow morning.

Mr. LAURIER. We have certain rules in regard to private Bills, but they can be dispensed with in case of urgency. In this case I understand that certain works have to be completed before the 1st July or the charter will be forfeited. They

have had four months, during which we have been sitting here, within which to make the application. No application has been made, and, as far as I see, no question of urgency has been shown. I have no reason to oppose this measure, personally or politically, and the Governmont must take the responsibility for it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the leader of the Opposition takes the proper course. I regard it as a dangerous course to pursue, and I shall feel it my duty to adhere to the course taken by the leader of the Opposition, as a follower of his.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

Mr. HESSON introduced Bill (No. 156) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

Bill read the first and second times.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SAVINGS BANKS—PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 154) respecting certain savings banks in the Province of Quebec. He said: This is an Act to extend the charters of the two savings banks in the Province of Quebec, the City and District Savings Bank and the Caisse d'Economie. They follow the general banking legislation of ten years ago, and their charters were at that time extended, and the privileges which they had before were also extended to them for a period of ten years. They expire on the 1st of July next year, so it becomes necessary to extend their charters. They are not banks of issue, of course, simply savings banks. The Bill was introduced into the Senate and passed there, and follows almost entirely the lines of the old Bill, without any new privileges, and without curtailing to any extent the privileges which they have heretofore had. The clauses in reference to unclaimed dividends are put in here anew, following the clause of the Bank Act with reference to the same matter. Most of the clauses are changed in sense; some of them are redrafted so as to read better, and I will point out these to the Committee as we pass through.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

Mr. FOSTER. The only change is the addition of the words "and all accumulated profits," giving them the power to invest their accumulated profits.

On section 18,

Mr. FOSTER. The only change is the omission of the words "on call," after the words "chartered banks." There is a provision afterwards which makes these moneys subject to the agreement which may be entered upon between these banks and the chartered banks with which they deposit.

On section 19,

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that complaints have been made to the Government that these banks were really doing a discount business, a bank business; am I correct in that opinion?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not heard of it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain resolutions respecting subsidies to railways.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These resolutions show the aid the Government propose to ask Parliament to grant in the way of assistance to railway companies by subsidies. Many of these are simply revotes; the amount of the new votes proposed will reach about $3,000,000. We have endeavored to keep the subsidies within very moderate bounds, and they are very moderate, compared with the votes that have previously been granted. We believe that assistance to a moderate extent in certain parts of the Dominion is of great importance to the development of sections of country through which these roads are to be constructed. The policy of the Government is well known and has been fixed for several years, and I need not, therefore, dilate upon that policy. I suggest that we consider the resolutions *seriatim*.

To the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from the western end of the 30 miles subsidised by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, towards Ottawa, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road was formerly known as the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway. The Act passed during the present Session changed its name to the Montreal and Ottawa Railway. The road was designed to commence at the Grand Trunk at Vaudreuil, and pass through the country near Hawkesbury, a distance of about 90 miles. By 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a subsidy of $96,000 was voted for 30 miles. Sixteen miles have been constructed and trains have been running over that portion. By this resolution a subsidy is proposed for 30 miles further, leaving 30 miles uncovered by subsidy. The road will pass through a magnificent farming country, which stands very much in need of railway facilities for its development. It has been decided by the Government to ask Parliament for a further subsidy to aid in carrying on the road to Ottawa.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not find any report as to this company in the reports brought down by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us at the outset what amount of subsidies have been applied for, and what amount the Government contemplate giving; that is, what the subsidies will amount to, to the railways incorporated which the Government have thought worthy of being subsidised. I notice that a very large number of railway charters have been granted, and I am told by an hon. gentleman who has looked into the matter, that at $3,200 a mile, it would require $70,000,000 to subsidise all these railways. I do not suppose that the Government has formed a favorable opinion of all these enterprises, although they have permitted the charters to be granted; but no doubt a very much larger number of railway

corporations have applied for aid than those included in the list. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what amount has been applied for, and to what extent the applications have been set aside.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The fact that a company has been chartered to build a railway in any section of the Dominion, does not at all presume that it is to be aided by parliamentary vote. There are a good many railways which have applied for charters for the purpose of competition. As a general rule, although there may be exceptions, I do not think Parliament will be asked, if any given section has a railway passing through it, to subsidise a competitive railway. Nearly every one of the commercial centres apply for a competitive railway, in order to regulate and coerce the railway already constructed. I think we had 80, or, perhaps, 100, applications for assistance or subsidies this year. The amount applied for was about $14,000,000. The resolutions now before the Committee involves, as I have already stated, about $3,000,000. There are altogether $3,000,000, or thereabout, in the items before the Committee; but there is $1,000,000 of revote, all of which will be explained as we go along.

Mr. LAURIER. The statement made by the First Minister, that applications to the amount of $14,000,000 have been made, shows that we have opened a very wide door in this policy. The hon. gentleman will, I think, agree with me, under such circumstances, that wherever a company which has been already favored with a subsidy, comes again for a subsidy, such as the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company, we ought to be satisfied as to the manner in which the subsidy already allowed has been applied. I do not find that this company have made any report as to their work, or that they have proceeded to build the section of the road for which they have already received a subsidy. I find from the report of the Minister of Railways, that in the month of February, 1889, a contract was entered into by the company, with the Government, for thirty miles from Vaudreuil towards Hawkesbury. But up to the 1st December, 1889, no payments had been made, and I presume they are not satisfied with the condition of the contract, and did not complete their work in whole or in part. Before we vote any further subsidy to this company, it would be interesting for us to know how far they have proceeded with the subsidy already advanced to them; because, if they have not earned the subsidy granted to them last year, it seems to me they should comply with the terms of the contract entered into with the Government before receiving additional aid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I spoke in too low a tone, and my hon. friend did not exactly catch what I said. The road is designed to run from the Grand Trunk Railway at Vaudreuil, through Rigaud, and the town of Hawkesbury, to Ottawa, a distance of about ninety miles. A subsidy of $96,000 was granted for the first thirty miles, last year, and sixteen miles has been completed and trains are running on it. I believe it has been graded and will be finished immediately to Rigaud, and I have no doubt, in the course of this summer, they will go on with the construction.

Mr. LAURIER. How much have they received already?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell for the moment. They apply and get their money when each ten miles is constructed.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has intimated to us, that this is only the beginning and not the end of this policy, I think it would be well if he would say what the total liability is that the country is expected to incur, in virtue of this policy, as respects this railway? We have given a subsidy already. We are now asked to grant more, and the hon. gentleman says we will be asked again for another subsidy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A subsidy for thirty miles was granted last year, a subsidy for thirty miles is now applied for, and the thirty miles will finish to Ottawa, altogether ninety miles. Then there will be a route from Vaudreuil to Ottawa, making another route between Montreal and Ottawa.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will, therefore, take $288,000 to build these ninety miles. We have already two roads from Montreal to Ottawa. What is the distance between these sections?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs on the other side of the River Ottawa, and the Canada Atlantic Railway runs from Coteau to Ottawa. The Vaudreuil Railway runs along the south bank of the Ottawa River, and passes through two or three or more counties which have no railway accommodation.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some years ago, when this system of subsidising railways was first introduced, a deputation from the Counties of Bruce, Grey and Wellington came here to urge on the Government the propriety of refunding to those counties the amounts of money they had contributed towards the construction of railways which had never received a single dollar of aid from the Dominion. My opinion is that if the Government wish to vote money for this purpose, it should be voted to open up new sections. I am glad to hear the hon. First Minister announce to-night, that the policy of the Government in the future will be to avoid assisting competing lines. The counties in the section of country I represent, contributed very large amounts of money towards the construction of the Wellington, Grey and Bruce Railway, and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, which is now a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The County of Bruce contributed as much as $400,000; some of the minor municipalities contributed as much as $60,000 and some $80,000; they have been paying taxes on these contributions for fifteen or sixteen years; and I ask the hon. Minister if it is just or fair to ask these municipalities, which have never received a farthing of assistance from the Dominion for railways, to contribute towards the construction of railways in other parts of the country. I admit that the Government did contribute towards the construction of a short line five miles long, from some point on the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway to Wingham, but that is the only railway they have assisted in that part of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that my hon. friend, instead of making any complaint, should be proud of the fact that the counties of

Wellington, Grey, Waterloo and Bruce have been wealthy enough to build their own railways without applying to Parliament. This small aid is intended simply to furnish the iron to iron the railways in localities that are not able to build railways for themselves. The hon. gentleman knows that $3,200 a mile will not construct a railway; in addition to that there must either be a subscription of stock by shareholders, of which there is not enough going on in Canada, or the municipalities must come forward and aid the railways by bonuses. In this way a sufficient fund may be obtained to commence the work, and after some progress has been made, they will be in a position to go into the market and issue bonds. But it would be a hopeless task if the Government were obliged to go back and consider the railways that have been built by localities and recoup them for the money they have expended. That would never do at all.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. McMillan) will not thank the hon. First Minister for supposing that the county he represents is not as well able to build its own railways as any county in the Province of Ontario. I think he would protest—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think he would protest very hard.

Mr. LAURIER—that one of the oldest and finest counties in the country is not entitled to be treated in a more beggarly manner than any other county. But wealthy as any section of the country may be, still any aid is welcome to it; and this is why my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is appealing for assistance to his section. He does not see any reason why any section of the country, less favored by nature than the section he represents, should be favored by the Government. Nor do I think the statement of the hon. First Minister altogether applies, for I see that aid is to be given to a railway in the County of Waterloo, in the very section of country my hon. friend adverted to.

Mr. LABROSSE. I think the hon. member for Wellington should not complain of money being granted to the County of Prescott, because it is a county which has not railway communication at present. When this railway was begun, the Province of Quebec voted $5,000 a mile to assist it; and two years ago we applied to the Ontario Government in the hope that they would grant us assistance, but failed. I was desirous that the County of Prescott should have its share of railway assistance as well as the County of Vaudreuil. I cannot say that it is a very poor county, but it should have its share of the money voted for railways, because it has minerals and mills and plenty of natural resources, and it greatly needs railway communication. For this reason, I do not think my hon. friend should complain.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not making any complaint at all. I am making an appeal for consideration for the Counties of Wellington and Grey for the enormous amounts of money they have contributed towards the construction of the Wellington, Grey and Bruce and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railways. They claim that if this policy is to be carried out, the Government should relieve them of some of the debt they incurred for the construction of those lines. I think that is only fair and reasonable; but that deputation got no encouragement whatever. Why, Sir, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce was one of the most important links in the Canadian Pacific Railway main line, by way of Owen Sound, and then by the lake to Port Arthur right on to Winnipeg, before the North Shore was built. The Canadian Pacific Railway have taken it and made it a portion of their main line. Under those circumstances, these people were entitled to some consideration. Take the case of the Province of Quebec. When the Government assumed the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, as it was called, and made it part and parcel of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Dominion Government considered, under the circumstances, it was only just that the Province of Quebec should be recouped for the money they put into that line. This road is in the very same condition. Why then is it that these people are denied the same consideration as was given to the Province of Quebec? I am not complaining of my hon. friend, who is quite right in obtaining what he can for his county. I have no objections to that, if it is a section of country which ought to be accommodated in this way. It appears to me there are quite a number of roads running south, but I suppose the Government have taken precautions to see that this road is not running directly parallel to lines already built, as the First Minister has laid that down as a principle on which subsidies should be granted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only state to my hon. friend that there may have been, some years ago, deputations on this subject from that part of the country, but certainly there have been none of late years; and I have not heard anything about it lately until just now from my hon. friend. All that I can say is that, if the various municipalities have expended their money as the hon. gentleman says they have, let them bring up their case, and we will take it into consideration by next Session.

Mr. BLAKE. They have done all that already.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to have that information from the First Minister. I am glad to see that he has expressed his willingness to give their case fair and serious consideration, and I shall convey that opinion to those municipalities, which, I am aware, have labored under great inconvenience.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend may as well read the communication addressed to the First Minister:

"We, the undersigned members of the House of Commons, respectfully recommend, that the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway be placed on the list of railways to be subsidised this Session, in the event of the Government adopting the policy of subsidising railway companies this Session.

"HUGH McMILLAN,
"J. G. H. BERGERON,
"J. W. BAIN,
"And 110 others.

"HOUSE OF COMMONS,
"18th March, 1890."

If my hon. friend had his 110 others in force, no doubt the Government would give his application all the attention it deserves.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the time the Government had to prepare those papers was so limited that the stenographer was not able to give us the

names of the 110 others; and I am sure this is rather unjust to them, who would only have been too glad to have their names published to the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Log rolling *in excelsis*, you may describe it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The right hon. the First Minister seems to have forgotten that the deputation was largely representative, which waited upon himself and the members of the Government some two or three years ago, to urge the claims the hon. member for North Wellington has referred to. It was a very large and influential deputation. I was there myself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Was I there?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The right hon. gentleman was there also. The matter was brought to his attention and that of his colleagues; and the claims of those municipalities were very properly and ably put before the First Minister. At that time the First Minister could not entertain the proposition which was made; and I did not think at the time he was quite right. I am glad to see he has approached nearer the principles of justice in what he has said to-night, and that he will consider their case. If there ever was a portion of a country entitled to the consideration of the Government, it is this one. They have contributed very largely to the railways they have built; in fact they have built their own railways without the aid of one cent from the Dominion treasury. There is not a single public building built by the Dominion Government, I think, in the County of Grey, although there are flourishing towns there, of which fact my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, is no doubt aware. We have built our own railways and public buildings, and we have helped to build the railways and public buildings of the rest of the Dominion; and I think the First Minister, the Government, and the House must be convinced that those counties which have not received public aid in any shape or form, which have taxed themselves largely for the purpose of building railways, should be recouped to some extent for their outlay. I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has made a very strong case. I think the case was made very strong before; I think the people are entitled to the consideration of the Government; and I am sorry that consideration should be put off until next Session. It might be attended to this Session. If the First Minister will look into the matter, he will find all they have done. Why, in the case of the Georgian Bay and Wellington Railway, the people in the municipalities there gave in the neighborhood of a million dollars. In the cases of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and the Wellington, Grey and Bruce Railways the municipalities gave nearly the same amount; and yet these people have had no return in public money for their expenditures, while they have helped to build and equip railways in other portions of the Dominion, as has been pointed out so well by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). It is high time they should receive some consideration from this Government which claims to be a paternal Government.

To the Waterloo Junction Railway Company, for 11 miles of their railway, from Waterloo to Elmira, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $35,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This subsidy will cover half the way, and it is proposed to continue it next year for another eleven miles.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose this policy of granting a little this year and more next, is not to shock us with the whole amount at once. What is the purpose of splitting up the grants in this way?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because you must cut your garment according to your cloth. We think that various portions of the Dominion deserve consideration in the construction of railways. I hope now this company will set to work vigorously, having got this vote, and build these eleven miles before we meet again. It is impossible to grant these various roads, all of which have merit, the whole extent of the subsidy they require to complete the full extent of each line, be it long or short; and our policy always has been to grant a certain sum to enable them to commence, and then grant additional subsidies year by year, according as the revenue will permit. Some of these lines, hundreds of miles in length, have obtained grants from year to year for many years. We have to consider the claims of other portions of the Dominion. According as the road is gone on with from year to year, it will be assisted until finished.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a section of country as to which the right hon. gentleman stated the people ought to have been proud of being able to build their own railways.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know this section of country pretty well, and I know it requires railway accommodation. I think, within the limits he has laid down, the First Minister is fairly justified in making this grant.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the statement of the First Minister to be practically a pledge that the remainder of this road will be aided as the commencement of it is aided. It is, therefore, necessary that we should know to what extent we are pledging ourselves. That being done, I think there may be an advantage in adopting the plan which the hon. gentleman is now adopting. In times past, the hon. gentleman has taken grants for a certain mileage, and the following Session he has proposed to apply the gross sum which he had taken for the longer mileage to a shorter mileage. It will be more difficult for him to pursue that iniquitous plan under this system, and, as he has done in the past, to double up the grants. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman states frankly to us, as he has done on these two items, what he intends to do, I think the adoption of this plan may prevent him from putting himself in the way of temptation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) is fond of indulging in a little sarcasm. I do not think, when Parliament grants a subsidy for a portion of a road, that Parliament is under any pledge to grant a further subsidy; but, as long as this policy exists and a railway has shown its worth, it may be assumed that Parliament will grant it further aid. There is no pledge that it will be granted either in a subsequent Session or in a subsequent Parliament. That is altogether within the discretion of Parliament. The hon. gentleman speaks of the doubling up of certain votes. That has occurred very rarely, certainly not more than three or four times, and that

has been done under circumstances of difficulty of construction, where it was found a railroad was really required, but that $3,200 would not be sufficient to build it.

To the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company, for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Act 45 Victoria, chapter 14, and 46 Victoria, chapter 25, nor exceeding in the whole $600.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is constructed ; but before the company was in a position to draw the subsidy, $35,600 had lapsed. It was intended to vote the money, but, by a typographical error, only $35,000 was voted, leaving this balance of $600.

For a railway from Woodstock *viâ* London to Chatham, in the Province of Ontario, 80 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 10, for a railway from Ingersoll *viâ* London to Chatham, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $256,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this case the railway undertook to go to London, and when the road was nearly completed, the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company bought it out and completed the road to Chatham ; but as Woodstock was found to be best adapted in the interests of trade for the starting point, Parliament is asked to sanction the change to Woodstock instead of Ingersoll.

To the St. Catharines and Niagara Railway Company, for 14 miles of their railway, from the eastern end of the 20 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, to Hamilton, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $44,800.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does not this subsidy violate the principle the hon. gentleman has laid down ? Is not this line almost alongside of the Great Western Railway ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway runs from Niagara Falls to St. Catharines, and is intended, I believe, to be extended to Toronto. However, we have granted this only for the fourteen miles of straight road connecting the line already completed with Hamilton.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this line subsidised to Hamilton now ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No ; only to St. Catharines. This is to enable them to construct the other fourteen miles into Hamilton, and that is all it is proposed to give them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Should not this be the western end instead of the eastern ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am much obliged to my hon. friend ; we will strike out the word " eastern."

To a railway from Ottawa to Morrisburg, 52 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $166,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen may remember that a grant of a similar sum was made to the Ottawa and Waddington Railway Company, and the Government has been advised that the charter has expired, and another company was chartered this Session to build the same line. It is a valuable line, and the Government were prepared to recommend that this subsidy be given to the Ottawa and Morrisburg line, considering that the other charter had expired. However, representations have been made by the former company that, notwithstanding the advice received by the Government, their charter still had life in it, was still in existence ; therefore, instead of asking Parliament to vote this sum specially to the Ottawa and Morrisburg Railway Company, we apply it to a railway from Ottawa to Morrisburg, and the question as to whether the first charter is in existence must be decided before the grant can be given. This is an old grant. The difficulty about the old charter arose in consequence of some quarrel between the shareholders, preventing the road going on as rapidly as it otherwise would.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that the only paper the hon. gentleman has brought down in connection with this road—though some communications I have received have led me to believe there are more papers—is a memorandum signed by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) on the 7th March, and another signed by Mr. J. P. Whitney for the incorporators, both of them relating to the new corporation of this Session. In the first of these documents the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) invites the attention of the Minister to the fact of the subsidy having lapsed, having been unearned by the existing company, which, he says, is now defunct, and he asks that the subsidy should be revived in favor of the new corporation of which, I understand, he is a promoter, as he has been for some time a promoter of Bills to achieve the object which is now embodied in the Act. I gave notice to the hon. gentleman to-day that on the occasion of this vote I should call the attention of the House to the circumstances connected with the vote of which this is a revival, and to his connection with it. Inasmuch as this formed one of those cases to which I thought the attention of Parliament and of the country ought to be directed, with reference to the connection of members with subsidised railway corporations, I had occasion, as in the case of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), before the last general election, to bring under the notice of the Canadian public the relations of the hon. member for Dundas to the former corporation, and I then used these words :

" The charter for the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway Company was obtained by a gentleman (not in Parliament) named Keefer, who was the chief promoter and mainspring of the enterprise. It is the fashion to give value to these charters by securing public subsidies. In order to give value to this charter a public subsidy was felt to be necessary. Dr. Hickey, the member for Dundas, was approached. He was given some stock; he was given a seat at the board; he was made the president of the company, so that they might obtain the proper power to work the governmental machine, so as to produce a subsidy. Dr. Hickey, M.P., presenting the merits of an enterprise which boasted of his presidency, a bonus was easily obtained from the Government, and voted by Parliament. By that means value was given to the charter; for the charter by itself simply gave authority to build and work the road, and if it had remained without a bonus, those who promoted it would have had to find persons who had confidence enough in the scheme to give money or backing enough to build it. But when $3,200 a mile was given as a free grant, of course that at once gave value to the enterprise, and was a great additional inducement to capitalists to enter upon the scheme. They got the Village of Morrisburg to take $10,000 of stock of which $1,000 was paid up. The company did hardly nothing at all ; the $1,000 given in cash by Morrisburg would pay for all they did. But they did not expect to do any work themselves, or to build the road themselves. They simply expected to sell out the charter and the bonus at a great profit to those who would build the road. How do I show that ? By stating that

the president, Dr. Hickey, the member for Dundas, prepared a proposal for some New York capitalists to sell the charter in the form of contracting for the construction. The very first provision of this proposal was that the company must have $15,000 paid to the order of the president, Dr. Hickey, to pay for bonds and other honorable engagements. Generally that is not the way in which contracts are made. If you were letting a contract to build a barn, or a house, you would expect to pay the contractors something for the work you bound him to do, but these bonus-hunters and charter-sellers demand that the men who are to do the work shall pay them something, and so the very first provision is that the contractors shall pay them $15,000. It would be rather interesting to know what the 'honorable engagements' were. Perhaps at a later day I may communicate to you what they were, but at present I say nothing. The fourth provision is that the existing corporators must retain a majority of the board (which consists of seven), to protect their interests, they binding themselves not to interfere with financial arrangements; or, they will bind themselves to give the contractors a majority on all money outlays, respecting the construction of the road and bridges. When the road is built this may lapse, if desired. Then they demand that $50,000 shall be deposited in the banks as a guarantee of good faith, which will be forfeited to the president and board of directors in the name of the president, C. E. Hickey, if the conditions of the agreement are forfeited. In the seventh clause, they agree to give the constructors two-thirds of the entire stock of $1,500,000, so they will still retain $500,000 of stock, the contractors getting $1,000,000. Then they agree to give all the bonds and bonuses, together with any bonuses they may get hereafter, and the balance due on the Morrisburg stock, $9,000. Then comes the tenth, the last provision, which is like unto the first. They want a liberal bonus in bonds of the first issue, or cash, for the seven promoters of the road, for labor expended and good-will."

Mr. HICKEY. May I ask the hon. gentleman from what he is reading?

Mr. BLAKE. I am reading from a report of my speech delivered at Kendal.

"The labor expenditure was mainly in getting a subsidy to be paid out of your taxes, and the good-will is in their willingness to get more. So they want $15,000 in cash, $500,000 in stock, and a liberal bonus in first mortgage bonds or cash, as the price of their position. I am not discussing the propriety of promoters of railway charters —though I confess I have not much confidence in the breed—trying to make the best bargain they can. What I do object to is members of Parliament, who are called upon to say whether it is in the public interest that public money should be voted to certain railway companies, who are called on to decide on the general legislation of the country, having private interest in those counties and personal relations with the Government, which must conflict with their public duty. This system is altogether a grand scheme for animating with additional fervor, large numbers of Government supporters by the consideration that they are to make profit by that support through the establishment of improper relations with the treasury.

"And as a matter of fact the result is, that what we give out of your taxes to build a road is very largely diverted to line the pockets of members who become promoters of the work and who build the road or sell out the charters to others. I call to you to judge whether this sort of transaction should be allowed."

Shortly after I made that speech, and it had been reported, the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) addressed to me a letter in rather angry terms. You can judge the kind of letter by the style of speech delivered by the hon. gentleman the other evening.

Mr. HICKEY. I will read the letter presently.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad. I am sorry to say I have not a copy, because I would have enlightened the Committee by reading a copy of it. I am not able to do so, but I am glad the letter is to be read. I answered that letter, and of the answer I kept a copy.

Mr. HICKEY. I have that also.

Mr. BLAKE. It is as follows:—

"POINTE AU PIC, P.Q.,
"August 11th, 1886.

"SIR,—On my return to Canada after an absence of several weeks, I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 22nd ultimo, in which you use several strong expressions in reference to certain statements made by me as to your connection with a railway enterprise which, as I conceived, affected your independence as a member of Parliament.

"Did your letter admit the substantial accuracy of my statements, I would be very ready to discuss with you anywhere their bearing and effect on your position as a representative of the people.

"But you deny their accuracy. It must, on reflection, be obvious to you that a public meeting at which we cannot compel the attendance and answer of witnesses, or the production of documents, or carry on an examination, affords perhaps the least satisfactory conceivable opportunity to get at the truth of disputed facts.

"There is another method, which, though not satisfactory, is at any rate better; and should you challenge me to enquiry there, I shall be ready to make a statement in the House of Commons, and to support it by evidence before a Committee.

"I shall be very glad, for your sake and that of the House, if the testimony shall show that I am misinformed; but at present I regret to be unable to withdraw the statements of which you complained, as my information is very positive.

"For example, I have before me a paper which I am assured is a copy of a document prepared by you, and from which I extract the following clauses.

"'1. We must have $15,000 payable to the order of our president, Charles E. Hickey, to pay bonds and other honorable engagements.

"'4. We must retain a majority on the board (which consists of seven) to protect our interests, binding ourselves not to interfere with financial arrangements; or, we will bind ourselves to give you a majority on all money outlays, respecting the construction of the road and bridges. When the road is built this may lapse if desired.

"'5. We must have a sum of say $50,000, deposited in the Molson's Bank here at our joint credit, as a guarantee of good faith, which sum must be deposited within ten days after the signing of our agreement, and which sum will be forfeited to the president and board of directors in the name of the president, Charles E. Hickey, when the conditions of said agreement have been forfeited.

"'7. We will give two-thirds of the entire stock of $1,500,000, to be divided equally on the road and the two bridges, *i.e.*, the St. Lawrence River bridge and the Ottawa River bridge.

"'8. We will give all the bonds and bonuses, together with all bonuses we may get hereafter—the stock taken by the village of Morrisburg, which is to be paid up in full, 100 shares, 10 per cent. having been paid thereon, leaving $9,000 still due.

"'10. We want a liberal bonus in bonds of first issue or cash, for the seven promoters of the road, for labor expended and good-will.'

"Unless this be a concocted paper, with which you had no connection, you will see that it contains the substance of that part of my statements which you seem most angrily to deny.

"I believe it to be genuine.

"I am yours, &c.,
"EDWARD BLAKE.

"CHARLES E. HICKEY, M.P.,
"Morrisburg."

I subsequently became, as the hon. gentleman is aware, possessed of the original of that document, signed by himself. At a subsequent period, as appears by documents which have become public, and which were brought before the other branch of the Legislature, the parties who were concerned in this matter, including the hon. gentleman, held a meeting. The minutes of the meeting are these:

"On the evening of the 11th June, 1886, at a meeting of the board of the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company, held at Morrisburg, the following resolution was passed:—

"'11th June, 1886.

"'Moved by Ira Morgan, seconded by Neil McIntyre, That the undermentioned shares of the capital stock of the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company, be given to the directors for reason,

as follows: To W. S. Carman, 200 shares; to Neil McIntyre, 200 shares; to Ira Morgan, 200 shares; to Chas. Odell, 200 shares; to R. C. Carter, 200 shares; to Chas. E. Hickey, 600 shares.'"

"FRIDAY, 30th July, 1886.

"The Board met this day at Morrisburg, when the resolutions of the last meeting, 11th June, were read over and adopted."

And this statement was read before the other branch:

"8th October, 1886.

"I, Charles Odell, called on Dr. Hickey at his house in Morrisburg, and asked to see the minute book, not having been present at the evening session, 11th June, or at that held 30th July. On looking over the minute book I saw and became aware for the first time of the above resolution—voting the stock to the directors, without any reason assigned. I asked Dr. Hickey whether it was paid up stock in full. He replied: No, certainly not, but it was to be held merely in trust. This I could not understand, considering we held everything in trust as directors, and it was not only unnecessary to adopt such a resolution, but irregular and fraudulent."

"20th October, 1886.

"Had a meeting of the Board at the Russell House, Ottawa, at 7 p.m., *re* resolution of 11th June before referred to, stood the same in the book as originally."

"21st October, 1886.

"This is the day of the annual meeting of stockholders for the purpose of electing a new board of directors for the ensuing year. The said meeting was called for 3 o'clock p.m.; the board met at 10 a.m.; nothing done; adjourned until 2 p.m.; then met again; no business of importance before them. I looked over the minute book and found that an alteration had been made during the interim in the resolution of the 11th June giving the stock to directors by scoring out the word 'reason' and inserting 'services as full paid up stock.' I at once told the board I repudiated the transaction, and would state so publicly at the general meeting, which I did, explaining all the above circumstances, considering it to be a fraudulent act, and one I would not be a party to."

I believe it was what the right hon. gentleman called the little family difficulties that had arisen in regard to these transactions, which I now bring before the attention of the Committee, that resulted in the formation of the two rival boards of directors, and the attendant commotion and conflict, which, of course, would thwart the efforts of any party and diminish the chances of success. I have only to say that I have taken this opportunity, when for the first time, since the period to which I alluded, a new proposition is being made by the Government to grant a subsidy to this company, and that at the instance of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), to lay before the House these facts, the facts which I stated in the speech which I have read, the proof of which facts are in the clauses of the documents which I have just read, which I myself abstracted from the document, and the subsequent facts with respect to the allocation of paid-up stock to the directors, including $60,000 of paid-up stock to the hon. gentleman himself. I do so, conceiving that it was my duty, as the hon. gentleman did not tender that challenge, which I invited him to tender to me, upon this subject before the last general election or at any time, it was my duty not to omit the occasion on which the hon. gentleman himself was promoting the grant of a lapsed subsidy for this same enterprise, under whatever form it may be promoted, to lay these facts before the Committee and the public.

Mr. HICKEY. I always feel a great deal of diffidence in addressing this House, and I do so on the present occasion. I must, however, congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the Committee on having gained a little courage during the last four years, so as to bring this matter up. I suppose he has some recollection of the letter I wrote and a little of the skirmish we had on this matter before, and since then he has been fighting in memory this little battle o'er. I have no doubt that the castigation I felt obliged to give to one of his bosom friends has reminded the hon. gentleman also of the past. I suppose he must have felt the gathering blows of the thongs of outraged and indignant truth when administered to his friend, reminding him of his ignominious retreat in 1886. I know the hon. gentleman is a great man in this country; that he poses as being, and he has been the leader of a great party, and he has been over-ambitious in desiring to be Premier of this country. But his political summersaults have sunk him so far in the mud that his best friends can scarcely reach him by the hair. What are the facts in this case. The hon. gentleman in a speech at Kendal in 1886, hundreds of miles away from my residence, made a speech which I presume is the speech he has read from to this Committee. He based that speech on information derived from a man whose name he did not dare to give to the Committee to-night. He says to-night I had since been aware that he had an original document in his possession signed by me. I deny the statement, and I challenge the hon. gentleman here or in any other place to produce the document, or any evidence which will show that his statements in regard to this matter are correct. I denounce it as an untruth, without a syllable of truth in it, as far as the statement is concerned. The history of this railway scheme is just this: The charter for the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway was obtained from this Parliament before I was a member of Parliament. It is true, my name was put in as an incorporator, but it was afterwards that I became a member of this House; and in 1884 I introduced a Bill amending the original charter. Subsequent to that time, I became part and parcel of this company, and was elected as president in the fall of 1885. You, therefore, see that the charter was obtained without any assistance from me, and the subsidy was given to the road before I had any special connection with it. I acknowledge that I used my best influence to help the company in any way I honestly could, because it was a road which I thought was of great importance to the country, and I did so especially because it went through the middle of my county. If the hon. gentleman supposed that I was going to hold my hands tied and say to strangers: "Help my friends through with this charter," he is mistaken. I had the courage to help my friends, and I did not fear, as the hon. gentleman does, to take an active part in the interests of my people lest some might criticise me for trying to assist them. I do not think the hon. gentleman will ever be accused in that way, because his life has been negative, and will be so to the end. The hon. gentleman is a pretty big blank in this country, and I choose to show that he is a bigger blank and a greater fraud than his greatest enemies have imagined.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that.

Mr. HICKEY. If that is unparliamentary, Mr. Chairman, I will take it back, but my meaning is expressed in these words, notwithstanding. Now, the hon. gentleman found a great deal of fault with the strong language that I used. It has been said that there are some occasions when language fails to express the indignation which an honest and decent man must necessarily feel over some transactions. When the hon. gentleman made that speech in Kendal, hundreds of miles away from my county, upon evidence which he admits had not my name attached to it, he spoke to strangers and to persons who did not know me. He made this statement far away, and I was properly indignant, and I wrote him the following letter on the 22nd July, 1886, which I am glad to present to him now, as I did on that occasion :--

"MORRISBURG, 22nd July, 1886.

"Hon. EDWARD BLAKE, M.P.

"SIR,—In a speech at Kendal on the 15th inst. you made an attack on me which I consider dishonest and unfair. Upon anonymous information you thought proper to tell an audience behind my back that, as president of the O. W. & N. Y. Railway and Bridge Company I have tried to sell out the charter of the company, &c., &c. Your assertions are simply the outcome of a wilful misrepresentation of facts by you or your prompter, or both.

"The board of directors and myself have done all in our power, at the expense of time and money, to effect the carrying out of the enterprise. It is true we have so far failed, but the charter is in our hands and will remain there until we can get able and capable parties to undertake the construction of the road.

"As statements and insinuations made by you could only affect, if at all, the confidence my constituents repose in me as an honorable man, and knowing that my actions as well as those of the board have been influenced by proper motives, I challenge you or your ablest deputy to meet me at any place in the County of Dundas, at your earliest convenience to discuss any proposals made by me or the board at any time to any person. Of course I shall expect your anonymous informer to be present. It will be no excuse for you to say that you referred to this matter as bearing on my independence as a representative of the people, because you labored first to show my acts were venal and therefore to be despised by those whose confidence I possess.

"In spite of your insinuations as to our 'honorable engagements,' you may perhaps find it difficult to convince the people of this community that the directors or myself have entered into engagements of any other nature.

"Yours truly,
"CHAS. E. HICKEY."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I may be very rough and very obtuse, as to refined or severe language, but I fail to see in that letter the odious language which the hon. gentleman endeavored to have this House believe this letter was couched in. The language is good plain English. Probably it is not like the language which would be used by the hon. gentleman, who has the disease which the French call *flux de bouche*, and who is able to talk around a great many things and not say anything. I have been blessed with fewer words than he, and if I speak in broad Saxon language, I hope that I am not misunderstood by the hon. gentleman now, or will not be in anything I have to say in the future. The hon. gentleman sent me back a reply to the letter I have quoted, which he has read to you and with which I will not trouble the House again. You will bear in mind that he carefully refuses to meet me, but he does say in one paragraph, that he will bring the matter up in the House if I challenge him. Lest I might forget it, I challenge the hon. gentleman to bring the matter up in this House at any time, with all the particulars and the evidence concerning it. My object, at that time, was to challenge the gentleman before the people who knew all about the circumstances, who knew the individual actors, and who could judge as between me and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and his informers, or those who are acting with him in this matter. I sent him that challenge, but like that gentleman during all his life, his coat tails are generally seen when a man is required to stand and face the public. In reply to the letter which the hon. gentleman read to you, I wrote him as follows, on 18th August, 1886 :

"MORRISBURG, 18th August, 1886.

"SIR,—Your letter of the 11th inst. received, and its contents fully ratify my opinion of your dishonesty and unfairness.

"Since you refuse to accept the challenge to meet me in the County of Dundas and make good the statements of your Kendal speech, I must, of course, submit to your decision. You were delighted to make those statements to a strange audience against me, but you find it to be 'the least satisfactory conceivable opportunity' to prove them before an audience not unacquainted with the actors and their deeds as respects the railway. This is conduct the would-be Premier of Canada may be proud of, and possibly a few of his friends may say well done, but no such conduct can have the approbation of right-minded men. Continue to wallow in the mire if you will to your sweet content, but when you return to the region of fair play, remember that I defy you to show, by respectable evidence, that the board or myself have been venal in our demands or deeds.

"As to the 'independence of Parliament,' 'our counsel in Canada' is not at liberty to cast the first stone.

"Yours truly,
"CHAS. E. HICKEY.

"Hon. EDWARD BLAKE,
"Q.C., M.P."

So you see, Mr. Chairman, I was fair to the hon. gentleman ; I did not let him off because he wanted to. I wished him for his own sake, for my sake and for the sake of the public, to face this unhallowed charge which he made against me, and to come before a tribunal of his own friends and my friends, and to decide who had been just in this matter. The hon. gentleman replied to me, on the 25th August, 1886, as follows :—

"POINTE AU PIC, 25th August, 1886.

"SIR,—I have received your communication of 19th inst. I will not now, any more than in my last letter, attempt to vie with you in abusive language, which I think inflicts disgrace only on its authors.

"As I have already stated, I cannot call witnesses at a meeting ; but I purpose, having regard to your letters, to say something on the subject in controversy at the gathering arranged for 1st September next at Winchester Springs ; and, if you desire to reply, I am sure the managers and the audience will gladly give you every opportunity.

"I have, &c.,
"EDWARD BLAKE.

"C. E. HICKEY, Esq., M.P.,
"Morrisburg, Ont."

I wish the House to remember the hon. gentleman's statement that I would get a chance to reply. It gave me some consolation to think that the hon. gentleman was going into my county, where I would have an opportunity to meet him before my friends as well as my foes. So, on the 30th of August, not having had any further information from him or his friends in the county, as the demonstration was to take place on the following day, I wrote this letter to the President of the Reform Association in the County of Dundas :—

"MORRISBURG, 30th August, 1886.

"JOHN FETTERLY, Esq.,
"President of the Reform Association in
"the County of Dundas.

"You are aware of the controversy between the Hon. E. Blake and myself regarding certain statements made

by him in a speech at Kendal; and that I have challenged him to discuss at a meeting for that purpose any proposition made by me or the board of directors of the 'Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company,' and that I have accused him of dishonesty, unfairness and of wilful misrepresentation; that a copy of his first letter to me was sent to you or your secretary and published in the *Herald*, last week, and it was also published with my second letter to him in the *Courier*. In Mr. Blake's letter he refused to accept my challenge to discuss before the people his slanders against me behind my back, because of his inability to, as he claims, to produce proofs and witnesses.

"In a letter from him of the 25th inst., received by me on Friday p.m., of the 27th, he has apparently reconsidered the matter, finding himself in an unfavorable light before the public. Having been urged, I presume, by some of his more manly and fair-play supporters here, he repents, and says: 'I cannot call witnesses at a meeting; but I purpose, having regard to your letters, to say something on the subject in controversy at the gathering arranged for 1st September next, at Winchester Springs; and if you desire to reply, I am sure the managers and the audience will gladly give you every opportunity.' Doubtless you or your secretary have also received a copy of this letter to me, and I have waited until this moment, 4 p.m., to receive an invitation from you as the President of the managers of the gathering on the 1st prox. to have an opportunity to reply to Mr. Blake on the subject of our controversy. His carefully worded letter does not invite me to attend your meeting, you perceive, and, therefore, I appeal to you. This delay is very unfair to me, and my friends, who cannot now be informed of my going to discuss this matter on the 1st with Mr. Blake, as a great many of them would have gone had they received notice. Mr. Blake's proposal is unfair and one-sided in many ways, but I shall waive all disadvantages in this past the eleventh hour if you will assure me an opportunity to follow Mr. Blake and reply as he suggests, to his attack upon me, the board of directors and other friends of the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company. I shall be as brief as possible, confining my remarks solely to the railway matter and shall only demand that Mr. Blake shall not, nor shall any other speaker discuss after me this subject without a suitable time for me to reply; and in addition I shall want the privilege of having Dr. McIntyre, if present, or Ira Morgan, Esq., or both of them, as they also are directors with me of the railway, to say whether I have, rightly or wrongly, represented the matters in question. Your reply in writing stating whether you will accede to Mr. Blake's suggestion and accept my terms, which are scantily fair to me, of necessity must be delivered to me by 8.30 a.m. of the 31st, to-morrow.

"Yours very truly,

"CHAS. E. HICKEY."

The reason I mentioned Dr. McIntyre and Mr. Ira Morgan was that they were political friends of the hon. gentleman, and I thought at least their friends would believe them if they would not believe me. But, Sir, in what spirit was I received in these circumstances by that magnanimous party which talks about fair play. Mr. Fetterly, on 30th August, wrote to me as follows—I suppose this was inspired by the hon. gentleman:—

"MORRISBURG, 30th August, 1886.

"CHAS. E. HICKEY., Esq., M.P.

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter to me to-day asking permission to reply to the Honorable E. Blake at the meeting to be held at Winchester Springs on Wednesday, the 1st proximo.

"As the controversy in question involves the independence of Parliament, I would consider it entirely a matter for investigation before a committee of the House of Commons. However, as you have supplied me with a copy of a letter from the Hon. E. Blake, saying that in all probability he would refer to the charge he preferred against you at Kendal, and intimating a willingness to grant you a right of reply, I feel it but justly due to you as a public man to extend to you the right of replying to any charge reflecting on your public character. But more especially I do desire to grant you the privilege in this case, as you stand charged by Mr. Blake with offering to sell for private consideration a charter and bonus, which you as the people's representative obtained from the Parliament of Canada, and thereby render yourself liable to censure.

Mr. HICKEY.

"In view of all the facts involved in this controversy, the committee of arrangements have decided to grant you 30 minutes to reply to Mr. Blake as soon as he refers to the matter in question, but cannot consent to any further interruption as our programme of arrangements is now complete, and only accede to your request as we believe it is a matter in which the people of Eastern Ontario are particularly interested.

"Your obedient servant,

"JOHN FETTERLY,

"*President R. A., Co. Dundas.*"

So you see, Mr. Chairman, that with that magnanimity which the hon. gentleman must have handed down even to the Reform Association of the county of Dundas, they were willing to have me sandwiched in between Blake and Blake—Blake before me and Blake behind me; and this House knows the kind of fair dealing any man would get from that hon. gentleman. They denied me a reasonable time, offering me thirty minutes. But I was not going to be put off in that way, and on 31st August I wrote to Mr. Fetterly:

"MORRISBURG, 31st August, 1886.

"JOHN FETTERLY, Esq.,

"Pres. R. A., Co. Dundas.

"SIR,—I have received yours of this morning. Mr. Blake slandered me behind my back. When I struck back at him and dared him to meet me and make good his charges, he waited a month and then shamefully refused to give me an opportunity to defend myself. Afterwards seeing that he made a blunder, and knowing he was coming to Dundas, he suggests that the managers of your demonstration would allow me to reply to him. In thus putting the responsibility as far as possible on your shoulders he is only carrying out the principles of his ordinary conduct. Besides, the cautious wording of his letter betrays the little game intended by him. If I should not appear at the meeting his letter would be read to show I could have done so. If I did appear he could shield himself behind you, and I would have to take your terms as to speaking. No doubt he chuckled heartily to himself as he posted the letter. You now have taken steps to render it impossible for me to defend myself while pretending to offer me a chance. Mr. Blake said I might reply to him. You say I may have thirty minutes in the middle of Blake's speech, *i.e.*, sandwiched by Blake. You therefore refuse to consent to Mr. Blake's proposals. You also know that limiting me to thirty minutes is practically shutting me out entirely. But evidently that is what you desire. You also positively refuse to allow Dr. McIntyre and Ira Morgan, Esq., co-directors, to utter a word in my justification. And neither your leader nor yourselves appear to be ashamed of such conduct. However, I must brand him as a calumniator and a trickster, and will yet force him to meet me before the people of Dundas or get into his smallest hole.

"There is just one consolation left me in all this. I have been the humble instrument of showing to the people of this county and of Canada what sort of clay the Grit idol if made of.

"Yours very truly,

"CHAS. E. HICKEY."

Then, Sir, I thought it my duty to have a parting word with Mr. Blake before he left the County of Dundas. Having failed in all my plans, and desiring to meet the hon. gentleman on the platform on a fair footing, I wrote to him as follows:

"MORRISBURG, 31st August, 1886.

"SIR,—So far you have persistently dodged my challenge to meet me in this county and make good the statements in your Kendal speech. The managers of your demonstration have, as you are no doubt aware, refused to allow me to reply to you at the meeting to-morrow, as suggested by you. But you shall not escape me.

"You have abandoned your first resolution to refuse me a chance to defend myself, and have asserted your willingness that I should reply to you. Therefore you cannot again refuse me when I again challenge you, as I do now, to meet me in this county at an early day and publicly discuss on equitable terms the matters in controversy between us.

"I shall not ask you to produce any proofs but those you have. You can have no excuse now.

"An early reply will oblige.

"Yours, &c.,

"CHAS. E. HICKEY.

"HON. E. BLAKE, Q.C., M.P."

I heard nothing of Mr. Blake, but I had the satisfaction of printing this correspondence and circulating it largely through the audience which Mr, Blake had the honor to address; and I am sure the audience was not very well prepared to listen to any fair proposition from an hon. gentleman who had treated their representative in so cavalier a manner. Now, I have read this correspondence, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has had the courage to bring this matter up, because I have done nothing in it that business men have not done very repeatedly, and would do again. I make this statement before going into particulars. I wish to refer to another point. It is evident, from the speech of the hon. gentleman, from the letter he wrote me, and from the statement he has made in this House, that either he or another hon. gentleman in another Chamber has stated an utter falsehood.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Whilst I am willing to allow the hon. gentleman every latitude, I must ask him to withdraw that expression.

Mr. HICKEY. I applied it to a statement which was made, and I do not think in that connection it is out of order. I was saying that I intended reading the statement which the hon. gentleman has repeated in this House, and which he wrote to me in this letter, and comparing it with the statement made by another hon. gentleman in another House, but made in a totally different manner. I think that is quite in order. I would be very sorry to step outside the rules of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to refer to a statement.

Mr. HICKEY. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) says I made a proposition in that statement, which, he says, was the first proposition I made. He had not the courtesy to this House to lay that proposition before it, so that hon. members could judge for themselves. In the first place, Sir, you will notice that he goes from one to four of the memorandum which, he says, I signed. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce any such document. I would like to see it. If the hon. gentleman has it, he is in honor and duty bound to this House to lay it before us, and the House see what it is, so that we can tell how far he is correct. He says that he has a paper, which, he is sure, is the copy of a document prepared by me, and from which he extracts the following clause—the first clause :—

"We must have $15,000, payable to the order of our president, C. E. Hickey, to pay bonds and other honorable engagements."

On the face of it, this would not seem to have come from C. E. Hickey alone, but from the board, of which I was president possibly at the time. But that is not the point I want to make. He says it reads:

"We must have $15,000 payable to the order of our president, C. E. Hickey, to pay bonds and other honorable engagements."

Senator Vidal, in another House, makes this first item read as follows :—

"In 1886, he says (referring to me), we must have $15,000 payable to the order of our President, C. E. Hickey, to pay or settle with directors and pay other honorable engagements, all of which will be accounted for."

So you see the very essence, the very thing, that ought to be mentioned by an hon. gentleman making a statement to this House, he leaves out, namely, the words "all of which will be accounted for." The hon. gentleman left this out in his statement to this House; he left it out in his Kendal speech; and I challenge him to say that his statement is correct. Here is Senator Vidal making a statement in another shape, and I leave it to the hon. gentlemen and to Senator Vidal to settle as to which one of them is telling the truth. No doubt, if they were fully investigated, the one statement would be found to have just about as much truth as the other; but he holds a blank pack, he holds the cards, and he places them in his own way. I tell him now, however, as I have told him before, that the course he has taken is a cowardly way to proceed, that it is not an honorable way to proceed against another gentleman who stands in this chamber or in any other place. I might go over all these other propositions. He talks about the $50,000 being paid to me. Well, if I had the whole document,—I do not know whether it is mine or whose it is—but I will leave it to any hon. gentleman, who knows anything of the transaction, whether that was not a proposition which it was proper to make to men who were interviewing us with reference to building our railway. I say that, whether that proposition be mine or not, it is a business statement. I say it was a perfectly fair proposition to these men that they should be asked, in order to show their *bonâ fides* in this matter, to deposit $50,000 in the Molson Bank at Morrisburg, to be repaid them according as they built the road. It was quite fair to propose to them that if their intention was not to deceive us but to carry out their engagements honorably, if they were honest and sincere, they should deposit this money. If the hon. gentleman will produce the whole statement, if it is mine, I will guarantee that there is not any business man, who loves honor and fair play between man and man, but who will say that the proposition made was a fair business one, to prevent our being humbugged by the individuals who expressed their readiness to undertake the work. A proposition was made to Mr. Alderson, a gentleman who had been a former president of the company. He was the first president, Mr. Odell was the next, and I was the third. I was elected in 1886. The very day of my election Mr. Keefer, who had been the manager of the company and its most active promoter, fell and broke his leg, and I never saw him afterwards. He died from the effects. Then our difficulties arose. I always defended and stood by Mr. Keefer. I did not take any particular interest in the company up to that date, but Mr. Keefer having died, and, a short time afterward, Mr. Imlay, I was obliged to step into the breach and do the best I could with what was left. What did we find? Our bonds were in the possession of Mr. Keefer. It was arranged at a meeting we held that Mr. Keefer would place those bonds in the Merchants Bank for safe-keeping, but he met with an accident and did not do so. After his death I came to Ottawa and asked for the books of the company and the

bonds, which had been in Mr. Keefer's possession as secretary of the company, and I found they had been placed with the Hon. Mr. Scott in this city, a lawyer. He told me he had them, and I said to him: That is all right; if you will take a memo. of them, and give that to me, and keep them in your safe, that is all we are concerned in at present. But shortly after that I came with a gentleman from New York, who was anxious to tender for this enterprise, to interview Mr. Scott, and we asked about the bonds. He said they were not there, and he did not know what had become of them, but he thought Mrs. Keefer had sent for them. We went to her and asked her if she had them, and she said she did not know anything about them. We went back to Mr. Scott, and he said that a carter had come for them and that he had given them to that carter. I asked him how it was possible that he would give those bonds to an individual whom he did not know. He replied that he did not want to know anything about it, and that he did not know where the bonds were. You see, therefore, the position in which we were. Our bonds were stolen; they had been spirited away by these people and another gentleman in this city. Mr. Keefer, whom I had backed up, and Mr. Imlay had died, and their wives had been approached by the enemies of Mr. Keefer, men to whom he would not have spoken in his lifetime, and who, by proposing to give these ladies fabulous sums of money out of the road, captured their confidence and the bonds. We were in this unpleasant position, that Mr. Keefer's enemies had slipped in and were about to wrest this enterprise away from those who had an interest in it. That led to this voting of stock which the hon. gentleman deprecates so severely. I want to tell the hon. gentleman, in the first place, that we had a legal right to have that stock to ourselves. Whether it was just or not we shall see. I submit that we had a legal right to do this, and one of the best lawyers in the country said that we had. For the information of the hon. gentleman I will read the 25th section of the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway Company:

"The directors of the company elected by the shareholders may make and issue, as paid-up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over such stock or the mortgage bonds of the company in payment of right of way, plant, rolling stock, or materials of any kind, and also for the services of contractors, engineers and other persons, whether directors or not, who may have been, are or may be engaged in promoting the undertaking and interests of the company; and such issue and all allotment of stock or bonds shall be binding on the company, and such paid-up stock shall not be assessable for calls."

I read that to show the hon. gentleman that we had a legal right to vote that stock to ourselves, but I also contend that we had a moral right to do it. The fact that our books and our bonds had been spirited away from us was sufficient to make us feel that we were morally bound to protect our interests and the interests of our friends. We are not ashamed of what we did, and for my part I would do it over again. I can tell the hon. gentleman who has made this charge against me, that my conduct has been endorsed by the most prominent Reformers in the county of Dundas, who knew the character of the men who were endeavoring to manipulate this matter, men who had no interest in the building of the railway and cared nothing for it, provided they could accomplish their own ends. The other stockholders might feel sore about it; I do not doubt that. But our books and bonds were stolen, and we would have been very simple to allow these people to defeat us in that way. The hon. gentleman says I was aware that he became possessed of a document with my name attached to it. I challenge him to produce that document.

Mr. BLAKE. I may have said that, but what I meant to say was that the document was in the hon. gentleman's writing.

Mr. HICKEY. So the hon. gentleman is the big coon, and he comes down from the tree. He now admits that he had not a document with my signature, though he stated that he had. I say that this is altogether a trumped-up charge, and that the hon. gentleman should not have been deceived by the people who approached him, but the fact is that he did it from malice against me and in order to make my people distrust me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw that statement.

Mr. HICKEY. I must bow to your ruling, but if an hon. gentleman does an act from malice——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Mr. HICKEY. I withdraw the expression very readily; but, if a statement is made which is calculated to do me injury with my people, what expression can I use? I cannot say that it was an act of kindness or an act of flattery. What word in the English language can I apply to such a statement, but whether it be malice, or kindness, or flattery, I will leave the House and the country to judge. The hon. gentleman said in conclusion that he had taken the first opportunity since 1886 of bringing up this matter. Since that date this line of railway has been three times before the House. I have introduced Bills in reference to this line of railway three times, and they received no opposition, and the hon. gentleman allowed them to go without any objection. Possibly it was because of the stings which were administered to a friend of his that he now desires to give a Roland for an Oliver, and to throw a little mud at me in the hope that some will stick, in reply to what I said in this House in reference to that friend of his. He asked what this $15,000 could be for? I have a statement here which was presented to the Senate, and signed by Chas. O'Dell, W. J. Anderson, T. B. Alderson, Hon. James Reddington, Grace Keefer and Elizabeth Imlay. These are the people who have been fighting me from the beginning to the end of this matter, and the claim which they put before the Senate as their proposed claim upon the gentlemen who are in the new charter. My name does not appear in the new charter; but I promoted the Bill, and I will do everything possible, in a legitimate way, to assist them, because I believe it to be in the interests of my constituents. The memorandum these people give is that the expenditure and liabilities incurred by the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company amounted to $34,490. I would like the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), to state how I could make any money out of that $15,000

if I had to pay $34,000? He also left out Senator Vidal's statement in regard to accounting for this money. I do not want to weary the House further, but I would remind the hon. gentleman of his peculiar conditions in life. When I first came to this Parliament, the hon. gentleman was known throughout the whole country as "our counsel in Canada." He was then a warm supporter of the Grand Trunk Railway, and was opposed to everything which was in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Afterwards, when he became the subsidised agent—I will not say that in any offensive way—when he was the agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we found him the slavish supporter of everything in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and now he is acting as the solicitor against me. He is the present solicitor of falsehood, slander and crime. He has endeavored to defend the people who, by means of falsehood, slander and crime, have endeavored to injure me. I have shown that, while in Kendal he was playing the political trickster, he was also my calumniator there. Now, I leave the matter with the House and country. I do not think the hon. gentleman has made much more out of this than he has out of many other undertakings in his lifetime. The political positions which he has taken in this country have been just about as quickly deserted, as he will be glad to desert this. When his schemes do not succeed, as a rule, as when he failed in 1887 in becoming Premier of Canada, like a sulky boy who scarcely smiled upon his friends, he did not say much in this House until, having been resurrected by something, he has sprung into activity. I congratulate him, and I congratulate the country, which is all the better for such activity as the hon. gentleman displays in this House sometimes. But when he descends to slander and vituperation, it sounds a good deal like slush from the gutter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that expression.

Mr. HICKEY. I withdraw the expression if it is unparliamentary.

Mr. BLAKE. You take a great deal of unnecessary trouble, Mr. Chairman, because we all know that if you acted rigorously on the rules which you apply to some hon. gentlemen, you would strike the hon. member dumb, because he could not speak at all if he did not use these phrases. The hon. gentleman has been good enough to read one of my letters in which I expressed my opinion of the only effect that abusive epithets have, and to whom alone they are injurious. I have long entertained that opinion, which I have expressed before, and which I repeat to-night; it happily leaves me in a condition of absolute equanimity under the administration of those epithets both by letter and by word of mouth. He has talked of my being guilty of vituperation. All I did was to read to you a statement which I made some years ago which is, I believe, absolutely true, and a letter which I wrote to the hon. gentleman in response to an offensive communication of his, which letter also I believe is absolutely true. It seems from what the hon. gentleman has said, and he is corroborated by the Minister of Customs, I think, that I used the word "signed" when I spoke of this document. I have already explained that what I meant to say was that it was in the handwriting of the hon. gentleman. I do not personally know the handwriting of the hon. gentleman, but whether the document was in his handwriting or not, the question is whether it is his document. You will observe he has not denied his connection with that document, he has not denied his connection with these clauses, but he professes to defend these clauses. But one of the clauses he has not referred to at all, and it is the one which is the most important of all—clause 10:

"We want a liberal bonus in bonds of first issue or cash, for the seven promoters of the road, for labor expended and good-will."

That was really the clause of the clauses; and the hon. gentleman has not, with his absolute certainty that he is able to make the statements of that document consistent with propriety—he has not even alluded to that clause at all. I do not wish to say anything more upon this subject. I have thought fit, at the earliest opportunity I thought proper, to bring this up. I did not, as the hon. gentleman assumed, say in my letter to the hon. gentleman that I would bring it up in Parliament. I told him that if he challenged me in Parliament, I would answer him. He says there were earlier opportunities, that there were earlier Sessions—in one of which I was not here, and in another of which I was not able to act—when he propounded Bills for the incorporation of companies. These did not create a public relation between him and the Government and Parliament of this country on account of his interest in the subsidy. The subsidy at that time belonged to the other corporation, and I did not conceive that such relation was created, or was proposed to be created, till the hon. gentleman became a promoter of the application for this subsidy, and thus became once more involved in that relation to the Government and the Parliament of this country, which I conceived, having regard to his personal relation to the affairs of the railway company, was a reprehensible relation, which ought not to subsist. Upon ascertaining that, and finding that the hon. gentleman was promoting a new enterprise, and asking for the old subsidy, it seemed to me that it was fitting I should acquaint the House and the country with the state of facts, which I have brought forward in the extracts from my speech, and in the letter which I have read, and these are not denied.

Mr. HICKEY. I do not object to the hon. gentleman bringing the matter before the House, I am glad he has done so. He speaks of my personal relations with this. Now, my personal relation amounts to this: I introduced a Bill for friends of mine. I wrote a letter to the Minister of Railways urging that this subsidy should be revoted to this company. That is my personal relation to it. Why does the hon. gentleman wish to bring that up? He does not accuse me of a breach of the independence of Parliament, but he hints at it, he wants people to infer that there is some wrong in a member of Parliament asking the Government to aid an enterprise in which he feels an interest, in which his friends are interested, in which his county is interested, and which will greatly help his county. If there is anything wrong in that, then I have done wrong, but I do not think there is. I have done what it was my duty to do. Now, he says I did not defend all the clauses. Sir, I distinctly stated that I did not

know whether the hon. gentleman was quoting them correctly or not. If the hon. gentleman will favor me with a copy—I have no copy—I will undertake to defend everything that I have written. But he studiously withholds the statement from the House, and from me, and tries to make a bugaboo out of something there is nothing in. I did see some of them once in the County of Dundas; they were produced, not for the purpose of doing me a particular injury, but as being in the interest of the railway; they were produced at a public gathering. That is the last I have seen of them. Now, I do not undertake to defend anything I have not seen, and I challenge the hon. gentleman again to bring before the House anything of which I am the author, and I will undertake to defend it before any sensible man, and I will undertake to show that I was not culpable, that it was a business transaction, wholly justifiable from that point of view, that it ought not to affect me as a member of Parliament, and it does not justify him in insinuating that I did it for the sake of making money. Anybody who knows anything about promoting railways, knows that it is money out of pocket, from beginning to end. Now, in this document the hon. gentleman has read, there are some eight or ten clauses, but he does not give them all, either. He skipped from one to four. The hon. gentleman has the document, let him produce it. It is unfair to this House, it is discourteous to this House, for the hon. gentleman to deal with a false document—I will not say a false document, it may be true. If he will produce it, I will undertake, at the risk of any position I have, to defend it, and if it is not mine, I will not undertake to defend it. As to his statement with reference to subsidies to the promoters of the road, if the hon. gentleman came to me and made a proposal to build our road, I would say, yes, if he would hand back the money to us. That may be considered a liberal bonus or it may not. I say it is unfair to ask me to answer to any statement the hon. gentleman has made, because it may be one of which part is mine and part is not mine. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce the document and lay it before me, and if the House will condemn me on that document, I will accept it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is very much to be regretted that we should have so many exposures of this kind. We have had three cases this Session. We had first, the case of Mr. Rykert, who has been pronounced guilty of conduct improper, scandalous, and unbecoming on the part of a member of this House. That hon. gentleman has been sent back to his constituents. We have had also the case brought forward by the hon. member for Victoria against another hon. member, who was shown to have been dealing in timber limits and to have made money out of the transaction. We had another case the other night. We have had a case brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works to-day with respect to trafficking in contracts let by the Department of Public Works. As to how far the allegations may be verified, it is for the future to say. We also had the case of the Caraquet Railway exposed a few evenings ago. So, Session after Session, we have brought before this House acts that are exceedingly unbecoming and certainly discreditable to members of this House. But these acts are the consequences of the policy inaugurated and encouraged by the First Minister. The policy of granting bonuses to railways was inaugurated, and accordingly charters were sought in all directions, and members of Parliament secured charters and then inducements were held out to them to apply for subsidies. A similar policy has been pursued with respect to timber limits. These are important questions that it is the duty of the Opposition to place before the people, and it is time these abominations should cease, and the Opposition must try to put an end to them. If hon. gentlemen opposite come to their senses and realise their position before the country, and if the First Minister and his followers have to shed penitential tears for the iniquities they have inaugurated, there will be such an exhibition of tears in this House that each member will require to provide himself with a pair of water-tight boots up to the knees to wade through the flood. These transactions are a disgrace to this House and to the country. The First Minister should introduce a Bill to amend the ten commandments. One of those commandments says thou shalt not lie, and another which says that thou shalt not steal. He is bound to seek to amend these commandments in order to protect his followers from the penalties attached to their violation. If he does not, it will go hard with them the last day in the afternoon. The Committee were glad to hear that the First Minister intended to stop granting subsidies to roads which would compete with other lines. The hon. gentleman must, however, not forget the importance of amending these commandments in order to bring his followers through these disgraceful transactions.

Mr. BOWELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. I also remember the son-in-law Jamieson case. I hope this will be an end to these disgraceful cases, and that the fate of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) will be a warning to all hon. gentlemen. What does that gentleman say in his address to his constituents? He says:

"Why I should be singled out for public censure when there are dozens of members in the same House who not only have applied for and obtained limits for themselves but sit there daily voting moneys into their own pockets, I cannot understand."

That is a condition of things which is exceedingly discreditable, but I hope we have got to the end of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is rather unfortunate this subject has been brought up at this late period of the Session, because we cannot get the case before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why was this resolution drawn in this peculiar way? Do we understand it is intended to give this amount to the Ottawa and Morrisburg Railway, of which the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) is president, or to some other railway?

Mr. HICKEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says I am president of or connected with the company. My name does not appear, and I am not associated with either one of the companies at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that if this subsidy to the railway from

Ottawa to Morrisburg is granted, in no respect the hon. gentleman will have any interest, or expect to have any interest, in such subsidy?

Mr. HICKEY. I expect indirectly to reap advantage from it. If it builds up my town I will reap advantage indirectly. But I have no interest in it, any more than has the hon. gentleman. The parties are friends of mine, and the road will go through my county.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad of it for the hon. gentleman's own sake. From the outset, I have always held the strongest possible objection to hon. gentlemen being parties to applications made to the Government for subsidies, in which subsidies they are personally interested. I hold that to be in spirit if not in letter a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and it is adverse to all possible good government. My views are sufficiently well known on this point. I hope to see them in the course of next Session put into still more emphatic shape. All I wanted to know—and I hope there is no misunderstanding about it—is to whom this subsidy is to be given. If I understood the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) aright, he proposes to have no part or lot in this, not in any shape or way, except indirectly, which does not matter, and he will not receive benefit from this grant. And I am very glad of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a renewal of the subsidy granted to the Ottawa and Waddington Railway. Parliament this Session has granted a charter to the Ottawa and Morrisburg Railway, which charter covers exactly the same ground. The parties interested in the Ottawa and Waddington Railway have made strong representations that, according to the law, their charter is still alive and has not lapsed or become extinct, and therefore the language has been used that this subsidy is to be given to the railway from Ottawa to Morrisburg, and the Government will fully advise themselves as to the legal status of both railways before they decide to make the grant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this road intended to connect with an American road on the other side, and does it practically involve a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Morrisburg?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have got a charter for the purpose of crossing the St. Lawrence as the Waddington Bridge Company had. I think from what has been stated in Parliament here that we can hardly encourage the building of another bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman declares that he is not prepared, as a part of the policy of the Government, to allow any bridge to be erected west of Coteau.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what length does that extend?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It extends across the St. Lawrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The question is one which has an interest for me and for the hon. gentleman too, perhaps. For example, is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that this prohibition *pro tem.* extends all the way to Kingston? If an enterprise is promoted there, would he feel it his duty to oppose any construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence in that region?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is my opinion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even though the American Government would consent on their part?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is my present opinion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know that the hon. gentleman's present opinions are qualified under conditions, but I want to know what they are.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, he has not decided whether this subsidy is to go to the new Ottawa and Morrisburg Company or to the old company, the Ottawa, Waddington and New York.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) would tell us if he has retained his interest in the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Company.

Mr. HICKEY. I have claimed for the last three years that the charter of the old company is dead. It is defunct, and I have repeatedly offered to sell my interest for 5 cents to the promoters of the old road. I will sell it to the hon. gentleman for 5 cents if he wishes to have it.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not deal in that.

To the Erie and Huron Railway Company, for 22 miles of their railway from Petrolea *viâ* Oil Springs to Dresden, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the Government contemplate subsidising in the future the line extending from Sarnia to Bothwell, because this is only a small section of the line projected by the company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; subject to the statement I made, that I do not think it would be any benefit to subsidise a portion of a road and leave the other unbuilt. If things go well and I am here, I shall be glad to have an opportunity of asking a subsidy for the branch from Dresden to Bothwell.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for a railway from Brockville to Westport, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, not exceeding in the whole $83,000.

Mr. LAURIER. Is this a renewal of a lapsed subsidy?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is in one sense; the road is built and in running order, but it did not come up to the standard, and the engineer would not certify for the money. These objections, however, have been removed and the road is now finished up to the standard.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway from Little Current to the Algoma Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Manitoulin Islands, which I remember as a boy were occupied only by Indians, now have a population, I am informed, of 14,000. These people from their insular position are cut off from railway communication; but by building this railway from Little

Current, they will have connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway road. During the winter months they are cut off from the rest of the world, and during summer they have a steamer plying there, which is a means of communication.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 36 miles of their railway, from the north east end of the 20 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 3, to Smith's Falls, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $115,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that contingent on the electors of Kingston doing the correct thing on their part?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We ask for a subsidy for the whole line, instead of a portion of the line, as is done in other cases. The reason of this is that otherwise the bonus would be forfeited. To show the importance which the local authorities attach to this road, I may point out that the city of Kingston gave $150,000; Leeds and Lansdowne, $20,000; Crosby, $10,000; South Elmsley, $4,000; and the town of Smith's Falls, $5,000; in all, $224,000. The promoters of this company want the whole sum voted, so that they may go on at once, and not run the risk of forfeiting this bonus.

To the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Eganville to Barry's Bay, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road commences on the Canadian Pacific Railway near Renfrew, and passes through Eganville. It will open up a valuable timber trade in that section of the country. The first section from the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville was subsidised by 49 Victoria, and this subsidy is to cover a further distance from Eganville to Barry's Bay.

To the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Belleville to Bridgewater, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway passes through a partially settled agricultural and mining country, crossing many parts which are well timbered.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway, from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a very important road to the town of Cobourg and the county of Northumberland, as it will give direct railway communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will also be of much value to the country tributary to the line and to the mining region to which it is projected. It is a short line, but it is nevertheless a very important one. The old Cobourg and Peterborough Railway, owing to its location, had to be abandoned, and it becomes absolutely indispensable that a new road be built in a good location.

To the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company, for 3½ miles of their railway, from the town of St. Stephen to the town of Milltown, a subsidy not exceeding $5,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $11,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Milltown and St. Stephen are manufacturing centres, having a cotton mill and a lumber mill. Milltown has neither navigation nor railway facilities. The population of Milltown is about 2,500 and St. Stephen 3,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

For a railway from a point at or near Fredriction *vid* Oromocto and Gagetown, to a point on the New Brunswick Railway west of Westfield Station, for 30 miles thereof, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $96,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road will run through a well settled, fertile district along the St. John Valley, at present unserved by a railway. It will touch several thriving towns, and will be a most serviceable road, which must extend and develop trade through that section of the country.

To the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, for 4½ miles of their railway, the distance which the previous subsidy granted is short of covering, from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $14,400.

Mr. ELLIS. This railway now connects with the Intercolonial. It appears to me that the resolution does not convey the exact idea.

Mr. FOSTER. It does connect with the Intercolonial, but the whole distance to the head of Grand Lake is not covered by the present subsidy. The head of Grand Lake is the terminus of the road. This is to take them to the head of Grand Lake, the terminus of the road. It will give them a subsidy for an additional 4½ miles beyond the amount for which the subsidy was granted before.

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for 70 miles of their railway, from St. Jérôme, northwesterly towards Désert, in the Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 10, a subsidy not exceeding $5,161 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $361,270.

Provided, that the subsidy hereby granted to the Montreal and Western Railway Company may be paid by instalments on the completion of each section of the railway, as follows, that is to say:—

SECTIONS.	Approximate length in miles.
St. Jérôme to Shawbridge	8
Shawbridge to St. Sauveur	4
St. Sauveur to Ste. Adèle	6
Ste. Adèle to Lac à la Fourche	6
Lac à la Fourche to Ste. Agathe	6½
Ste. Agathe to St. Faustin	14
St. Faustin to St. Jovite	7½
St. Jovite to Summit Lake	8
Summit Lake to La Chute aux Iroquois	7
La Chute aux Iroquois towards Désert	3

Such instalments to be proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established as aforesaid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a revote. It is provided that the subsidy shall be paid as the road is finished, from station to station, according to the value of each portion. The Canadian Pacific Railway has agreed to run the line; and the moment a station is reached, that portion will be run.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the First Minister to the last paragraph, which reads as follows:—

"Such instalments to be proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken to be established as aforesaid."

This paragraph is scarcely in accord with the statement the hon. gentleman has just made, because the subsidy is to give $5,161 per mile. If this is to be divided by sections, and the subsidy to be paid on each section according to its length, instead of on the usual section of ten miles, the calculation is easily made. But there is in the last paragraph a source of complication which may land us in the same difficulty as we experienced last year in

regard to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, the subsidy for which was all expended and the road not completed. How is the proportion to be established? First of all, there is the value to be placed on the whole work, and then the relative value to be placed on each section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an estimate by an engineer of the value of the whole line. When an instalment is asked for a finished portion, its value will be established in proportion to that of the whole line.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the ordinary clause.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it is not the principle upon which these subsidies are given at all. It is a clause which is sometimes introduced into aids given to railway companies, but the principle on which the subsidies are given is a mileage clause; no matter what the difficulty of the work may be, so much a mile is given. That is the ordinary principle.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, then, do we find a special provision here, because all the difference then would be that, instead of paying by sections of ten miles, we would pay by the sections given here. If that is what is intended, there is no need for this closing paragraph.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole amount of the subsidy is $5,161 per mile. This road passes through a very broken country, so that some sections will cost much more than others. One section may cost $5,000 and another only $2,000 per mile. There would, therefore, be sufficient kept back from the less difficult sections for the purpose of adding to the assistance given the more difficult ones.

Mr. BLAKE. That I understand, and that is special, and not as the Secretary of State says, the ordinary arrangement.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is the ordinary clause, except that it is not by sections of ten miles. The ordinary clause provides for payment by sections of ten miles; but in this case each section will be paid for, per section of ten miles, according to the proportion of value of those ten miles to the whole work undertaken.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend may say no, but I say yes. If my hon. friend will look at the end of all these resolutions, he will find exactly the same provision for each ten miles as for each of these sections. I may tell my hon. friend that the difficult part of this road is between the twentieth and thirtieth mile. This resolution has not been made in this form on purpose to draw subsidies for one section more than for another; but it has been so divided because the Canadian Pacific Railway, in making the agreement which has been ratified by this Parliament, said they would guarantee a loan of $4,000 on each section. The clause is the ordinary clause, and the appropriation is the ordinary appropriation.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is so.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, there is no reason why there should be a special provision here which we do not find appended to the other resolutions at all. In the case of a railway, in which the proposed subsidy is more than half as large again as the ordinary subsidy, it becomes all the more necessary to take care that the subsidy is not disproportionately expended on some portions of the line; and although in principle there can be no objection at all to a proportionate expenditure, yet that necessarily involves a very careful instrumental survey and estimate right up to the end of the whole seventy miles, as otherwise the subsidy may be found to come very short indeed. There may be but a perfunctory examination and valuation; the difficult sections may appear to be those which have first to be grappled with, as the difficulties which have to be met a year or two later may appear less than those which are nearest. So it is absolutely necessary, if that is to be done, particularly when the subsidy appears to be larger in proportion to the whole cost of the work than is usual, that the examination and survey should be complete and that we should have an account of how many more rivers we have to cross. So I think it is desirable that we should know the difficulties which may occur. There is another vote later on for the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway. We have already given a large subsidy to that railway, but it is not the Secretary of State who takes a paternal interest in that, but the Minister of Militia, and his turn will come. I see that in that connection we are to be asked to vote a sum for a bridge, which is something altogether new. I simply mention this to show that it is important that we should see that we are not led into further expenditures than Parliament expects to grant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The first eight miles of this road from St. Jérôme to Chambery are very easy, but the 20th or 25th mile will be in the mountains and will be very difficult. These proportions have been very carefully taken by the Government engineer.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be true, but, if the concluding portion of this resolution has no more effect than the ordinary resolution, there is no reason for putting it there. All you need say would be that this should be calculated with a view to the broken sections.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A loan has been contracted with a company, and that is based on the broken sections. Otherwise there would not be any difficulty.

Mr. GIROUARD. The ordinary resolution states that the money shall be paid on sections of 10 miles, but in this case it is necessary to provide that it shall be paid on sections of 6 or 8 or 7 or 3 miles, and so on, because the road is so different in various parts that the section of 10 miles would hardly apply to it.

For 75 miles of the railway from Shelburne, in the County of Shelburne, and from Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, to Annapolis, in the Province of Nova Scotia, to be so contracted for as to secure the construction to both Shelburne and Liverpool, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $240,000.

Mr. LOVITT. It would appear from this that it is only seventy-five miles to connect these two points with Shelburne.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The whole line from Liverpool to Annapolis, with the branch to Shelburne, will be 105 miles, but the subsidy for

seventy-five miles is only in aid of the road. I would ask the First Minister to change the word "to" to the word "towards."

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to make an explanation. When the principal promoter of this company, Mr. Hervey, appeared in Ottawa, he wished to put through a Bill rather hurriedly, and I, with another gentleman from the town I represent, signed a petition for the passage of this Bill. Our names crept into the Bill in that way. I never had any interest in the Bill, it never cost me anything, I never heard of it before, or from that day to this. While not saying that there is anything reprehensible in members of Parliament having an interest in these matters, I desire to say that I have no interest in this project and never had.

Mr. LOVITT. Does the Minister of Justice know that in the western part of Shelburne meetings have been held and representations made in favor of the railway going the other way?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have been fully informed as to the meetings. This vote is designed to afford railway communication to Shelburne and Queen's, of which they have hitherto been deprived. They are fine counties, and have very considerable resources in the way of agriculture, shipping and lumbering. The development which has gone on heretofore has been principally in connection with maritime pursuits and lumbering, but the capabilities of these counties for agriculture and fruit-growing are very considerable. They have been cut off from the rest of Canada through lack of railway facilities, and they have felt that want very considerably. This is designed to give them railway communication with Annapolis, and in that way they can reach Liverpool in the County of Queen's, which has a very fair harbor, Shelburne, which has a magnificent harbor, and Annapolis, from which steamers ply to the United States and to the adjacent Province of New Brunswick. I know that the western part of Shelburne naturally desires railway connection not in this direction but in the direction of Yarmouth, but that will be a matter for consideration hereafter. I know it is important to that part of the county which trades with Yarmouth, and sends its exports there, but, while that is so, it cannot be expected that one line can accommodate the whole of Shelburne county, nor is that aimed at. The county will receive connection with the general railway system of the Province by the branch which it is intended to extend from Caledonia to the harbor of Shelburne.

General LAURIE. There is a difference of opinion in Shelburne County as to which will be the most desirable method of carrying out this communication. A portion of the western part of the county desires to be connected with the shire town of Shelburne, others desire to be connected with Yarmouth. The charter, to which I assume this subsidy will be given, provides for a branch being made from this line to Barrington and Lockeport. I understand that proposals are now being made to connect Barrington with Yarmouth, which will satisfy all the desired conditions. But it would have been unreasonable to ask the Government to do more than has already been proposed to be done at present. This will afford needed facilities to Shelburne County. I may give an idea of the resources of Shelburne and of the business to be done there, from the report of the sub-collector of customs, at the mouth of Shelburne harbor. This year, 378 vessels were entered, between 21st October of last year, and 8th April of this year; of these, no less than 250 were engaged in catching fresh fish for the markets of the Upper Provinces and the United States. The fish caught, according to the reports of the captains, amounted to the large quantity of ten and a quarter million pounds. It is most desirable that these fish should be sent either by railway or by steamer, not by sailing vessels. I may also mention that the interior of the country is now developing gold mines, and that the wages paid to men working them amount to over $20,000 per month, and that is only the beginning. The interior of the country through which this railway will pass is a very rich fruit-growing and agricultural district; I think, therefore, the opening up of this country will be of great value to the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt that that portion of Nova Scotia to which this resolution refers, in common with certain other portions which have received assistance at various late Sessions, has been very much neglected, and its progress retarded for the want of railway communication. I think it is deeply to be regretted in the interest of the whole Province of Nova Scotia that what I must call the profligate railway expenditure which has taken place in other parts of that Province, should have resulted in a failure to meet the real wants of the Province. The expenditure which has taken place in connection with the Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, being constructed at the Dominion expense, and other transactions which have resulted in lines now constructed at the Dominion expense, have produced this result: that the gross sum which the Dominion has paid, and for which it is now liable, shows a very undue disproportion in Nova Scotia relatively to the other Provinces. Take the lines to which I have referred in the counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, and take the Cape Breton Railway which is being constructed wholly at the expense of the Dominion; take the line in connection with the Gut of Canso, which has been acquired at the expense of the Dominion, and you find this large mileage of railways, some of them producing hardly any appreciable Dominion result at all, others producing some good result, no doubt. I will repeat what I said on a former occasion in the course of this very lavish expenditure for Nova Scotia, when I found in that region with which we are now dealing, an absence of appropriation altogether—I say this region is deserving of consideration, and I only wish the enormous expenditure in Nova Scotia, on the part of the Dominion, had been more judiciously made, and then it would not be found necessary to give this grant, which will not answer the whole exigencies of that Province, and may be inadequate to answer this particular purpose. I think we would have found plenty of money, on the general principles which we have applied in aiding railways for local purposes in Nova Scotia, to do everything that ought to have been done.

To the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, for 50 miles of their railway from Port Hawkesbury to Broad Cove, a subsidy not exceeding $1,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $50,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a line of railway running on the northern side of the Island of Cape Breton. It was fully discussed before the Railway Committee this Session, and the charter of this company was protected from interference by the rejection of another charter. The railway is to connect with the Government railway at Port Hawkesbury and to run along the coast towards Port Hood and Broad Cove. That side of the Island is studded with coal deposits, all of which are recognised as being highly important and extensive. The construction of the road, after it leaves Port Hood, towards Broad Cove, is not very difficult. The company is incorporated by the Provincial Legislature, which will probably subsidise it; the County of Inverness has likewise subsidised it. The information that I have in regard to it is that the construction of the fifty miles along that coast towards Broad Cove, is not a very difficult piece of work, and for that reason we are only asking for a subsidy of $50,000, which is little more than $1,000 per mile. in addition to which it receives a provincial subsidy of $3,200 per mile, and expects to receive a municipal subsidy as well. The line as authorised by the Provincial Legislature, extends beyond that to the northern point of the Island, but the construction there is altogether problematical, and unlikely to take place for many years to come. It likewise includes a branch from Broad Cove to Grand Narrows, which portion of the work we are not asking to subsidise. We are asked to subsidise those portions which, I understand, the Provincial Legislature has subsidised.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that $1,000 a mile is all that was asked?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not all that was asked by the company, but it was all that was asked by the friends of the enterprise in the county.

Mr. BLAKE. I looked hurriedly over the papers and it seemed not only that this amount was asked, but that the Provincial Legislature's agreement to grant a subsidy was dependent on the action of this Parliament, and I was apprehensive that we would find ourselves told next Session that the arrangement had failed, and it was necessary to grant a larger sum. I observe by the Estimates, which we fortunately have in this case, and we have a little more information than usual, that the road is not an expensive one and that the County of Inverness gives $100,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The agreement provides that the County of Inverness shall give not less than $50,000 spread over these fifty miles.

Mr. BLAKE. That is $1,000 per mile; then there is this $3,200 per mile outside of the Provincial subsidy. Has the hon. Minister of Justice satisfied himself reasonably that the scheme of the company can be carried out as regards the fifty miles for $5,200 per mile?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have, to a reasonable extent. The satisfaction I have had on that point is to this extent: The company, while pressing very strongly its claims for subsidies on the Dominion and the Provincial Government, actually went to work and built and graded a considerable mileage without having any contract with the Government, and they have spent a very considerable sum of money. I think they have graded about twenty-five miles. They have, moreover, entered into contracts for a large supply of ties and so on. The parties making the advances are capitalists, whose means I am assured of; but, in addition, the company have secured the assistance of capitalists in the Province, who have placed a considerable sum in the enterprise, and they have done so without any assurance that it will receive even the ordinary subsidy. Although the portion of the district through which the railway runs is not a very populous one, its indications of strong support from persons connected with that part of the country, some of them are my personal friends, indicate to me that the company has more backing than I would have expected it, as a new enterprise of this kind. The company has gone forward at the risk of no aid being given. I do not wish the House to understand that this is the total amount asked by the company, but this aid, together with that of the Local Government, will enable the company to carry out the undertaking, I am told. The Government at a future time might think proper, in answer to an application by the company, to subsidise the branch from Broad Cove.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear the statement of the hon. Minister, because those who recollect the first stage through which a little scheme passed, will remember that it was urged that the Cape Breton Railway was to be a simple subsidised road, and that we were to provide the necessary railway communication at very small cost. We recollect that in the end the Dominion Parliament were called on to undertake the building of that railway, certainly not with any view that we should be called to give further aid to Cape Breton. An examination of the route of the railway made it plain that it did not serve any very important railway purposes with respect to the region to which the hon. gentleman is referring, and it was clear that if railway accommodation were required for Cape Breton there would still be a gap to be filled some other day.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister of Railways was absent the other day, when I referred to the railway system of this country, by which a length of 9 miles connecting Derby branch with the Northern and Western Railway, one owned by the Government and the other subsidised by the Government, has remained unused during the last two or three years. It is a perfect outrage on the people of my constituency that such a state of things should exist. The hon. First Minister has now the opportunity of stating, inasmuch as one of the proprietors of this link has been here for the last few days, whether any arrangement has been made between the Government and the proprietors of the road for opening out and working this section. It has been constructed between two and three years, but it has never been used, although it forms an important link as regards one section of the County of Northumberland. I ask if any arrangement has been made in regard to this link with one of the proprietors of the road in question, who has been in close communion with the First Minister within the last few weeks. It is no use opposing these grants, but I enter my protest against the manner in which they are brought before this House, and carried no matter what the opposition may be. I have looked with deep regret at the enormous amount of money

voted, money voted not because of any particular merits of the schemes themselves, but because they happen to be advocated by hon. gentlemen who sit on the Government benches or by influential men throughout the country who happen to have the ear of the Government. It is most immoral and demoralising alike to the counties in which the money is spent and to the representatives who come to this House as the representatives of those counties. I know that any representations I have made have been treated with the utmost neglect. It is useless for me to ask for my county the most common justice in regard to any matter. When I reflect on the items submitted and consider how hon. gentlemen can obtain for their counties consideration when the public money is to be spent, while I for my county can receive no consideration, I feel there is something wrong in the manner in which public affairs are administered and in which public money is appropriated and expended. I have already two or three times referred to this same circumstance, and I repeat it again. It is useless to oppose any measures brought in by the Government because they are bound to be carried. When I look at the counties favored in Nova Scotia and in my own Province, I find that counties extending all along the St. John River and in the western section of the Province have favors, but there is scarcely anything for the group of counties surrounding the county I have the honor to represent, and I feel that a special injustice is done to my section of the country. The effect is, that the people in my county say: "What is the use of you in Parliament? We send you there, but what do you get for our county?" The right hon. gentleman may laugh, but he knows it is true, and we might as well have a little truth about it now as at any other time. The people of my county say: "We send you to Parliament, and while we see money scattered all around the Province, and appropriations made for this county and that county and the other county, Northumberland is utterly neglected. We had better put you out and send one who will support the Government." That is the talk of the people, and that is what the Government aim at. My right hon. friend may smile and smile, but that is the object he has in view. I have been dancing attendance on the right hon. gentleman all this Session and have met him in his office, by his appointment, to try and get just and proper claims settled, but I cannot succeed. I find, that this process of demoralisation and corruption is going on throughout this country, for which the Government is responsible. If this thing continues, the result will be one of two things. Either, there will be an awakening on the part of the people, which will send these men out of power, or else, the people will say: "We will have to choose representatives in Parliament, who will go on their knees to the Administration, and who say 'yea, yea,' and amen, to all their iniquities, and then we will get something done, for independence is of no use," or else—and I take my chances on this platform of independence—the people of the country will say: "This Government does not render justice, and we will put them out of office." I have great hope that the honesty of the people of Canada will induce them to take this latter course.

For completing the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company, from Montreal to Sorel, $40,000.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought this railway was a built railway, and a bonded railway, and a fondled railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was built some years ago and was for a time operated by the Grand Trunk Railway, but they refused to continue to operate it on account of its being so dilapidated. We then granted a subsidy to put it in safe condition for traffic, but through lack of funds it was allowed to get into disrepair and was partially closed. The present subsidy is to give aid to put it in good repair.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has taken the trouble to obtain a statement from this company as to how this money has been applied? When a company which has been in operation like this one, comes again seeking favor from the Government, it seems to me, that the least they should do is to have their books audited by the Government to see how the money was applied. I believe that if there had been proper management of that road, there is no reason why it should be in a dilapidated condition to-day. This railway is built through an even country, it has been favored, I understand, by grants of right of way, there is no river, between Montreal and Sorel, except the Richelieu, and they have no bridge over the Richelieu, and it seems to me that no railway could be built at a cheaper price than this one. It seems a very extraordinary thing that a road, which has been in operation for not more than eight years, if that long, should be in such a dilapidated condition now.

Mr. BLAKE. This seems to be one of those roads, I think among the earliest of the latter series of roads, which has been the cause of very great discredit to this country, by reason of the operations on the London market, of those who were concerned in it. The most severe reflections have been made upon the persons who were concerned in the issue of the bonds of this road, and Canadian credit generally has suffered very much by it. If a company, after building a road in this way, and after actually opening their road, comes to Parliament and obtains a grant in order to repair it and enable it to be opened again, gets that grant, uses it or misuses it, I know not which, keep the road open for a little while longer, then closes it again, and comes back to Parliament for another grant in order to put the road in repair so that it may be operated—where is this to stop? What guarantee in the world have we, if we make this grant, that this sort of thing is not to go on for ever? This condition of things seems to me to be intolerable. A business-like inspection of the affairs of the company should have been made in the first place to see that the management of the road was such that the aid proposed to be given would put it in proper repair, but now we find the road closed again, and we are called upon to pay money to keep it open. Where is this going to stop?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not at all attempt to defend the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company, as I am not sufficiently acquainted with the facts, either to defend it or to join in any charge against it. I am aware that there were some severe reflections made, as to the manner in which the bonds of this company were floated, and I fear that there has been a good deal of misman-

agement in this road. Perhaps the funds were insufficient at first to put the road in a substantial condition, and that the Grand Trunk Railway, by operating it when it was imperfectly finished, injured the road. At all events the Grand Trunk Railway abandoned operating it, and whatever may have been the conduct of the company, this road is a necessity for that part of the country, and it is in the interests of the inhabitants, and not of the company, that this item has been inserted in the Estimates. I can assure the Committee that this money shall be expended under the direct supervision of the Government engineer, and in such a manner that no portion of the money can be diverted from the purpose of putting the road into complete repair.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, the first subsidy was granted by the Government under exactly the same circumstances, and was expended under their supervision. The railway has been built ; it was not in running condition ; application was made to this Parliament for aid ; and aid was given. Then I presume the aid was expended, as the hon. gentleman proposed it should be expended, under the supervision of the Government, and yet we find the railway in no better condition than it was before. If the motive is to develop this section of the country, that is a laudable motive, but the company have shown themselves such bad husbandmen that they should not be entrusted with the expenditure of this money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Wholly apart from that, even if these people have a right to receive from other portions of the country a contribution to their railway, they have had it once, and it does appear to me an improper act on the part of the Government to grant it twice. There are other sections of the country infinitely more in need of railways which have not received a cent from the Government—railways for which application has been made this Session by hon. members of this House. There is no pretence that this little road of 40 miles in length is for the general benefit of Canada ; to call it so is an insult to our intelligence ; it is a local road, and the hon. gentleman in contributing to it is defrauding other parts of the country which are applicants for similar favors. I do not approve of the system at all ; but if it is adopted, it should be carried out with some regard to equity between one part of the country and another ; and in the name of those sections, which are without any advantage from the Government, I protest against this double bonus, for which, in the light of these facts, there does not appear to be the slightest justification.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first vote was $1,600 a mile, and I suppose that the money raised in addition to that sum by bonds and otherwise was insufficient to make the road a first-class permanent road. There was a great deal of trestle work, which partly accounts for the road getting into disrepair. I dare say that if it had got $3,200 a mile it would have been built as a first-class railway, as it ought to have been built. But when we are informed—I was not aware of the fact until just now—that the road got only half the subsidy given to other railways, I think the hon. gentleman can well allow this road to be put into full and complete repair. The first building of the railway was carried on by the company, and all the Government had to do was to examine 10 miles when built. However, this money will not be given at all to the company. Warned by previous experience, we have decided that the money shall be expended under the direction of the Government officers just as if it were a Government railway.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that this road would probably be all right if the company had before received $3,200 a mile. But we on this side of the House knew that it had received only $1,600 a mile, and we knew the reason why. It was because this road was built and running when the system of subsidies was invented, and the amount of $1,600 was to repair it. It was not to build the road ; but it was so badly built or was so old, or the company had managed it so badly, that the road had got worn out, and to repair it and make it as good as new, the hon. gentleman made that grant. This time the company are not to be trusted ; but we all know that the Government are to be trusted ; they never make extravagant expenses ; they are economical ; and so the hon. gentleman gives us to understand that this economical and wise Government will take charge of the expenditure of this money. But what security have we that the road will be kept in repair after that ? First, the company built the road ; then they ran it down ; we subscribed $1,600 a mile to get it repaired again ; then they ran it down again ; and now we are to vote $40,000 to repair it again. What certainty have we that the road will not be run down again ? There must be something wrong with the road or with the corporators, perhaps with both. If the hon. gentleman had explained to us how this road, after being once built, could not be kept open, and how after having been once repaired, it could not be kept open a second time, and how the same thing was not going to occur after this third grant, we might have some reason for it. We know nothing of the cause of the former failures, and we know not that the same cause may not continue to exist and produce a third failure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to know if we are to understand that it is part of the policy of the Government to repair roads that get out of order, because, if so, I do not think, if this is the first application, it will be the last. The hon. gentleman is establishing a precedent that will give plenty of trouble to himself and his successors.

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company for 7½ miles of their railway, from Hull to Aylmer, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $24,000.

Mr. BLAKE. This seems to be another innovation. It is not a subsidy to build a railway or to repair a railway ; it is a subsidy with reference to some 7½ miles of a railway which already exists and is in repair ; it is to assist the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company to buy that piece of road from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company can either lease it or sell it to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company ; but the proposition is that we shall contribute towards the purchase money the sum of $3,200 a mile. What public interest in the way of development is to be served by this subsidy ? The road is not going to be sold

at more than it is worth, and if the Pontiac Pacific Junction Company buy it at what it is worth, they can afford to pay what it is worth. But I believe this is not the first time that we have been called on to pay for this road, for I think it is part of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, which was built by the Province of Quebec, and was sold by the Province of Quebec to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at a discount, and in respect of which this Parliament afterwards contributed to the Province of Quebec a large sum, about, I think, $1,000,000, to make up the difference between the cost and the value of the road. The Province of Quebec having on the sale lost a considerable sum, it appealed to us in reference to the general proposition of the extension eastward of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It appealed to hon. gentlemen opposite in various ways. It appealed by petition; it appealed by memorials; it appealed, not by open representations in Parliament but by the convention in No. 8; and it succeeded in obtaining a large grant from the Dominion revenues to make good its loss on that operation. The Dominion paid the loss to the Province of Quebec, or so much as it was thought equitable to pay, in respect of the whole line which had been sold; the Canadian Pacific Railway had acquired it, and I thought we were quit of it. Then the Pontiac Pacific asked for leave to acquire it, and the Canadian Pacific Railway got leave to dispose of it. Why then should we step in now and pay $24,000 more to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, to enable it to pay a part of the price of the acquisition of this railway. I observe that the application made in this report asks the Government, in making the grant or any other grant to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, to have regard to the creditors of the road, those employed on the road, and also to the interests of the county. Some of us may yet remember the circumstances connected with the earlier agitations for subsidies for this road, a considerable portion of which have been paid, and some of which, I believe, remain as yet unpaid, in which it turned out that an understanding had been reached between the authorities on behalf of the County of Pontiac and the railway itself that, for whatever aid the representatives of the County of Pontiac might be able to acquire from a kindly and paternal Government and a generous people, the County of Pontiac should receive credit, I believe, from time to time. The county of Pontiac had given $100,000 in bonds as its contribution to this road; and if Parliament here were to grant $100,000 or $50,000 towards that railway, then Pontiac county was to get the benefit of it; so that the application made to us here, and which was conceded, was in substance, although not in terms, a grant in ease of the county of Pontiac, to save it from the payment of its municipal bonus. I believe this was the arrangement, although it was not signed, sealed, or defined in some formal instrument. I believe it is not yet, but perhaps may be implemented. But such it was. I think the hon. the Secretary of State, who, I am glad to say, has just come in, has a good deal to do with this railway. He and Mr. Church and a few others were the board of directors; and during the period of the earlier events of which I have spoken, the hon. gentleman was interested, to a very large extent, in the road. I do not know if his interest still continues, but I should like to know from the Government how it is that, under these circumstances, it is proposed we should purchase, on behalf of a railway company, an existing railway, which that company is able to acquire at its value, and in respect of which we have already expended quite a considerable sum.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I had no interest in that road, and I am not interested in defending this vote. A subsidy was voted in 1884 for a line from Hull to Pembroke.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it was from Hull or Aylmer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. From Hull or Aylmer? That is to say, it was from Hull. In 1884, the House voted a subsidy from Hull to Pembroke.

Mr. BLAKE. From Hull or Aylmer?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. From Hull or Aylmer. It is the same vote; nothing added to it; and to-day that company is entitled, as far as I know, to this grant. I am not here to give an explanation of this subsidy, which is voted by Parliament and to which the company is entitled at present.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is quite in error.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not.

Mr. LAURIER. I will refer the hon. gentleman to the petition with regard to this subsidy. After reciting the advantages, the petition proceeds as follows:—

To this end (that is to say, the advantage of the railway) a renewal of the relapsed subsidies is indispensable as well as the granting of a subsidy of $3,200 for the acquisition by the company of the branch line of seven miles in length between Aylmer and Hull, towards which no Dominion subsidy has yet been paid.

Now, it is asked that this Government should pay a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for seven miles of railway. For what object? To aid a railway in need? Not at all. To aid the construction of a railway? Not at all. To confer any public benefit on any section of country? Nothing of the kind. What for, then? Simply to enable the Pacific Junction Railway Company to buy that piece of road from the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is to enable one company to sell and another to buy a piece of railway which is already in existence. Surely that is not at all a thing which can be defended here. Upon what ground can it be defended? I have always understood that the principle which underlies these grants of subsidies to railways it to enable railways to be constructed and to favor public localities. But there is nothing of the kind in this. It is not to favor any section of country, because a railway already exists there. It is simply to enable a company to buy a road from another company.

Mr. BRYSON. I may say at the outset that this subsidy of 7½ miles does not materially interfere with me, so far as it is not in any portion of my county; but as the representative of the County of Pontiac, I am particularly interested in the people of that county having one line of railway connection with the city of Ottawa instead of having two lines as at present. Therefore, the sooner the Pontiac road should own the portion of the railway from Hull to Aylmer the better. The hon. member for West Durham has referred to the subsidy voted in 1884. In 1884, the Pontiac Pacific

Junction Railway was granted a subsidy for a line of railway from Hull or Aylmer to Pembroke.

Mr. BLAKE. How many miles?

Mr. BRYSON. I think 85 miles; $272,000 in all. Then a subsidy was voted for a portion of the road between Montreal and Ottawa, a distance of 120 miles, at $12,000 per mile, so that the portion of the road now proposed to be subsidised, from Hull to Aylmer, has not before been subsidised by the Federal Parliament. If you will look, Sir, to the Quebec Statutes, you will find that the Pontiac Pacific Junction received a subsidy to the extent of $6,000 a mile for 85 miles from Hull or Aylmer to Pembroke, and that during the Session of 1888 a subsidy was voted for ten additional miles, or, that is, these seven miles now under discussion, and the three miles subsidised by this Parliament in the Session of 1888. If the Local Government was justified in subsidising that additional ten miles, and they were perfectly justified, because the entire distance from Hull to the town of Pembroke, which the company was subsidised to build, is 95 miles; so that the one is quite in keeping with the other, and both are quite right.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company for a bridge over the Nicolet River, and also a bridge on the St. Francis River, a subsidy of 15 per cent. on the value of the structures, not to exceed $37,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why do the Government assist in the construction of this bridge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are two new large bridges there, and the policy of the Government is to give 15 per cent. for bridges costing $100,000 or more, and these will cost from $250,009 to $300,000.

To the Drummond County Railway Company, for 24 miles of their railway, from Drummondville to Ste. Rosalie, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $76,800.

Mr. McMULLEN. The First Minister said it was not intended to grant a bonus to any road for a section of country that was already accommodated. In the petition in this case, they complain that the freights they have to pay are excessive and that they want competition.

Mr. COLBY. This road makes a very important cut-off between Montreal and Quebec. By the construction of this road of about 50 miles, there is a saving in distance of about 21 miles between Montreal and Quebec, and of course a corresponding saving in our connection with the Lower Provinces over the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. According to the petition it is only a cut-off of 12 miles, and it is asked because the petitioners desire competition in freights.

Mr. COLBY. The only road with which there could be any competition is the Grand Trunk Railway, and that road is not averse to the granting of this assistance.

Mr. LAURIER. This projected road will not interfere with any existing road. It is true that Drummondville is already connected with St. Rosalie, but it is by two sides of a triangle, and this will give the straight connection.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Quebec; we have built a railway on the north shore which the Dominion of Canada has had to buy as a competitive road, and the vote passed just before this for bridges is for another road between Montreal and Quebec. It is useless to talk about the policy of the Government being not to build competitive roads. The policy of the Government is simply to get the votes.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) ought not to find fault with this line, because it is putting the leader of the Opposition in close communication with his friends at St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. MITCHELL. What have I to do with the leader of the Opposition? I am here as an independent critic of public matters, and nineteen times out of twenty I agree with the leader of the Opposition, because I find him acting in the interests of the public.

Mr. COLBY. It shortens the distance between the hon. member's present residence and his county.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are already three competitive lines to my county from this section of the country.

To the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from the northern end of the 15 miles subsidised by the Act 52 Victoria, Chapter 3, towards the point of St. Michel des Saints, on the River Mattawa, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $48,000

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to know who asked for that railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know who the corporators are. It is the railway company that is asking for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the railway company a vote in this House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am afraid their servant has.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for 90 miles of their railway, from St. Francis Station on the Quebec Central Railway to a point on the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, near Moose River, or from a point on the Quebec Central Railway between the Chaudière River and King station, to a point on the International Railway at or near Lake Megantic, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, a subsidy not exceeding $21,191.54 per annum for twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period, as interest on the bonds of the Company, such annual subsidy for twenty years representing a grant in cash of $288,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of this resolution is merely to make the subsidy granted by 51 Victoria, chapter 3, apply to an optional route.

Mr. LAURIER. How is that optional route to be determined?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the railway company I take it, with the approbation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the subsidy formerly granted otherwise than in this shape?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Always, with the guarantee and all.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose we do not guarantee the bonds until construction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the conditions are set forth in the latter part of these resolutions.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for a railway bridge over the St. Charles River, to give access to the City of Quebec, a subsidy not to exceed in the whole $30,000; also for 12 miles of their railway from Lorette *viâ* Charlesbourg, to Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $38,400—$68,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road now connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway about five miles out of Quebec; they have found it a roundabout way of reaching Quebec, and the line has to encounter a very heavy grade.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimated cost of the bridge?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Upwards of $200,000. It is a very large bridge, crossing the River St. Charles opposite the gas works.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimated cost of the 12 miles of the road?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is an expensive piece of road. I have not got the estimate, but the right of way is very expensive, as it comes down through one of the best portions of the country. Some of the grades are heavy.

Mr. BLAKE. We all know that it would cost more than $3,200 a mile. That is a heavy piece of road, the right of way is going to be expensive, it is going to include the termini. So this will amount to $240,000 for the railway and $200,000 for the bridge, or $440,000, to which must be added $60,000 for pickings, which is very moderate in that locality, or in all half a million dollars. But the road has already access to the city of Quebec over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is thus proposed to spend half a million dollars to give them better facilities for entering the city. I think that this proposed grant could be very much better expended.

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company, for 22 miles of their railway from the village of Prince William towards the town of Woodstock, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 50-51 Victoria, chapter 24, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400.

Mr. ELLIS. Is this railway really necessary? There is already a railway on each side of the river, and this road, I presume, will run between them. We have already granted a subsidy for a road from Fredericton down to Wellesly, so this is the third railway along the banks of the River St. John.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is no use hon. gentlemen opposing this amount, as there is a letter from the Minister of Finance to the Minister of Railways recommending it.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I once again bring before the Minister of Railways the question of taking over some of the branches of the Intercolonial, to which I called the attention of the House, many of which branches can be bought to great advantage to the country. I cannot express the surprise, but I must express regret, that no move has been made in the direction I urged on the attention of the House and the Government the other night. My poor scheme seems to have been buried beneath irrelevant matter. Cold water was thrown on the scheme, which was perhaps not very ably presented, among others by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) from whom I had very good reason to expect better things, remembering that he knew much better than did the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or the hon. membar for North York (Mr. Mulock), the facts on which my arguments were based. I repeat that I was surprised to find that hon. gentleman throwing cold water on my scheme and not meeting my arguments fairly. I again express not my surprise, but my profound regret, that no movement has been made in this direction. In spite of all the rebuffs I have received, I shall feel it my duty, if I have the good fortune to come back next Session, to press on the Government, at an early hour in the Session, this scheme once more, and to submit it more fully and completely; and if I cannot move the Government in any degree, I shall endeavor to influence opinion outside of this House in favor of what is, in my judgment, a scheme in the interests of the Lower Provinces and of the whole country, namely, the taking over of such branches of the Intercolonial as have commercial value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the hon. gentleman does not consider any want of respect has been shown to his opinion or suggestions because he does not see any tangible evidence in these resolutions. It is almost impossible when a question is brought before the attention of the Government, especially involving a sum of money, for the Government to come to any conclusion during the Session. So instead of the hon. gentleman waiting until next Session to impress his views on the Government, I shall be exceedingly obliged to him if at an early day during the recess he will lay his views before the Government and they will receive the most respectful attention.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I will certainly do so.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman must remember that, although the First Minister may desire to calm the perturbed feelings of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), the First Minister is going to throw the whole community into a state of agitation, for the hon. gentleman has already said that the Intercolonial was burden enough for this country to bear, and that he had no idea of taking over the branches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did say so; but, unlike the hon. gentleman, I am not infallible.

Mr. TEMPLE. I find the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) does not know the geography of his own country. He does not seem to be aware that while two railways run from Fredericton to Woodstock, they are 20 miles from the river on each side. This grant is a revote made four years ago, and the road will pass through the best country in New Brunswick, and there is no road near the river except the highway.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not think it is necessary for the hon. gentleman to endeavor to correct me. He knows very well I am talking of the road on the right bank of the St. John, which is not twenty but often five miles from the river.

Mr. TEMPLE. It is twenty miles from the river all the way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it intended to cross the hon. gentleman's bridge?

Mr. TEMPLE. I will tell you about that later on.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

HARBOR FEES IN NEWFOUNDLAND.

General LAURIE. Before the House goes into Supply, I would like to call attention to a matter of considerable importance to the Province from which I come. It is in connection with the heavy charge made upon fishing vessels, which are required to pay harbor dues in Newfoundland, every time they call there for bait. Perhaps the House is not aware of the enormous burden this will impose on our fishing industry. There are in Nova Scotia 690 sea-going fishing vessels manned by 6,644 men. If they call at any of the harbors of Newfoundland, in order to bait, which is necessary for them to do about five times in the year, it means a tax on our Nova Scotia fishing vessels of $345,000 a year. In the Province of New Brunswick, which has 153 fishing vessels, the tax will amount to about $76,000. In Prince Edward Island with 70 vessels, $25,000, and in the Province of Quebec with 115 fishing vessels if all of them go on the bank, $57,000 a year. Altogether this tax on our fishing vessels will amount to about half a million dollars a year. To show that this is no fanciful idea, I take the following item from a Halifax paper :

"CANSO, 9th May.

"Ar. schrs. *James Ryan*, Halifax; *Donald Cann*, Hines, Grand Banks (400 qtls. cod., 2,000 lbs halibut), baited last at Fortune Bay. Captain Hines declares the Newfoundland bait law is prohibitory and he will be obliged to take his bait in Nova Scotia throughout the season."

This means that these vessels will have to come back from the Grand Banks to Nova Scotia, to obtain bait. This burden as I have just shown, will be so prohibitory as practically to destroy all prospect of carrying on the fishing industry with any profit at all, and it will be a most serious injury to our fishing trade. Considering that the Newfoundland delegates have lately come here with a grievance of their own, and have asked the sympathy of Canada in their trouble, it does seem in the very highest degree absurd, that at that very time, they should have taken upon themselves to impose the onerous tax on our vessels going into their ports. I am aware that the matter has already been brought to the attention of the Government and of the House, but considering that this is now the time that fishing will be actively prosecuted, I do trust that every possible effort will be made to have this heavy tax on our fishing industry removed. Should that effort not be successful, I trust that we shall improve the fishing intelligence bureau, as I pointed out last evening, by receiving reports by telegraph, so as to give information, both at the central office and to vessels calling at any port to obtain information from the central office by telegraph, as to where bait can be obtained. If they must come to Nova Scotia to obtain bait, the information as to what port bait can be found at is of equal importance to them as a knowledge of where the fish are to be found. I trust that if we cannot obtain the remission of the duties in Newfoundland, greater attention will be paid the fisheries intelligence bureau, and that these two cognate subjects will be considered together. I myself, and our people as well, consider it of more importance that the remission of the Newfoundland harbor fees should be obtained. I trust the Government will recognise the great importance of this matter to our people, and that they will spare no effort to obtain the abolition of this obnoxious tax.

Mr. LOVITT. I am happy to second the remarks of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie). I sent a communication to the Minister of Justice, from which it appeared that one of our vessels had to leave Newfoundland and come to Canso for bait. I am glad to state that I have been assured by the Minister of Justice that everything that could be done by the Government would be done in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This matter has been fully attended to, so far as it can be by the Canadian Government. The statute under which the obnoxious tax has been imposed, was passed in Newfoundland, a little more than a year ago, and it then formed the subject of very earnest remonstrances on the part of this Government, directly to the Government of Newfoundland, and also to the Colonial Office, in England, where the propriety of the Act was under consideration, in connection with the whole subject of the sale of bait to foreign vessels. At that time the decision of the Imperial Government was to allow the Act, although a previous Act of the same character had been disallowed. Before that decision was arrived at, there was a very definite and positive assurance given, on the part of the Newfoundland Government, that the Act would never be applied to Canadian fishermen. The Act was subject, however, to a suspending clause, providing that it should not go into operation until it was proclaimed. It has only recently been proclaimed, and since the proclamation was issued—very much to the surprise of those who were aware of the negotiations that had taken place and the promises that had been given—was applied to Canadian vessels; remonstrances were again used, and the Imperial Government was addressed upon the subject. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) wrote me a note on the subject, and called my attention to it, as one of the Ministers from the Province, and it was only to-day I had time to reply to him. I suppose he has not received the letter yet, but I enclosed him an extract from a letter of a member of the late Government of Newfoundland, in which I may say, for the information of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie), that gentleman stated most distinctly that the policy of the late Government, which secured the passing of the Act, was that it should not apply to Canadian vessels; that these assurances were given in good faith, and that it was a matter of surprise to every one in Newfoundland who was aware of the policy of the Government, and the restrictions upon that policy, and the pledges that were given, that these pledges have been disregarded and the Act made to apply to Canadian vessels.

THAMES RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works if he can give me the information

he promised me to-day in reference to the dredging of the River Thames?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The answer to the question put by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) will supply the information which the hon. gentleman asked. Attention having been called to the existence of a bar off the mouth of the River Thames, an examination was made of the same, and in May, 1887, a report thereon was made, estimating the cost of opening a channel to twelve feet depth at $7,500. Since that date several applications have been received, and during the past summer a dredge was engaged in opening a channel seventy-five feet wide to a depth of three feet, at a cost of $4,179. On the 1st instant a report was transmitted to the Department. It is obvious that the constant use of a dredge will be necessary to keep a channel open through this bar, unless it is made of a permanent character by the construction of protection works of a length of say 5,000 feet, the cost of which, with the dredging required, is estimated at $85,000. Under those circumstances the Government are not ready to expend such a large sum of money. But a careful examination will have to be made, to see what smaller amounts might be required.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. Minister is aware that the cut he speaks of, having been made last year, was only carried two-thirds of the distance through the bar, and all that the people ask now is the appropriation of a small amount to continue that work through the bar. If it is not done, all the money spent last year will have been thrown away.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask leave to withdraw my motion for the time being, as the Minister of Railways wishes to go on with certain matters first.

DISMISSAL OF ROCKPORT DEPUTY POSTMASTER

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will take advantage of this motion to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the matter which I brought to his notice last night, regarding the intended dismissal of a postmaster at Rockport. The facts, as disclosed in the documents which the hon. Postmaster General was good enough to hand to me, appear to be these: To the postmaster himself, I understand, no blame is attached; but the postmaster's deputy, who was acting as his assistant, was accused by a party of the name of Hunt, of having opened letters addressed to him. An investigation was made, and it appeared that Hunt had authorised the deputy postmaster to open certain correspondence between the legal firm of Britton & Whiting, of Kingston, who are well known to the hon. First Minister, and this man Hunt. After investigation, it appeared that there was really small cause for supposing that the deputy postmaster had done anything improper. Two reports were presented, one by Mr. Macarrow, who was sent down to report the evidence in some detail, and another by the Inspector at Kingston, Mr. Gilbert Griffin. Without detaining the House, I may say that the evidence submitted, and all the circumstances, appear to me hardly to bear out the conclusion attained by Mr. Macarrow, and rather tend to bear out the report made by Mr. Griffin in a letter from which I will read that part which is material. After reciting that he had been instructed to examine into this matter, he says:

"Mr. Dailey is a busy man, reeve and magistrate; keeps a large business, and is looked up to by all. Mr. Hunt lives on an island off the port, and being indifferently educated authorised Mr. Dailey to act for him. This Dailey did for some time without any objection from Hunt until a dispute arose about other matters, when Hunt lodged this complaint, which as you will judge by the evidence, is founded on personal quarrels, not on any breach of post office duties. Mr. Britton, Q. C., who was attending to law business for Hunt, explains that Dailey always wrote letters for Hunt, opened his correspondence, and acted as Hunt's agent frequently without reference to Hunt at all. I have seen Mr. Dailey and have had the Rockport office inspected, and you may be satisfied that Mr. Dailey's action towards Hunt was that of a friend, and no complaint would have been made if Hunt had settled his private indebtedness to Mr. Dailey.

"I enclose herewith memorial from residents at Rockport expressing their confidence in Mr. Dailey; letters from Dailey himself; letters from B. M. Britton, Esq., Q. C.,; letters from Mr. Cornwall, postmaster, Rockport."

There is a long and highly respectably signed petition from the residents in favor of this Mr. Dailey. I submit that on the evidence of these papers, there hardly appears to be any ground for dismissing this officer who has been in the service of the Department for 33 years, and against whom the only fault alleged in reality is that by mistake he had opened one or two letters besides those which had been addressed by those legal gentlemen to Mr. Hunt—a mistake which one would say might naturally and easily occur. I think, therefore, that if the hon. Postmaster General would carefully consider the question, he would see that it would be dealing very hardly with this officer to dismiss him summarily under the circumstances.

Motion withdrawn.

FURTHER SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the courtesy of the House, I will now move that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the railway resolutions which are set down for to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

To the Temiscouata Railway Company, for 16 miles of their railway, from the west end of the 20 miles of their branch railway from Edmundston, subsidised by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 3, towards the St. Francis River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a branch of the Temiscouata Railway. It springs from the main line at Edmundston, and runs through a country where there is considerable settlement without railway facilities. The first twenty miles have been subsidised to the extent of $5,000 per mile. This resolution proposes a further subsidy for sixteen miles.

For a railway from the north end of the 14 miles for which a subsidy was granted by the Act 50 and 51 Victoria, chapter 24, to the Tobique Valley Railway Company, from Perth Centre towards Plaister Rock Island, 11 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $35,200.

Mr. ELLIS. This line ought not to be opened. Where it is intended to run there are scarcely any inhabitants. In the parishes of Perth and Gordon there are not altogether more than 2,500 souls,

and there are not more than 400 people along the line of the railway. The railway runs along the Tobique River from St. John to the Plaister Rock. There is a thin fringe of settlement, not anywhere more than one mile and a-half in depth, along the bank of the Tobique River, and there are no people there outside this fringe of settlement. The Tobique Valley itself is no doubt a very fertile valley, but this road does not serve any number of people. The House in 1886 granted a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for twenty-eight miles of railway ; in 1887 that was changed to a subsidy of $6,400 per mile for fourteen miles of railway. In the *Hansard* I can find no record whatever of any discussion or resolution, but the vote must have passed. The next year, Sir Charles Tupper came down and endeavored to get the subsidy transferred to another company, but there was so much opposition that he was compelled in the end to withdraw the vote. There is no reason whatever for this line.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Any one coming from New Brunswick who heard the statement of the hon. gentleman with regard to the subsidy for the road from Fredericton to Westfield Station, will not be surprised at his statement as regards this subsidy. He said then that we were subsidising a third road when there were two roads running along the bank of the St. John River. There is no foundation for such a statement.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. We have passed that grant with a very inadequate discussion, to which the hon. gentleman might have contributed if he pleased.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) is altogether wrong in his remarks concerning this subsidy. I say that from the mouth of the Tobique there is hardly a vacant lot for sixty miles along that river on either side. If you look at the files of the newspaper which is edited so ably by the hon. gentleman, you will find that country described by himself as the garden of New Brunswick, and as one which should be developed by settlement. But beyond all that, the reason for the construction of the road was given to Parliament. A petition was signed by members of Parliament from Quebec, and Ontario, and other Provinces, setting forth, not only that this road should be constructed to accommodate the inhabitants there, but that its real object was, in addition, to give an outlet to one of the most extensive deposits of gypsum there is on this continent. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has ever been in that country, but I do know from personal knowledge that there is not a vacant lot on either side of the river. It is one of the best portions of New Brunswick for settlement, and it is a new country which has made more rapid progress in a short time than any other part of New Brunswick.

Mr. ELLIS. I have been through that country, and endeavored to write it up. I have been up the Tobique Valley as many times as the hon. gentleman, and I know the country as well as the hon. gentleman does. Notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman says, he does not contradict my statement that there are not more than 3,000 people in the parishes of Perth and Gordon, and not more than 400 or 500 people along the whole line of railway on the Tobique River. The hon. gentleman says every lot is taken up. There is a narrow strip of fertile land along the valley. It is true there are settlers there and there are wild lands ; and if it comes to a question of veracity between myself and the hon. gentleman, I can give him all the figures. I was in the country a short time ago, and I found in the Tilley and Athley settlements, a number of houses closed up. With regard to Plaister Rock, there is a deposit there of gypsum, no doubt very valuable to any one who wants it, but it is not worth while building a railway to get to it.

Mr. TEMPLE. The hon. gentleman says he knows more about that country than the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and probably he may, but I can tell him that I have travelled that country fifty times to his once, and I think I know fully as much about it as the hon. gentleman. It is one of the finest valleys we have on the St. John River.

Mr. ELLIS. I said that.

Mr. TEMPLE. It is a fine farming country, and the object in building this road is to reach Plaister Rock, which is of great value to the whole Province of New Brunswick and the country to the south of it. I have seen no less than fifty to one hundred teams there a day hauling away this plaster to Aroostook County for fertilising purposes.

General LAURIE. I have a brother officer of mine who has lately settled there, and he gives me the most glowing accounts of it. He describes it as a most fertile country, and he says there is every reason to believe that a large number of people will flock into it as soon as its resources are opened up.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) to authorise the granting of subsidies to certain railways and railway companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

The estate of the late Major R. S. King, Welland Field Battery:— Rent of building to store guns, &c., of the Battery, from 1862 to 1883, 22 years, at $100 per annum.	$2,200 00
Transport of ammunition, stores and arms of the Battery (O. C., 6th January, 1890).....	102 53

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the item came up before I was asked to produce some papers. I produce all the papers that could be found in the Department, and I have the statement of the Deputy Minister that some of the papers have been mislaid. He says :

" On examining the docket, I find that some papers in this case are not now on file, having made a most thorough search for these papers and not succeeding in tracing them. The search will, however, be continued, and I hope may be more successful. In the meantime, I send an exhaustive *résumé* of the case made by Mr. Sulte, who was in charge of the branch at the time."

The only account missing is the report of Col. Otter, who recommended the payment of the claim after he examined into it ; and, in fact, it was upon his recommendation that this was the

amount to be paid to Major King that the item was put in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is only one item. What about the transport of ammunition and stores?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. After taking evidence and examining vouchers for money actually paid, and for the transportation of guns and ammunition, Colonel Otter recommended that this amount should be paid.

Mr. LAURIER. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot expect that we will carry this item this Session. He promised to put the House in possession of the facts upon which he asked this vote. Now, at the fourteenth hour, he places these papers on the Table, and asks us to pass the item. We know no more now than we did before, as we have had no opportunity of examining those papers. I would, therefore, suggest that the item should stand.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot agree to the item standing. The claim is a fair claim, and has been thoroughly investigated. I have produced every paper which could be found in the Department, and I am prepared to repeat, if the hon. gentleman desires it, the items of the account which I gave before. It is only a question as to whether proper precautions have been taken or not, and I state that every precaution has been taken in this matter, and that the account should be paid, as it is a fair claim.

Mr. LAURIER. It may be a perfectly fair claim, but how am I, and how is the House to know that? The hon. gentleman says he has investigated it, and has found it right; but if that rule were to prevail, his will would become law. This is a claim twenty years old, and is brought in here without any vouchers; and now the hon. gentleman puts some vouchers on the Table, and it seems to me that the Committee would be stultifying itself if it passed the item without having the opportunity of examining those vouchers.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I have some personal knowledge of this claim, having known the late Col. King and knowing the present Major King.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Were you born then?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). This claim ought to have been paid years ago. The sum of $200 a year is paid to all field batteries in the Dominion for taking care of the guns and armories and storehouses, but that allowance was not made to this battery. It was formed in 1862, at the time of the Trent affair, under the late Col. King, and in 1866 Col. King went to Fort Erie in order to protect that part of the country against the threatened invasion at that time. There he lost his leg and his health. Major King provided buildings, and continued to care for this battery without any provision being made for them by the Government until 1883, when I prevailed upon the Minister of Militia to do something for this battery. For all these years, the only battery in this country that saw actual service, has not been provided with a building or with the protection which other batteries have been provided with. I have personal knowledge of the buildings that were erected at Port Robinson by the late Col. King, in which this battery was stored. I know that in 1866 he had to build a barn in which to store the ammunition when it was sent there during the Fenian raid, for which he never received anything. I think it is due to the House, and the respect the House must have for the militia and defence of the country, and especially for a battery of this kind, that has done such noble service for the defence of the country, that he who has sacrificed not only his money but his life, should now obtain recognition. This claim has been fairly investigated by the authorities. I know that Col. Otter made an investigation and a report; it is a misfortune that the report should have been mislaid by the Department, but I know that Col. Otter, after full and careful investigation, taking evidence and examining the buildings, reported that the claim ought to be paid, and it should have been paid years ago. The present Major King is the only surviving heir of the late Col. King, and to him this money ought to be paid. I do not think there ought to be a question about it at all. This battery is one of the most efficient in the Dominion. Every member of this House, every one who has anything to do with militia affairs knows that the commander of the militia battalions, and especially the commander of field batteries, has to keep these batteries in an efficient condition at a very large outlay to himself. I know that the present Major King is one of the most efficient, one of the most trustworthy, and one of the most loyal officers in the Militia of this country, and a man whose character is above reproach, a man who would not make a demand for a dollar that he was not fairly entitled to, a man who is ready at all times to defend his country, and is making large personal sacrifices from year to year to keep that battery in the efficient condition it is now in. I have personal knowledge of the whole matter; I have personal knowledge of the fact that Col. Otter made a careful investigation of the affair; he examined the buildings and made a report, and the fact that the Militia Department unfortunately has lost that report, should be no reason why this gentleman should be deprived of his just dues from the Government of this country. I would urge upon the House to grant to Major King that which he is justly and fairly entitled to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, if he knows all about the matter, should state to the House why this claim of nearly thirty years standing was not preferred before. I have not heard, in any explanation that has been given, the slightest statement as to the reason which induced Col. King, deceased, to withhold this claim from the year 1862 to 1883. It appears to me that in all conscience, and as a mere matter of precedent, even if we do ultimately pay the claim, we ought to throw it over till a reasonable explanation is given for this apparently inexplicable delay. I cannot see why it is allowed to accumulate for twenty years, nor can I see why, having accrued due in 1883, we are asked to pay it now in 1890. There is another consideration which deserves attention. A considerable portion of this claim was incurred before the Dominion came into existence. If it is to be paid by anybody, it should be paid by the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. But we ought undoubtedly to know what the records of the Department show as to whether this claim was preferred during the period from 1863 to 1883.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). There are reasons which, perhaps, I would be justified in giving the House why this claim was not preferred. The late Col. King, as everybody knows who knew him, was a man of a very sensitive nature, of the very highest honor, and after the loss of his leg in 1866, and after the treatment which he always said was unjust and unfair on the part of the Government, he lapsed into a state of despondency and never would prefer any claim—at least, I never heard of any. After 1866, he always was under the impression that he had been unfairly and unjustly treated by the people of this country, in being put off with a paltry pension of $400 a year, after being disqualified and disabled from practising his profession in the defence of his country. I think the House will agree that the treatment Col. King received was not a fair treatment. However, I have no right to question the inaction of the Government in past years. But that was always his belief until he died. His son, who has taken charge of the battery, never preferred a claim till after the death of his father, because he had not the papers; but since 1883 I have been urging an investigation of the claim, and ultimately the present Minister of Militia instructed Col. Otter to investigate the whole thing, which he did, and reported that this claim was just and equitable, and ought to be paid.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) has the advantage over every one of us in this matter, that he knows the facts and we do not. Probably if we had the same knowledge we would come to the same conclusion. The only thing I ask is that the Government should allow us to look at these papers before we come to a conclusion. Surely this is a business matter, and under these circumstances, no one, except the hon. gentleman himself having any knowledge of these facts, it is only business-like to allow the House to see the papers before asking us to pass this vote of money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask my hon. friend not to be too rigid as a business man, in this case. After the statement made by my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson), I think the House will feel pleasure in voting this money. I think that after the positive statement made by my hon. friend, who is acquainted with all the facts, we may fairly accept his personal statement in lieu of the papers. The papers would give us no more information than my hon. friend has stated. It is true that, even if there were reasons given why the claim was not made before, that is not the question. The question is whether it is an honest claim, and the Crown pays its debts without pleading the statute of limitation.

Mr. LAURIER. The claim is not less if it is only postponed.

Preparation of the Report of the Labor Congress at Paris..... $3,605

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The other evening I called attention to the circumstances under which this vote is proposed. If the Minister of Finance was correct, this work was ordered to be done without the authority of the House, and apparently we are asked to pay for work which was done without any authority of ours. I fail to see what use the synopsis of the report, as I take it to be, can possibly be to us. We can obtain all the information as to this Labor Congress, without Mr. Helbronner's assistance. They have been printed in the various newspapers in Europe, and I think in a more compact form, in a sort of book. That is quite sufficient, I think, for us to have, without going to the expense of obtaining a report of this kind.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is mistaken. Not only these documents are not printed, but information concerning 1,116 exhibitors at the Congress of Social Economy in Paris, has been collected with an immense amount of labor. Mr. Helbronner was delegated by the Central Board of Trades Unions in Montreal to go to Paris, and the Government had no right to choose him as an official delegate. But we took advantage of his visit to Paris to ask him to make a collection of these documents, to attend the Congress, and to prepare them and give them to the working classes, as an appendix to the voluminous report of the Labor Commission. This book which has been printed will be distributed to members. The work has been done with the greatest care, and it will prove a most useful acquisition to those who are studying questions connected with the working classes. I have had the pleasure of reading it, and I consider it a most valuable contribution to the literature on these questions. The Government have not paid Mr. Helbronner his expenses in Paris, but this small amount of $2,500 is asked for the preparation of this report. The work performed by the Labor Commission was most useful, but on the whole it was not well digested. This work will, however, appropriately complete the documents submitted to the House. I am sure great service has been done in this preparation. I hope Mr. Helbronner will give to the Library the collection of documents which he has made, and which are not available to members in the Library or elsewhere.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What position did this gentleman occupy? Was he agent of the Government in Paris?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I gave him a letter of introduction to Mr. Fabre, and he was engaged on no official mission whatever. He has not been paid for any work, even for his travelling expenses. He has prepared, under my direction, this report, and he has devoted eight or nine months of his time to the work, and as a recompense I ask the small vote appearing in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the Secretaty of State, without the authority of Parliament, pledged himself to this gentleman to pay him a considerable sum of money. That is not a proper way to incur liabilities. We should know something about this work for which we are asked to make this grant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was laid on the Table of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not seen it. I am contending for the right that we should know how public money will be expended before it is voted. The work is now put into my hands for the first time. I observe it is dedicated to the Secretary of State. I do not object to that even with such a dedication as I have seen in some works. I observe that the writer states that he was

instructed to make this report. If the Secretary of State last year intended to have had such a report prepared, an appropriation should have been placed in the Estimates. I affirm that this expenditure is contrary to proper principles, and that it is improper to first incur liability and then to come down to Parliament and ask for money grants.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When I arrived last year the exhibition was open in Paris, and I did not know that Mr. Helbronner was going there. I knew the congress was going to be held there, but I did not know that I would have any one present prepared to make a report.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Secretary of State seems to take a different view on these matters to that sometimes taken by the Minister of Public Works. It seems that this work had been ordered, and the first we know of it is when we are asked to vote a sum of money for work ordered without the sanction of the House. I do not approve of that course at all, for I think that in all cases a vote should be taken first. I remember that last summer a vote had been taken the previous year for a work in a certain part of the country, but it was found that the sum was not quite sufficient to complete the work, and so careful was the Minister of Public Works that he would not allow one single dollar to be spent, no matter how important the work was, and no matter how much the interests of the country were being served by it, unless the money had been previously voted by Parliament. The Board of Trade, the Town Council and all the principal men in the neighborhood of that work, telegraphed the hon. gentleman, asking him to allow the dredge to stay a few days longer and complete the work which, if not completed, would render all the money expended worthless; yet the hon. gentleman was so very careful not to encroach on the rules of Parliament, that he would not allow a dollar to be spent, unless the vote was approved by this House. That is quite contrary to the course pursued by the Secretary of State in this case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I can promise the hon. gentleman that he will not have a vote to complete in this matter next year.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 153) to further amend the Indian Act, chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes. He said: For the most part the alterations in this Bill, as compared with the old Act, are only the alteration of a word or two. There is a new clause inserted here, which I will explain. I found a few years ago that it was very difficult to get the Indians to settle on their farms in any kind of rectangular shape, or to erect their buildings in any kind of uniformity. I, therefore, suggested to our surveyors that they should sub-divide all the reserves into sections of from 40 to 160 acres. It was some little time before we could induce our Indians to understand the purport of this, but subsequently they got into the idea, and many of them have requested to have their land subdivided in this way. We are by this means enabled to locate their farms in a rectangular shape, so that they can keep persons from trespassing on their boundaries. In section 3, it is prohibited for Indians to take away cordwood from the reserve. The word "cordwood" is added to the 26th section of the old Act. Section 5 places the power of issuing patents in the hands of the Department of Indian Affairs, and not in the office of the Registrar General, as heretofore. Another section provides that where liquor has been given under medical certificate, the burden of proof is placed on the accused. There was also some difficulty as to whether the progeny of animals given in treaty should come within the meaning of the clause in the old Act, and a clause is provided by which the progeny, as well as the original animal given to the Indian, come under the clause. Clause 11 is put in as a new clause at the suggestion of the Grand Indian Council of Ontario and Quebec; it provides that the punishment of imprisonment may be added to that of a fine against an Indian guilty of deserting his or her family, wife or husband. Clause 12 provides that the Indian agent may try cases of infraction of the Vagrant Act, so as to reach Indians who loiter about towns. Clause 13 gives the Superintendent-General power to put the game laws in force. There is a new clause to provide against any parties, such as Indian officials or missionaries, trading on Indian reserves.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to remark on only one section of this Bill, that is, section 9. If I understood the Minister aright, he says it is introduced at the request of some council of the Indians; but I do not think even that circumstance, extraordinary as it is, is a justification for the introduction of this provision in the Statute-book of Canada. That section provides for the punishment by imprisonment of any Indian proved guilty of deserting his or her family, wife or husband, as the case may be, without just cause, or of living in concubinage. I do not see on what principle we can undertake to apply very much more severe penalties, or a higher standard of morality to Indians, than we propose to enforce among the white population of this country. You say the Indians are less advanced than we are, that they occupy a lower position in morality, that some of them are pagans, that the christianity of some of them is not as high as we boast our own to be; they are to be guarded carefully; but then why in the world should you propose to enforce, by the criminal law, these provisions against them when you do not in the same way enforce such provisions against whites?

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. DAWSON. I do not desire to oppose the Bill, but I wish to draw attention to this clause, which makes a man liable to a fine for cutting, carrying away, or removing trees, &c. In the district which I represent there are large tracts of Indian lands where a voyageur is often obliged to land his canoe, and it is a matter of necessity, the custom of the country, for him immediately to take his axe and clear a place for his camp, and cut some saplings for firewood. He has no intention of destroying or stealing anything from the Indians, and probably only stops for a night; but under this section it would be in the power of any one to have him brought before an Indian agent and fined

$20. I think it is a pity to burden the law with unnecessary details of this kind.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is an old clause of the Act, and I have never heard of any hardship arising under it. It must be strict to protect the property of the Indians.

On section 9,

Mr. DEWDNEY. After the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), we will drop this clause.

On section 11,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This section declares that no persons shall be allowed to barter directly or indirectly with any Indian on a reserve, or sell to him any goods or supplies, cattle or other animals. Is it intended that no one will be allowed to sell on a reserve anything to the Indians? There are Indians on reserves and Indians who are not; or does it mean that no one will be allowed to sell to Indians living on the reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is not the intention.

Mr. BLAKE. The words "an Indian on the reserve" would mean an Indian who lives on a reserve.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This will be circumscribing their liberty very much. You would not be allowed to go on a reserve and have any dealings with the Indians, not even to sell to them for cash.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is to prevent traders from starting stores on a reserve without consent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In absolutely forbidding any trading on a reserve, you would prevent Indians engaging in perfectly legitimate dealings. This, of course, applies to all the bands. Take the reserve in my riding, where the Indians are advanced. They engage in buying horses and cattle, and if they should do so on the reserve it would be illegal.

Mr. BLAKE. You had better apply your law to the locality in which the mischief arises and not anywhere else.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The real object is to keep traders and peddlers from going on the reserves and robbing the Indians.

Mr. McNEILL. Very often traders bring liquor with them on to the reserve to sell to the Indians. In my constituency the Indian agents have complained of men coming on the reserve to trade but really to sell liquor.

Mr. BLAKE. Better amend the clause by making this portion refer only to Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That would be the better way, it would then suit Manitoba and the North-West.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House ajourned at 2.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 14th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That Bill 155 and Bill 156 be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration immediately after routine proceedings, in accordance with the eighteenth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 155) respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 156) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Hesson.)

DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA ACTS.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. McCARTHY) asked, Whether any petitions or remonstrances have been presented to His Excellency the Governor General, or to the Government, asking for the disallowance of the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba respecting Public Schools, and of the Act of the same Legislature abolishing the dual language? If any such petitions or remonstrances have been presented, by whom have they been presented? Has any action been taken by the Government respecting the said Acts? Does the Government propose to bring down such petitions or remonstrances, if any such have been presented?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Petitions or remonstrances have been presented to the Government by a despatch from the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, conveying the remonstrance of the school board; also from the Rev. Mr Bernier, on behalf of the school board; also from Mr. Prendergast of Manitoba. No action has yet been taken by the Government respecting the said Acts. In answer to the fourth question, it is too late to bring down these petitions now, and there has been no request made for them.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. COOK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish again to ask the Government, and for the last time, if they propose to comply with the Order of the House made on the 10th March, for a return in reference to the expenses in connection with the Dominion License Act, commonly known as the McCarthy Act? I wish to know whether the Government are going to bring down the papers this Session, or whether they propose to repudiate the request made by this House?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The return asked for involves a good deal of labor, and the clerks have been engaged upon it. I will make enquiries.

Mr. COOK. When will it be down?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As soon as possible.

NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, the fact that the Session, I pre-

sume, is just now drawing to a close, justifies me in asking the Government what position the fishery question is in at Washington? It may be that the Government may not feel inclined to tell us; possibly it may be prejudicial to the interest of the country for them to state it, and in that case I do not press the question. But I have heard rumors from Washington, that for the last three weeks the question of the Atlantic fisheries has been practically agreed upon, and that in reference to the Behring Sea question the *mare clausum* pretension of the United States has been practically abandoned, that the question of how seals are to be taken by the inhabitants of both countries, or by people at large, has been practically settled. I would like to ask the Government, whether there is any truth in these rumors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I am quite in a position to answer any of those questions the hon. gentleman puts now. At this moment, all I can say is that the negotiations, so ta as we can learn, have been going on very pleasantly, and I hope with happy results. I think I will be able to give a more positive answer on Friday.

INCREASED INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS AND SENATORS.

Mr. LABROSSE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the Government intends to grant an extra allowance to the members of this House and to the senators, on account of the unusual length of the session. It is unreasonable to be kept here thirtydays beyond the ordinary duration of a Session, and receive the same indemnity. The employés and messengers of the House receive an increase of salary, and it seems to me but just that the members and senators should receive $10 extra for each and every day over the ninety days. I know agreat number who desire it, and I think that both sides of the House would be glad to receive that amount. The Government would do the right thing by granting my request.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say is that the Government do not propose to bring down a measure this Session to alter the amount of the indemnity.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when he will bring down the papers in connection with the McGreevy matter, and if he has any further information than was brought before the House yesterday by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron)?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the last part of the question, that matter is being investigated. I will be able on Friday, I think, to bring down the papers that I promised, at all events, so far as they have been collected.

PRIVILEGE—THE TEMPERANCE COLONISATION COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before you leave the Chair, I have a matter to bring before the attention of the House of considerable moment, a matter that I have gleaned from a return which was brought down to the House a short time ago. It was a return which was asked for by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in reference to the Temperance Colonisation Company and the Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Company. In that return was a letter which I think it but right I should bring before the attention of the Government and the House. The contents of this letter, with your permission, I will read:

"22 SWORD STREET,
"TORONTO, 13th June, 1887.

"HON. THOMAS WHITE, M. I.,
"Ottawa, Ont.

"HON. SIR,—I heard reported that it was the intention of the Government to compel the Temperance Colonisation Company to abandon all legal proceedings against scrip holders, otherwise the Government would take away their charter. I trust this is your intention; and let me say in faith that you will be doing an act that God will bless you for. How many homes have been blighted by this curse? But the worst is still to come, and these present directors are just as eager to-day, to collect, in any and every way, exorbitant sums from scrip holders, without the least concern of the injury they are doing. They are a set of men who have no hearts, and have forgotten that they have souls. Let me beg of you to listen to my own case. I owned a house for which I had nearly paid, when this company came into existence, when I got into the meshes of the Rev. Dr. Hunter, one of its promoters. To make a long story short, I mortgaged my home, which has since passed out of my possession, to pay him $2,000 premium on stock. I expected to sell some of this stock as I could not afford to keep it. He assured me that so long as I paid the interest on the call that had been made, another $2,000, it would be all right, and I could hold it. After I had the stock about six weeks, I received a post card from him, stating that the call had to be paid. A day or two after receiving this card, he called on me himself and offered me, in exchange for the stock some three acres of land adjoining the town of Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, which he assured me was worth $2,500. The position I had got myself into so harassed me that I took this land and gave him back the stock. This land is valued by the Portage municipality at $150 altogether. I also subscribed for half a section of scrip, which I sold. I bought another half section which cost me $75 premium in addition to the first call I paid on it, being $60 more, and two years ago the present directors served me with a writ for some $300. I joined the Defence Scrip Association, and in the early part of this year they compromised to pay $133 cost for half section, and to forfeit all claims to lands. I paid them this $133 last week, borrowing $100 on my salary, yet to earn, on which I am paying 20 per cent. interest, so that on this scrip alone I am out $278. As soon as they had received this money from me they sent me another statement of claim, as enclosed, for the half section I sold. The sacrifice I have made to pay them this $133 will keep my home pinched, which I have experienced during the long five years this curse has been hovering over me. I have a family and an aged mother to support, and while I do not wish to trouble you with my misfortunes, I trust, from the relation in which the company stand to the Government, that you will stop this wholesale extortion. I am not speaking for myself alone, but there are a great many throughout the country who will yet be ruined by it, people of limited means. If the company are allowed to go on, now that the Defence Association is broken up, and provided they can make a settlement with the Government and are allowed to retain their prerogative to collect on scrip, they will be more heartless than ever. In travelling through the country I came across some very distressing scrip cases. One grey-haired man went to one of the old ex-directors who left the company in disgust, and, in tears, remarked that all he possessed in the world was a little farm near Hamilton, and that if he was obliged to pay this company their demand, he would have to sell it. I am intimately acquainted with Mr. Armstrong, Manager of the York Farmers' Colonisation Company, and in speaking of writing to you, he strongly urged me to do so.

"Now, Sir, as you are, I am sure, impressed with the fact that this scrip was procured under false pretensions of the basest character, and that what land the company have paid the Government for is all out of the pockets of the scrip holders, which they have to forfeit, surely the thing ought to stop here. Would you kindly return me the enclosed claim of company against me? Not the

newspaper advertisements, if they are any use to you. Submitting this to you in confidence,

"I am, yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) "JOHN W. CAMPBELL."

I should like to ask what action the Government have taken in regard to this matter? I should like to know if any enquiry has been made into the conduct of the directors of the company, and what the Government have done in regard to the company; also whether Dr. Hunter has been compelled to disgorge the fruits of the misrepresentations and frauds as indicated in the letter I have read? It is the duty of the Government to look into this matter, as this letter shows a heartless piece of rascality perpetrated by the directors of the company on innocent and honest men.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman had intimated to me the information he required, I would have endeavored to obtain it and given it to him at once. All the negotiations that took place with the directors of this colonisation company occurred before I took charge of the Department. The only communication I have had with them was in regard to an application to extend the time with regard to the selection of their lands. I had been aware, but almost entirely through the newspapers, that a great many complaints have been made against the Temperance Colonisation Company, and in regard to the negotiations they had with different parties to settle on their lands. I have not read the whole of the correspondence which I submitted to the House some time ago. May I ask the date of that letter?

Mr. LANDERKIN. 13th June, 1887.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was before I took charge of the Department. I will look into the matter, and give the hon. gentleman all the information I can obtain between now and prorogation. There has been much litigation; I do not know whether this particular case has been in litigation or not. Within the last few days, several cases have been brought before the courts, and have been settled in favor of the Temperance Colonisation Company. I do not believe the heads of the corporation have knowingly perpetrated any dishonest action, or have knowingly treated any of the settlers who went to their colony harshly.

Mr. WALLACE (York). No doubt a great deal of hardship in connection with the affairs of this company has arisen on account of the representations made by the promoters of the company to takers of stock. Before the Government settles with the company, there should be a distinct understanding with respect to settlement and other matters. Several cases of severe hardship have come under my own notice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior whether this colonisation company has been dissolved or is still in existence?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The colonisation company is still in existence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The charge in the letter is a very serious one and requires the attention of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many of the colonisation companies remain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think only three—the Temperance Colonisation Company, a company in the neighborhood of Red River, and the York Colonisation Company.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion of the net amount of $10,000,000, which was expected to be derived by the Government from the colonisation companies, is now expected?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not the statement at my fingers' ends.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The statement contained in the letter read is such that it is the duty of the Government to make a searching enquiry into the whole matter. If the statements are true, there has been a heartless amount of rascality, which should be exposed by the Government for the benefit of the people.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FOSTER. It is necessary that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means to rectify an error in item 203 of the Customs Bill passed a few days ago. This is not to make any change in the duties under the old tariff; but by a clerical error the Committee omitted to provide for baking powders and yeast cakes under fifty pounds in bulk. I move the following resolution to rectify this error:—

That item 203 of Bill No. 143, of the present Session, entitled: "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," be amended so as to read as follows:—

Yeast cakes and baking powders in packages weighing one pound or over, and compressed yeast in packages weighing one pound or over, but not over fifty pounds, six cents per pound—the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported, and concurred in.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. FOSTER introduced Bill (No. 159) to amend an Act of the present Session entitled an Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties on Customs.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

To increase salaries of Chaplains at Stony Mountain Penitentiary, on condition of their whole time being given to the prisoners, $200 each..... $400

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it possible that two chaplains should be required to give their whole time to the Manitoba Penitentiary? The total number of prisoners, if I recollect aright, averages about eighty, and this seems to be an unduly large provision for their spiritual welfare: one reverend gentleman to forty prisoners.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are pretty hard cases up there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, if the chaplains were able to divide the duties between them we would not require the services of two, but I am afraid that is not practicable; and otherwise

it is necessary that the chaplains should devote their whole time to the penitentiary, particularly so as it is situated fifteen miles from Winnipeg, and there is no neighboring settlement in which they can have parochial charge. The Protestant chaplain attends the prisoners every day; and besides that, he instructs the children of the officers on the reserve, which has become quite a settlement. I think we ought to allow him enough to live on and to support his family. The other chaplain may devote his whole time.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides which, judging from the efficiency of the admonitions which the Minister himself, and the House indirectly, have addressed to the warden with reference to the scale of expenditure in that penitentiary, I rather think the warden himself would require a pretty large proportion of the services of both chaplains in order to keep him any way near right.

Railways and Canals chargeable to income..... $56,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When we were in Committee of Supply I took occasion to call the attention of the House to the extraordinary disproportion between the annual charges on income, and the annual receipts of these railways. Now, looking at the whole, I find that, besides the $56,000 here demanded, we spent something like $140,000 in salaries and ordinary maintenance, and about $330,000 are chargeable to income besides, making in all within the merest fraction of $900,000. Our total receipts are something like three or four hundred thousand dollars, giving us a deficit on that head of close on half a million dollars, which certainly is a matter which requires more attention than the House has yet given to it. It would be idle at this stage of the Session to engage in any prolonged debate on the subject, nor, I am certain, that, without a complete reversal of the policy of the Government in some important respects, much good is likely to accrue. Still, I take this opportunity, as there was some little doubt as to the amount, of calling the attention of the House again, and also of the Minister specially in charge, to the fact that our expenditure is increasing in most enormous proportions. I think we have now to face an annual loss of not very far short of two-thirds of the amount annually charged; and I need not say that is quite irrespective of the fact that a very large portion of our public debt represents the cost of these canals and a large portion of our charge for interest. I trust that between this and next Session, the First Minister will be prepared to come down with some proposals tending to lessen this enormous annual deficit. In view of the fact that the Government are asking for very large sums on capital account for further expenditure on canals, it seems to me more attention should be given than has been to the best mode of reducing this enormous expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite well aware of the justice of the hon. member's remarks with regard to the unfortunate fact that the expense of the canals has been considerably increased, while the earnings of the canals have not correspondingly increased. I do not know that there is any present means of altering that state of things. Of course we cannot increase the earnings unless commerce takes the canals instead of the railways. I believe the rates charged are as low as possible, unless we desire to make them free. That is a question which may arise sometime in Parliament, but it is not a question for this Session. I am not aware that there has been any extravagance in the management of the canals. The person chiefly responsible for that, the Chief Engineer of Canals, is a very prudent and economical Scotchman, who will not knowingly allow any extravagance. However, it is quite true that this state of things should be thoroughly investigated, and I shall, during the recess, do what I can to see if there is any mode of making both ends meet. I have been told that I had been over sanguine in other matters. Perhaps I may be over sanguine in this, but I think, when the canal system is improved and we have a deep water and canal navigation from the west to the seaboard, a very considerable portion of the trade which has been diverted by the railways may return to the canals. I will not make any prognostications; I will not prophesy until I know, being instructed by the continual reminder of the hon. gentleman, that my anticipations have been too sanguine in other matters. But I shall make enquiry as to the best means of reducing the expenditure on the canals without lessening their efficiency and safety. It would be poor economy, by the reduction of the staff, to cause interruption of trade or danger for want of a sufficient number of officers to have the canals efficiently worked.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is quite the custom, whenever anything comes up in the House concerning the Intercolonial Railway, to hear gentlemen from Ontario, not alone on the Government side, but also sitting very near me, occasionally interject remarks about getting rid of it because it costs too much money. They never seem to think of the enormous cost of the canals and the money lost on them. When they talk of getting clear of the Intercolonial Railway, they should consider whether it would be judicious to hand over the canals to a private company too. I think the one is in the same category as the other. What I rose particularly to refer to was the intimation just now by the right hon. gentleman as to what might occur when we had a deep water system from the lakes to the sea. Does my hon. friend propose to deepen the canals and have more enormous expenditure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. You have the system then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not quite. There is a little more to spend yet before we get to a uniform depth.

Mr. MITCHELL. We would be laying the foundation of a large expenditure in deepening the canals one or two feet more.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no such intention.

Mr. COOK. In deepening the canals it would be necessary to deepen the St. Lawrence in many places where the river is more shallow than the canals. There are heavy shoals running across at a point a little below Morrisburg, which, at high water, gives a depth only of twelve or thirteen feet. Steamers have to make a great detour and

can scarcely get over in low water. If the canals are to be deepened, there must be very large expenditures indeed in deepening the St. Lawrence at various points.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The depth was fourteen feet, I think. I was inclined to have the same suspicion as the hon. gentleman, that it would be useless to deepen the canals to the depth settled long ago, and sanctioned by Parliament, on account of the fact that the interruption to navigation on the St. Lawrence would be very considerable through the shallowness of portions of the river. I am glad to learn, however, after my attention was particularly called to the subject as Minister of Railways, from the information given by the chief engineer, who knows the river thoroughly, that the expense would be very slightly enlarged. There are one or two points where there may be some little use for dynamite, but in very few points in the river as a whole. There is, therefore, less hesitation in finishing the canals according to the plan of Parliament.

Carillon and Grenville Canals—Repairs, $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this item is put, I want again to call the attention of the First Minister to the facts I brought to his notice a few years ago. Facts which, if confirmed, go to show that there has been constant and systematic fraud with regard to the expenditure on these canals. The right hon. gentleman will remember that I called his attention to the alleged fact that men who had been dead for a considerable number of years figured on the pay-roll, and also men who had been absent from the country. At that time the hon. gentleman said he was prepared to make some enquiry into the matter. I should be glad to hear what enquiry he has made and what he proposes to do. Although, I suppose, it is too late now to ask for the papers; I take it for granted that if he has made an enquiry, he will engage that the report shall be laid on the Table when we meet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman called the attention of the Committee and myself to the allegation that there had been frauds committed in paying persons who were absent or dead. On receiving that information, I at once instructed enquiries to be made by the Deputy Minister of Railways, and dispatched an officer to investigate the matter. I have reason to believe, from sundry informations, that there is some truth in what the hon. gentleman stated. The officer sent to make special enquiries has not yet been able to report. I will not only see that the papers are laid before the House, but, if the hon. gentleman requires, I will send the record over to him, or to the leader of the Opposition, if it is made during recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What officer is in charge of the examination?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know. I will ascertain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this is an Ontario matter, perhaps the hon. gentleman had better send the report to me when he receives it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will do so.

Additional public building, Wellington street, Ottawa—To complete payments..... $155,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. Minister was to give definite information as to the total cost of this building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the hon. gentleman asked what had been the estimate of the officers of the Department. I enquired about that, and I had not the report when I came from the Department this morning. However, there is very little difference between the estimate made and the liability of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Including this $155,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. As I said, I am not sure that all this will be required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister will no doubt remember that a claim for $393,000 was preferred, which he expected to cut down to $200,000. Is that included in this vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is expected by the chief architect that the whole claim will be reduced to less than $150,000. The $5,000 above that are for paying small amounts.

Mr. COOK. I would like to enquire whether, when the contract was first let, the Department omitted to include a roof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman was not here the other day when that question was asked me. The answer was, that it was not forgotten, but we did not know whether the contractor would be able to undertake such a roof as we wanted, in iron or copper; and therefore the chief architect advised that we had better have a separate contract for that, and the contractor for the building would be able to tender for it at a lower rate than others, because he would be already in possession of the building.

Mr. COOK. Did the original contractor get the contract for putting on the roof, and was his tender the lowest?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. COOK. Does the Minister of Public Works intend to go on with the post office at Orillia at once? Why does he make an exception in the case of Orillia, because in all other places the Government furnishes the lot, but in Orillia the people have had to purchase the lot?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is no exception. In very many cases the lot is given by the municipality. They agree as to the site, and there is no squabble about it—if I may use the term—and it is much more pleasant for them and for the Government, that there should be no difficulty about the site. They are also under the impression, which is not a false one, that, if they furnish the site, the money which might be expended on the purchase of the site will be put into the building, and that they will, therefore, have a better building. Of course the Government will go on with this building. I may say that Toronto, and Port Arthur, and Brantford, and a number of other places have provided the lots.

Mr. BLAKE. In the absence of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), I would call the

attention of the Minister of Public Works to an arrangement which was made for a public building at Lunenburg. The Government purchased a site for that building as long ago as 1886, and then promised to make a provision for the building, but, since that time, although the site has been purchased and paid for, no progress has been made. In the interval, I am informed that the population, the shipping, and the general business of the port of Lunenburg, has very largely increased. I am informed that the West India trade there is almost equal to that of Halifax, some hundreds of vessels entering and leaving that port each season. I am further informed that the post office and Customs revenues there are much larger than they are in a great number of towns in which buildings of this kind have been erected. The Government having obtained an appropriation in 1886, and having purchased a site which remains unused till this day, it seems to me that they should give some explanation as to why they have not carried out the expressed view of Parliament in this regard.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I answered the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) on this subject when he was here. I told him that, although the lot had been purchased, we had not been able to appropriate a sum of money for the building this year. That is not the only case in which that has occurred, and I hope that, later on, we may be able to provide a public building in that place and in other places, which we cannot do this year.

Manitoba, Red River Survey..... $2,000

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if it is intended to go on with that survey this coming season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

To pay the mail service between Canada and the United Kingdom, in virtue of a contract passed with Mr. Andrew Allan, at the rate of $125,000 a year..... $125,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I forget whether it was stated, on the occasion of the discussion, whether the Government had fixed a special rate of speed which must be maintained, in the agreement they made with the Allans.

Mr. FOSTER. No special rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That leaves the matter almost entirely at their discretion.

Mr. FOSTER. Certain vessels were to be employed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you have fixed no special rate?

Mr. FOSTER. No; they may go just as fast as they like.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And as slow as they like.

Additional amount for Immigration..$150,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this item was last up, I called the attention of the First Minister to the desirability of seeing if an arrangement could be made with the Manitoba Government by which a portion of this sum would be placed at their disposal, inasmuch as they had far greater facilities for carrying on a scheme of immigration than the Dominion Government. The right hon. gentleman said he would take that suggestion into his consideration. I desire to enquire whether he has considered the suggestion, and whether he will place a portion—and, if he does so, perhaps he could state what portion—at the disposal of the Manitoba Government for that purpose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was only the other day the hon. gentleman made the suggestion, which I said was worthy of consideration. During the last days of the Session I have been unable to give the subject consideration, and I regret to say the hon. Minister of Agriculture is quite unwell. No time will be lost by the Government in taking the subject up. We cannot place a sum at the disposal of the Manitoba Government until we have communicated with them. We will do so in order that there may be conjoint action. I understand they are doing their work very well, as regards obtaining settlers for Manitoba from the older Provinces. We must think, however, more of getting an annexation from without than of transferring people within the Dominion. However, immediate communication will be made with the Manitoba Government with a view to some concerted action.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware of my own knowledge that the Manitoba Government have been making good use of their limited resources, and the present Premier of that Province has been especially successful in securing a large number of immigrants from Ontario for Manitoba. No doubt it is true that Manitoba is largely engaged in transferring settlers from one part of the Dominion to another; but it is of the first moment that, if settlers are decided to leave Ontario, they should go to Manitoba or the North-West, or they will certainly go to the United States. It is admitted to be more important to keep our own people in the country than to bring in people from outside, and for that reason the co-operation of the Manitoba Government is important. I did not expect a scheme could be prepared in the very short time that has elapsed since I brought this subject to the attention of the First Minister; but if the hon. gentleman feels desirous of adding to the population of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, which is a matter of the first moment to all of us, he will find that, with the assistance of the Manitoba Government, he will secure greater results than by the unaided action of the Dominion Government.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER moved:

1. *Resolved*, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1890, the sum of $2,038,168.96 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. *Resolved*, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1891, the sum of $25,464,944.95 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 158) to grant to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for paying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1890, and 30th June, 1891, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is here demanding $25,000,000 odd. Does that include any provision for redemption or for a new loan? I presume from the amount it does not, but I should like to know definitely.

Mr. FOSTER. Not for a new loan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What borrowing powers have we still unexhausted?

Mr. FOSTER. I am unable to say just now, but I shall make up a statement and give it to the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first, second and third times, and passed.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 157) to authorise the granting of certain subsidies to certain railways and railway companies.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and read the third time and passed.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of land subsidies to certain railways therein mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should be obliged to the hon. gentleman for giving us some information as to the meaning of this. Who are the promoters? what the cost of the enterprise is? and a variety of other particulars which ought to be always laid before us, but which, I fear, have not been with regard to a great many other matters.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The line applied for now will extend 125 miles. It commences at the city of Winnipeg, running in a south-easterly direction for about 20 miles, and thence in a direct line as near as the circumstances of the country will allow, to near the north-west angle. It is to be built principally for the purpose of enabling the people of that section of the country to send their timber, of which there is a great quantity about the southern end of the Lake of the Woods—not only timber but firewood—to Winnipeg and southern Manitoba. I may state that already twenty-five miles of this road are located, and six miles, I understand, are graded. It runs through a portion of country which has no railway communication whatever at present; and although the country is not specially attractive, it is thought that the construction of this road will bring into it a large number of settlers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does the hon. gentleman propose to select the land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Along the line of the railway, twelve miles on each side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it supposed to be in connection with any extension on the American side of the border?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; it does not go within twenty-four miles of the boundary line. It runs direct to the Lake of the Woods.

Mr. WATSON. I certainly approve of this land grant for the proposed road, which will run through an attractive country as yet entirely undeveloped, and I have no doubt that it will be advantageous, not only to its promoters, but to the country. I regret, however, that the Government have not seen fit to give a land grant to the North-West Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway, which is promoted by gentlemen who have been promoting a railway for that section for several years. They were promoters of the old Emerson and North-Western Railway, of which fifteen miles were graded north-west from Emerson, and which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company afterwards obtained possession of. There is plenty of room in that section for two roads, and I hope the Minister will give that railway some assistance next year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman knows that the section he speaks of, from Portage la Prairie to Emerson, is not so much in need of railway communication as the section for which we are giving a land grant to-day. The railway he speaks of intersects the Northern Pacific and the South-Western, and in considering the two railways, the Government thought it more necessary to give a land grant to that portion of the country most in need of railway communication.

Mr. WATSON. I refer to the portion between Buffalo Lake and the Manitoba South-Western. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it should not have a land grant for the portion from the South-Western Railway to Portage la Prairie; but from the junction with the South-Western to the Lake of the Woods, I think it is entitled to a land grant. The Government, some years ago, spent $50,000 to aid in the construction of a bridge across the Red River at Emerson, and the people there burdened themselves with taxation for the purpose of raising sufficient additional money to complete the bridge; but there is no railroad running across it, and it is useless to-day. This North-West Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway would occupy that bridge, and some return would be made to the people of Emerson for the large amount of money they spent in its construction.

On resolution 3,

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the land granted to the Lake Manitoba and Canal Company's railway will be along the line of that railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As far as practicable. In the first place, as the hon. gentleman knows, there are twenty-four miles between Portage la Prairie and the lake which belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The railway will get some lands on the western side of the lake along its own line; but the land grant of the Hudson Bay Railway is on the east side. The question depends a good deal on the location of the road. I am in hope that the location will be made pretty far west, so that the railway will accommodate the Lake Dauphin dis-

trict, where, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is a large settlement.

Mr. WATSON. I hope some arrangements will be made by which this railway will accommodate the people who would have been accommodated by the railway which I promoted in this House, but the Bill for the incorporation of which the hon. First Minister had slaughtered in committee, on the ground that it would interfere with the Hudson Bay Railway. I do not think it is fair to the people of Manitoba and the North-West, to be treated in the way they have been treated by this House, because the company were prepared to build that railway if they had got a charter, and we have not received any intimation, and at this hour of the Session are not likely to receive any, that the Government are going to grant assistance to the Hudson Bay Railway. But is that railway going to be made an excuse for preventing all other corporations building railways in that section of the country? I hope that if the Government are going to grant assistance to the Hudson Bay road, they will grant it at an early day. It was hoped by the people of the North-West that it was going to receive some substantial assistance this Session. It was not stated in plain words, but it was intimated by the hon. First Minister, that the Government felt disposed to assist that railway. I regret that has not been done, as I want to see that railway built; but I do not want the Government to make that an excuse for killing off all other railway enterprises running north from Portage la Prairie. There is a large settlement in the Lake Dauphin district which this railway cannot serve as well as a railway running to the west side of the lake; but I hope the Government will induce the company to run the road a sufficient distance to the west to accommodate at least a portion of the settlers in that district.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 160) authorising the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the first and second times, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman imply when he states that this may possibly interfere with the Hudson Bay line? Has this line been laid out over the territory traversed by the Lake Manitoba and Canal Company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A small portion of the land on the west of Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis has been reserved for a portion of the land grant selected by the Hudson Bay Company. It extends about eight or ten miles to the west of Lake Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. All along the west side?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; all along the west line, a certain distance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any population there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, there is quite a large population, and a mill working at Meadow Bridge, and there are other mills along the lake. There are two or three townships there pretty well settled just now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why is this called a canal company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year a land subsidy was given for seventeen miles of road from Portage la Prairie to the southern end of Lake Manitoba, and it was proposed then to cut a canal across the Meadow Portage. The canal would cost $600,000, and the difference in level between the two waters being a little over eighteen feet, it was, upon further consideration by the company, found more desirable to build the road direct to Meadow Portage, and thus accommodate the lumber business, which will be very extensive on the north shore of Lake Winnipegosis and the tributaries of the rivers running into the lake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any reliable information as to the navigation of Lake Winnipegosis?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; there is a report this year in the Indian Department from one of our surveyors, who went up in a boat last year. Lake Winnipegosis is fairly fit for navigation by steamers drawing five or six feet of water, and probably more; but it would require a great deal of work to make Lake Manitoba navigable, it being full of boulders and shoals.

Mr. WATSON. The navigation on Lake Winnipegosis is much better than on Lake Manitoba, which is very shoaly. I think the company did well to abandon the canal scheme and ask for power to build a railway, because a railway will be available all the year round and pay much better than a canal. The canal would cost a considerable sum, and the navigation is not good on Lake Manitoba. In several places on that lake you could hardly navigate, drawing four feet of water, and if you drew eight feet out of Lake Manitoba, you would only have a few pond holes left. The road is intended to operate the lumber limits on Lake Winnipegosis and tributaries; and it will also accommodate a large number of settlers. I only regret that the people on the west shore of Lake Dauphin will not be accommodated by this road. I hope the Government will do all they can for this company, so as to have the road constructed at the earliest possible date. There are five or six townships pretty well settled there now, and people have been rushing in there all last fall and this spring. Before another year there will be eight or ten townships well settled in that section.

Bill reported.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the Bill be read the third time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that Bill is read the third time, although I am afraid it is almost a waste of time, I must enter my final protest against the policy of the Government in respect of the land question generally. As to these two last land grants, I am not in a position to say whether or not they will do as much mischief as I believe will ensue from the land grants heretofore made. I took occasion, when this question was up before, to point out to the House—and the Minister of Interior substantially admitted, if not altogether, the accuracy of my contentions—that we were, if we made allowance for the lands we must reserve to settlers accord-

ing to our present policy, departing with the entire control of that great belt of territory between parallels 49 and 54, extending from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains. We are now adding to the enormous grants we have already given to railroads, amounting to 33,000,000 acres, a total of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 acres more; and we are doing that without any consideration, and I have no doubt that in twenty or thirty years hence—perhaps in a much shorter time—the same difficulties will arise in that country, which we know have arisen in various portions of the older Provinces, in consequence of our tying up of huge blocks of lands in the power of various corporations. I think that, bad as it is to delay bringing down the railway subsidies in money until the last day or two of the Session, the policy of delaying these land grants until the Supply Bill is passed is still more reprehensible. I think the House has been acting in almost utter ignorance in regard to these matters. Within the last two or three days we have handed over close upon 6,000,000 of acres to these various companies—that amounts to a territory half as large as the western peninsula of Ontario, taking in the counties of Kent, Essex, Lambton, the Bruces, the Hurons, the Perths and the Middlesexes, some eighteen constituencies, and those among the best in the Province of Ontario. Whether the hon. gentleman is going to be successful in introducing immigration to this country or not, I cannot say, but I think he was wise in not prophesying in regard to that. But, while we are parting with our control over that great territory, we find, at the same time, that our expectations as to the immigration into Manitoba and the North-West have not been fulfilled. We find that our large expenditure from 1880 to 1885 resulted in our putting 7,000 families into Manitoba, and something like 12,000 families into the North-West and Manitoba put together. In order to do that, we have to expend something like $7,000,000 a year—if you put together the interest we have to pay on the amount we incurred for the railway, the annual charge for Indians, the annual charge for the Mounted Police, and the annual charge for immigration, which, to all intents and purposes, is useful only for that country, besides the amount for the management of the Department of the Interior and the miscellaneous expenditures which we incur. There was a little dispute the other evening as to the amount of available land we had in the North-West. I find a few suggestive facts shown in the map which the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table. I find that, in the enormous extent of territory between the 3rd and 4th parallels which was known as the dry or arid region, the Canadian Pacific Railway would only accept about one-third of the 2,000,000 acres of the belt located there. This map shows that of 2,208,000 acres, they would only accept 830,000 acres, according to the hon. gentleman's statement; and I am told that a large quantity of that was on the north side of the road. I fear it is only too evident that the great proportion of the region south of the Canadian Pacific Railway line and extending to the boundary between the 3rd and 4th parallels, can hardly be deemed fit for settlement. We know that all along the other parallels to the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, there is a great deal of broken land. I believe that the land of better quality to the north has been largely appropriated by the Canadian Pacific Railway and others, and it is clear that, wholly apart from the grants which have been made to the Manitoba and North-Western and other railways, we have been dispossessing ourselves of the greater portion of this land, extending up to the 53rd degree of latitude, and that we will be obliged to hand the balance over free to the settlers, or that, at most, we may have a small portion remaining for pre-emption purposes. I desire to remind the House that we have failed altogether in putting immigrants in that country in the number we had a right to count upon, and in obtaining any return for our expenditure upon it, the fact being that the balance in our land Department is on the wrong side. I also point out that we are now doing a double wrong. In the first place, we are making a mistake in subsidising these railways by grants of land which lie at a distance from the line of railway. We give them large blocks of land far removed from their line, and there is no inducement to them to bring settlers in. If these sections become reasonably populous, the people will be perpetually dependent upon us. In the old Provinces, large resources were derived formerly from the sale of lands, and later, from the timber limits, but these resources will be taken away from the people of the new territories, and we will probably have continual battling for additional subsidies and additional accommodation which those territories will have a right to expect. On all these accounts, I think the policy of making this land grant is much to be deprecated, and my own impression is that we will gain very little by it. We are locking up these lands in the hands of corporations, which, in many cases, depend upon the sale of their bonds to make any headway at all, and we are only placing an obstacle in the way of other companies which might probably at a later date be willing to construct roads through that country. We have an instance of that in the case of the Northern Pacific Railway in the Province of Manitoba, which has been ready, I believe, to construct lines there for the very small bonus of $1,500 to $1,700 per mile. I also believe it is a bad policy to scatter settlement which these grants are calculated to do. I believe it would have been better to devote our attention to the concentration instead of scattering it; I believe we would have had very many thousands more settlers than we have now, and that the whole problem of the North-West would have been solved in a more reasonable way. However, it is all but hopeless to endeavor to control the Government now that they have embarked on this policy. No one can look at this map without perceiving that the chances are immense, that in years to come our successors may be compelled, at great cost and at great inconvenience, to undo the work which we are now so heedlessly accomplishing.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to add one word to the protest I made in regard to this absurd policy of the Government in embarking in these enormous railway enterprises, in a country which has only about a quarter of a million of inhabitants. They are anticipating the wants of the country; they are engaged in the business of building railways under the most unfavorable circumstances, and they are obliged to offer inducements for the

construction of railways prematurely, year after year, in advance of the necessities of their being built faster than they would be required by the natural growth of settlement. This whole policy of granting millions upon millions of acres in the North-West to corporations, making grants that will prove eventually to have been unnecessary if we waited till the roads were needed, is one that the country will bitterly regret in the future. I predict it, and I predict it from the experience that has been given in precisely similar cases in the country to the south of us. I regret, furthermore, that the Government have determined, as they seem determined, to pursue this policy of bartering the heritage of the future for the advantage of certain monopolies; and inasmuch as they insist upon doing this, I regret they have even refused that poor boon of fixing the maximum price with regard to these lands, the policy which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) pointed out had been repeatedly pursued in the United States in the interest of the settlers who were to occupy the lands which were granted to railways in various parts of that country. I hold that it is an entirely unjustifiable refusal on the part of the Government, having decided to grant these lands, to refuse to the settler that safeguard he is entitled to demand, that is, the establishment of a maximum price. I now record my protest against the whole policy, against the policy *per se* of making grants, and against the refusal, having taken that step, of minimising the evil by establishing a maximum rate.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The plan which the hon. gentleman has been looking at shows the lands accepted by the Canadian Pacific Railway, amounting to, I think, 8,340,000 acres. I explained the other day that they had already notified us of having accepted now over 9,000,000, and expect to select 10,000,000 before the selection is completed. We asked last year for an appropriation of $2,500 for the inspection of land; it was for the purpose of paying our inspector for examining the lands which the Canadian Pacific Railway has indicated they were not going to take. Since the inspection was made, Mr. Hamilton, on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Mr. Pierce, on behalf of the Government, have been at work every day making a final selection which, I am satisfied, will reach 10,000,000. The section which has been examined most carefully is that portion in which the smallest selection has been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister state whether I was correctly informed that the bulk of the selection, in what is known as the arid belt, between the 3rd and 4th parallels, has been made north of the line?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that is very likely. There is a very large area south of the track in which Old Wives Lake is situated, a lake which is some eighty miles long and ten or fifteen miles wide in some places. There is a great deal of land within the railway belt south of the line. A great deal of land around that lake is dry alkali land, which would not, under any circumstances, be accepted by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. CHARLTON.

RESPECTING INTEREST.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 140) to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled An Act respecting Interest.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When that Bill was before considered in Committee there was a discussion in which the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) took part, with regard to the propriety of repealing all the exceptional provisions of the Interest Act. The Bill as passed by the Senate deals with sections 9, 10 and 11, namely, those making special provisions with reference to Ontario and Quebec. The hon. member for St. John gave me notice that he desired to ask for the repeal of sections 18 to 23 with regard to New Brunswick, and the member for Queen's, P. E. I., desired to repeal sections 28, 29 and 30 with regard to Prince Edward Island. I agree to the repeal of all the sections after number nine. The effect will be to remove a number of those enactments which were particularly intended to keep alive the penalties with regard to the then existing contracts, which are now practically run out. Hereafter, in all the Provinces, the rate of interest may be fixed by agreement.

Mr. BLAKE. It leaves still undisturbed, except in so far as specially amended, the provisions as to the power of redemption, or rather limitation of the right to charge interest after a certain period.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It does not affect that.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 161) to amend "The Pilotage Act," chapter eighty of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Colby.)

ADJOURNMENT TILL FRIDAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that when this House adjourns to-night it stand adjourned until Friday morning at eleven o'clock, to receive any messages from the other House.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 131) further to amend chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, The Territories Real Property Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 112) authorising the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments.—(Sir John Thompson.)

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL. The House will have in its recollection that when the Bill was passed in regard to steamboat inspection, a very strong feeling was expressed on this side of the House, and also on the other side of the House, against the provi-

sion that an engineer should require to be domiciled here three years before he could be employed. The acting Minister of Marine, with the courtesy which usually characterises him, stated he would strike out the section in accordance with the wish of the House. I believe some error was committed. The hon. gentleman intended to make the alteration, but the original clause went up to the Senate. I think the Minister's intention was to change that particular section, and I regret it has not been done.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. gentleman has stated the case exactly. In deference to the views of my hon. friends from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), Queen's (Mr. Davies), Halifax (Mr. Jones) and some other hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, I announced to the House that, for the present, we would not press that clause. By an error which was not discovered until the Bill had passed the Senate beyond recall, that clause was retained and another clause was taken out. I immediately placed myself in communication with the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, and stated that if they attached sufficient importance to it, I would endeavor to have another Bill put through to-day that would amend the Act. It was understood, that as the clause had been considerably modified, it might stand for a year.

Mr. MITCHELL. And you will amend it next year.

Mr. COLBY. I probably will not be in the position next year that I now so unworthily occupy ; but it will be open for amendment then.

Mr. CHARLTON. The law as it now stands would not allow a person to be an engineer in Canada, unless he was domiciled on a British vessel.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes ; but if you want to get an engineer from the United States you could not have him.

Mr. LAURIER. I think that clause will be found very inconvenient.

Mr. CHARLTON. Better let the Bill stand for this Session.

Mr. COLBY. We cannot do that now, but I can get a small Bill drafted which will change the law to meet the views of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that would be better.

Mr. CHARLTON. Better draft a small Bill. As arrangements have now been made by the steamboat owners, this law would be found very inconvenient.

Mr. COOK. I am glad the acting Minister of Marine has decided to give this matter consideration. I introduced a Bill sometime ago, that persons should not be appointed to the Civil Service unless they were residents in the country five years. The second reading of that Bill was moved in my absence, and I understood the First Minister gave a promise that he would consider the question next Session, or that he would not employ any more foreigners, or even persons from Great Britain, in the Civil Service, unless they had a residence in Canada. A large number of our young men are qualified for these positions and they ought to be given a chance. So far as the policy of the Government is to keep Canada for the Canadians, in this respect I shall assist them. I expressed my regrets that a Bill had been introduced in reference to the qualifications of engineers other than those on steamboats. I drew the attention of the House the last few Sessions, to the importance of this matter, and I hope that next year the Government will take it up. I trust they will pass a Bill next Session, by which they will give that honored and respected class of the community the right to pass an examination, so as to put them on an equality with the steamboat engineers.

THE MICMAC INDIANS.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have received from the Chief of the Micmac tribe of Indians, a petition in which he asks, among other privileges, that they shall be allowed the privilege of spearing salmon at the distance of three miles, on the north-west branch of the river, in connection with their reserve. The Indians are very poor, and have not the best facilities for catching fish, and they ask what they used to have in former years, the privilege of spearing within a limit of three miles. I would ask the hon. Minister to give the matter his early attention, and see what can be done to meet their wishes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have read the papers which were handed to me by the hon. gentleman, and which contained the application he has mentioned and other matters. I will give them my immediate attention, and will communicate with the hon. gentleman as soon as I have anything definite to communicate.

NEW BRUNSWICK CAMP GROUND.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like, also, to ask the hon. Minister of Militia whether he can comply with the reasonable request I made on behalf of the Mayor and Council of the city of Moncton?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sorry I cannot give an answer to the hon. gentleman's question, relating to the location of the camp for the annual drill of the militia in the Province of New Brunswick. The question of the selection of the localities for the different camps has not yet been taken up ; but I have received several petitions on behalf of the city of Moncton, and the matter will be taken up at an early day, when I shall be glad to consider the recommendation the hon. gentleman has made.

CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS.

Mr. COOK. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to the fact that a great deal of distress prevails among the Christian Island Indians. I had the honor and profit of attending a camp meeting on the island last summer, when I discovered that there were a number of indigent persons there, and that they have not organs in their different churches. As the Government have been supplying organs to bands of Indians in other sections, they ought to supply an organ to each denomination of the Indians on Christian Island. I hope they will also attend to the indigent persons who are there, and who are worthy to receive assistance, apart from the fact that they are wards of the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was not aware, until the hon. gentleman mentioned it, that it has been usual for the Government to give organs to the Christian bands of Indians, and I cannot promise the hon. gentleman anything in that respect. The only organ which, I think, it might be within the means of the Indian Fund to send them is the Toronto *Globe*. I will enquire into the case of the indigent persons.

THE NEWFOUNDLAND QUESTION.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have the Government anything to communicate to the country concerning the negotiations with Newfoundland, with regard to its admission into the Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have had no communications from the Government of Newfoundland, except one. On hearing that their Bait Bill was applied to Canadian vessels, we remonstrated by telegraph, and also communicated with the Colonial Office. We received an answer from Newfoundland that the Act was *intra vires*. We have had no answer yet from the Colonial Office, but do not cease to press the matter, because we think it was the original intention of the Newfoundland Government and Legislature not to apply it to Canadian vessels; but it appears, under the terms of the Act, it is applicable to all vessels, either British, Canadian or foreign.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman's answer throws a good deal of light on matters between the Island and the Dominion, so far as it goes. But the question I desire particularly to obtain information upon is, as to whether there were any negotiations on the basis of admitting Newfoundland into Confederation.

Mr. TROW. I see in the papers that the Newfoundlanders are annexing themselves to the Dominion. Over 250 of them have come to Montreal; and if negotiations are kept quiet they will annex themselves.

MAJOR-GENERAL MIDDLETON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask what action the Government propose taking, in consequence of the report made in reference to the case of General Middleton? Do the Government propose to press General Middleton to pay the amount of money the Committee reported was due to Mr. Bremner, or what action do they propose to take?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have taken no steps on that report, and have had no communication with General Middleton. He is absent at Toronto. We have been too busy to consider what steps should be taken.

Mr. LAURIER. That was not exactly the purport of the question of my hon. friend. He did not suggest that the Government had had any communication with General Middleton, but he asked what the intentions of the Government were in regard to that report. It may be premature to ask the Government what their intention is, but, as I understand, the object was to ascertain what was to be done in regard to this man Bremner, who is, I believe, a most deserving man, who was charged with being a rebel though there was no evidence against him, and the evidence shows that he was not guilty of rebellion. The whole of his property was in furs, and I think this matter requires prompt action on the part of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not had time to consider that point, but I would remind the hon. gentleman that a most solemn protest was entered here by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) against the Government paying a farthing to Bremner.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not pretend that Bremner should be paid by the country, but the Government may have means of persuasion which they could bring to bear on those who should pay this damage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will consider that matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Bremner is entitled to be recouped in some form, and we should not separate before that is understood. This man's furs were placed in the custody of an officer of the Government, and were handed over on the order of another officer of the Government, and I think we are bound to see that that man is recouped.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be fully considered.

Mr. TROW. I will ask the Minister of Militia if he intends to have battalion drill this year in the city of Stratford? That city has gone to considerable expense in extending waterworks to the old drill field, which I think is the best in the Province, and to have everything prepared for battalion drill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is, no doubt, a great inducement to send the camp to Stratford that the waterworks there are in perfect order. As far as I am personally concerned, I should be glad to give a definite answer on the subject, but, as I have already stated, the question of the selection of the camps has not yet been considered. It will be one of the first questions to be taken up by the Department after Parliament rises, and I shall be glad to consider the application which the hon. gentleman has made.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move the House do now adjourn, to meet again on Friday morning at eleven o'clock.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 16th May, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BERGIN moved that the ninth report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in. He said: This recommends the printing of documents reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation; it also recommends that the Patent Office reports be

distributed once a year in a bound volume, instead of loose sheets as they are at present, once a fortnight or once a month; also, that instead of the large trunks that are now distributed every Session to members of Parliament, one good trunk be substituted. We find that $4.80 has been paid for each one of the basswood trunks, amounting to $24 a Parliament. They are really of no use, and we recommend that a moderately fair trunk be substituted once in each Parliament.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not know whether it would be in order now to say anything on the subject, but I think it would be a very good thing if it were possible to have enough copies of the bound *Hansard* printed to supply the mechanics' institutes in the different parts of the country. There is no publication of Parliament that is so interesting to the general public as the *Hansard*, and they have no opportunity of consulting it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I observe that the seventh report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament recommends the printing of a number of documents—7,000 copies of the report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture, in English and French, in the usual ratio; 10,000 copies of the report of the Select Standing Committee on Colonisation; 50,000 copies of the report of the Dairymen's Association; 25,000 copies of the report of the Fruit Growers' Association, and that the Patent Office reports, instead of being distributed as at present, be bound and distributed once a year, commencing on the 1st of July. Well, probably, this last recommendation is a good one, because we wish to preserve these Patent Office reports. Next, I see that the report recommends that, instead of the large trunks now given to each member every Session, there be substituted one of a much better quality, to be given next Session, and thereafter one at the beginning of each Parliament; also, that the supply of stationery for the use of members be of a better quality, such as was formerly used.

Mr. BERGIN. The quality used this year is very bad.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking be concurred in. He said: The amendments to the Banking Act are not very important. On page 21, line 25, after the word "person" at the end of the clause, add the following:—

Provided always, that no payment, whether in Dominion notes or bank notes, shall be made in bills that are torn or partially defaced by excessive handling.

I am not quite sure that this will not be a somewhat mischievous clause, and if it were earlier in the Session I should ask the Committee to send it back. But at the late hour of the Session, and considering that this Act does not come into force until the first of July, 1891, and that we will have an opportunity to review it next year, for the despatch of business I shall ask the Committee to concur in this amendment with the condition, as I have stated, that we may review it another year.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to hear that the hon. gentleman would concur in such an amendment at all. I cannot see that anything but injurious effects will arise from it. It is, of course, too late in the Session to debate it, but if the hon. gentleman carries it we must carry it on division. I think it is a very mischievous law.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. What is the effect of it?

Mr. LAURIER. If bills are defaced or torn, no payment will be made.

Mr. FOSTER. We will be able to amend it next year.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me it ought to be sent back to the Senate. I think that if there is such a strong expression of opinion in this House, they will not insist on it, or they ought not at any rate. I cannot see the object or the reason for this amendment.

Mr. GUILLET. The Act does not come into force until July, 1891. Therefore, it can be amended next year, as it is a mere matter of detail.

Mr. FOSTER. It is with that intention I ask the House to pass it.

Amendments concurred in.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. DALY moved that the amendment made by the Senate to (Bill No. 155) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway be concurred in.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. DALY. It limits the building of the railway to the Saskatchewan River, a distance of 400 miles within four years.

Amendment concurred in.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Mr. BOWELL presented the Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, for the year ending 30th June, 1889.

Mr. LAURIER. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his punctuality.

Mr. BOWELL. The report was put in my hands by the Queen's Printer, and I should not have had the honor of laying it on the Table, were it not that the Secretary of State is ill. I present the hon. gentleman with a copy which I presume will be interesting to him.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government stated a day or two ago that probably on Friday he would be able to give us some idea as to the position of the fishery question. I only ask him to give what information he is possessed of, if it can be given without detriment to the public service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fully expected to be able to give an answer to-day which, I think, would, to a very considerable extent, have been satisfactory to the House, but we have not got the information fully. In the first place, I may say that a message came from England which was not explicit enough, and we have asked for an explan-

atory message which has not yet arrived. In the second place, Mr. Tupper, who has been in Washington in connection with this matter, is on his way home. I thought he would have been here by this time, but he is very unwell and has to travel slowly. I thought we would have heard from him before this, and perhaps we may have the information before 3 o'clock. All I can say now is that things are looking very well.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear that statement, which will so far be satisfactory to the public.

THE BREMNER FURS.

Mr. TROW. I have been requested to ask the Government whether they have come to any decision as to the payment of the claimants in regard to the Bremner furs, in order to avoid litigation, as I understand they intend immediately to take action.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question, of course, we cannot answer just now. The Committee very properly made no recommendation on that point, as that was no part of their business. They said that a certain sum of money would be a sufficient compensation for these furs. My hon. friend (Mr. Trow) will remember that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) implored the Government not to pay any portion of it, and said he would be very sorry indeed to see it done. In fact he used as strong language as possible on that subject. He said the compensation must come from another source. Since that report has been discussed we have been altogether too much occupied with parliamentary business to take up the matter. We will take it up next week and see what can be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose everything depends upon whether the furs were ever legally in the possession of the Government. If they were improperly taken out of the possession of Bremner so that General Middleton was a trespasser from the beginning, of course, the position taken by the member for West Durham would be unquestionably a sound and legal position. If they were legally in possession of the Crown at any time, and the taking by General Middleton was a taking of possession for the Crown, of course the man would be responsible to Bremner, and then General Middleton would be responsible to the Crown. I have not looked into that point, to see what the taking was originally. The member for West Durham was strongly of the opinion that they never were in the possession of the Crown at all; if that is so, unquestionably he is right, and I suppose the responsibility rests on the Government to look after the payment, and to see that the party who was their officer does his duty to the one whom it was his duty to protect. The duty, I suppose, rests on the Government, whether the responsibility does or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question of the liability of the Crown, or the master, in any case, for the acts for his subordinate or servant, is a delicate one. There is a very narrow line between what the liability of the master is, and whether the liability is thrown on the servant altogether. I have not looked into the evidence in this case, personally, at all, and I really do not know whether the Crown could be considered liable. Of course, if there is liability, the Crown will acknowledge it at once, and they will also do what they can in order to recover whatever is due to this man.

Mr. MITCHELL. The distinction I take is this: My hon. friend has placed before the House what the member for West Durham states to be the law upon the subject, that is, where the legal liability rests as between master and servant, that is to say, where a servant executes a particular duty and exceeds his power, the master is not liable, but the servant is personally liable. Here there is a broad distinction between a duty performed by a servant to a master, and that existing between a high officer of the Government supposed to hold certain extraordinary powers in a crisis such as that. Now, whether Bremner could bring a personal action against General Middleton is a point I do not pretend to discuss; but there is this clear, that if the commander of the forces of Canada, in subduing an insurrection, chooses to take property away from any man, whether he be innocent or guilty of taking any part in the insurrection, and if he takes that property in possession for the Crown and disposes of it, somebody is responsible to pay that man. If General Middleton is not responsible certainly the Crown is, and if the Crown is not legally liable, then it is the duty of the Government to bring the matter before Parliament with the view of seeing that justice is done to the unfortunate man whose property is taken. I am not one of those who think that General Middleton ought to be permitted to pursue such a high-handed course as that, and appropriate this property for his own use and have the country pay Bremner for it. I would not like to see that done; but I say it is the duty of the Government, and Parliament will expect it of them, to see that General Middleton pays that man for his furs, and if that is not done this Parliament will take means to see that justice is done to Bremner, after proper steps are taken against General Middleton.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There is a total misapprehension on the part of hon. gentlemen as to the way these furs came into the possession of the police. This man Bremner had come into Battleford with these furs, and the furs were being pillaged by people there; by whom I do not know; but, at all events, it is stated that an officer of the police came to the General to say that these furs were being taken from him, and he asked for authority to have them handed over to the police for safe-keeping. At that time the General had no idea whatever of giving any order for confiscating the furs, or asking that they be put up for himself. They were handed over to the police for safe-keeping, just as Bremner himself was arrested and handed over to the police for safe-keeping. Two months after that, when word was brought to General Middleton that Bremner had gone to Regina as a prisoner, as the reporter states, Mr. Reed then asked the General whether these furs should be confiscated, and what was to be done with them. After he had come back, on the 4th of July, from pursuing Big Bear, he gave that order to confiscate the furs, and then said that some might be given to his staff, and some left for himself, and receipts were to be taken for them; so that they were really in possession of the

Mounted Police, that is, of the Government, and whoever received the furs is the party that should be called upon to pay for them.

Mr. LAURIER. That is an extraordinary state of things, although the statement of the hon. gentleman may be correct in fact. It is an extraordinary state of things that when Bremner was brought to Battleford as a prisoner the day after Poundmaker surrendered, these furs of Bremner should have been pillaged while the Commander of the Forces was there, and that no steps were taken by him to protect them from pillage.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. He did take that step ; he told the officer of the police to take them for safe-keeping into the barracks, but not for himself.

Mr. LAURIER. Whether by the police or not, the furs were taken from this man by order of General Middleton. It seems to me that when the commander of the forces was present, the property of any British subject should have been safe, and that the furs of Bremner should have been just as safe in his possession as they would be in the barracks. However, for reasons of his own, the furs were taken to the barracks, where they were in the custody of the police and of the Government ; but afterwards General Middleton chose to confiscate those furs and appropriate them for himself.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No ; only a portion.

Mr. LAURIER. No matter.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes ; it does matter.

Mr. LAURIER. A portion went to the General, another portion to Reed, and another to Bedson. Surely the reparation due to Bremner is that he shall be put into possession of all the furs which were taken away from the police ; and if they cannot be accounted for, then their value must be given to him by those who profited from them, and not by the Canadian Government.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Bremner was not examined, therefore we cannot tell whether it was by his consent or not ; but my impression is that he was a consenting party that the furs should be taken care of, and that a policeman should be appointed to guard them. Of course, under the circumstances then existing, they could not have had a policeman standing over them all the time, and so they were put into the police barracks. Remember Bremner was himself arrested, and if the furs had not been put away into the barracks for safe-keeping, there would not have been one of them left upon the prairie among all the Indians and others who were roaming about.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would be an instance in which the General had neglected his duty to protect property, because he was there for the purpose of protecting both life and property.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. He did so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He took these furs into his possession. The case of Cockburn against the Queen, I think, is a case exactly in point, where a Lieutenant in the Navy committed an act that was held to be illegal, and it was decided that in that case, first, that the lieutenant was not an officer of the Crown at all, but that he was an officer of Parliament, although I do not know whether the same rule would apply to a General in the army ; it was also held that having acted beyond his authority, he was personally responsible, and that the public was not responsible.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a great distinction between the responsibility existing on the part of every employé of the Government, every tide-waiter, for instance, and a high officer entrusted with almost absolute powers.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The General would have been worthy of all praise for taking care of that property and endeavoring to protect it, if he had not subsequently given orders to confiscate it. We are talking now about how the furs came into the possession of the police. The question was between allowing the furs to lay on the prairie and protecting them by the police, or putting them into the police barracks there to be protected. If nothing more had been done, I think no censure could have been passed upon the General. Now, if nothing more had been done, I think no censure would have been passed upon it. Therefore, for that act of putting the furs in the police barracks there is no blame to be attached to the General.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As the hon. gentleman knows, in law the subsequent act makes him responsible.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The subsequent act is the act of indiscretion which was committed, and it is there the blame comes in. The taking possession of the furs for the Government in order to protect them, was not worthy of blame ; but, on the contrary, it was for the protection of Bremner's property.

Mr. MITCHELL. We differ about that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) draws a distinction between officers in high rank and others. There is no distinction that I am aware of. They have all got the limit of their duties stated, and the Crown is no more responsible for the act of a civil servant who is on the top of the ladder than one who is at the foot of it. If the Crown is responsible for an offence committed against the civil law, it is also responsible for an offence against the criminal law. When General Luard committed an offence the Crown was not responsible ; he was punished. Governor Wall, of Gibraltar, was hanged. He was an officer high in rank, and he thought he had a right to flog the people to death, but he was hanged for that. I should not like that—if General Middleton had exercised martial law in the North-West and had hanged anybody—I should be hanged in his place.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the simile is correct. I do not want to see General Middleton hanged, although as was stated the other day by the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) the penalty for looting, under the Articles of War, is death. I do not want the General killed, but I do want to see him made to pay for the furs which he stole.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They were not stolen ; there was a receipt given for them.

Mr. LAURIER. If the Crown is not responsible for the wrong-doing of its employés, high or low, the Crown can at least make this officer atone for wrong-doing,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Crown will do anything they can to make him atone.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I told the hon. member for the West Riding of Durham (Mr. Blake) the other day, that I would cause enquiry to be made in my Department in reference to the matter in connection with the Quebec harbor improvements to which he referred. I now submit the papers. The result so far obtained in the enquiry made respecting the tenders of the cross-wall harbor works, Quebec, does not show that any persons connected with the Department was guilty of indiscretion, or that any of them has given information to any person outside of the Department. The officers, who, by the nature of their duties, might have had cognisance of the tenders and who still belong to the Department, declare that they did not give such information to any person. (See attached letters of the Deputy, Mr. Baillairgé, the Chief Engineer, Mr. Perley, the present Secretary, Mr. Corbeil, the Chief Engineer's stenographer, Mr. Lightfoot, and his mail clerk, Mr. O'Brien.) The assistant engineer, Mr. Boyd, in whose handwriting the extension of the tenders was made, Mr. Ennis, who was secretary of the Department in 1883, and Mr. James Walsh, the correspondence clerk, who wrote the letters and reports to Council, presumably under Mr. Ennis' orders and at his dictation, are now dead—but they never gave any reason to suspect their discretion. The enquiry will be continued.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER communicated to the House that he had received the following letter from the Governor General's Secretary :—

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE, OTTAWA.

"SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament this afternoon at four o'clock.

"CHARLES COLVILLE, *Captain*,
"*Governor General's Secretary.*

"The Honorable
"The Speaker of the House of Commons."

House rose at 11.34 a.m., to meet again at 3.34 p.m.

House resumed at 3.34 p.m.

SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That the balance of the indemnity of the late Adam Hudspeth, Esquire, be paid to his legal representatives, and that the indemnity of Samuel Burdett, Esquire, be paid to him in full, he having been obliged to leave town on account of illness.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TROW. We have concluded a long and tedious Session, and I presume we are all glad it has come to a close. Elections are going on in various Provinces, and many members will be soon engaged in those elections. I think the Government are a little culpable in not bringing forward important measures earlier in the Session, for we have done a great deal of business during the past few weeks, and especially during the past two weeks. We have voted away in the Supplementary Estimates and for railway bonuses over $50,000,000, which is rather a serious amount for a country with such little resources as we have. This is a very difficult country in which to arrange the tariff to suit all circumstances. What will suit one Province will be opposed to the interest of another Province. Therefore, the Minister of Finance and Minister of Customs, notwithstanding all these deputations that came to give them information from time to time, had a very difficult task to perform. I hope that the tariff will be for the benefit of the inhabitants of the various Provinces, but I doubt very much if the imposition of a higher duty on flour will satisfy the Maritime Provinces, and there are various other changes that evidently are not satisfactory to all. However, I presume the Government have done the best they could from the information they have derived, in many instances from interested parties. The Government, no doubt, have a very difficult task to perform. I must say that some members of the Government are energetic and fine departmental officers ; one of the Ministers in particular, the hon. Minister of Public Works, although he has on various occasions made promises that he has not performed—for my part I never asked him for anything—still, we know very well that a harder working member of the House is not to be found than the Minister of Public Works, and I question very much whether there is a better departmental officer in the Government than that hon. gentleman. During the past Session I think the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have had exceedingly onerous duties to perform in the preparation of the revised tariff, and I think they have done their work very well, notwithstanding the criticisms that have been made by members of the Opposition. The members of the Opposition have criticised almost every item in the Estimates and have done a great deal of good. Then there is the Minister of Agriculture, whom I must mention, and for my part I am satisfied with his work. Having myself had some experience, not as a practical farmer, but in paying practical farmers for their services, I consider that hon. gentleman has done an extremely good work with his experimental and model farms throughout the country. Their good result will not appear immediately. When you plant a tree it takes some time to bring it to maturity ; and so I anticipate in good time that this country will reap a great deal of benefit from these farms in the various Provinces. I am aware that a great deal has been done in that connection which is not yet apparent to the casual observer, but the good effects of which will appear later on. Of course the expense has been large at the Central Farm, and it could not be otherwise when we see what has been done in laying out streets, planting groves, making fences and erecting buildings. It is not my duty to flatter the Government, but I must say that they have done, in many respects, very creditably. Of course some are dissatisfied, there always will be some dissatisfied people ; and I have no doubt that if our friends of the Opposition were siting on the other side of the House, there would be still some dissatisfied people, although I think they give very general satisfaction. I hope our friends, when they get there, will practice rigid economy, instead of spending fifty or sixty million dollars a Session, as this Government has done. I am afraid that hon. gentlemen oppo-

site have become somewhat reckless and lavish in their expenditure. I am very much pleased that the First Minister has enjoyed such good health during this Session, He seems to be as vigorous and as determined as he was ten or fifteen years ago. It is true he is not the hardest worked member of the Administration, but, at the same time, his absence would be, in my estimation, a fatal blow to the whole Conservative party. I hope that in eight or ten months we will all meet here again enjoying our usual health, and that the Government will be better prepared to bring down their measures earlier in the Session. I think it is greatly to be desired that their important measures should be placed before the House within a few weeks of the opening of the Session, in order that the House may be able to give them the needed attention. I would like now to hear from the newly elected hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh).

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I never more fervently prayed for the arrival of the Governor General than I do at the present moment, and am sure you all participate in my sentiments. So far as I am concerned, I sympathise with you and the country in the fact that during this Session, and for the last three Sessions, you have been deprived of my presence in Parliament. I apologise for my absence, upon behalf of the electors who voted against me. I am one of those who believe in always being candid with my friends, and in my friends being candid with me. I, like many others, considered in years gone by that this country had not a Government that met the wishes of the people, but since the accession of the right hon. Sir John Macdonald to power I have realised the fact that the country had a statesman at the head of affairs, and wanted other statesmen to support him. When I was urged by so many people of this constituency to become a candidate for Parliament, I accepted the invitation, and can honestly state that hundreds of votes were given on behalf of the Government of the right hon. gentleman, and thousands given to me as a manifestation of good will and personal regard. I quite appreciate the ability and the geniality of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), and of the Opposition generally, who, when I was in Parliament before, treated me in the most considerate and courteous manner. In fact, I only remember what good things they said, and allowed the hard words to pass into oblivion. I am glad to get back to the House of Commons again, and to associate with the hon. gentlemen whom I see around me. I shall endeavor, like my friend the leader of the third party, to be independent, with a strong gravitation towards the policy of the Administration. I may venture to say that I came back here mellowed, somewhat, by experience, and prepared to give my right hon. friend the leader of the Government what I call an independent support. I will not trespass upon the time of the House any longer, but trust that next Session I shall be able to take an active part in the proceedings of Parliament. I was slaughtered, so to speak, three years ago, but the general impression appears to be that my resurrection is complete and I hope permanent.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker——

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER :

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act respectiug the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to amend "The Exchequer Court Act."

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Home Life Association of Canada.

An Act further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act."

An Act respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.

An Act respecting Grants of Public Lands.

An Act for the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer.

An Act for the relief of Christiana Filman Glover.

An Act to amend an Act concerning Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.

An Act respecting H. H. Vivian and Company (Limited).

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue, chapter thirty-four of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to amend "The Interpretation Act."

An Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.

An Act to facilitate the purchase by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the Branch Line of Railway between Hull and Aylmer.

An Act respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith.

An Act respecting the Hereford Railway Company and the Maine Central Railway Company.

An Act relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.

An Act further to amend the Criminal Law.

An Act to amend "The Indian Advancement Act," chapter forty-four of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to amend "The Gas Inspection Act," chapter one hundred and one of the Revised Statates.

An Act respecting Railways.

An Act to amend "The Seamen's Act," chapter seventy-four of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act," chapter seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes.

An Act further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter five, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.

An Act respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Harbor of Pictou.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.

An Act respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act of the present Session intituled: "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs."

An Act to further amend "The Indian Act," chapter forty-three of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to incorporate the York County Bank.

An Act to provide for the collection and publishing of Labor Statistics.

An Act to make further provision respecting the Bounty on Pig Iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian Ore.

An Act to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting Interest."

An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.

An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in Land to certain Railway Companies.

An Act respecting Banks and Banking.

An Act respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Then the Honorable the SPEAKER of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:—

"An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1890, and the 30th June, 1891, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Fourth Session of the Sixth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In bringing to a close this somewhat protracted Session of Parliament, I desire to convey to you my best thanks for the diligence with which you have applied yourselves to your important duties.

The negotiations respecting the Behring Sea question are still in progress at Washington with good prospects of an equitable settlement. Meanwhile the continuance for another year of what is known as the *Modus Vivendi*, will serve to show our earnest desire to cultivate the most friendly relations with the United States Government and people.

The re-adjustment of the Customs Tariff, intended to promote the development of our agricultural, manufacturing and other industries, will, I have reason to hope, operate for the general benefit of all classes.

I am glad to believe that the Act relating to Banking has been most carefully considered, and will be found to guard the interests of the public and to be sufficiently liberal to those who are more immediately affected by its provisions.

The measure relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes will, doubtless, render more certain and plain the law relating to these instruments, and make the law in that regard uniform in almost all respects throughout Canada.

The amendments to the criminal law include a great number and variety of provisions, all of which will probably be found useful, and several of which were urgently demanded for the public welfare.

The creation of a Bureau of Labor Statistics will promote the investigation and study of the questions which affect the relations of Capital and Labor, and which are now engaging the attention of all great Nations. It will likewise aid the diffusion of information on all that concerns the occupations and well-being of the working classes. In some other measures of the present Session your desire to improve the laws which apply particularly to those engaged in industrial pursuits will be likewise recognised.

The various provisions to amend the laws relating to Railways, Patents, Copyrights, and Trade-Marks and to the Department of Inland Revenne, and, likewise, the enactments to improve the Statutes for the management of our Indian population, are well adapted to promote the efficient administration of the Departments to which they relate, while the large amount of private Railway Legislation indicates a spirit of enterprise throughout the country which, it is to be hoped, will lead to a substantial development of the railway works of the country.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the liberal provision which you made for the requirements of the Public Service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I take leave of you for the present, with the earnest hope that in the coming season our people in every part of Canada may be blessed with an abundant reward for their labors and may witness a marked advance in the prosperity of the Dominion.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate, and

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Monday, the twenty-third day of June next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Monday, the twenty-third day of June next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 23rd day of June next.

For Lists of other Bills assented to, SEE *26th March* (2385), *and 24th April* (3873).

INDEX.

FOURTH SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1890.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret. Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl. Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4082 (ii).

Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4584 (ii).

Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 963; (personal explanation) 1069 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders for Supplies (Ques.) 1120.

Grandin's, Mgr., Letter to Cardinal Taschereau (Ques.) 119 (i).

Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 2212 (i).

I. C. R., Freight Rates on Flour (Ques.) 248 (i).

Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4845 (ii).

Laurie, Gen., Mileage, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4003 (ii).

Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2073 (i).

Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 126 (i).

Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1811 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).

Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1348 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*

Otter, Steamship, and Mail Service (Ques.) 123 (i).

Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4659.

Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1515 (i).

Quebec Post Office, Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O.C.'s, &c., 62 (i).

Queen's Counsel, position of (Ques.) 1486 (i).

—— Appointments (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2099; wthdn., 2124 (i).

Revising Officer, Champlain (Ques.) 2022 (i).

St. Michel Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 246 (i).

SUPPLY:

Indians (Surveys) 2161 (i).

Militia (Monuments) 4652 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116 (ii).

Railways — Capital: I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4016 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4379, 4523; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. on a div., 4590 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1831 (i).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2030 (i).

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 315 (i).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1032 (i).

Armstrong, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1134 (i).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2511 (i).
Indians : Ont. (Oneida) 4784 (ii).
Militia (compensation in lieu of land) 1288 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3239, 3402, 3538 (ii).

Bain, Mr. J. W., *Soulanges.*
Beauharnois Canal enlargement (M. for Reps., &c.) 517 (i).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1258 (i).
Dundas and Waterloo Macadam Road (Ques.) 68.
——— (M. for Ret.) 149 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2027 (i).
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1502 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1057 (i).
Grand Trunk Railway B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2180 (i).
Oleomargarine, Imports from U.S. (Ques.) 122.
SUPPLY :
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2422 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3288, 3544 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Co.'s B., on M. to suspend Rules, 4822 (ii).

Baird, Mr. G. F., *Queen's, N.B.*
SUPPLY :
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies and S. America) 1990 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3755 (ii).

Barnard, Mr. F. S., *Cariboo.*
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1131 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) 1143.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3138 (ii).

Barron, Mr. J. A., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4281 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 107 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2711 (ii).
Debates, Official, accommodation for Staff, 3723.
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 44, 1°*) 184 (i) ; Order for 2° read, 3703 (ii).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3901 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 905 (i).
Goderich and Strathroy P.O., Tenders (Ques.) 2377 (i).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Hudspeth, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 4831 (ii).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1345 (i).
Quebec Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
——— article in *Le Canadien* (remarks) 4825 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Telegram read) 4563 (ii).
Sultana Island, Lake of the Woods (M. for Ret.) 140 (i).
——— incomplete Rets. (remarks) 2186 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 2277 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Canals (Maintenance, &c.) 3871 (ii) ; Post Office, 2290 (i).
Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2154 ; (N. W. T., Schools) 2173 (i).
Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1325 (i).
Miscellaneous (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4071.
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 4703 (ii).
Toronto Harbor Improvements, Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1712 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Bridge (remarks) 3703 (ii).
——— Commission (Ques.) 118 ; (M. for Ret.*) 145 (i).
Voters' Lists, Revising Officers' Rets. (Ques.) 2827 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3016 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Berthier County Mail Service (M. for Pets., &c.) 529 (i).
Drill Hall, Montreal, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 883 (1).
Fernetville P. O., Closing (M. for Pets., &c.) 529 (i).
Fishermen in St. Lawrence, Licenses, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4569 (ii).
Floods in Laprairie (Ques.) 884 (1).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2° (Amt. to Amt.) 554 ; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 876 ; on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 997 (i).
Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 884 (i).
St. Edmond, Erection of P. O. (Ques.) 91, 401 (i).
St. Gabriel and St. Damien Mail Service (M. for Pets., &c.) 529 (i).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Calvin, services *re* prosecution (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1154 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 926 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1350 (i).
Pagans in Joliette County, on M. for Ret., 513 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, purchase of Land (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3121, 3747, 3884 (ii).

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 92, 1°*) 883 (i).
Thousand Islands Bridge and Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 94, 1°*) 883 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4658 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Enlargement (Ques.) 187 (i).
Beauharnois Junction Ry. Co., Subsidies voted (M. for Stmnt.) 3693 (ii).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Bridge, Subsidies voted (M. for Stmnt.) 3663 (ii).
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) Rep. of Standing Com. (presented) 2310 (i).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4586 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2178, 2184 (i).
"Hungry Bay" Dam, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 3319 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., extension of time (Ms.) 84, 449 (i).
St. Louis River Public Works (Ques.) 245 (i).
Valiquette and Col. Hughes (remarks) 3592 (ii).
Valleyfield Dam, Public use (remarks) 884 (i).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2713 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, letter of John Page presented to Parlt. in Ret., 1122 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3371; on M. for 2° (Amt.) 3441; neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals B. 5 on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1854 (i).
Experimental Farm Rep., recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
——— Stmnt. of cost for Printing, 1856 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1056 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1779 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. (B. 123, 1°*) 2020 (i).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3712 (ii).
Printing Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 3440 (ii).
——— 9th Rep. (M. to conc.) 4928 (ii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Lebourdais Bros., case of (Ques.) 187 (i).

Blake, Hon. E., *West Durham.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) procedure, 2198 (i).
——— on presentation of Rep., 3367 (ii).
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2231 (i).
——— on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656 (ii).
Baltic, Steamer, outrage (remarks) 4027 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2243 (i); on M. for 2°, 3815; in Com., 3881, 4277, 4375, 4508 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1080, 1519 (i); on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 4411; agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, informality of procedure, 2594 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-breeds, &c. (remarks) 1518 (i).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (remarks) 4449 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep., 4732 (ii).
B. C. Defences, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1199 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3875, 4505 (ii).
Can. and Jamaica, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1199 (i).
Caraquet Ry., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601, 4606 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3164, 3368; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 3448; (Amt.) 3459 (ii).
——— on drafting Amts. (remarks) 3456 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m.h., 1854 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. 4488 (ii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1265 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4584 (ii).
Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage B. 126 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).
Disallowance, Power of (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4084; agreed to, 4094 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt., on prop. Res (Mr. *Davin*) 3317 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2673, 2742 (ii).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3193; in Com., 3195 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3910; on Sen. Amts., 4664 (ii).
French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 670 (i).
Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2181 (i); in Com., 3229, 3622.
Hudspeth, Mr., late M. P., deceased (remarks) 4831 (ii).
Hurrell and Valiquette Pensions (remarks) 2259(i)
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3606; in Com., 3626.
——— B. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4904; in Com., 4905 (ii).
I. C. R., Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup. 4601 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4924 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3157, 3603 (ii).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).

Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 4836 (ii).

Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) *re* documents, 724 (i).

——— on consdn. of documents presented, 1476.

——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2087 (i).

——— on presentation of Rep. of Com., 4397 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 4170 (ii).

Mining Machinery, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) procedure, 1144, 1145.

Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2695 (ii).

Newfoundland and Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1199 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4452; in Com., 4466 (ii).

Printing Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 3440 (ii).

——— 6th, on M. to conc., 4661 (ii).

Private Bill Legislation (remarks) 2312 (i).

Privileges and Elections Com. *See* "Lincoln, Member for."

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2255 (i).

Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).

Public Accounts Com., non-meeting of, 2596 (ii).

Public Lands Grant B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Quebec Harbor Improvements, article in *Le Canadien*, 4828 (ii).

Railway Statistics, Rep. (remarks) 4658 (ii).

Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 511 (i).

Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).

Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 4359; on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to M. for 3°, 4400 (ii).

Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2706 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2389.

Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 2281 (i).

Collection of Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 4122. Rys. (P.E.I.) 4124 (ii).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2409 (i).

Indians (B. C.) 4044; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4049 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and United Kingdom) 4776 (ii); (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1972; (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1998 (i).

Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1276 (i).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Miscellaneous (C.P.R. Lands, examination) 4058 (Govt., N.W.T.) 4066; (Seed-grain, collections) 4060 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Man.) conc., 4911 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (N.S.) 4914. *Income:* Roads and Bridges, 4767 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 129 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3160 (ii).

Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4668 (ii).

——— (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4850 (ii).

Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4910 (ii).

Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3199 (ii).

Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2191 (i).

Toronto University conflagration, 1950 (i).

U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3595, 3877 (ii).

Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1276; (remarks) 2311 (i).

Valiquette and Col. Hughes (remarks) 3592 (ii).

Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Dawson*) in Com., 3232 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3391, 3524, 3557, 3735 (ii).

Boisvert, Mr. F., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, construction of Piers (Ques.) 4588 (ii).

Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3706 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*

Hall's Harbor, N.S., Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies) 2031 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2442 (i).

Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S.) 1641 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London, St. John and Halifax) 1961; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1924 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3270, 3430 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. F., *St. John's, Que.*

Isle aux Noix Wharf, construction (Ques.) 1357 (i).

Mount St. Nicholas P. O., change of Name (M. for Cor.*) 3319 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*

American Freight in Bond, on M. for O.C., 99 (i).

Beef (Fresh) Importations, on M. for Ret., 89 (i).

Bridgewater, Ship, seizure (Ans.) 248 (i).

Chinese Immigration, on M. for Ret., 87 (i).

Corn for Seed, Duty on (Ans.) 2829 (ii).

Corn, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 204 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
Crow Harbor Postmaster (Ans.) 400 (i).
Customs Collectors, Instructions (remarks on adjnmt.) 4083 (ii).
Customs Duties, *per capita* (Ans.) 188 (i).
——— B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4497 (ii).
Debates, Official (M. for Sp. Com.) 4 (i).
Fish, Bonded, Regulations (Ans.) 248; (remarks) 275 (i).
Flour and Wheat Importations (Ans.) 55 (i).
Flour, Can., Imported to Mar. Provs. *viâ* U. S., &c. (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1038 (i).
——— (explanation) 1049 (i).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4648 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for (prop. Res.) *re* documents, 723 (i). *See* "Privilege."
——— additional documents (presented) 795, 1652.
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1770 (i).
Logs, Export Duty, Amount (Ans.) 884 (i).
Manufacturing Machinery, arrears of Duty (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Importation (Ans.) 562 (i).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 231, 358, 368 (i).
Oleomargarine, Imports from U. S. (Ans.) 122 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2466 (i).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4930 (ii).
Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limit, 571 (i).
Registered Letters and Dead Letter Office, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).
Roberts, E. K., American Tug (Ans.) 3291 (ii).
Rooth, Tug, seizure, on M. for papers, 1699 (i).
Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce (remarks) 91 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 720.
Charges of Management, 167 (i).
Civil Govt. (Customs) additional clerk, 4574 (ii); (Printing and Stationery Dept.) contingencies, 358; (Privy Council) contingencies, 231 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1420 (i). Excise (Patrick Cullen, extra services) 4020 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2437 (i). Miscellaneous (John Dyke) 4119; (Salaries, &c.) 2330 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Gratuity, late Dr. Wilson) 4011 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1469 (i); (Drill shed, Brantford) 4707 (ii). Roads and Bridges, 1650 (i).
Tobacco Seizures in N.W.T. (Ans.) 4171 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (remarks) 2565; in Com., 3082, 3129, 3208, 3241, 3387, 3475, 3726, 4482 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., *Monck.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3864 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 4412 (ii).
Chinese Immigrants, par. in *Empire* (remarks) 3624 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3405, 3469, 3547 (ii).

Brien, Mr. J., *South Essex.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2713 (ii).
Corn, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 453 (i).
Essex County Jr. Judgeship (Ques.) 563 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 409 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1158 (i).
——— (B. 114, 1°) 1581 (i); 2° m., 3720 (ii).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3936; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3948 (ii).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1272 (i).
New Canaan, establishment of P.O. (Ques.) 563.
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3714 (ii).
Mail Clerks, additional Appointments (Ques.) 562 (i).
Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 92 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2503 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1272; (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3460, 3532 (ii).

Brown, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1075 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3959 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (i).
Canadian Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 62, 1°*) 342 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention (B. 5, 1°*) 26; 2° m., 1203; Order for Com. read, 1506; in Com., 1835; (M.) to restore to Order Paper, 1854 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4497 (ii).
Fire Arms, &c., improper Use (B. 148, 1°*) 2311.
Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4271 (ii).
Hamilton Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 66, 1°*) 449 (i).
Hereford Ry. Co.'s (B. 51, 1°*) 244 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1811 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1132 (i).

Brown, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
National Construction Co.'s incorp. (B. 40, 1°*) 184 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) salaries, 221 (i).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 45, 1°*) 212 (i).
Walker, Emily, Relief (B. 142, 1°) on a div., 3624 ; 2° m., 3694 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2767 ; in Com., 4482 (ii).

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*
Fort Coulonge and La Passe Interprovincial Bridge, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
Lumber, Import Duties (Ques.) 4662 (ii).
North Canadian Atlantic Ry. Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°*) 794 (i).
Pontiac Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 87, 1°*) 794 (i) ; M. to receive Pet., 3511 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4888 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Roads and Bridges, 4771.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3501, 3582.

Burdett, Mr. S. B., *East Hastings.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 116, 343, 1089, 1520 (i).
Cereals, prevention of Fraud in Sale (prop. Res.) 184 ; Order for Res. called, 1148 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2729 (ii).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 232, 360 (i).
Picton Harbor, Dredging, &c., on M. for Cor., 2194 (i).
Read and Shannonville Mail Service, Contracts, Cor., &c. (M. for Ret.) 1486 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) contingencies, 232 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 489 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., *Gloucester.*
Caraquet Ry., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4618 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3941 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3950 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4111.

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Inverness Ry. incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1355 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2368 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 1984 (i).
Public Works—Income : Dredging (N.S.) 1638 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3012 ; in Com., 3274 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4310 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 351, 1082 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 4406 (ii).
Dredging, &c., McGregor's Creek (M. for Ret.*) 530 (i).
——— River Thames (M. for Pets., &c.*) 144 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4894 (ii).
——— removal of Bar (Ques.) 55 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3195 (ii).
Flour and Wheat Importations (Ques.) 55 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 318 (i).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3936 (ii).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4843 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).
Rondeau Point, Govt. Lands (Ques.) 2022 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Lachine) 2275 (1).
Collection of Revenues : Excise (salaries) 2322. Post Office, 2292 (i).
Fisheries (Protection Service) 2375 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2486 (i) ; (expenses) 3649 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2168 ; (P.E.I.) 2164 (1).
Legislation : House of Commons (contingencies) 711 (i).
Militia (Armories, &c., care of) 1321, 1327 (i) ; (Estate R. S. King) 4161 : (Monuments) 4652 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Labor Congress Rep.) 4903 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 4727 ; (Repairs, &c.) 4166. Roads and Bridges, 4771 (ii).
Railways—Capital : I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1925 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, 2020 (i).
Superannuation, 1312 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3423, 3463, 3502, 3589 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1052 (i).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 2306 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3503 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J., *London.*
Agricultural Bulletins, publication in German (Ans.) 1796 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2260 (i).
Barley, Two-rowed, distribution and purchase (Ans.) 4172 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4504 (ii).
Canadian Historical MS. (Ans.) 1021 (i).
Cattle Disease in Western States (Ans.) 85 (i).
——— Quarantine Stations on Frontier (Ans.) 92 (i).
Census, next Enumeration (Ans.) 2827 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 19, 1°*) 90; on Sen. Amts. (M. to conc.) 2098 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 408 (i).
Engineers' (Steamboat) Licenses (remarks) 4925.
Experimental Farm (Central) establishment of Dairy (Ans.) 145 (i).
——— Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
——— Rep. (presented) 3104 (ii).
High Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 3104 (ii).
Immigrant Rates to Winnipeg (Ans.) 186 (i).
Patent Act Amt. (B. 17, 1°) 90; in Com., 1076 (i).
Seed Barley, Date of Arrival (Ans.) 1795 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2387; (Criminal Statistics) 498; (Dairying, development) 2399; (Experimental Farms) 715, 2383 (i), 3783 (ii); (Health Statistics) 499; (*Patent Record*) 496 (i), 4000; (Seed, distributing) 3999 (ii); (Societies, N.W.T.) 2384 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 179; (Contingencies) 473; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 372 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2403 (i); (expenses) 3847, 4001 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1455 (i).
Quarantine, 4001; (Grosse Isle) 3654; (Public Health) 3655, 4001; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3654 (ii).
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. (B. 18, 1°) 90; 2° m., 1076 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3406 (ii).

Caron, Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., *Quebec County.*
"A" Battery, Officers' Quarters (Ans.) 1358 (i).
A.D.C., Appointment (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4748 (ii). *See* "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
British Columbia Defences, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1199 (i).
Canteens, Fredericton (remarks) 3079 (ii).
Cavalry School, Que., Officers' promotion (Ans.) 3292 (ii).
Drill Hall, Montreal, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 884 (i).
Esquimalt Fortifications and Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1485 (i).
Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4565 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *Mc Carthy* (explanation *re* vote) 882 (i).
Helmets for Active Militia (Ans.) 886 (i).
Hurrell's Militia Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1272 (i).
——— Ans., 2378; (remarks) 2312 (i).
Hurrell and Valiquette Pensions (remarks) 2259 (i).
Land Slide at Quebec, on M. for O.C., &c., 65 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1805; (Amt.) 1809 (i).
Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4928 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—*Continued.*
Military College, Kingston, Board of Visitors (Ans.) 245 (i), 3662 (ii).
——— Inspection (Ans.) 4026 (ii).
——— prop. Changes (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 4170 (ii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 275 (i).
Militia Camp Ground at Moncton, 4926 (ii).
——— Clothing Supplies, Tenders (Ans.) 3811 (ii).
——— Deptl. Sec., Appointment of (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Official Documents Disclosure (B. 122, 1°*) 2020 (i); 2° m., 3203; in Com., 3599 (ii).
Portneuf Battalion of Militia (Ans.) 245 (i).
Powell, Col. Walker, resignation (Ans.) 562 (i).
Queen's Wharf, Annapolis, Govtl. Control (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
St. Sauveur Fire and "B" Battery (Ans.) 1200 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4891 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Militia) contingencies, 375 (i), 4012 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1316; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1321; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1267 (i); (Estate R. S. King) 4156, 4898 (ii); (Military College) 1337 (i); conc., 4273 (ii); (Military properties, &c., care of) 1336 (i); (Monuments) 4651 (ii); (Ordnance, Rifled) 1335; (Permanent Forces) 1341; (Rifle Associations) 1332; (Salaries, Militia Branch, &c.) 1315 (i).
Miscellaneous (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Drill Shed, Brantford) 4708 (ii).
Territorial Accounts, 4253 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1267; (remarks) 2311, 2259 (i).
Valiquette, Sergeant, and Col. Hughes' declaration (read) 3592 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 2532 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
Alcoholic Liquors, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3633 (ii).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1228; procedure, 2194 (i).
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjmnt., 2309 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts (remarks) 3522.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4637, 4694 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2241 (i); (remarks) 3155; on M. for 2°, 3811; in Com., 3860, 3893, 3957, 4074, 4377, 4416, 4512 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, papers respecting (remarks) 30 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 351, 1078, 1522 (i).
Bresaylor Half-Breeds Claims, on M. (Mr *Lister*) for Sel. Com. (Amt.) 1399 (i).
BUDGET, The, Reply to Annual Stmnt., 2566; (Amt.) 2584; neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 3075 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1094; (remarks) 1475, 2312 (i).
——— Delay, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1946 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 1859, 2098, 2228 (i); 3875, 4504 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4419; in Com., 4436 (ii).
Census, next Enumeration (Ques.) 402 (i); 2827 (ii).
Chartered Banks and Liquidation since Confed., on M. for Ret., 82 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 452 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3170, 3369 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4488; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4527; neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544 (ii).
Cypress Hills, Timber Limits (remarks) 531 (i).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
Debates, Official, accommodation for Staff, (remarks) 3724 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) remarks *re* Vote of Member, 2228 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2742 (ii).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3194 (ii).
Fish Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 213 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 838 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2182 (i).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1273 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3626; in Com., 3627 (ii).
I. C. R., Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
——— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 68, 1357 (i).
——— Steel Rails, Purchase (Ques.) 2021 (i).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4836; in Com. on Res., 4837 (ii).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4648 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for (Ques. of Priv.) 449 (i).
——— (Ques. of Priv.) documents submitted, 638 (i). *See* "Privilege."
——— on presentation of additional documents, 812 (i).
——— further documents asked for, 1094 (i).
——— Cor. (remarks) 1402 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Lincoln, Member for, on consdn. of documents presented, 1474. (i).
——— (prop. Res.) *re* Timber Limits, 1714 (i).
——— on rsmng. adjd. deb. (remarks) 1936 (i).
Middleton, Maj.-Genl., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4928 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1141 (i).
Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 73 (i).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828, 4322 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbor (Dredging, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limits, 570, 638 (i).
Public Accounts Com., non-meeting (remarks) 2186 (i), 2596 (ii).
Public Works, P.E.I. (remarks) 4830 (ii).
Receipts and Expenditure (M. for Ret.*) 83 (i).
Rockport dep. Postmaster, dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4895 (ii).
Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, on Mess. (remarks) 1342 (i).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on prop. Res., 4589, 4669, 4917; in Com., 4919 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4852, 4873 (ii).
SUPPLY: on M. for Com. (remarks) 160 (i), 4499 (ii); in Com.:
Arts, Agriculture, &c., 4650 (ii): (Experimental Farms) 721 (i).
Canals—Capital: (Cornwall) 2275: (Lachine) 2275; (Murray) 2277; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2273; (Tay) 2288; (Tay) 4652; (Welland) 2277 (i). *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 4655, 4913; (Lachine) 4653; (Welland) 4654 (ii).
Charges of Management, 161 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 179 (i); (Contingencies) care, &c., Buildings, 4575; (Finance Dept.) contingencies, 4571 (ii); (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 213; (Indian Affairs) 173; (Interior) 171; (Marine) 179; (Postmaster General) 177; (Railways and Canals) 180 (i), 3779) Accountant's salary, 4570 (ii); (Sec. of State, 168 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (additional pay, &c.) 4152; (gratuities) 4150; (Maintenance, &c.) 3865 (ii). Excise (Culling Timber) 2343 (i), 4121; (salaries, &c.) 2328; (Travelling expenses, &c.) 2338 (i). Post Office, 4153, 4794. Railways (Cape Breton) 3809; (I. C. R., Repairs, &c.) 3804; (P.E.I.) 3809, 4144. Slides and Booms, 3872. Telegraph Lines, 3872 (ii).
Dominion Lands:—Income, 3660 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection Service) 2375 (i).
Geological Survey, 2124 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2417 (i); (expenses) 3647, 4797, 4805; conc., 4915 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Indians (B.C.) 2165 (i), 4043 (ii); (Man. and N.W. T.) 2170, 2172 (i), 4049; (Ont. and Que.) Annuities, 4051 (ii); (Two Mountains) 2156 (i).
Insurance (Superintendence) 2124 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 477 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries) 704; (N.W.T.) 2307 (i); Senate (Salaries, &c.) 3873 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lower Traverse River) 2019 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canada and United Kingdom) 4773; conc., 4915 (ii); (Halifax, St. John and S. America) 1984 (i).
Marine Hospitals (Gratuity to Dr. Wells) 4043 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1316; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1268 (i); (Estate R. S. King, rent, &c.) 4156, 4899 (ii); (Military College) 1337; (Militia Branch, &c.) 1315 (i).
Miscellaneous (C. P. R. Lands, examination) 4067; (Defalcations, Kingston) 4162; (Labor Congress, Rep.) 4815, 4901; (St. Catharines Milling Co., costs) 4058 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2345 (i), 4053 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Can. Registration of Shipping) 2017; (Que. River Police) 2018 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3647; (Dorchester) 3637; (Kingston) 3635; (Man.) conc., 4910; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3635, 4649; (Regina Jail) 3647 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1099; (Ont.) 1095, 1621 (i); Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 4913 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (Conservatories) 1469; (Major's Hill Park) 1466 (i); (Military College, Kingston) 4704 (ii); (N.S.) 1445; (N.W. T.) 1443; (Ont.) 1437 (i); (Ottawa Deptl. Buildings) 4696 (ii). Repairs, &c., 1455 (i). Dredging (N.S.) 1645 (i). Roads and Bridges, 1649 (i), 4769 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R., conc., 4911; (Onderdonk Contract, arbitration) 4653 (ii). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1927; (Rolling Stock) 1928. Oxford and New Glasgow (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). Short Line Ry., 4796 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 3654; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3654 (ii).
Superannuation (Wallace, R. W.) 1290, 1315 (i).
Unprovided Items, 4156 (ii).
Supply B. 158 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4917 (ii).
Tariff, The, rumored Changes (remarks) 1070 (i).
Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4909 (ii).
Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1268 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 2566; (Amt.) 2584 neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 3075; in Com., 3083, 3213, 3233, 3390, 3484, 3523, 3725, 4480 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1242; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Amt.) 2206 (i).
Ballot Boxes, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2234 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3823; in Com., 4315 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4760 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1394 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Chartered Banks and Liquidation since Confed., on M. for Ret., 80 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2716 (ii).
Commercial Treaties with Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 3680 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Currency, Public (prop. Res.) 189 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) (explanation) *re* vote, 2227 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3935; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for 3°, 3949 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 284 (i).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2724 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4243 (ii).
Kettle Creek, Engineer's Rep. *re* Canal, on M. for Ret., 155 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2069 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry., Tolls, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 157 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1137 (i)
Montreal P.O., Drop Boxes (Ques.) 3512 (ii)
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1350 (i).
Order, Ques. of, M. that Com. rise, 2469 (i).
——— unparliamentary Language, 378 (i).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4350.
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2255 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1907 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Pet. *re* increase of Salaries (Ques.) 187 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2390; (Criminal Statistics) 498; (Dairying, development) 2402; (Health Statistics) 501; (Agents' salaries) 2425 (i).
Charges of Management, 166 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) contingencies, 473; (Civil Service Examiners) 218; (Geological Survey) 173, 2126 (i), 4790 (ii); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 223; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 387; (Interior) contingencies, 382; (Marine) contingencies, 474; (Militia) contingencies, 378; (Privy Council) contingencies, 225; (Public Works) contingencies, 470, 472; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 461 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 3649 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2165 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1288; contingencies, 1331; (Drill Instruction) 1320; (Mili-

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
tary College) 1339 (i); (Monuments) 4652 (ii); (Ordnance, Rifled) 1335; (Permanent Forces) 1341; (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Gophers, destruction) 4790 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4038; (N. W. T.) 4039; (Ont.) 4036 (ii); (Repairs, &c., Ottawa) 1474 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 3655 (ii).
Railways—Income (Gov. Gen.'s Car) 4021 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 378, 382 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., *L'Islet.*
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (remarks) 4450 (ii).
——— on M. to conc., 4757 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4587 (ii).
Electoral Lists for Dom., Expenses (M. for Ret.) 83 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1005 (i).
Independence of Parlt. (B. 12, 1°) 67; 2° m., 2208 (i).
Land Slide at Quebec, on M. for O.C., &c., 65 (i).
Lebourdais Bros., case of (Ques.) 187 (i).
Priv. and Elec., *re* ex-Member for Lincoln, on M. to conc. in Rep., 4731 (ii).
Quebec P. O., Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O.C.'s, &c., 62 (i).
Voters' Lists Revisions, Printing (remarks) 2381 (i)

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Ballot Boxes, Patent (M. for Sel. Com.) 2230; Rep. of Com. (presented) 4656 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (remarks) 4449 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act, Working, &c. (Ans.) 1021 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2715 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on. M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4583 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1261 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 275 (i).
——— B. 44 (Mr. *Barron*) on Order for 2°, 3703.
——— (B. 136, 1°*) 3196; in Com.. 3895; 3° m., 3937; further consdn. of Sen. Amts., 4663 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 53; on Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2°, 816 (i).
Labor, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
Labor Statistics (prop. Res.) 4590; provision (B. 148) 4398; 2° m., 4835; in Com. on Res., 4836; in Con.. on B., 4838 (ii).
LeSueur, P., Dual Salaries (Ans.) 504 (i).
Secy. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 118 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4877 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Patent Record*) 4000 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Sec. of State) 169 (i); Civil Service List, 3992; (Queen's Printer) extra salaries, 3992 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 170; contingencies, 461 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (P.E.I.) 4133 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2524 (i).
Legislation (French Translators, extra pay) 4008.
Miscellaneous (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4113; (Labor Congress Rep.) 4902; (Printing Bureau, plant) 4118; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4069 (ii).
Voters' Lists and Franchise Act (Ans.) 3154 (ii).
——— Receipt of (Ans.) 3724 (ii).
——— Revising Officers' Reps. (Ans.) 2827 (ii).
——— Revision, Printing (remarks) 2380 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Alaskan and Canadian Boundary (Ques.) 188 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3856 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries and U.S. Protection (remarks) 725 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 107, 351, 1522 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4410 (ii).
Blackfeet Indians, capture of White Girl (remarks) 815 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4504 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4426; in Com., 4440 (ii).
Census Return of Pagans (M. for Ret.) 513 (i).
Copyright Act (remarks) 4606 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3165; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. for 3°, 3445 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4536 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 38, 1°) 159; 2° m., 2212 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., M. for Sel. Com., 403; neg. (Y. 63, N. 94) 447 (i).
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4447 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for 2°, 3722 (ii).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3939 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1166 (i).
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists (prop. Res.) 1489 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 651; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 970 (i).
Grazing and Pasture Leases in N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 3693 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Hull, Religious Disturbances (remarks) 393, 506.
Jesuits' Estates Act, Ret. (Ques.) 1071 (i).
——— (Enquiry for Ret.) 2020 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4173; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1762; (personal explanation) 1789 (i).
Lord's Day Observance (B. 110, 1°) 1477; (remarks) 3720 (ii).
Lucas, S. B., Indian Agent, N.W.T., Charges against (M. for Ret.*) 3319 (ii).
Lumber Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3989 (ii).
Maybee, Miss, Dismissal from P.O. at Quebec (M. for Cor., &c.) 2187 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1136 (i).
Newfoundland, admission into Confederation (remarks) 4927 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).
Pagans, Census Returns of Ste. Elizabeth (M. for Ret.) 513 (i).
Pasture and Grazing Leases in N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 3693 (i).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4332 (ii).
Ry. Statistics, delay in Issuing (remarks) 3663 (ii).
Religious Disturbances in Hull (remarks) 398, 506 (i).
Rooth, Tug, seizure, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 1698 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4113.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3187 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 4680; on M. for 3°, 4922 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2390 (i); (Seed, distributing) 4000 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Post Office) Savings Banks, 3994 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4121. Rys. (P.E.I.) 4123 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4053 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2509 (i); (expenses) 4001 (ii).
Indians (Man., and N. W. T.) 4050 (ii).
Legislation (J. S. Thompson, Indemnity) 4004 (ii),
Mail Subsidies (St. John, S. America and W. Indies) 1987 (1).
Miscellaneous (C. P. R. Lands, examination) 4068; (Seed Grain, collections) 4060; (Skeena Expedition) 4057 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4053 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1620 (i).
Tassé, E., and Duvernay, L. D., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 4026 (ii).
Timber Limits granted by Dom. Govt. since March, 1885 (M. for List) 2188 (ii).
——— Enquiry for Rets., 2674 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Timber Limits, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2634 (ii).
——— in Com., 3100, 3135, 3474, 3533, 3746 (ii).
——— (Amt.) neg. (Y. 44, N. 85) 3777 (ii).
——— on relevancy of Amt., 3779 (ii)
Wrecking and Towing in Can. Waters (B. 2) 2° called, 146; 2° m., 1202 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3704 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656.
Crane Island Mail Service (Ques.) 121 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 11, 1°) 67 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1162 (i).
Greenly Island Lighthouse-keeper, dismissal (Ques.) 3154 (ii).
Montmagny and Beauce, Judge's Residence (Ques.) 2021 (i).
——— Wharves, Coll. of Tolls (Ques.) 4026 (ii).
Pierreville Post Office (M. for Reps., &c.) 517 (i).
River du Sud Public Works (M. for Reps.*) 530.
St. Rosaire Post Office (Ques.) 400 (i).
Savings Banks in Ont. and Que. Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°*) 1652 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation (French Translators) 4009 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 4726 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4014 (ii.)

Cimon, Mr. S., *Charlevoix.*
Can. Temp. Act, Working, &c. (Ques.) 1021 (i).
Experimental Farm (Central) establishment of Dairy (Ques.) 145 (i).
Judge's Residence, Saguenay District (Ques.) 3292 (ii).
St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse, Erection (Ques.) 1656 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4304 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3748 (ii).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., *Toronto Centre.*
Abell, Mr. John, alleged Insolvency (Remarks) 3513 (ii).
Bankers' Safe Deposits and Warehousing Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°*) 449 (i); in Com., 3323 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2246 (i); on M. for 2°, 3845; in Com., 3863, 3879, 3956, 4078, 4278, 4513 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1521.
Confederation Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 74, 1°*) 449 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1219 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—*Continued.*
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 752 (i).
Penny Postage (Ques.) 4762 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Loyalty to Her Majesty and newspaper par., 184 (i).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3716 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2429 (i).
Legislation (N. W. T.) 2306 (i).
Threats, Intimidation, &c., Legislation (Ques.) 1857 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3482 (ii).

Colby, Hon. C. C., *Stanstead.*
Alberton Lighthouse, Expenditure for Breast-working (Ans.) 1657 (i).
Baltic, Outrage on Steamer (Ans.) 1859 (i), 4027.
——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4663 (ii).
Buoys in St. Lawrence River, contract (Ans.) 2185 (i).
Cascumpec Harbor, Expenditure for Repairs (Ans.) 1655 (i).
Duvar, Lt.-Col., Superannuation (Ans.) 1485 (i).
Engineers' (Steamboat) Licenses (remarks) 4925.
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3193 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on M. for Com., 3325; (Amt.) 6 m.h., 4441; agreed to, 4447 (ii).
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1497 (i).
Gauthier, Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 3077 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Tenders for Supplies (Ans.) 1120.
Greenly Island Lighthouse-keeper, dismissal (Ans.) 3155 (ii).
Greer, James, late Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 3811.
Hereford Ry. (B. 147) in Com., 4503 (il).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2084 (i).
Lonely Island Lighthouse (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Lotbinière County Mail Service (Ans.) 85 (i).
Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1020 (i).
Montmagny County Wharves, Coll. of Tolls (Ans.) 4026 (ii).
Pictou Harbor Acts Amt. (B. 152, 1°) 4588 (ii).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 2047 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 161, 1°*) 4924 (ii).
Reuter's Telegraph Agency (Ans.) 145 (i).
Ste. Croix Floating Light (Ans.) 2021 (i).
St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse, Erection (Ans.) 1656 (i).
Salmon Fishing with Nets (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4098 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 135, 1°) 3153; 2° m., 4359; 3° m., 4400 (ii).
Smelt Fishing in the Miramichi (Ans.) 2229 (i).

Colby, Hon. C. C.—*Continued*
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 118, 1°*) 1792 (i); 2° m., 3186; 2° m. and in Com., 4362, 4663 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4889 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) contingencies, 224 (i).
Fisheries, 4041 (ii); (Protection) 2375 (i), 4779 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 2351 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2510 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lower Traverse River) 2019 (i).
Marine Hospitals, &c., 2019 (i).
Miscellaneous (classification of Old Records) 4791.
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018; (Registration of Shipping) 2017 (i); (Tidal Observations) 4041 (ii).
Yamachiche Floating Light, on M. for Pets., &c., 1702 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2585, 3411 (ii).
——— in Com., 3140 (ii).

Cook, Mr. H. H., *East Simcoe.*
Abell, Mr. John, alleged Insolvency (remarks) 3514 (ii).
Christian Island Indians, distress (remarks) 4926.
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°*) 118 (i).
Collingwood Harbor, Expenditure (Ques.) 1655 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4494 (ii).
Dom. License Act (enquiry for Ret.) 4906 (ii).
Engineers' Examination and Licensing provision (B. 31, 1°*) 118 (i); (remarks) 4925 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (remarks) *re* 2°, 160.
——— (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 918 (i).
Govt. Property, Damage to by Steamers, &c., Claims (M. for Ret.*) 1488 (i).
LeSueur, P., Dual salaries (Ques.) 400, 504 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on presentation of additional documents, 814 (i).
Liquor License Act, Cost of Enforcement, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1713 (ii).
Lundy's Lane, Protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1805 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1137 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 29, 1°*) 118 (i).
Roberts, E. K., American Tug (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farm) 2383 (i).
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence) conc., 4912 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 222; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 214; (Privy Council) contingencies, 233 (i); (C. S. Examiners) 4272 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2436 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 490 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa) 4914.
Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 4275 (ii)
Superannuation (LeSueur, P.) dual salary, 1304 (i).

Cook, Mr. H. H.—*Continued.*
Voters' Lists, Revision, reprinting, 2380 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3476, 3528, 3736 (ii).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 22, 1°*) 104 (i).
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 86, 1°*) 794 (i).
Corn, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 198 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. (No. 9, 1°) 37 ; in Com., 1071 (i).
Dom. License Act, on enquiry for Ret., 4906 (ii).
Fertilisers, Agricultural (B. 95) 2° m., 3190 ; in Com., 3195 (ii).
Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°) 3290 ; 2° m., 4266 ; in Com., 4271 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°*) 1792 (i).
Grain Tester, prop. Change (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (Bill 133, 1°) 3151 ; 2° m., 3626 ; in Com., 3627 (ii).
——— *re* Tobacco Sales (Ans.) 85 (i).
Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (remarks) 2258 (i).
Malt, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 516 (i).
Salt Manufacturers, prosecution (Ans.) 1654 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4897 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 390 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 2344. Excise (Culling Timber) 2343 ; (Distillery Officer, extra pay) 2337; (Fréchette, translation) 2339 ; (Methylated Spirits) 2342 (i), 4792 (ii) ; (Preventive Service) 2335 ; (salaries, &c.) 2313 (i), 4792 (ii) ; (Travelling Expenses, &c.) 2338 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Cost, &c.) 4255 (ii). Weights and Measures (Mr. McDonell, increase of salary) 2343 ; (Rents, &c.) 2344 (i) ; (salaries) 4792 (ii).
Tobacco, Law respecting Native Grown (Ans.) 2229 (i).
——— Pets. from Manufacturers (Ans.) 275 (i).
Weights and Measures, Inspection Fees (Ans.) 1121 (i).

Couture, Mr. P., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Escoumains, proposed Wharf (Ques.) 274 (i).
Malbaie and Tadousac Mail Service (Ques.) 275 (i).
Saguenay River, Winter Crossing (Ques.) 274 (i).
Seeds and Grains Vote (personal explanation) 1069 (i).
Tadousac Wharf, Sum for completion (Ques.) 274 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Montreal, Centre.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3891 (ii).
Belding, Paul & Co.'s incorp. (B. 23, 1°*) 104 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2712 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J.—*Continued.*
Court House, Montreal, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.) 2188 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to ref. back, 4578 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3370 (ii).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 300 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 592 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. (B. 125) M. to suspend Rules, 2178 ; 1°*, 2184 (i) ; in Com., 3228, 3621 (ii).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4843 (ii).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1810 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1131 (i).
Montreal Court House, Cost of construction (M. for Ret.) 2188 (ii).
Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 2914 ; (remarks) 3077 (ii).
Montreal Harbor Police, Gratuity to Sergeants, &c. (Ques.) 92 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1293 ; neg. (Y. 23, N. 124) 1353 (i).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3713 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements, Memo. of Mr. McGreevy (read) 4566 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1114.
Tidal Observations in Gulf and Atlantic Coast (M. for Ret.) 527 (i).
Vessels Lost in Gulf and on Atlantic Coast (M. for Ret.) 527 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3209, 3548 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4292 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1408 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3185 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4431 ; in Com., 4438 (ii).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 340 (i).
Hudson's Bay Ry. (B. 155) M. to suspend Rules, 4821 ; 1°*, 4822 (ii).
Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2697 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) 3358 (ii).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4344 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M.—*Continued.*
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4684 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2988 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. B. (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4930 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1852 (i).
——— on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2308 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 3516 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3959, 4077, 4285, 4373, 4415, 4511 (ii).
Belle Creek Harbor and Breakwater (Ques.) 2377 (i), 2669 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 351, 1091, 1406, 1552 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4265, 4405 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3875, 4504 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 3719 (ii).
Cove Head Harbor Surveys, Reps. of Engineers, &c. (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3183, 3369; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 3451 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2914 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°) 1343 (i); Order dschgd., 3720 (ii).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 3196; in Com., 3913; on M. for 3°, 3938; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3942 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 941 (i).
Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4564 (ii).
Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4271 (ii).
Govt'l. Expenditure in Ottawa (remarks) 1860 (i).
Grain Elevator at Halifax (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4414 (ii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Workshops, Pets. *re* Increase of Wages (M. for copies) 1711 (i).
——— Employés Insurance Scheme (M. for Ret.) 1710 (i).
——— Employés Wages payments (Ques.) 1357 (i).
——— Official Cars (M. for Ret.) 1710 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1771 (i).
Marine Hospital, Sackville, original Cost (M. for Ret.*) 1713 (ii).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 364 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1300 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Hesson*) unparliamentary language, in Com. of Sup., 1451, 2467 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction (Ques.) 505 (i).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4327.
Privilege (Ques. of) 3591 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3328 (ii).
Sackville Marine Hospital, original Cost (M. for Ret.*) 1713 (i).
St. John and S. America Mail Service, on Ques. of Order, 1985 (i).
Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, on Mess. (remarks) 1341 (i).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1543 (i).
Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 525 (i).
Smith, late Mr. Justice, on M. for Ret., 1695 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3188; in Com., 4363 (ii).
Summerside Bank (B. 72, 1°*) 449 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2386; (Experimental Farms) 716 (i).
Civil Govt. (Militia) contingencies, 378; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 364 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1424 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). Post Office, 2290 (i); (defalcations, Kingston) 4166. Rys. (I.C.R., repairs, &c.) 3807, 4125 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2148 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2413, 2460 (i), 4812.
Justice, Administration of (Judge's salary, P.E.I. Admiralty Court) 3995, 4575 (ii); (Librarian, Supreme Court) 481; (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 485 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii). (Senate) miscellaneous, 700 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964, 1970; (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 1980 (i).
Militia (Estate R. S. King, rent, &c.) 4158 (ii); (Military College) 1340 (i).
Miscellaneous (collection, seed grains) 4063; (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4113; (Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 3658; (O. C.'s, collection) 3658; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 3659; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4070 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018; (Registration of Shipping) 2017 (i).
Open Account (Seed Grain for N.W.T.) 4167 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3646; (Man.) 3637; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3636 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1098; (Que.) 1105. *Income:* Buildings (Conservatories) 1468; Major's Hill Park) 1465; (N.S.) 1108, 1447; (Removal of Snow) 1464; (Repairs, &c.) 1457. Dredging (N.S.) 1643. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1615; (N. B.) 1624; (P. E. I.)

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
1577. Roads and Bridges, 1649. Telegraph Lines, 1649 (i).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1932 (i), 4019 (ii). I.C.R. (Rolling Stock) 1928 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). *Income:* Gov. Gen.'s Car, 4021 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 2019 (i).
Tracadie Harbor Survey, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies*) 1065 (i).
Trade Combinations Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 3704, 3810 (ii).
Trade Relations with U.S. (remarks) 2313 (i).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 378 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3593; in Com., 3597, 3876 (ii).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3698.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3248, 3438, 3546, 3571, 3743 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*
Alberta Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 722 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4487 (ii).
Elbow River Water Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 76, 1°*) 449 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1137 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Steamship and Ry. Co.'s (B. 36, 1°*) 159 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Agricultural Bulletins, publication in German (Ques.) 1796 (i).
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1302 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3166 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1823 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4540 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1263 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 4396 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4581 (ii).
Doig, Mrs. A. A., Claims for Improvements (Ques.) 1486 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 3316 (ii).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 433 (i).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 532; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 873 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
Half-breeds' Claims in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 3309.
Herchmer, L. W., contingencies (M. for Ret.*) 3319 (ii). *See* "Mounted Police."
Homesteads in N. W. T. (Ques.) 2023 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) 3298 (ii).
——— Memorials of J. Holden and J. Shera (M. for copy*) 1065 (ii).
Irrigation in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 3292 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4228 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 4170 (ii).
Mounted Police, N.W.T., Commissioner (prop. Res.) 1503 (i).
——— Commissioner, Res. from Leg. Assembly, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1485 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) Management, &c., 2674; neg. (Y. 52, N. 76) 3367 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) deb. rsmd., 3332 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4451; in Com., 4468 (ii).
N.W.T. Memorials, &c., passed by Leg. Assembly (M. for copies*) 212 (i).
——— Registry Offices, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 885.
——— (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4662 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1876 (i).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4818 (ii).
Rys. in N.W.T., Fire-guards (prop. Res.) 3315 (ii).
Scrip, Volunteers', &c., Rep. in ref. (Ques.) 1485 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4373 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4675 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2419 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4048 (ii).
Militia (Rifle Associations) 1331 (i).
Miscellaneous (collection, seed grains) 4061; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4070 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4056 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1471 (i); (Man.) 4038 (ii); (N.W.T.) 1441 (i), 4040, 4719 (ii).
Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3201 (ii).
Tobacco Seizures in N.W.T. (Ques.) 4171 (ii).
University for N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 3315 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3071; in Com., 3090 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. S. J., *Algoma.*
Baltic, Steamer, alleged Outrage (remarks) 3080, 4027 (ii).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1160 (i).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3911; on Sen. Amts., 4664 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. S. J.—*Continued.*
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 598 (i).
Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4028 (ii).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4904 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1132 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4465 (ii).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4356 (ii).
Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14, 1°) 84 (i).
Rainy River Boom Co.'s incorp (B. 60, 1°*) 342 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 27, 1°*) 104 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 93, 1°*) 883 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4113.
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1969 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Protection) 4781 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2140 (i).
Indians (Annuities) 2153 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4719 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1619 (i).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2270 (i).
Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2189 (i).
Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s (B. 124, 1°*) 2097 (i); in Com., 3231, 3622 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3480 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1241 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3852 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3933 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 557 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1804 (i).
May, Samuel, Relief *re* Patent (B. 16, 1°) 86 (i).
Military College, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 3662.
——— Inspection (Ques.) 4026 (ii).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3715 (ii).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1968 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2428 (i).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1320; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1324; (Military College) 1339 (i); (Monuments) 4651 (ii); (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Georgian Bay Survey) 3657 (ii).
York County Bank incorp. (B. 39, 1°*) 184 (i).

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L., *St. Maurice.*
Shawinegan Senatorial Division (Ques.) 27 (i).

De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., *Portneuf.*
Portneuf Battalion of Militia (Ques.) 245 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3862, 4080, 4304 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1085, 1525 (i).
Debates, Official (M.) to conc. in 1st Rep., 1261.
——— (M.) to ref. back, 3153 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 3368 (ii).
——— (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4578 (ii).
Montreal and Western Ry. Co. and the C. P. R. Co. confirmation of Agreement (B. 82, 1°*) 638.
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4890 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) 2288 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1102. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 1115 (i).

Dessaint, Mr. A., *Kamouraska.*
Bélanger, P. R. A., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1797, 2024 (i).
Dionne, Jos., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2023.
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 784 (i).
I.C.R., Passenger and Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 147 (i).
Kamouraska Wharf, accounts *re* Building (M. for Ret.) 97 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, repairs (Ques.) 92 (i).
St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse (Ques.) 2826 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E., *East Assiniboia.*
Alaskan and Canadian Boundary (Ans.) 188 (i).
Bélanger, P. R. A., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 1797, 2024 (i).
——— Payments as Surveyor (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
Blackfeet Indians, capture of White Girl (remarks) 815 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4439 (ii).
Cape Crocker Indians, Annuity paid (Ans.) 505 (i).
Caughnawaga Indians, engagement for Circus (Ans.) 1655 (i).
——— Indemnity for encroachments on Reserve, on M. for Cor., 1709 (i).
——— Letter of Agent to Council (Ans.) 1797 (i).
——— Moneys in hands of Supt. Gen., on M. for Stmnt., 1712 (i).
——— Reserve, Rep. of Mr. Walbank's Survey (remarks) 1069 (i).
——— Cost of Survey (Ans.) 247 (i).
——— Quarries (Ans.) 86, 247 (i).
Christian Island Indians, distress (remarks) 4927.
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3176 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Crofter Immigrants at Pelican Lake (Ans.) 1796.
Dom. Lands Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3316 (ii).
Doig, Mrs. A. A., Claim for Improvements (Ans.) 1486 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 932 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. (B. 116, 1°*) 1792; 2° m., 2099 (i); in Com., 4028 (ii).
Geological Survey Reps., on M. for Ret., 1027 (i).
Half-breeds' Claims in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3310 (ii).
Homesteads in N.W.T. (Ans.) 2023 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3301 (ii).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2726 (ii).
——— Amt. (B. 132, 1°) 3151; 2° m., 3604; in Com., 3625, 4034 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 153) 2° m., 4903; in Com., 4905 (ii).
Interior Dept., Extra Clerks (Ans.) 2827 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 33 (i), 2739 (ii).
Land Claims under Man. Act (remarks) 514 (i).
Micmac Indians, Pet. *re* spearing Salmon (remarks) 4926 (ii).
Mississauga Indians, settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1656 (i).
Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3340 (ii).
N.W. Council, Memorials, &c., *re* French Language (Ans.) 402 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 146, 1°*) 4373; 2° m., 4449; in Com., 4465 (ii).
N.W.T. Registry Offices, Receipts (Ans.) 885 (i).
——— Surveys, Cost per acre (Ans.) 403 (i).
Paul, Peter, expenses of Trial (Ans.) 505 (i).
Prince Albert, Settlers' claims (Ans.) 2668 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2257 (i).
Rys. in N.W.T., Fire-guards, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3316 (ii).
Rondeau Point, Govt. Lands (Ans.) 2022 (i).
Saw Logs, rebate of Duty (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
School Lands in Man., Sale (Ans.) 145 (i).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, B.C., on M. for Pets., &c., 129 (i).
Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 92 (i).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°) 184; 2° m., 1079 (i); (prop. Res.) 4589; in Com., 4669; (M.) to conc. in Res., 4832 (ii).
——— (B. 160) prop. Res., 4917; in Com., 4919 (ii).
Sultana Island, incomplete Rets. (remarks) 2186 (i).
——— Sale, on M. for Ret., 140 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs) 174 (i), Byshe, F. R., salary, 4574 (ii), contingencies, 387; (Interior) 171, contingencies, 381 (i); Rowatt, H. H., salary, 4572 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 4121 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4155. *Income*, 3660 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2124 (i), 4053; (Artesian Wells) 4789 (ii).
Indians (B. C.) 2165 (i), 4043, 4789; (Ont. and Que.) 2151 (i), 4051; (Oneida) 4783; (Ont.) 4787 (ii); (Man. and N.W.T.) 2170, 2172 (i), 4047, 4788; (N.S.) 4052 (ii); (P.E.I.) 2164; (Que.) 2156; (Surveys) 2157 (i).
Legislation (N.W.T.) 2306 (i).
Miscellaneous (B.C. Appeal to Privy Council) 4118; (Banff Hot Springs) 3658; (Bow River Lumber Co.'s costs) 4060: (C. P. R. Lands, examination) 4067; (Govt. N. W. T.) 4066; (Gophers, destruction) 4789; (Half-breeds, N. W. T.) 4069; (Seed Grain collections) 4060; (Skeena Expedition) 4057; (St. Catharines Milling Co., costs) 4059 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4054 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain, purchase for N.W.T.) 4167 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 4720 (ii).
Unprovided Items, 4156 (ii).
Surveys in Montcalm County (Ans.) 186 (i).
Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4909 (ii).
Timber Limits, Enquiry for Rets. (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
Tourigny, Mr., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 2377 (i).
University for N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
Vancouver Island Ry. Lands, Squatters' Rights (Ans.) 274 (i).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Bankers' Safe Deposit, &c., Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. *Cockburn*) in Com., 3323 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act Amt (B. 102, 1°) 1198 (i).
——— B. 103 (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2° m., 3717; 3° m., 3720 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3168 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3701 (ii).

Dickinson, Mr. G. L., *Carleton, Ont.*
Benevolent Societies, Legislation (Ques.) 188 (i).

Doyon, Mr. C., *Laprairie.*
Caughnawaga Indians, Claims for Indemnity, (M. for Cor., &c.) 1703 (i).
——— Engagement for Circus (Ques.) 1654 (i).
——— Letter of Agent to Council (Ques.) 1797 (i).
——— Moneys belonging to (M. for Stmnt.) 1711.
——— Reserve, Rep. of Mr. Walbank's Survey, 1069 (i).
——— Cost of Survey (Ques.) 247 (i).
——— Quarries (Ques.) 85, 247 (i).
Floods in Laprairie (Ques.) 884 (i).
Immigrant Rates to Winnipeg (Ques.) 186 (i).

Doyon, Mr. C.—*Continued.*
Indian Advancement Act Amt. (B. 42, 1°*) 184; on Order for 2°, 1507 (i); 2° m., 2718 (ii).
——— B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3608.
Legal Services, Amounts paid certain Firms (Ques.) 3292 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of), par. in *Empire*, 84, 90 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 2302 (i).
Indians (Surveys) 2157 (i).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
C.P.R. and Ry. Bridges in Bagot Co. (M. for Pets., &c.) 141 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 439 (i).
Experimental Farm (Central) establishment of Dairy (Ques.) 145 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1006 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2395.

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2471 (i).
Ocean and River Service (*Sir James Douglas*, steamer to replace) 4779 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Bank Charters, B.N.A. and B.C. (M. for copies) 255 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4392 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Telegraphic intelligence from Washington, 1510 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4265 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-Breeds' Claims on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1377; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1401 (i)
Bridgewater, Ship, seizure (Ques.) 248 (i).
Chinese Immigrants, par. in *Empire*, 3624 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt., Proclamation (Ques.) 84 (i).
English Periodicals, Cost of Mailing, 1919 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 298 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 895 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1804 (i).
Provincial Legislation (Ques.) 248 (i).
Royal Prerogative (M. for Cor.) 88 (i).
Welland Canal Commission, Mr. Wood's Rep. (Ques.) 885; (remarks) 1515 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1083 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3749 (ii).

Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., *Lunenburg.*
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4445 (ii).
Fish, Bonded, Regulations (Ques.) 248 (i).
Mahone Bay Lighthouse (Ques.) 885 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties (prop. Res.) 1811 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4094 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2299 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 2373 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 2010 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1108, Dredging (N.S.) 1641. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1615 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3396 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John, N.B., City.*
Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559.
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3859, 3880, 3963 (ii).
Caraquet Ry., Financial Aid (Ques.) 3723 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1217 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1261 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4587 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3942 (ii).
Geological Survey Reps., on M. for Ret., 1028 (i).
Maritime Provs., delay of Mails (remarks) 1582 (i)
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1816 (i).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4820 (ii).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1969 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3189 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4891, 4896 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Postmaster General) 177; (Public Works) contingencies, 471; (Privy Council) contingencies, 232 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (N.S.) 1425. Excise (salaries) 2323. Post Office, 2289 (i). Rys. (I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 3808 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection service) 2376 (i), 4783 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2318 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 493 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (Library, salaries) 714 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 4276 (ii); (Liverpool or London, and St. John and Halifax) 1960; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).

Ellis, Mr. J. V.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1327 (i).
Miscellaneous (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4113 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 1112; (N.S.) 1108; (Repairs, &c.) 1460. Dredging (N.S.) 1645 (i), 4729 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1616; (N.B.) 1613 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (St. John, City front) 1932 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2970; in Com., 3245, 3435, 3488, 3545 (ii).
West India Steam Communication, Advtsmts., Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1713 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3240, 3575 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., *Welland.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1252 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4286 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m.h., 1854 (i).
Detroit River Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°*) 794 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2027 (i).
Geological Survey Rep., on M. for Ret., 1028 (i).
——— Reps. published and Sold (M. for Ret.) 530 (i), 1027 (ii).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1056 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery (prop. Res.) 1798 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians (B.C.) 2168 (i).
Militia (R. S. King, Estate) 4899 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 4768 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2656; in Com., 3419, 3533 (ii).
Welland Canal Commission, Rep. of Mr. Wood (M.) 1515 (i).

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., *Rimouski.*
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1152 (1).
I. C. R., Pets. of N. and A. Ouellet, G. Voyer, F. Coté, &c., *re* Damages to Properties (M. for copies*) 1713 (i).
Matane Branch Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 561 (i).
——— Pets., &c., *re* Building (M. for copies*) 3693 (ii).
Portneuf Battalion of Militia (Ques.) 245 (i).
Rimouski Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 1063 (i).
Ste. Angèle de Merici Mail Service (Ques.) 561 (i).
Telegraph, North Shore St. Lawrence (Ques.) 4762 (ii).

Fisher, Mr. S. A., *Brome.*
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for Adjnmt. 2309 (i).
Census, next Enumeration (Ques.) 402 (i).
Chambly and Longueuil Canal (Ques.) 401 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 207 (i).
——— removal of Duty (prop. Res.) 1583 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 414 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3192 (ii).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1049 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4248 (ii).
Montreal Harbor Commission, abolition (Ques.) 401 (i).
Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3355 (ii).
St. Edmond Post Office (Ques.) 401 (i).
St. Louis Lake, erection of Piers (Ques.) 401 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3794 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2289 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2418 (i).
Legislation: Senate (Miscellaneous) 702 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468 (i).
Tariff, The, extension of Free List (Ques.) 403 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2892; in Com., 3143, 3506, 3571 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P., *Richmond, N.S.*
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2744 (ii).
Fisheries Question and negotiations at Washington (Ques.) 1021 (ii).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 2032 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1869 (i).
Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 249 (i).
Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 511 (i).
Sick Mariners' Fund (M. for Cor.) 519 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2354 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (salaries, &c.) 2331.
Mail Subsidies (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1961 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2782 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 90 (i).
Alcoholic Liquors, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3634 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1021 (i).
——— Anderson's Contract (remarks) 3440 (ii).
——— Contracts (remarks) 3521 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4696 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Banking Act Amt. (B. 127) prop. Res., 2234; 1°* of B., 2249 (i); 2° m., 3811; in Com., 3853, 3879, 3995, 4074, 4310, 4373, 4415, 4507; 3° m., 4590; on Sen. Amts., 4929 (ii).
BUDGET, The, Annual Statement, 2531 (ii).
——(Ans.) 1094 (i).
—— Delay, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1942 (i).
—— (remarks) 1475, 2312 (i).
Benevolent Societies, Legislation (Ans.) 188 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 1860 (i).
Chartered Banks and Liquidation since Confed., on M. for Ret., 82 (i).
—— on Enquiry for Ret., 2252 (i).
Contractors' Cheques and Govt. Banks (Ans.) 28, 29 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
—— removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1609 (i).
Currency, Public, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 193.
Customs Act Amt. (B. 143, 1°) 3779; in Com., 4484; 3° m., 4527; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4530 (ii).
—— (B. 159) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 4910 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1266 (i).
Estimates, The (presented) 149 (i).
—— 1889-90 (presented) 2531, 3955 (ii).
—— 1890-91 (presented) 4479 (ii).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1180 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1042 (i).
Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 1122 (i).
McLaggan, Customs Officer (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
Meat Imports, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 123.
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 149 (i), 2531, 3955, 4479 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. to Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1139 (i).
Order (Ques. of) St. John and S. America Mail Service, 1985 (i).
Pig Iron Bounty (prop. Res.) 2828, 4321; agreed to (Y. 69, N. 45) 4403 (ii).
Pork, &c., increase of Customs Duty (Ans.) 55 (i).
Public Accounts Com., non-meeting, 2596 (ii).
P. E. I. Govt. and Dom. Capital Account (Ans.) 27 (i).
Returns, incomplete P. O. (remarks) 394 (i).
Savings Banks Quebec (B. 154, 1°*) 4761; 2° m. and in Com., 4847 (ii).
Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, on Mess. (remarks) 1342 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4876 (ii).
SUPPLY (prop. Res.) for Com., 25; (remarks) 160 (i), 4499 (ii); in Com.:

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 722 (i), 4795; (G. L. Macdonald) 4796; (Jamaica Exhibition) 4796; (*Patent Record*) conc., 4272 (ii).
Charges of Management, 161 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 179; (Civil Service Examiners) salaries, 219 (i); (Contingencies) care, &c., Buildings, 4575 (ii); (Customs) 176; (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 474 (i); (Finance) contingencies, 4751 (ii); (Fisheries) 180; (Geological Survey) 173; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 168, contingencies, 223; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 213; (Indian Affairs) 173; (Inland Revenue) 176; (Interior) contingencies, 382; (Justice) 168; (Penitentiaries Branch) 168; (Marine) 179; (Militia) 168, contingencies, 377; (Post Office) 176 (i), Savings' Banks, 3994 (ii); (Privy Council) 168 (i), conc., 4272 (ii); (Public Works) 180; (Railways and Canals) 180; (Printing and Stationery) 169; (Printing Bureau) cleaning, 475.
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4121; Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4258 (ii).
Immigration, 4815 (ii).
Insurance Superintendence, 2124 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (Dep. Speaker's salary) conc., 4273 (ii); (contingencies) 713; (Library, salaries) 713; (Miscellaneous, Printing, &c.) 715 (i). (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii). Senate (Miscellaneous) 700 (i); (salaries, &c.) 3873 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and United Kingdom) 4773, 4915 (ii); (Gaspé and Campbellton) 1961; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 1958; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964, 1971; (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1973 (i), 4276 (ii); (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1960; (Magdalen Islands) 1955; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1961; (San Francisco and B. C.) 1972 (i).
Militia (Military College) conc., 4273 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 3658; (Georgian Bay Survey) 3657; (L'Abbé Tanguay's Dictionary) 3659; (Labor Congress Rep.) 4815; (O.C.'s, collection) 3658; (Quebec Debates, 1888, 1889, 1890) 4791; (Science, N.W.T.) 4167 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (O'Brien's claim) 4042 (ii); (Que. River Police) 2018 (i); (*Sir James Douglas*, steamer to replace) 4779 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Drill Shed, Brantford) 4705 (ii). Harbors and Rivers, 1631 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 3657 (ii),
Territorial Accounts, 4254 (ii).
Supply (B. 158) Res. rep. from Com. on Ways and Means, 4916; 1°, 2°, 3°, 4917 (ii).
Tariff, The, extension of Free List (Ans.) 403 (i).
Three per cent. Loan of 1888 (Ans.) 27 (i).
Trade Relations with U.S. (remarks) 2314 (i).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 377, 382 (i).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 2531; Res., 2552.
—— The Tariff, in Com., 3081, 3225, 3233, 3461, 3523, 3725; M. for 2° of Res., 3776; 4880, 4910 (ii).
—— on relevancy of Amt., 3779 (ii).

Freeman, Mr. J. N., *Queen's, N.S.*
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1848 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 434 (i.)

Freeman, Mr. J. N.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3946 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2366 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S.) 1647 (i).
Ways and Means— The Tariff, in Com., 3110, 3271, 3734 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 2379 (i).
Tourigny, Mr., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2377.
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 589 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1250, 1853 (i).
——— on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
Canteens, Fredericton (remarks) 3078 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4486 (ii).
Flag's Cove Breakwater, erection (Ques.) 1795 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4105.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 2371; (Protection service) 2375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1454 (i). Telegraphs, 4773 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3149, 3248, 3391, 3421, 3529, 3589, 3746 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., completion (Ques.) 2671 (ii).
——— Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 2378 (i).
Buoys in St. Lawrence River, Contract (Ques.) 2185 (i).
Great Eastern Ry., on M. for Pets., &c., 144 (i).
I.C.R., St. Jean Chrysostome Siding (M. for Pets., &c. *) 530 (i).
——— Station at Lévis, Property Sold for extension (M. for Stmnt.*) 531 (i).
Lévis P.O., Pets. *re* erection (Ques.) 506 (i).
Loans, Public, negotiations (Ques.) 4589 (ii).
Ste. Croix Floating Light (Ques.) 2021 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2291 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1116 (i).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4759 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2078 (i).
——— reprint of documents, &c., *re* investigation (M.) 2185 (i).
——— (M.) to summon Senator Macpherson, 2311 (i).
Priv. and Elects. Com. (M.) to employ Shorthand Writer, 2098 (i).

Girouard, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elects. Com.'s Rep. *re* ex-Member for Lincoln (presented) 4397 (ii).
——— 1st Rep. (M. to conc.) 4730 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4878 (ii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Chinese Immigration, repeal of Act (Ques.) 68 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Nanaimo and Vancouver Mail Service (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
Ry. Lands in Vancouver, Squatters' Rights (Ques.) 274 (i).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, B.C., on M. for Pets., &c., 138 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Monuments, &c.) 4651 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 4738. Dredging, 4729 (ii).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4378; on Sen. Amts., 4930 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1847 (i).
Eggs, Imports and Exports to and from Ont. and Que. (M. for Ret.*) 3693 (ii).
Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 1122 (i).
Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 72 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2708 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3088 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 2251 (i).
——— Allan's Contract (remarks) 3519 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
Berthier County Mail Service, on M. for Pets., 529 (i).
Bliss' Patent Letter Box (Ans.) 2827 (ii).
Crane Island Mail Service (Ans.) 121 (i).
Crow Harbor Postmaster (Ans.) 400 (i).
English Periodicals, Cost of Mailing (Ans.) 1857, 1919 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural (prop. Res.) 1402 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1189 (i).
Gaspé County Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 194 (i).
Greer, James, appointment as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
Little Dover P.O., on M. for Pets., &c., 94 (i).
Malbaie and Tadousac Mail Service (Ans.) 275 (i)
Maple Hill P. O. (Ans.) 27 (i).
Maritime Provinces, delay of Mails, 1582 (i).
Megantic County Mail Service, on M. for Pets., 1148 (i).
Montreal P.O. Drop Boxes (Ans.) 3512 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Moreau, Elie, payment of Account, 1797 (i).
Nanaimo and Vancouver Mail Service (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
New Canaan, establishment of P.O. (Ans.) 563 (i).
New York Mercury, circulation in Dom. (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
Otter, Steamship, and Mail Service (Ans.) 123 (i).
Oyster Ponds P.O., on M. for Cor., 93 (i).
Palmer Road Chapel P.O. (Ans.) 92 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 519 (i).
Pembroke P.O. Robbery, on M. for Ret., 159 (i).
Penny Postage (Ans.) 4762 (ii).
Petit Cascapedia Savings Bank (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
Pierreville P.O., on M. for Ret., 517 (i).
Postmaster Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 69 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2256 (i).
Quebec P.O., Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O. C.'s, &c., 61 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Pet. *re* increase of salaries (Ans.) 187 (i).
——— additional Appointments (Ans.) 562 (i).
Read and Shannonville Mail Service, on M. for Ret., 1488 (i).
Registered Letters, reduction of Fees (Ans.) 1122 (i).
——— Fees and Guarantees (Ans.) 2022 (i).
Returns, incomplete P. O. (remarks) 394 (i).
Rimouski Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1064 (i).
Ste. Angèle de Merici Mail Service (Ans.) 561 (i).
St. Edmond, erection of P.O. (Ans.) 92, 401 (i).
St. Edouard Mail Service, on M. for Pets., &c., 1680 (i).
St. Rosaire P. O. (Ans.) 400 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 177, contingencies, 472 (i); Finn, M., re-appointment, 4574 (ii); (Sec. of State) contingencies, 465 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2288 (i), 4794; (C.P.R., service) 4155; (defalcations, Kingston) 4163; (salaries, &c., Halifax) 4153 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2146 (i).
Superannuation, 1315 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3864, 3881, 4079, 4284 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., *North Perth.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1231; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1249 (i).
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2232 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3836; in Com., 4393 (ii).
Banks, Chartered, in Liquidation, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 76 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 2251 (i).

Hesson, Mr. S. R.—*Continued.*
Can. Cable Co.'s incorp. (B. 41, 1°*) 184 (i).
Dunnville Dam, damages at Loomis Creek (Ques.) 2021 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 417 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 328 (i).
——— and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1501 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1053 (i).
Grain Tester, prop. Change (Ques.) 4399½ (ii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary language, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 2567 (ii).
Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Ry. incorp. (B. 78, 1°*) 561 (i).
Public Accounts and Auditor General's Rep. (M. to ref. to Standing Com.) 184 (i).
——— Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2705; on M. for 3°, 3320 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 717 (i).
Civil Govt. (Finance) contingencies, 4573 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2429 (i); (expenses) 3650 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Judge's salary, P.E.I., Admiralty Court) 3996, 4576 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (salaries) 709 (i).
Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1326 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 4003 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2787; (personal explanation) 2861 (ii).
——— in Com., 3267, 3751, 4484 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 156) M. to suspend Rules, 4822; Rules suspended and 1° of B., 4846 (ii).

Hickey, Mr. C. E., *Dundas.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3944 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1787 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1802 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2465 (i).
Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 28, 1°*) 104 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B., on M. for 3° (Amt.) 6 m.h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 93) 3321 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4861 (ii).
Timber Limits, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545; Amt., 4554; wthdn., 4559 (ii).

Holton, Mr. F., *Chateauguay.*

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4506 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 981 (i).

Hudspeth, Mr. A., *South Victoria, Ont.*

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1216 (i).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i).
Imperial Trust Co. of Can. incorp. Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 159 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 21, 1°*) 104 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1285 (i).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*

"A" Battery, Officers' Quarters (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Cattle Disease in Western States (Ques.) 85 (i).
Chicago World's Fair, Can. Representation (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1262.
Dom. Voters' Lists, Revision (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4658.
Voters' Lists (1889) printed outside of Printing Bureau (M. for Ret.*) 29 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying, development) 2399; (*Patent Record*) 497; (Health Statistics) 502 (i).
Civil Govt. (Printing Bureau, cleaning) 475 (i).
Dominion Police, 496(i).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2249 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (i).
Criminal Law Act Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1015 (i).
Hereford Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) Rule suspended, 4396; (1°*) 4397 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1875 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4108.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3747 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 7, 1°) 26; 2° m., 1220; in Com., 1221 (i).
Fish-breeding Establishment (Ques.) 85 (i).
Gaspé County Mail Service (M. for Cor., &c.) 193 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G., *Halifax.*

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1071 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1022 (i).
——— Contracts, 3519 (ii).
——— Anderson's Contract (remarks) 3440 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2247 (i); in Com., 3956, 4075 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries (remarks) 886 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1079, 1414 (i).
Customs Collectors, Instructions, on Adjnmt. (remarks) 4083 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4485 (i).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1794 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3191 (ii).
Fisheries Question and negotiations at Washington (Ques.) 1021 (i).
Fishermen's Safety (B. 96, 1°) 1198 (i); on Order for Com., 2710; M. for Com., 3325; 2° m., 4440 (ii).
Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4569 (ii).
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1498 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1185 (i).
——— Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3946 (ii).
Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 4267 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 3153 (ii).
I. C. R. and C. P. R. Freight Rates (Ques.) 2024 (i).
I. C. R. Freight Charges on Coal (Ques.) 1796 (i), 4503 (ii).
——— amended Tariff, 3078 (ii).
——— Pig Iron rates (Ques.) 2828 (ii).
——— Tariff of Rates, change (Ques.) 2379 (i).
——— Tenders for Supplies (Ques.) 1796 (i).
Jamaica, Govtl. relations with (remarks) 1201 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1097 (i).
Military College, Students' Marks, on M. for Ret., 1026 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1132 (i).
Modus Vivendi (remarks) 814 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 2043 (i).
Port Arthur Harbor, &c. (dredging, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1096 (i).
Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4099.
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1557 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Smith, late Mr. Justice, N.S., Cor. *re* leave of absence (M. for Ret.) 1681 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 1692 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2398; (Experimental Farms) 716 (i)), 3800 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Maintenance) 3867 (ii). Customs, 1420. Excise (salaries, &c.) 2321. Post Office, 2289 (i). Railways (I.C.R., Repairs) 3802; (P.E.I.) 4136 (ii). Weights and Measures (McDonell's salary) 2343 (i).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2351, 2370 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2449 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 487 (i); (Judge's salary, P.E.I.) 3996 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (Miscellaneous, Printing, &c.) 715; (salaries) 704. Senate (Miscellaneous) 703 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 1973, 2002 (i); conc., 4275 (ii); (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1958; (St. John and Annapolis) 1973; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1316; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1267 (i); (Contingencies) 4012 (ii); (Military College) 1339 (i), conc., 4273 (ii); (Ordnance, Rifled) 1335 (i).
Miscellaneous (O'Brien, Jotham) conc., 4277 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018 (i); (Tidal Observations) 4041 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1096; (Que.) 1103 (i). *Income*—Buildings (Conservatories) 1470; (Major's Hill Park) 1466; (N.S.) 1106, 1448. Dredging (N.S.) 1631, 1637. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1515; (Miscellaneous) 1651 (i), 4167 (ii); (N.S.) 1568; (Que.) 1616. Telegraph Lines, 1648 (i).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton Ry., 1932 (i), 4019 (ii). Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021. I. C. R. (Dartmouth Branch) 4014 (ii); (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1920; (Rolling Stock) 1929 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i); (St. Charles Branch) 4014 (ii).
Superannuation, 1309 (i).
Supreme Court, filling Vacancy (Ques.) 885 (i).
Trawl Fishing in St. Mary's Bay (Ques.) 2377 (i).
Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1267 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2829 (ii).
——— in Com., 3081, 3262, 3393, 3503, 3560 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 2250 (i), 3518 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3829; in Com., 3891, 4080, 4383, 4418, 4526.
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1086, 1411 (i).
Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2915; (remarks) 2673 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4447 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1098 (i).
Merchant's Shipping Acts, Imp. Legislation (remarks) 2382 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1299 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1819, 2036 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4351 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4101 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Smith, late Mr. Justice, on M. for Ret., 1694 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 3806; (P.E.I.) 4145 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Magdalen Islands) 1953 (i); (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 1980 (i); (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1959; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
Militia (Military Properties, &c., care of) 1335 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1098 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Military College, Kingston) 4704 (ii); (N.S.) 1107. Dredging (N. S.) 1635. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1568 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, 2019 (i).
Rys.—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1921 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2930 (ii).
——— in Com., 3283, 3496, 3561 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A. *Guysborough.*
Crow Harbor Postmaster (Ques.) 400 (i).
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4446 (ii).
Fish Commission, Cost, in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
Little Dover P.O. (M. for Pets., &c.) 94 (i).
Lobster Fishing Regulations (Ques.) 885 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction (Ques.) 402 (i).
Oyster Ponds P.O. (M. for Pets. and Cor.) 93 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1817 (i).
Ry. Communication with Eastern N.S. (remarks) 3324 (ii).
Salmon Fishing with Nets (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3794 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (salaries, &c.) 2323 (i). Rys. (I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 3806; (P.E.I.) 3809 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 2352 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2434 (i).
Indians (N.S.) Medical services, 4052 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1971 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1454. Dredging (N.S.) 1639. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1615; (N.B.) 1612 (i).
Superannuation, 1306 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3466, 3561 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3879, 3960, 4277, 4373 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 115, 344, 1413, 1520 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4408 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Payment (remarks) 4932 (ii).
C. P. R. Act (1889) Amt. (B. 56, 1°*) 342 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (personal explanation) 392 (i).
Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 121, 1°*) 1936 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1045 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3631 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2050, 2097 (i).
Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2690 (ii).
Private Bills, suspension of Rules (M.) 1936 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4370 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1319; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1320 (i); (Military College) conc., 4273 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3090 (ii).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).

Labrosse, Mr. S., *Prescott.*
Indemnity to Members, &c., increased (Ques.) 4907 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4851 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Annapolis P. O., purchase of Site (Ques.) 2229 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4300, 4416, 4526 (ii).
Baltic, Outrage on Steamer (Ques.) 186, 1858 (i).
——— (remarks) 3079, 4028 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 106 (i).
Bliss' Patent Letter Box (Ques.) 2827 (ii).
Cape Crocker Indians, Annuity paid (Ques.) 505.
Corinth P.O. (remarks) 94 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) 195; neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 211 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4498 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Disallowance of Provincial Bills since Confed., &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 28 (i).
English Periodicals, Cost of Mailing (Ques.) 1856, 1918 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 332 (i).
Goderich and Strathroy P.O., Tenders (Ques.) 2377 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2184 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Regulations (M. for copy) 145 (i).
Indians, Selling Liquor to (M. for Ret.*) 29 (i).
Iroquois Lockmaster, Superannuation (Ques.) 3077 (ii).
Legal Services, Sums paid to Firms in Peterborough (Ques.) 1199, 1484 (i).
Malt, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) 516 (i).
Maple Hill P.O. (Ques.) 27 (i).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 229, 372 (i).
Paul, Peter, expenses of Trial (Ques.) 505 (i).
Peterborough Public Buildings, Expenditure (Ques.) 1366 (i).
Postmasters in Rural Districts (salaries) on M. for Ret., 93 (i).
Private Bills, suspension of Rule (M.) 60, 1936 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2257 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).
Registered Letters, Fees and Guarantees (Ques.) 2022 (i).
——— Reduction of Fees (Ques.) 1121 (i).
Reuter's Telegraph Agency (Ques.) 145 (i).
Sawdust in Ottawa River, Sandford Fleming's Rep. (M. for copy*) 1065 (ii).
Saw Logs, rebate of Duty (Ques.) 3662 (ii).
Seed Corn, Duty on (Ques.) 2829 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4853 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2391.
Civil Govt. (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 223; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 216; (Postmaster General) 178; (Privy Council) contingencies, 224; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 466; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 372; (Railways and Canals) 181 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (additional pay) 4153 (ii). Excise (salaries, &c.) 2319 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). Post Office, 2297 (i); (defalcations, Kingston) 4166 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2141 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2426 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4048 (ii).
Militia (Estate R. S. King, rent, &c.) 4159 (ii); (Military Properties, &c., care of) 1336 (i).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058; (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4703 (ii).
Superannuation, 1306 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4907, 4910 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
Vollett, Robert, expenses of Trial (Ques.) 27 (i).
Voters' Lists, Receipt of (Ques.) 3724 (ii).
——— Revision, reprinting (remarks) 2381 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3081, 3114, 3146, 3222, 3407, 3464, 3503, 3585, 4481 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Inspection Fees (Ques.) 1121 (i).

Landry, Mr. P. A., *Kent, N.B.*
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 769 (i).
Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1621 (i).
Moncton and P.E.I. Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 64, 1°*) 342 (i).

Langelier, Mr. C., *Montmorency.*
Cavalry School, Que., Officers' promotion (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
Drill Hall, Montreal, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 883 (i).
French Language in N.W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 949 (i).
Govt. Steamers, carriage of private Merchandise (Ques.) 504 (i).
Imperial Federation Association and Govt. Employés (Ques.) 886 (i).
Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 884 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Quebec Centre.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3854, 3888, 4278 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 106, 1093 (i).
C. P. R. and North Shore Ry. Debentures (M. for Cor.) 55 (i).
Cullers' Office, Quebec, Superannuations (M. for O.C., &c.) 66 (i).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2915 (ii).
Gareau, Joseph, Appointment and Removal (M. for Cor., &c.*) 66 (i).
I. C. R. Passenger and Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 146 (i).
Land Slide at Quebec (M. for O. C.) 63 (i).
Lépine, L. P., Appointment as Supt. of Govt. Works (M. for Cor.*) 66 (i).
Marine and Emigrant Hospital, Quebec, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 75 (i).
——— (M. for O.C., &c.*) 66 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminus Co.'s incorp. (B. 97, 1°*) 1019 (i).
Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 1582 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
Quebec P.O., Superannuations (M. for O.C.) 60 (i).
St. Sauveur Fire and "B" Battery (Ques.) 1200 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2387 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2293 (1).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2404, 2421 (i).
Indians (Surveys) 2162 (i).
Miscellaneous (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4115 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1099. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 1112 (i).

Langevin, Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Annapolis P.O., on M. for Ret., 254 (i).
——— purchase of Site (Ans.) 2229 (i).
——— Public Building, on M. for Cor., 3689 (ii).
Ash Wednesday, Adjnmt. (M.) 794 (i).
Bell Creek Harbor, Survey and Reps. (Ans.) 2377 (i), 2669 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, on informality of Procedure (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on Order for resuming adjnd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1508 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
Cascapedia River, Great, Bridge (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
Carlton Point, North (P. E. I.) Survey (Ans.) 1484 (i).
Collingwood Harbor, Expenditure (Ans.) 1655 (i).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
Debates, Official, Accommodation for Staff, 3724.
Derby Branch Ry. extension, on M. for Cor., 516 (i).
Dionne, Jos., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 2023.
Dundas and Waterloo Macadam Road (Ans.) 68.
——— on M. for Ret., 152 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (M.) 2914 (ii).
Elbow River Water Power Co.'s B. 76 (M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c.) 1019 (i).
Escoumains, proposed Wharf (Ans.) 274 (i).
Esquimalt Dry Dock, enlargement (Ans.) 1120.
Fisheries and *Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 2916 (ii).
Fertilisers, Artificial, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) to remove Duty, 1811 (i).
Flag's Cove Breakwater, erection (Ans.) 1795 (i).
Floods in Laprairie (Ans.) 884 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 267 (i).
French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 600 (i).
Goderich and Strathroy P. O., Tenders (Ans.) 2377 (i).
Tenders for Repairs (Ans.) 84 (i), 3154 (ii).
Govt. Business (M.) to take in Thursdays, 794 (i).
——— on M. for Adjnmt. (remarks) 1511 (i).
Govt'l. Expenditures in Ottawa (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2181 (i).
Hall's Harbor (N.S.) on M. for Reps., &c., 2032.
Hereford Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4499 (ii).

Langevin, Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Isle au Noix Wharf, construction (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 2210 (i).
Indian Advancement Act B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on Order for 2°, 1507 (i).
I. C. R., Freight Rates on Flour (Ans.) 248 (i).
——— Passenger and Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 146 (i).
Kamouraska Wharf, Building, on M. for Ret., 99.
Land Damages, Yamaska County, on M. for Cor., 530 (i).
Legal Services, Payments (Ans.) 246 (i).
Lévis P. O., Pets. *re* erection (Ans.) 506 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on resuming adjd. deb. (remarks) 1936; (M.) for special Order, 1937 (i).
McKinack River Works (Ans.) 4172 (ii).
Maine Central Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4499 (ii).
Miminegash Breakwater, repairs (Ans.) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
Miminegash (Little) Harbor Survey (Ans.) 2022.
Montreal Harbor Commission, abolition (Ans.) 401 (i).
——— Improvements (Ans.) 884 (i), 2914; (remarks) 3077 (ii).
Nicolet, construction of Piers (Ans.) 4588 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4468 (ii).
Ottawa (new) Deptl. Building Expenditure (Ans.) 1859 (i).
Picton Harbor, Dredging, &c., on M. for Cor., 2193 (i).
——— Rep. of Engineer (Ans.) 2186 (i).
Post Offices, erection (Ans.) 1485 (i).
Prieur, Arthur, employment as Translator (Ans.) 2022, 2185 (i).
Printing Com. (M. to add name) 1651 (i).
——— (9th Rep.) on M. to conc., 4929 (i).
Private Bills, Reps. from Coms., extension of Time (Ms.) 1198 (i), 2531, 3540 (ii).
——— B's. 155 and 156 (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4906 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).
Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 212 (i).
Quebec Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
——— on reading of Telegram, 4564 (ii).
——— article in *Le Canadien* (remarks) 4827 (ii).
——— papers, &c. (Ans.) 4907 (ii).
——— alleged Irregularities (remarks) 4935 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3327 (ii).
Rainy River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 60 (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for 2°, 531 (i).
Revising Officer, Champlain (Ans.) 2022 (i).
Rimouski Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1064 (i).
Saguenay River, Winter Crossing (Ans.) 274 (i).
Seed Barley, distribution (remarks) 1510 (i).
Select Standing Com. (Rep. presented) 30 (i).

Langevin, Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 92 (i).
St. Louis River Public Works (Ans.) 245 (i).
——— erection of Piers (Ans.) 401 (i).
——— (N.B.) completion of Wharf (Ans.) 506 (i).
St. Michel Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 246 (i).
St. Peter's Bay, Survey for Wharf (Ans.) 247 (i).
Sessional Indemnity (Res.) 4935 (ii).
Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce, M. to add name, 91 (i).
——— Rys. (M. to add name) 1651 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4368 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4889 (i).
Summerside Harbor, Breakwater (Ans.) 121, 247 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2397 (i).
Civil Govt. (Public Works) contingencies, 470 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Telegraph Lines, 3872 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2449 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (salaries) 704 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (N.S.) 4915; (Ottawa) 4913 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1105; (Que.) 1100; (Ont.) 1095; (N.B.) 1098. *Income:* Buildings, 1443; (B.C.) 1443; (Conservatories) 1468 (i); (Drill Shed, Brantford) 4706 (ii); (Gas, &c., Ottawa) 1465; (Man.) 1439 (i), 4038 (ii); (N.B.) 1111 (i), 4700 (ii); (N.S.) 1109, 1444, (i), 4056, 4699 (ii); (N.W.T.) 1440 (i), 4039, 4719 (ii); (Ont.) 1437 (i), 4036, 4702; (Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa) 4696; Govt. Printing Bureau) conc. 4274 (ii); (Heating, &c.) 465; (Removal of snow) 1464; (Telephone) 1465; (Que.) 1112 (i), 4036, 4702 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 1455. Dredging (Man.) 1648: (N.S.) 1643. Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1630 (i), 4739, (dredging) 4729 (ii); (Man., repairs, &c.) 1627: (Mar. Provs.) 1615 (i), 4040; (Miscellaneous) 4167 (ii); (N.B.) 1610; (N.S.) 1568 (i), 4721 (ii); (Ont.) 1617 (i), 4727, conc., 4275 (ii); (P.E.I.) 1571 (i), 4723 (ii); (Que.) 1616 (i), 4727; (Repairs, &c.) 4166 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 1651; (Major's Hill Park) 1465; (Surveys and Inspections) 1651. Roads and Bridges, 1649 (i), 4766 (ii). Telegraph Lines, 1648 (i), 4041, 4772 (ii).
Tadousac Wharf, Sum for completion (Ans.) 274 (i).
Telegraph, North Shore St. Lawrence (Ans.) 4762 (ii).
Thames River dredging, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4895 (ii).
——— removal of Bar (Ans.) 55 (i).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. *Hesson*) on M. for 1°, 4846 (ii).
Wrecking and Towing in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Order for 2°, 146 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 433 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Sen. Amts., 4666 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Continued.*
French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 51; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 983 (i).
Indian Reserves in Man. (M. for List) 514 (i).
Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°*) 794 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4454 (ii).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3714 (ii).
Land Claims under Man. Act (prop. M. wthdn.) 514 (i).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4682 (ii).

Laurie, Lieut.-Gen. J. W., *Shelburne.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 4412 (ii).
Canada and Treaties of Commerce, communications between H.M.'s Govt. and Dom. Govt. (M. for copies) 3666 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4445 (ii).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1048 (i).
Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1667 (i).
Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4003, 4646 (ii).
Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3351 (ii).
Newfoundland Harbor Fees, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4893 (ii).
Personal explanation *re* par. in *Globe*, 3197 (ii).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1814 (i).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3716 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4879 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2394 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2289 (i).
Fisheries (Protection) 4782 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 2360 (i).
Geological Survey, 2141 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2420 (i).
Legislation (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4004 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and West Indies and S. America) 2012; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1960; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (1).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1320; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1325 (i); (Monuments) 4652 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S.) 1642 (i).
Rys.—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1927 (i).
Treaties of Commerce, Comms. between H. M.'s Govt. and Dom. Govt. (M. for copies) 3666 (ii).

Laurie, Lieut.-Gen. J. W.—*Continued.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2845 (ii).
——— in Com., 3287, 3396, 3587 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Address, on the, 13 (i).
Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4560.
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1231 (i).
——— procedure, 2202 (i).
——— on M. to print extra copies, 2911 (ii).
American Freight in Bond (M. for O.C.'s, &c.) 99 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service and Messrs. Anderson (M. for Cor.) 100, 1021 (ii).
——— on M. for Cor., 1022 (i).
Ballot Boxes, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2231 (i).
——— on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656 (ii).
Baltic, Steamer, Outrage (remarks) 4027 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on Sen. Amts., 4930 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, papers respecting (Ques., 30 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c. B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 116; on M. for Com., 343 (i).
Bremner Furs, Payment (remarks) 4933 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 4759 (ii).
See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1385; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1400 (i).
——— on Order for resuming adjd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1508; (remarks) 1517.
——— Precedence (M.) 1654 (i).
——— on presentation of Rep. of Com., 3810 (ii).
BUDGET, The, &c., Delay (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1937; (Amt.) 1940; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1950 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 637, 1511 (i), 3875, 4505 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4427 (ii).
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy for Bridge, on M. for Stmnt., 3665 (ii).
Cardin, Elphège and Jean, Claims for Damages to Lands (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
Caughnawaga Indians, Indemnity for encroachments on Reserve, on M. for Cor., 1709 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2714 (ii).
Corn, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3165; (remarks) 3368 (ii).
——— drafting Amts. (remarks) 3455 (ii).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1262 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4582 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to M. for 2°, 2218(i)
——— (remarks) *re* Vote of Member, 2228 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2596, 2671, 2674, 2741, 2915 (ii).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
Fish Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 213 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 262 (i).
——— and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1493 (i).
——— Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 3196; in Com., 3900; on M. for 3°, 3937; on Sen. Amts., 4664 (ii).
Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4568 (ii).
Freight in Bond on American Vessels (M. for O.C.'s, &c.) 99 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 53, 54; (remarks) *re* 2°, 160; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2°, 725; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1012 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 2228, 2250 (i).
——— on M. to take in Thursdays, 794, 1066 (i).
Half-breeds' Claims, and Res. of Leg. Assembly, N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3310 (ii).
Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1679 (i).
Hereford Ry. B. 147 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4503.
Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 155 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. to suspend Rules, 4821 (ii).
Hull, Religious disturbances (remarks) 394, 510 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on Order for 2°, 1507 (i); on M. for 2°, 2725 (ii).
——— B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3604; in Com., 3625, 4034 (ii).
I.C.R., Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 1357 (i).
——— Steel Rails, purchase (Ques.) 2021 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3156; in Com., 3158 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on proposed Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4226 (ii).
Kent (N. B.) representation, Issue of Writ, 3591.
Land Damages in Yamaska County (M. for Cor.) 530 (i).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4646 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on Ques. of Priv., 451 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 723 (i).
——— on additional documents, 812 (i).
——— on consdn. of documents presented, 1476.
——— on further Cor., 1654 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2059, 2097 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 132 (i).
Lonely Island Lighthouse (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
Maybee, Miss, on M. for Cor., 2188 (i).
Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4927 (ii).
Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 70 (i).
Ministers' Salaries and Expenses, on M. for Ret., 103 (i).
Modus Vivendi. See "U.S."
Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2687 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3355 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for Cor., 59.
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4450; in Com., 4469 (ii).
N. W. T., Res. of Leg. Assembly *re* Moneys voted by Parlt. (M. for Ret.*) 104 (i).
Pagans in Joliette County, on M. for Ret., 513 (i).
Perley, late Mr., remarks on decease, 2740 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2258 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1868 (i).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1533 (i).
Quebec Harbor Improvements, Article in *Le Canadien*, 4827 (ii).
——— Papers, &c. (Ques.) 4907 (ii).
Quebec P. O., Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O. C.'s, &c., 62 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for Com., 3325 (ii).
Religious disturbances in Hull, 394, 510 (i).
St. Germain, Bruno, Claims for damages to Land (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
St. Sauveur, Fire, application for Aid (Ques.) 1121(i)
Saskatchewan Provisional District, Populations by Origin (M. for Stmnt.*) 1065 (ii).
Savings Banks, Quebec, B. 154 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4847 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4106.
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 4359; in Com., 4360; on M. for 3°, 4402 (ii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserves, B.C. (M. for Pets., &c.) 137 (i).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch (Ques.) 399, 505.
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1533; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566 (i).
Speaker, Deputy, and Chairman of Coms., on M. to appoint, 32 (i).
Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce (remarks) 91 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3187 (ii).
Subsides (Land) to Rys., on prop. Res., 4824 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4849 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY: On M. for Com., 161 (i), 4499 (ii); in Com.:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 2383.
Civil Govt. (Interior) contingencies, 381 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2295 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4259 (ii).
Fisheries, 4041 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2513 (i).
Legislation (French Translators, extra pay) 4008 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Canada and United Kingdom) 4774.
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1276 (i); (R. S. King, Estate, &c.,) 4899 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Bow River Lumber Co.'s Costs) 4060; (Half-breeds, N. W. T.) 4069; (Le Vieux Lachine) 4791; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 4059; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4069 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 4650 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468; (N.S.) 1109 (i), 4696; (Que.) 4036, 4702. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4723 (ii); (Que.) 1616 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4015 (ii).
Timber Limits, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4558 (ii).
Tonnancourt, Geo., Claims for damages to Land (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3594 (ii).
Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3082, 3472, 3730 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. *Hesson*) on M. to suspend Rules, 4823; on M. for 1°, 4846 (ii).
Yamaska River Dam, Claims for damages to Land (M. for copy*) 1065 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4590; neg. on a div., 4595 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°) 1199 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 614 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1349 (i).
Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Convicts' punishment (Ques.) 1120, 2836 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3055 (ii).

Lépine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1247 (i).
Labor, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 3661 (ii).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4841 (ii).
Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 2914 (ii).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3709 (ii).

Lister, J. F., *West Lambton.*
A. D. C., appointment (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1233 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 344 (i).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4749 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-Breeds' Claims (M. for Sel. Com.) 1358, 1398 (i).
Civil Service, appointments of Professional Men without passing C.S. Exam., Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3693 (ii).
Erie and Huron Ry. Co.'s (B. 57, 1°*) 342 (i).
Fishing Licenses, Unsettled Returns (M. for Cor.*) 1065 (ii).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 294 (i).
Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 4268 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 155 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. to suspend Rules, 4822 (ii).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1283 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3604 (ii).
McGirr, William, Travelling Expenses (M. for Cor.*) 1065 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 4171 (ii).
Militia and Defence Dept., Promotions and Changes (M. for O.C.'s*) 3693 (ii).
——— Clothing Supplies, Tenders (Ques.) 3811.
——— Deptl. Sec., appointment (Ques.) 2670.
Mining Machinery, Importation (Ques.) 562 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1301 (i).
Powell, Col. Walker, resignation (Ques.) 562 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior) contingencies, 384; (Militia) contingencies, 380 (i).
Geological Survey, 2149 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2523 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 712. Senate (Miscellaneous) 701 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1283 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3640 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Deptl., Ottawa) 4698; (Ont.) 4710 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 380, 384 (i).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to suspend Rules, 4823 (ii).

Lovitt, Mr. J., *Yarmouth.*
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for Adjnmt., 2308 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 2251 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1526 (i).
Green Cove Breakwater, repairs (Ques.) 84 (i), 3154 (ii).
Newfoundland Harbor Fees, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4894 (ii).

Lovitt, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3190 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (St. Peter's) 4655 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Preventive Service) 2335 (i).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2370 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 712 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Grand Manan and Mainland) 1957; (Liverpool or London, and St. John and Halifax) 1960 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1615; (N.S.) 1568 (i), 4720. Telegraphs, 4772 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 2020 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3589 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., *Kingston.*
Address, on the, 22 (i).
Adjnmt. (M.) 4924 (ii).
Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4561 (ii).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1228, 1850; on procedure, 2195; on Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) 2206 (i).
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt. 2308 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 100, 1022 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4695 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 2378 (i).
——— completion (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2231 (i).
Baltic, Steamer, alleged Outrage (remarks) 3080.
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3991 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, construction, on M. for Ret., 517 (i).
——— enlargement (Ans.) 187 (i).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, papers respecting (Ans.) 30 (i).
——— Protection by U. S., 513, 725 (i).
——— (remarks) 886 (i).
——— on Telegram from Washington, 1068 (i).
——— negotiations at Washington (Ans.) 1201 (i), 4907 (ii). *See* "Fisheries."
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 343 (i).
Bremner Furs, payment (Ans.) 4931 (ii).
——— Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4756 (ii). *See* "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1388; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1399; (remarks) 1517 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 631, 2098 (i), 3874, 4504 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (prop. Res.) 4261, 4404; M. for Com. on Res., 4419; in Com., 4435; 1°* of B., 4440 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Cont'd.*
Can. and Jamaica, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1199 (i).
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy for Bridge, on M. for Stmnt., 3664 (ii).
C. P. R. Bridges in Bagot County, on M. for Pets., &c., 141 (i).
——— Telegraphic Rep. in *Mail re* stoppage of traffic through Maine, 1791 (i).
Can. Commissioners Abroad, on M. for Ret., 101 (i)
Cape Traverse Wharf, expenditure (Ans.) 2378.
Caraquet Ry. Co., Financial Aid (Ans.) 3723 (ii).
——— Earnings (Ans.) 3811 (ii).
Census, next Enumeration (Ans.) 402 (i).
Chambly and Longueuil Canal (Ans.) 401 (i).
Chicago World's Fair, Can. Representation (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Repeal of Act (Ans.) 68 (i).
Chisholm, late Mr., deceased (remarks) 3081 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2713 (ii).
Commercial Treaties with Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 3683 (ii).
Copyright Act (remarks) 4606 (ii).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) M. to adjn. deb., 392 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 451 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Letter of John Page, presented to Parlt. in Ret. (remarks) 1125 (i).
Criminal Law Act Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1855 (i).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
Disallowance of Provincial Bills, on M. for Stmnt., 29 (i).
——— Man. Municipal Acts (Ans.) 4906 (ii).
——— Power of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 4093.
Divorce Bills, introduction (remarks) 3324 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38, on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 2212; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Vote of Member, 2228 (i).
Dom. Voters' Lists, Revision (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Dunnville Dam, damages at Loomis Creek (Ans.) 2021 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2671, 2741 (ii).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural (B. 95, 1°*) 963 (i).
Fish Commissioners' Reps. (remarks) 395 (i).
Fisheries Question and negotiations at Washington (Ans.) 1021 (i), 4930 (ii).
——— Newspaper par. (remarks) 752 (i).
Fishermen in St. Lawrence, Licenses, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4570 (ii).
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1492 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Cont'd.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for 2°, 3721 (ii).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3940 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 53; (remarks) *re* 2°, 160; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2°, 745; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 890 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
Govt. Business (M.) to take in Mondays, 3937 (ii).
——— (M.) to take in Thursdays, 1066 (i).
——— (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 2241 (i).
Govt. Ry. Subsidies (Ans.) 4173 (ii).
Grain Elevator, Halifax (Ans.) 3291 (ii).
Grandin's Letter to Cardinal Taschereau (Ans.) 121 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2182 (i); in Com., 3230 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 2379 (i).
Half-breeds' Claims in N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3312 (ii).
Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1677 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 155 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. to suspend Rules, 4821 (ii).
Hudspeth, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 4831 (ii).
Hull, Religious disturbances (remarks) 394, 508.
Imperial Federation Association and Govt. Employés (Ans.) 886 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., increased (Ans.) 4907 (ii).
Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 1°, 68; on M. for 2°, 2211 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2733 (ii).
I. C. R. and C. P. R. Freight Rates (Ans.) 2024 (i).
——— accommodation at Bryanton (Ans.) 187 (i).
——— amended Tariff, 3078 (ii).
——— Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— Employés Wages, payment (Ans.) 1357.
——— Freight charges on Coal (Ans.) 1796 (i), 4503 (ii).
——— on Pig Iron (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
——— Passenger and Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 148 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 68, 1357 (i).
——— Steel Rails, purchase (Ans.) 2021 (i).
——— Tariff of Rates, change (remarks) 2379 (i).
——— Tenders for Supplies (Ans.) 1796 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 31 (i).
Iroquois, Lockmaster, Superannuation (Ans.) 3077 (ii).
Jamaica, Govtl. relations with (remarks) 1202 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, Ret. (Ans.) 1071 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Cont'd.*
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4647 (ii).
Legal Services, Amounts paid certain Firms (Ans.) 3292 (ii).
LeSueur, P., dual Income (Ans.) 400 (i).
Library of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 31 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 450 (i). *See* "Privilege."
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) *re* documents, 724 (i).
——— on presentation of additional documents, 813, 1095 (i).
——— Cor. (remarks) 1402 (i).
——— on consdn. of documents, 1475 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2097 (i).
Loans, Public, negotiations (Ans.) 4589 (ii).
Loyalty to Her Majesty, on Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 132 (i).
Lumber, Import Duties (Ans.) 4662 (ii).
——— Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3991 (ii).
Malt, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 516 (i).
Matane Branch Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 562 (i).
Maybee, Miss, dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2187 (i).
Message from His Ex. (presented) 275 (i).
Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4927 (ii).
Military College, Students' Marks, on M. for Ret., 1025 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on procedure, 1146 (i).
Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 70 (i).
Ministers' Salaries and Expenses, on M. for Ret., 102 (i).
Modus Vivendi (remarks) 532, 814 (i), 3076 (ii).
Mounted Police Commissioner, Res. from Leg. Assembly, N.W.T. (Ans.) 1485 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2685 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3352 (ii).
Newfoundland, admission to Confederation (remarks) 4927 (ii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1199 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for Cor., 60 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. Bill 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4460; in Com., 4466 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 2 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction (Ans.) 402, 505 (i).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 187 (i).
Peake's Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 118 (i.)
Perley, late Mr., remarks on decease, 2739 (ii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Employés (Ans.) 3722 (ii).
Portage la Prairie and Duck Mt. Ry. Co.'s B. 78 (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3322 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Cont'd.*
Printing of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 31 (i).
——— (6th Rep.) on M. to conc., 4660 (ii).
Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limits, 570, 576 (i).
Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2186 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).
Public Works, P.E.I. (remarks) 4830 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for Com., 3325; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3332 (ii).
Rys. (B. 151, 1°*) 4480; 2° m. and in Com., 4816.
Rys. and Canals, deptl. Rep. (presented) 1343 (i).
Ry. Communication in Eastern N.S. (remarks) 3324 (ii).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3704 (ii).
Ry. Statistics, delay in issuing (remarks) 3663 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 4658 (ii).
Ranches, N.W.T., List of applications, on M. for Ret., 1698 (i).
Religious disturbances in Hull (remarks) 304, 508.
St. Sauveur Fire, application for Aid (Ans.) 1121.
Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3321 (ii).
Scrip, Volunteers, &c., Rep. in ref. (Ans.) 1485 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) 3 (i).
——— Com. to prepare List (M.) 29 (i).
——— Rep. of Sp. Com. (M.) to conc., 33 (i).
Shawinegan Senatorial Division (Ans.) 27 (i).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch (Ans.) 399, 505 (i), 2674 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Snow Ploughs, "Rotary," Rep. *re* efficiency (Ans.) 1797 (i).
——— on Govt. Rys., purchase (Ans.) 1656 (i).
Speaker, Deputy, and Chairman of Coms. (M.) 32 (i).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 184 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) 4824 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (prop. Res.) in Com., 4762, 4848, 4896; 1°* of B. 157, 4898; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4917 (ii).
——— on M. for Ret., 69 (i).
SUPPLY—on M. for Com. (remarks) 4499 (ii); in Com.:
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 2275 (i); (St. Peter's) 4653 (ii): (Lachine) 2275; (Murray) 2277; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2273; (Tay) 2288 (i), 4653 (ii); (Trent River Nav.) 2280; (Welland) 2277 (i). *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 4913 (ii); (Chambly) 2288; (Lachine) 2288 (i), 4653; (St. Peter's) 4654; Welland) 4654 (ii).
Civil Govt. (C. S. Exams.) salaries, 220; (Privy Council) contingencies, 243; (Railways and Canals) 181 (i), 3779, Accountant's salary, 4570, contingencies, 3993, 4570; (Queen's Printer) salaries, &c., 3993 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (additional pay, &c.) 4152; (gratuities) 4150; (Maintenance, &c.) 3866.

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Cont'd.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Rys. (additional pay, &c.) 4793; Cape Breton, 3809; I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) 3803; P.E.I. 3809, 4135 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2405, 2431 (i), 4797; conc., 4916 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (French Translators) 4009; (Indemnity to Mr. J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canada and United Kingdom) 4775 (ii).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1269 (i); (contingencies) 4013; (R. S. King, Estate, &c.) 4901 (ii).
Miscellaneous (classification of Old Records) 4118; (Seed Grain collections) 4065 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2345 (i), 4053 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1086 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Military College, Kingston) 4704 (ii).
Rys.—Capital: C. P. R. (construction) 4013, 4653, conc., 4911. Cape Breton, 1932 (i), (construction) 4019 (ii). Eastern Extension (Mulgrave, increased accommodation) 1936 (i). I. C. R., (Dartmouth Branch) 4014; (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1951 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1928; (Moncton, increased accommodation) 1927 (i); (St. Charles Branch) 4013 (ii); (St. John, City Front) 1931 (i). Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021 (ii). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). Short Line Ry., 4796. *Income* (Gov. Genl.'s Car) 4021; (Surveys, &c.) 4021 (ii).
Tariff, The, rumored changes (remarks) 1070 (i).
Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2189 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4557 (ii).
Toronto University Conflagration (remarks) 1952.
Trent Valley Canal Bridge (remarks) 3703 (ii).
——— Commission (Ans.) 119 (i).
Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (i).
Valleyfield Dam, Public use (Ans.) 885 (i).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3697.
Welland Canal Commission, Mr. Wood's Rep. (Ans.) 885, 1515 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Disallowance, Man. Municipal Act (Ques.) 2377.
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 419 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 289 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2512 (i).
Superannuation, 1313 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2856 (ii).
——— in Com., 3233, 3406, 3487 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1370 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H.—*Continued.*
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
French Language in N. W. T., redistribution (remarks) 882 (i).
Homesteads in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3306 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1778 (i).
Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3339, 3361.
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., *re* Management, 2689 (ii).
Prince Albert, Settlers' Claims (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2420 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 2168; (Man. and N.W.T.) 2170, 2174.
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3645 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2347 (i).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Prorogation (closing remarks) 4937 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4513 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Acts (Ques.) 4906 (ii).
——— Provincial Bills, on M. for Stmnt., 28 (i).
French Language in N.W.T., M. to read Pets., 504 (i).
——— Ordinances, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 83 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) (B. 10, 1°) 38; (remarks) *re* 2°, 160; 2° m., 532; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2°, 835; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1016 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4455; in Com., 4472 (ii).
Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limits, 574 (i).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Cape Breton Ry., construction of Telegraph (M. for Ret.*) 3319 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1970 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3261 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4338 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
St. Peter's Canal, unpaid Labor (remarks) 3665 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: Eastern Extension, 1936 (i); Oxford and New Glasgow (Rolling Stock) 1934 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., *King's, P.E.I.*
Mackerel Fishing, Purse Seines and Gill Nets (M. for Pets., &c.) 248 (i).
St. Peter's Bay, Survey for Wharf (Ques.) 246 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2358, 2369 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1575 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Glover, Christiana Filman, Relief (B. 120, 1°) on a div., 3324 (ii).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4844 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1138 (i).

McKeen, Mr. D., *Cape Breton.*
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2818 (ii).
——— in Com., 3275 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Barley, Two-rowed, distribution and purchase (Ques.) 4172 (ii).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).
——— removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1606 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4495 (ii).
Fertilisers, Artificial (prop. Res.) 1811, 2024 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3915; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3947 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 337 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty (prop. Res.) 1029, 1041; neg. (Y. 59, N. 84) 1062 (i).
N.W.T. Surveys, Cost per Acre (Ques.) 402 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3330 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying development) 2401; (Experimental Farms) 715, 2383 (i), 3780, 4795 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2499 (i).
Civil Govt. (Sec. of State) contingencies, 461 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2878 (ii).
——— in Com., 3112, 3281, 3395, 3470, 3526, 3566, 3751 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. H., *Vaudreuil.*
Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co.'s (B. 59, 1°*) 342.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) M. to adjn. deb., 1853 (i).
——— on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2308 (i).
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4657 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3861, 3959, 4380 (ii).
Bank of Upper Canada (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1201 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1089 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4411 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Cab Hire, in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
Canadian Commissioners Abroad (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) 2° m., 2710 (ii).
Contractors' Cheques and Govt. Banks (Ques.) 27.
Corn, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1598 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3178 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4485 ; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4542 (ii).
Dead Letter Office and Registered Letters (M. for Ret.) 83 (i).
Deptl. Building (new) Ottawa, Expenditure (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to M. for 2°, 2219 ; (correction) 2225 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 303 (i).
Govt'l. Expenditures in Ottawa (Ques.) 1857 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1044 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2738 (ii).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage (remarks) 3198 (ii).
——— in Com., of Sup., 4003 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4644 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1785 (i).
Manufacturing Machinery, arrears of Duty (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
Members, imperfect hearing (remarks) 3878 (ii).
Ministers, &c., Expenses since Confederation (M. for Ret.) 70 (i).
——— Salaries and Expenses (M. for Ret.) 101 (i).
N. W. Council, Memorials, &c., *re* French Language (Ques.) 401 (i).
Order (Ques. of) 4557 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 187 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (M. for Ret.*) 29 (i).
Post Offices, erection (Ques.) 1484 (i).
Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4661 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
Registered Letters and Dead Letter Office (M. for Ret.) 83 (i).
Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 506 (i).
Returns incomplete (enquiry) 394 (i).
St. Rosaire Post Office (Ques.) 400 (i).
Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 15, 1°) 84 (i).
Savings Banks Deposits in Dom. (M. for Ret.*) 29 (i).
Seed Barley, Date of Arrival (Ques.) 1795 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2709 (ii).
Snow Ploughs on Govt. Rys., purchase (Ques.) 1656 (i).
——— "Rotary," Rep. *re* efficiency (Ques.) 1797.
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4850 (ii).
——— since Confed. (M. for Ret.) 69 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying development) 2402 ; (Experimental Farms) 715 ; (*Patent Record*) 497 (i) ; (Seed distribution) 4000 (ii) ; (Societies, N.W.T.) 2384 (i).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 2276 ; (Trent River Nav.) 2283 ; (Welland) 2277. *Income* (Chambly) 2288 (i).
Charges of Management, 162 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 179, contingencies, 473 ; (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 474 (i) ; (Queen's Printer) salaries, &c., 3992 ; (Finance) contingencies, 4572 (ii) ; (Fisheries) contingencies, 474 ; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 222 ; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 213 ; (Indian Affairs) 176, contingencies, 387 ; (Interior) 172, contingencies, 381 ; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) contingencies, 355 ; (Marine) 179 ; (Printing and Stationery) 170, contingencies, 244, 353 (i) ; (Post Office) Finn, M., re-appointment, 4574 (ii) ; (Public Works) contingencies, 472 (i) ; (Rys. and Canals) 3780 (ii) ; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 461 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Distillery Officers, extra pay) 2337 ; (Fréchette, payment for translation) 2339 ; (Preventive Service) 2336 ; (salaries) 2315 (i), 4792 (ii). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). Post Office, 2288. Weights and Measures (McDonell's salary) 2343 (i).
Immigration, 4850 (ii) ; (Agents' salaries) 2403 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 4044 (ii).
Legislation : H. of C. (contingencies) 712 ; (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii). Library (contingencies, salaries) 713. Senate (Miscellaneous) 700 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Can. and United Kingdom) 4779 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Seed Grain collections) 4062 ; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058 ; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4069 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4055 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 496 (i) ; (Man.) 3999 ; St. Vincent de Paul) 4650 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.B.) 1111 ; (N.S.) 1106 (i) ; (Ont.) 4036, 4702 (ii) ; (Que.) 1114, (i), 4036 ; (N.S.) 4036 (ii). Roads and Bridges, 4766 (ii).
Rys.—Capital : I.C.R. (Rolling Stock) 1928 ; (St. John, extension) 1931. Oxford and New Glasgow (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). Short Line Ry., 4796 (ii).
Superannuation (LeSueur, P.) 1304 ; (Wallace, R. W., allowance) 1290 (i).
Territorial Accounts, 4254 (ii).
Upper Canada Bank (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
Voters' Lists Revision, reprinting (remarks) 2380.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2745 (ii).
——— in Com., 3119, 3219, 3244, 3387, 3485, 3526, 3735 ; (Amt.) 3776 ; neg. (Y. 44, N. 85) 3776, 4481 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Baltic, Steamer, Outrage (remarks) 4027 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4663 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (presented) 4732, 4754 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 3810 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3875 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 3454; (Amt.) 3460 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1843 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt., to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 688 (i).
Printing Com.'s Rep. (9th) on M. to conc., 4929.
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4107.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 2374 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Can. and United Kingdom) 4778 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Health) 5002 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3484 (ii).

Madill, Mr. F., *North Ontario.*
Mississauga Indians, settlement of Claims (Ques.) 1656 (i).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 128, 1°*) 2594 (ii).
——— Rep. of Standing Com., on presentation, 2310 (i).
Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2915 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1126; (Amt. to Amt.) 1138; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 1144 (i).
South Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°*) 449.
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2472 (i).
Geological Survey, 2132 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 2166 (i).
West Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 68, 1°*) 449.

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*
Grain Tester, prop. change (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
Meat Imports (prop. Res. wthdn.) 123 (i).
Pork, &c., increase of Customs Duty (Ques.) 55 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3888 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1405, 1529 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 936 (i).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4820 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Protection) 4780 (ii).
Legislation: Library (salaries) 714 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3426; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3022 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Annapolis Public Building, on M. for Cor., 3690.
Privilege (Ques. of) Sale of Land to Govt., 1515.
Queen's Wharf, Govtl. Control (Ques.) 2828 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. No. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 1°, 32; on M. for 2°, 1239; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1259; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2205 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2249 (i); in Com., 3881, 3980, 4277, 4375.
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, protection by U.S., (remarks) 513 (i).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Con., 105, 347, 1405, 1528 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4404 (ii).
Bremner Furs, payment (remarks) 4931 (ii). *See* "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1388 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4425; in Com., 4433 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2715 (ii).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 456 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3380; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 3452 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Joncas*) in Com., 1221 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 412 (i).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3193 (ii).
Fish Commissioners' Reps. (remarks) 395 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3907; M. for 3°, 3948; (Amt.) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954; on Sen. Amts., 4666.
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1176 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 618 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4031 (ii).
Half-breeds' Claims, N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3313 (ii).
Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 2211 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2730 (ii).
——— B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3619; in Com., 3625 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4414 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Jesuits' Estates Act, Papers (remarks) 189 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4236 (ii).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4835; in Com., 4838 (ii).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4648 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on presentation of additional documents, 813 (i). *See* "Privilege."
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1749; (personal explanation) 1777.
Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4927 (ii).
Mining Machinery, on procedure, 1145 (i).
Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 74 (i).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 228, 360 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4462; in Com., 4466 (ii).
Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limits, 571 (i).
Public Expenditure (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).
Queen's Counsel, Appointments, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2119 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3187; in Com., 4362 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4686.
——— (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4848 (ii).
Sultana Island, sale, on M. for Ret., 140 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3792.
Civil Govt. (Customs) additional clerk, 4574 (ii); (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 215; (Indian Affairs) 174; (Interior) 171; (Postmaster General) 177; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 360; (Privy Council) contingencies, 228 (i), conc., 4272 (ii); (Sec. of State) contingencies, 468 (i).
Geological Survey, 2143 ().
Immigration, 4798 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2165; (Ont. and Que.) 2151; (Man. and N.W.T.) 2175 (i), 4045 (ii); (P.E.I.) 2164 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 478 (i); (Judge's salary, P.E.I.) 3998 (ii); (Librarian, Supreme Court) 480.
Legislation: H. of C. (Dep. Speaker's salary) conc., 4273; (Indemnity, J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii); (salaries) 708 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 2014 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1270 (i).
Miscellaneous (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4071 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1110; (N.W.T.) 1440 (i).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) 4013 (ii).
Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4909 (ii).
Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Dawson*) in Com., 3231 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3097, 3131, 3255, 3475, 3529, 3732 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1229, 1238, 1850; procedure, 2195; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2205 (i); on M. to print extra copies, 2913 (ii).
Annapolis, Sale of Land to Govt. (remarks) 1515 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts (remarks) 3521
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4695 (ii).
Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2230 (i).
——— on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3834; in Com., 3957, 4309, 4378, 4509 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Telegram from Washington (remarks) 1068, 1509 (i).
——— negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1201 (i), 4906 (ii). *See* "Fisheries."
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 105 (i); on Sen. Amts. 4265 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4757 (ii).
——— payment (remarks) 4932 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-Breeds' Claims, on order for rsmng. adjd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1509; (remarks) 1518 (i).
Budget, &c., Delay, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Business of the Hse., on prop. Res. to take in Wednesdays, 2229 (i).
——— (remarks) 3874, 4504 (ii).
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B., Rep. of Standing Com., on presentation, 2310 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3163; in Com., 3165, 3371; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. for 3°, 3443; (Amt.) 3447; neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4485 (ii).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2267 (i).
Debates, Official, accommodation for Staff, 3724; 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4588 (ii).
Derby Branch Ry., extension (M. for Papers, &c.) 514 (i).
Divorce Bills, introduction (remarks) 3324 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Joncas*) in Com., 1221 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3317 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2744, 2915 (ii).
Engineers (Steamboat) Licenses (remarks) 4924.
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
Extradition Treaty with U.S. (remarks) 3810 (ii).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3193; in Com., 3195 (ii).
——— Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
Fisheries and *Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 2916 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*
Fisheries, negotiations at Washington (remarks) 4930 (ii).
——— Newspaper par. (remarks) 752 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3902 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3939, 3942 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3952 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 325 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 887 (i).
Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 4268 ; in Com., 4271 (ii).
Govt. Business, to take in Thursdays, 794, 1067 (i).
——— on M. for adjnmt. (remarks) 1511 (i).
Govt. Ry. Subsidies (Ques.) 4172 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2183 (i) ; in Com., 3229, 3622 (ii).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4034 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 3151 ; in Com., 3627 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2826 (ii).
I. C. R., accommodation at Bryanton (Ques.) 187.
——— Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
Kent (N.B.) representation (remarks) 3440 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on M. to reprint documents, &c., *re* investigation, 2185 (i). *See* "Privilege."
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2056 (1).
Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 133 (i).
Maybee, Miss, on M. for Cor., 2188 (i).
Micmac Indians, Pet. *re* spearing Salmon (remarks) 4926 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 4170 (ii).
Militia Camp Ground at Moncton, 4926 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on procedure, 1146 (i).
Modus Vivendi with U.S. (remarks) 532, 814 (i), 2916, 3076 (ii). *See* "U.S. Fishing Vessels," "Fisheries.
Official Documents prevention of Disclosure B. 122 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) on M. for 2°, 3203 ; in Com., 3599 (ii).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828 (ii).
Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limit, 575 (i).
——— Ques. of (Mr. *Cockburn*) Loyalty to Her Majesty (remarks) 185 (i).
Provincial Govts. transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1513 (i).
Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 252.
Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3329 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*
Religious disturbances in Hull (M. to adjn. Hse.) 509 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4104.
Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 527 (i).
Smelt Fishing in the Miramichi (Ques.) 2229 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3189 ; in Com., 4368 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 184 (i).
——— to Rys., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4690 (ii).
——— (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4882 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income, 2288 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Customs (N.S.) 1422. Excise (salaries, &c.) 2314 (i). Rys. (P.E.I.) 4123 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2512 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4049 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 478. (Supreme Court Reps.) 481 (i). Judge's salary, P.E.I., 3998 (ii).
Militia (Estate R. S. King) 4158 ; (Military College) conc., 4273 ; (Monuments) 4651 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4057 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3999 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings, 1443 (i) ; (N.B.) 4700 (ii) ; (N.W.T.) 1440 ; (Que.) 1116. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1581 (i). Roads and Bridges, 4768 (ii).
Quarantine, 4001 (ii).
Railways—Capital : I.C.R., conc., 4912 (ii).
Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3200 (ii).
Trade Relations with U. S. (remarks) 2312 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 3153 ; on M. for 2°, 3594 ; in Com., 3598, 3877 (ii).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3696.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2917 (ii).
——— in Com., 3082, 3236, 3390, 3464, 3529, 3560, 3727, 4480 (ii).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *Lambton.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4390 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 349, 1418, 1526 (i).
Glover, C. F., Relief (B. 120) 2° agreed to (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 (ii).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2701 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 4712 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Dunnville Dam, Damages at Loomis Creek (Ques.) 2021 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3918 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2728 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2154; (B.C.) 2169 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3488 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1071 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) procedure, 2202 (i).
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2309 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3855, 3978, 4082, 4377, 4417, 4507 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 116, 352, 1078, 1414, 1528.
Caraquet Ry. Co.'s Earnings (Ques.) 3811 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3177 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1219 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4497 (ii).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2268 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 2223 (i).
Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2915 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3913; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3945; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3954; on Sen. Amts., 4666 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 576 (i).
Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4567 (ii).
Geological Survey, Instructions to Officers (M. for copies *) 1713 (ii).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1039 (i).
Hurrell and Valiquette Pensions (remarks) 2258.
Hurrell's Militia Pension (Ques.) 2378 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).
I. C. R., Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4595 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4249 (ii).
Loyalty to Her Majesty, prop. Address, 96, 123; agreed to (Y. 161, N. 0) 136 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 145, 1°) 4168 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation (Amt.) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1133 (i).
——— on procedure, 1147 (i).
Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2692 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3361 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4479 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language 2464 (i).
Priv. and Elec., Rep. of Com. *re* ex-Member for Lincoln, on M. to conc., 4730 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3325 (ii).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4816.
Seed Barley, distribution (remarks) 1510 (i).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1563.
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2709 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4370 (ii).
SUPPLY, on M. for Com. (remarks) 4499 (ii); in Com.:
Arts, Agriculture &c. (Dairying development) 2401 (i).
Civil Govt. (High Commissioner) contingencies, 216 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (gratuities) 4151; (maintenance, &c.) 3867 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2404 (i), 4808 (ii).
Justice (Judge, Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I.) 4578,
Legislation: H. of C. (French Translators, 4008; (Miscellaneous) express service, 4011 (ii).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1274 (i); (contingencies) 4012; (Estate R. S. King, 4162 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Legislation, N.W.T.) 2306 (i); (Seed Grain collections) 4060 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1450 (i); (Ont.) 4036 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 1461 (i). Harbors and Rivers (Miscellaneous) 4167 (ii).
Railways—Capital: Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017. *Income* (Gov. Gen.'s Car) 4022; (Surveys, &c.) 4021 (ii).
Territorial Accounts, 4254 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 129 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3160 (ii).
Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3203 (ii).
Toronto University, Conflagration (remarks) 1952,
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3082, 3125, 3235, 3245, 3435, 3542, 3737 (ii).

Neveu, Mr. H., *Joliette.*
Prieur, Arthur, amount paid as Translator of H. of C. (Ques. and M. for Ret.) 2185 (ii).
——— employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2922 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1397 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 455 (i).
Disallowance of Man. Acts (Ques.) 4906 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2673 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 545 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*
Grand Trunk Ry. B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2178 (i).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1273 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, Reps. and Opinions of Law Officers of Crown (M. for copies) 95 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2072 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4821 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4672.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3797.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2300 (i), conc., 4272 (ii).
Fisheries (protection) 4779 (ii).
Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2155 (i); (B.C.) 4044 (ii); (Surveys) 2157 (i); (Man. and N.W.T.) 4046 (ii).
Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1322; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1273 (i).
Miscellaneous (Customs, repairs, &c.) 4118; (L'Abbé Tanguay's Dictionary) 3659 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1618 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2853 (ii).
——— in Com., 3266, 3483 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W., *Brant.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4283 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 107, 1087, 1416, 1525 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4405 (ii).
Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 58, 1°*) 342 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3168 (ii).
Customs Duties, *per capita* (Ques.) 188 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3906; on M. for 3°, 3938; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3943 (ii).
——— and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1494 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal) 270 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1012 (i).
Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2734 (i).
——— B. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4905; on M. for 2°, 3617; in Com., 3625, 4034 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3628 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2079 (i).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2465 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1076 (i).
Reapers and Mowers, Self-binders, exported (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 720 (i).
Civil Govt. (Post Office) contingencies, 472; (Privy Council) contingencies, 230; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 462 (i).
Charges of Management, 166 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 2344. Excise (Methylated Spirits) 2341; (Preventive Service) 2335; (salaries, &c.) 2320 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4121; 4257 (ii). Weights and Measures (rent, &c.) 2344 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2424, 2504 (i), 4801 (ii).
Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2156 (i); (B.C.) 4789; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4788; (Ont.) Oneida, 4784 (ii); (Ont. and Que.) 2151; (Survey of Reserves) 2157 (i).
Legislation: Library (salaries) 714 (i).
Mounted Police, 2345 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Brantford Drill Shed) 4706 (ii); (Conservatories) 1473; (Ont.) 1437. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 404 (i). Roads and Bridges, 4772 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
——— in Com., 3085, 3139, 3218, 3469, 3494 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., *Essex.*
Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 26, 1°*) 104 (i).
Engineers' (Steamboat) Licenses (B. 139, 1°) 3512.
Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 135 (i).
McLaggan, Customs Officer (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. (B. 144, 1°) 3811 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Gas Well in Essex Co., 2252.

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Alberton Lighthouse, Expenditure for Breast-working (Ques.) 1657 (i).
Bedique, Wharfage Dues collected (Ques.) 561 (i).
Cape Traverse Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 2378.
Cascumpec Harbor, Expenditure for repairs (Ques.) 1655 (i).
——— Improvements (M. for Ret.) 1711 (ii).
Dredging by Str. *Prince Edward* (M. for Stmnt). 159 (i).
Duvar, Lieut.-Col, Superannuation (Ques.) 1485.
Fisheries Inspector for P.E.I. (Ques.) 55 (i).
Lobster Factories in P.E.I. (remarks) *re* Ret. 650.
Miminigash Breakwater, repairs (Ques.) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
Miminigash (Little) Harbor Survey (Ques.) 2022.
Palmer Road Chapel P.O. (Ques.) 92 (i).
——— (M. for Pets., &c.) 517 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F.—*Continued.*
P.E.I. Govt. and Dom. Capital Accr. (Ques.) 27 (i).
Prince Edward, Str., Dredging (M. for Stmnt.) 159 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1879 (i).
Summerside Harbor Breakwater (Ques.) 121, 247.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (N.S.) 1429. Post Office, 2303 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S.) 1643; Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1569 (i).
Superannuation, 1308 (i).
Tignish Breakwater Repairs, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 96 (i).
Tignish, Wharfage Dues collected (Ques.) 561 (i).
Wharves, Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.*) 1149 (ii).

Platt, Mr. J. M., *Prince Edward.*
"A" Battery, Officers' quarters (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Dom. Voters' Lists, Revision (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 309 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1042 (i).
Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1670 (i).
Military College, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 245 (i).
——— Students' Marks (M. for Ret.) 1025, 1064.
——— prop. Changes (Ques.) 3662 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation (prop. Res.) 1125 (i).
——— on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) 1142 (i).
Picton Harbor, Dredging, &c. (M. for Cor., Pets., &c.) 2192 (ii).
——— Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 2186 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).
Quinté, Steamer, Rep., Evidence, &c., *re* loss (M. for copies) 149 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 502 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2301 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers, 1631.
Quarantine (Public Health) 4002 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).
——— in Com., 3083, 3240, 3439, 3585 (ii).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 4 (i).
Cattle Quarantine Stations on Frontier (Ques.) 92.
Corn, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1593 (i).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4588 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3147, 3570 (ii).

Porter, Mr. R., *West Huron.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to M. for 2°, 2222 (i).
Goderich and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1°*) 104 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2958 (ii).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Chambly and Longueuil Canal (Ques.) 401 (i).
——— Vessels, Tonnage, &c., passed through (M. for Stmnt.*) 1401 (ii).
Chambly Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 91, 1°*) 794 (i).
Montreal Harbor Commission, abolition (Ques.) 401 (i).
St. Louis Lake, erection of Piers (Ques.) 401 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 9 (i).
Esquimalt Dry Dock, enlargement (Ques.) 1120.
——— Fortifications and Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1485 (i).
Keefer, Hugh Forbes, Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 2° m., 3694; agreed to (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1135 (i).

Purcell, Mr. P., *Glengarry.*
Ry. Employés protection (B. 52, 1°*) 245 (i).; 2° m., 3704 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3582 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
Great Eastern Ry., &c. (M. for Pets., &c.) 142 (i).
Legal Services, Payments (Ques.) 245 (i).
Lotbinière County Mail Service (Ques.) 85 (i).
——— (M. for Pets., Cor., &c.) 1680 (i).
Megantic County Mail Service, Pets. and Cor. *re* Change (M. for copies) 1147 (i).
Ste. Croix Floating Light (Ques.) 2021 (i).
——— (M. for Pets., Cor., &c.*) 2207 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2807 (i).
Yamachiche, Floating Light opposite (M. for Pets. and Cor.) 1702 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. E., *King's, P.E.I.*
Peake's Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 118 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com., of Sup., 1876 (i).
Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 253.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (N.S.) 1426 (i).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2353 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1961 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S.) 1647. Harbors and Rivers, 1630 (i).

Roome, Mr. W. F., *West Middlesex.*
Health Dept., establishment (prop. Res.) 1660; (wthdn.) 1680 (i)
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 502 (i).

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4677 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3059 (ii).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1036 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3798.

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 595 (i).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., *Lincoln.*
Lincoln, Member for, on Ques. of Priv. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 450 (i).
——— (personal explanation *re* Timber Limits) 563 (i).
——— on presentation of further Cor., 1653 (i).
——— further documents (presented) 1657 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1733 (i).
Resignation Tendered, 4355 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 449 (i).
Stationery and contingencies of Senate, prop. Mess., 883 (i).

Ste. Marie, Mr. L., *Napierville.*
McKinack River Works (Ques.) 4172 (ii).

Scarth, Mr. W. B., *Winnipeg.*
Brandon and South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71, 1°*) 449 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1906 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 718 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1471. Harbors and Rivers (Man. repairs, &c.) 1627 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1247 (i).
Cruelty B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1218 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1011 (i).
Grain and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1061 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1811 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
New York Mercury, circulation in Dom. (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1430 (i).
Miscellaneous (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4070 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1616 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3570, 4481 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1191 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1040 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3001 (ii).

Shanly, Mr. W., *South Grenville.*
Railway Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°*) 1343; M. for Com., 3325 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (protection) 4783 (ii).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 350 (i).
Commercial Treaties with Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 3683 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court) 486 (i).

Small, Mr., J., *East Toronto.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35, 1°*) 159 (i).
Don Improvement, Toronto (B. 81, 1°*) 638 (i).
Great North-Western and Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 106, 1°) 1506 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 638 (i).
Home Benefit Life Association incorp. (B. 63, 1°*) 342 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt., *re* Tobacco Sales (Ques.) 85 (i).
Inverness Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 100, 1°*) 1066; 2° m., 1355 (i).
Louisburg and Richmond Ry. Co.'s (B. 101, 1°*) 1066 (i).
Owen Sound and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 99, 1°*) 1066 (i).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 34, 1°*) 159 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief (B. 98, 1°*) 1066; 2° m., 1506; M. for Com., 1965, 2699; 3° m., 3319 (ii).
Toronto Board of Trade (B. 109, 1°*) 1420 (i).
Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust (B. 113, 1°*) 1581 (i).

Smith, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1500 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2876 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) 2207 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2248; on M. for 2°, 3828; in Com., 3855, 3892, 4291, 4380 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m.h., 1856 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1141 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Colonisation Companies and Dept. of Interior (M. for Cor., &c.*) 66 (i).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1264 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4583 (ii).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1794 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3924 (ii).
Greer, James, appointment as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 3662, 3811 (ii).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
Hydraulic Rents, Names of Parties in Arrears (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (i).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4003 (ii).
Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3342 (ii).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 235, 360, 369 (i).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Employés (Ques.) 3722 (ii).
Saskatchewan Colonisation Co. and Dept. of Interior (M. for Cor.*) 66 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1969 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 501; (*Patent Record*) 496 (i). 4000 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) salaries, 221; (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 475; (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 223; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 215; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 389; (Interior) contingencies, 382; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) contingencies, 354; (Militia) contingencies, 375 (i); (Post Office) Bank Deposits, 3994 (ii); (Printing Bureau) cleaning, 476; (Printing and Stationery) 169, contingencies, 360; (Privy Council) contingencies, 235; (Public Works) contingencies, 471 (i); (Queen's Printer) salaries, &c., 3993 (ii); (Secretary of State) contingencies, 465 (i), Civil Service List, 3992 (ii); (Railways and Canals) 180 (i), contingencies, 3993 (i).
Charges of Management, 165 (i).
Dominion Police, 493 (i).
Geological Survey, 2142 (i).
Indians (P.E.I.) 2164; (Surveys) 2159 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2410 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 479; (Supreme Court Reps.) 482 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Legislation: H. of C. (French Translators) 4011; (Newspapers) 4011; (Indemnity, J. S. Thompson) 4004 (ii).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1277 (i).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3635 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1467; (N.S.) 1447; (Ottawa, heating, &c.) 1464; (Removal of Snow) 1464; (Repairs, &c.) 1455; (Telephone, Ottawa) 1465 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Health) 4001 (ii).
Railways—Income (Gov. Gen.'s Car) 4021 (ii).
Temp. Colonisation Co. and Dept. of Interior (M. for Cor., &c.*) 66 (i).
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 375, 382 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3404, 3464, 3488 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUIMET) *Laval.*
Adjnmt. of Hse. (remarks) 3516 (ii).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) Member called to Order, 1246 (i).
——— procedure, 2194 (i).
Annapolis, Sale of Land to Govt., Members' remarks checked, 1516 (i).
Baltic, Steamer, alleged Outrage, Member ruled out of Order, 4028 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1519 (i).
Bills, Royal Assent, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).
Cereals, prevention of Fraud in Sales, on M. to introd. B., 184 (i).
Compton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Controverted Elections (Haldimand) Judgment of Supreme Court, 83 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on drafting Amts., 3455 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) procedure, 1507 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) ruling *re* Vote, 2227 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 3°, Member called to order, 3942 (ii).
Haldimand, Representation, Issue of Writ, 83 (i).
——— Return of Member Elect, 1402 (i).
Internal Economy (H. of C.) Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 32 (i).
Kent (N.B.) Representation, Issue of Writ, 3722.
Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Costigan*) Member ruled out of Order, 2258 (i).
Interruptions from the Galleries, Orders to stop issued, 1279 (i).
Lincoln, Representation, Issue of Writ, 4396 (ii).
Lobster Factories, Members called to Order, 651.
Member called on to withdraw unparliamentary Language, 1117 (i).
Members' remarks checked, 1516, 2433 (i), 3514, 4113 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 32, 149, 275, 393 (i); 2531, 3955, 4479 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, procedure (ruling) 1144, 1146 (i).

Speaker Mr.—*Continued.*
Members, New, notification of Ret., 1, 1402, 4449.
New Westminster, Representation, Issue of Writ, 3439 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Hesson*) unparliamentary Language (ruling) 1452, 2476 (i), 4346 (ii).
——— on interrupting Members, 4557 (ii).
Ottawa, Return of Member Elect, 4449 (ii).
Parliament (4th Session) opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4937 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Cockburn*) Loyalty to Her Majesty, ruled out of Order, 185 (i).
——— (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well (ruling) 2258 (i).
——— (procedure) on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) 571 (i).
Prorogation, communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 4935 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements, irregularity of Deb., 4825 (ii).
Religious disturbances in Hull, Member called to Order, 506, 509 (i).
Richelieu, Ret. of Member Elect., 1 (i).
Royal Assent, Letters from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 2 (i).
Stanstead, Ret. of Member Elect., 1 (i).
Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, Mess. (read) 1341 (i).
St. John and S. America Mail Service, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1986 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 712 (i); (French Translators) extra pay, 4008; (Newspapers) 4011 (ii); (salaries) 709 (i); (Miscellaneous) Express service, 4011 (ii).
Tassé, E., and Duvernay, L. D., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 4026 (ii).
Vacancies, notification, 1 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) relevancy, 3778 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1074 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. to print extra copies, 2913 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4290, 4417 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 348, 1092, 1080, 1416, 1530 (i).
C.P.R. (Aylmer Branch) Co.'s (B. 141, 1°) 3591.
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 199 (i).
——— removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1603 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. 4491 (ii).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 409 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3944 (ii).
——— on prop. Res.(Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 312 (i).
——— and Provincial Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1490 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 758 (i).
Gauthier, W., Fishing Licenses (Ques.) 3076 (ii).
Health Dept., Establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1674 (i).
Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46, 1°*) 212 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2465 (i).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3709 (ii).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1966 (i), 2706 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4685.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying development) 2400 (i); (Experimental Farms) 3791 (ii); (Health Statistics) 500 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2407 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1111 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 4002 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3044 (ii).
——— in Com., 3235, 3535, 3553, 3749, 4481 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Helmets for Active Militia (Ques.) 886 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1904 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1966 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Monuments) 4651 (ii).
Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 84, 1°*) 722 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition (B. 8, 1°) 32; 2° m., 1221; adjd. deb. rsmd. on 2°, 1850, 2194; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 2204.
——— printing extra copies (M.) 2911 (ii).
——— Rep. of Sel. Com., 3367 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4380 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4581 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Macdonald*) to M. for 2°, 2225 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1794 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1047 (i).
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°*) 342 (i).
Ministerial Expenses from Confed. (Amt.) on M. for Ret., 70 (i).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).
Printing Com.'s Rep., 6th (M. to conc.) 4658 (ii).
St. Lawrence International Railway and Bridge Co.'s (B. 70, 1°*) 449 (i).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2446 (i).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1439 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3407, 3486, 3755 ; (Amt.) 3777 (ii).
York County Bank B. 39 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2° m., 352.

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N.B.*
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4892, 4896 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2443 (i).
Fisheries (Protection) 4783 (ii.)

Thérien, Mr. O., *Montcalm.*
Hillaker, Mr., Claim (Ques.) 402 (i).
Moreau, Elie, Fees *re* Queen *vs.* Boucher (Ques.) 1657 (i).
——— payment of Account (Ques.) 1797 (i).
Survey in Montcalm County (Ques.) 186 (i).
Tobacco, Pets. from Manufacturers (Ques.) 275.
——— Law respecting Native Grown (Ques.) 2229.

Thompson, Sir J. S. D., K.C.M.G., *Antigonish.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1073 ; on further consdn., 2099 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1233 ; procedure, 2202 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3822 ; in Com., 3857, 3882, 3957, 4077, 4278, 4375, 4415, 4512 ; on M. for 3°, 4593 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Telegraphic intelligence from Washington, 1509 (i).
Bills of Exchange, &c. (B. 6, 1°*) 26 ; 2° m., 104 ; in Com., 106 ; M. for Com., 343 ; in Com., 345, 1077, 1089, 1403, 1519 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 4261 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1379 (i).
——— on Order for rsmng. adjd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1508 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
Calvin, services *re* prosecution (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 2°, 3719 (ii).
Chinese Immigrants, par. in *Empire* (remarks) 3624 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2711 (ii).

Thompson, Sir J. S. D.—*Continued.*
Criminal Law Amt. Seduction, &c. (B. 65, 1°*) 342 (i) ; 2° m., 3161 ; in Com., 3165, 3368 ; 3° m., 3441 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt., Proclamation (Ans.) 85 (i).
——— B. 19 (Mr. *Carling*) on Sen. Amts., 2098. (i).
Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage (B. 126, 1°*) 2739 ; 2° m. and in Com., 4035 (ii).
Disallowance, Man. Municipal Act (Ans.) 2377 (i).
——— Provincial Bills, on M. for Stmnt., 28 (i).
Dom. Police, Rep. of Commr. (presented) 33 (i).
Essex County Jr. Judgship (Ans.) 563 (i).
Extradition Treaty with U.S. (remarks) 3810 (ii).
Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3194 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Order from Com., 2710 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3913 ; on M. for 3°, 3937 ; on Sen. Amts., 4667 (ii).
Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1493 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) Amt. to Amt. to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 877 ; agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1018 (i).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2737 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3622 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 140, 1°*) 3624 ; 2° m., 4266 ; in Com., 4414, 4924 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. (130, 1°) 2825 ; 2° m., 3155 ; in Com., 3157, 3600 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, papers (remarks) 189 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4192 (ii).
Judge's Residence, Saguenay District (Ans.) 3292.
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4645 (ii).
Lebourdais Bros., case of (Ans.) 187 (i).
Legal Services, payments (Ans.) 246 (i).
——— Sums paid to Firms in Peterborough (Ans.) 1200, 1356, 1484 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits 1745 ; (Amt.) to adjn. deb., 1749 ; agreed to (Y. 94, N. 72) 1790 ; on Res., 2093 (i).
Modus Vivendi. See "U. S."
Montmagny and Beauce, Judge's Residence (Ans.) 2021 (ii).
Moreau, Elie, Fees *re* Queen *vs.* Boucher (Ans.) 1657 (i).
Newfoundland Harbor Fees, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4894 (ii).
Official Documents prevention of Disclosure B. 122 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) on M. for 2°, 3207 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) deb. not before Hse., 1452 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1076 (i).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property authorisation (B. 112, 1°) 1512 (i).

Thompson, Sir J. S. D.—*Continued.*
Provincial Legislation (Ans.) 248 (i).
Public Lands Grants (B. 138, 1°*) 3624 (i); M. for Com., 4034; in Com., 4035 (ii).
Public Stores Act Amt. (B. 53, 1°) 245; 2° m., 1077 (i).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 111, 1°*) 1506; 2° m., 1532; 3° m., 1582 (i).
Queen's Counsel, Appointments, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2112 (i).
——— position of (Ans.) 1486 (i).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4817 (ii).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3714 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe, purchase of Land (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4103.
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to M. for 3°, 4401; in Com., 4360 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1541.
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1965; in Com., 2702 (i), 3227 (ii).
Smith, late Mr. Justice, on M. for Ret., 1685 (i).
Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Convicts punishment (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
——— Punishment by Flogging (Ans.) 1120 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4878 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) contingencies, 355 (i); (Post Office) Finn, M., reappointment, 4574 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Ordnance Lands, 4122. Post Office, 4795; (defalcations, Kingston) 4164 (ii).
Dominion Police, 493 (i).
Indians (Surveys) 2162 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 476; (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 483 (i); Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I.) 3994, 4576; (Man. Penitentiary) transfer of convicts, 3990 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3646; (Dorchester) 3637; (Kingston) 496 (i), 3634; (Man.) 3638, 4650; conc., 4910; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3635, 4649; (Regina Jail) 3647 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4038; (N.S.) 4699 (ii.)
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton Ry. (construction) 4019. C.P.R. (Onderdonk Arbitration) 4653. I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4016. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4018 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 129, 1°) 2595; in Com., 3160 (ii).
Supreme Court (N.S.) filling Vacancy (Ans.) 885.
Territories Real Property Act Amt. (B. 131, 1°) 2914; 2° m., 3198 (ii).
Threats, Intimidation, &c., Legislation (Ans.) 1857 (i).
Trade Combinations Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 3704 (ii).

Thompson, Sir J. S. D.—*Continued.*
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* (B. 134, 1°) 3153; 2° m., 3593; in Com., 3595, 3876 (ii).
Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Dawson*) in Com., 3232 (ii).
Vollet, Robert, expenses of Trial (Ans.) 27 (i).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3695; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3096, 3244, 3553 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1260 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3864, 3882, 3957, 4078, 4373, 4419, 4513 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087, 1409; on Sen. Amts. 4410 (i).
Calgary Water Power Co.'s (B. 75, 1°*) 449 (i).
Criminal Law Act Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3184, 3383; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. for 3°, 3445; (Amt.) 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) 1823; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1854; on M. for 2°, 1209; (Amt.) 6 m.h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1219 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 442 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3922 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 321 (i).
Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 80, 1°*) 638 (i).
Haldimand Election (Ques. of Priv.) par. in *Globe*, 1344 (i).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1767 (i).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3696 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3275, 3463, 3557, 3737 (ii).
York County Bank (2° m.) 352 (i).

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth.*
Alaskan and Canadian Boundary (Ques.) 188 (i).
Annunciation Day (M.) for Adjnmt., 2308; agreed to (Y. 59, N. 24) 2309 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4524 (ii).
Bremner Furs, payment (Ques.) 4931 (ii). *See* "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4429 (ii).
Caraquet Ry. Co.'s Earnings (Ques.) 3811 (ii).
Collingwood Harbor, Expenditure (Ques.) 1655.
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1216 (i).
Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2914 (ii).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) 2° m., 1581 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1149 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1048 (i).
Homesteads in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3308 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3632 (ii).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4226 (ii).
LeSueur, P., Dual Salaries (Ques.) 400 (i).
Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4928 (ii).
Military College, Kingston, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 245 (i).
Militia Clothing Supplies, Tenders (Ques.) 3811.
Montreal P.O. Drop Boxes (Ques.) 3512 (ii).
Newfoundland, admission into Confederation (remarks) 4927 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 187 (i).
Prorogation (closing remarks) 4935 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
Ranches in N.W.T., Applications, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1698 (ii).
Roberts, E. K., American Tug (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
Salt Manufacturers, prosecution (Ques.) 1654 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1506; on M. for Com., 1966 (i), 2701; on M. for 3°, 3320 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Seed distribution) 4000 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2138 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2524 (i), 4806 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1630 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., *Pictou.*
Baltic, Outrage on Steamer (Ans.) 187 (i).
Bedique, Wharfage Dues collected (Ans.) 561 (i).
Fish-breeding Establishments (Ans.) 85 (i).
Fish Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 213 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 85, 1°) 722 (i).
——— Inspector for P.E.I. (Ans.) 55 (i).
Govt. Steamers, carriage of private merchandise (Ans.) 504 (i).
Hillaker, Mr., Claim (Ans.) 402 (i).
Lobster Factories in P.E.I. (remarks) 651 (i).
——— Fishing Regulations (Ans.) 885 (i).
Mahone Bay (N.S.) Lighthouse (Ans.) 886 (i).
Marine and Immigrant Hospital (Quebec) Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 75 (i).
Merchants' Shipping Acts, Imp.-Legislation (remarks) 2382 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 393 (i).
Modus Vivendi. See "U.S."
Montreal Harbor Police, Gratuity to Sergeants, &c. (Ans.) 92 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H.—*Continued.*
Navigable Waters protection Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°) 212 (i).
Newspapers Subscriptions and Advertisements (Stmnt.) 228, 357, 373 (i).
Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 251.
Quinté, loss of Steamer, on M. for Ret., 149 (i).
St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse (Ans.) 2826 (ii).
Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 522 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) contingencies, 474; (Marine) 179; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 357; (Privy Council) contingencies, 227.
Tidal Observations, on M. for Ret., 529 (i).
Tignish Wharf, Dues collected (Ans.) 561 (i).
Trawl Fishing in St. Mary's Bay (Ans.) 2378 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* (B. 133, 1°) 3153 (ii).

Turcot, Mr. G., *Megantic.*
Bélanger, P. R. A., payments as Surveyor (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
Great Cascapedia River Bridge (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Interior Dept., Extra Clerks (Ques.) 2826 (ii).
Petit Cascapedia Savings Bank (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2903 (ii).

Trywhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
SUPPLY:
Territorial Accounts, 4254 (ii).
Militia (Rifle Associations) 1334 (i).

Vanasse, Mr. F., *Yamaska.*
Canadian Historical MS. (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Waldie, Mr. J., *Halton.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. fo 2°, 3842; in Com., 3855, 3879, 4308 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
English Periodicals, cost of Mailing (remarks) 1919 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3915 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 335 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (Ques.) 2258 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1144 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4367 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Fréchette, Translation) 2341 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2410, 2438 (i).
Miscellaneous (Customs) 4120 (ii).
Voters' Lists and Franchise Act (Ques.) 3154 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3089, 3128, 3430, 3470, 3523 (ii).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Abell, Mr. John, alleged Insolvency (remarks) 3512 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1001 (i).
Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 50, 1°*) 244 (i).
Orange incorp. (B. 32, 1°*) 145; 2° m., 395; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 69) 398; 3° m., 1293, 1298; agreed on (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i).
Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 512 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2699; on M. for 3°, 3320 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4365 (ii).
Temp. Colonisation Co., Cor., Memorials, &c., (M. for Ret.) 2032 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4909.
Trade Combinations prevention Act Amt. (B. 77, 1°*) 504 (i); 2° m., 3703; 3° m., 3810 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3221, 3395, 3490, 3550 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *East Durham.*
Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2192 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3008 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4305 (ii).
Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1373 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4430; in Com., 4438 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Order for Hse. in Com., 1507 (i).
Disallowance, Man. Municipal Act (Ques.) 2377.
Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 431 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 3°, 3938 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 339 (i).
Franking Privilege, abuse (remarks) 1582 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1002 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1060 (i).
Homesteads in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3305 (ii).
Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1286 (i).
Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management (Amt.) 2690; neg. (Y. 52, N. 76) 3367 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4476 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2464 (i).
Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4342 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1905 (i).
Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4820 (ii).
Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3717 (ii).
Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. 15, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3322 (ii).
School Lands in Man., Sale (Ques.) 145 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1965 (i), 2699; on M. for 3°, 3320 (ii).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4676.
——— B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on prop. Res., 4918; in Com., 4920; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 4832; neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 719 (i).
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 389 (i); (Interior) Whitcher, A. H., salary, 4572 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). Post Office, 2304 (i); (C.P.R. service) 4153 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4155. *Income*, 3660 (ii).
Immigration (Expenses) 3647, 4809 (ii); (Agents' salaries) 2408 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2171 (i).
Legislation (N.W.T.) 2307 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1286; (Military properties, care of) 1336; (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Gophers, destruction) 4790 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3638 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Deptl., Ottawa) 4697 (ii); (Gas, &c.) 1465; (N.S.) 1454 (i); (N.WT.) 4720 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 1463. Dredging (Man.) 1648. Harbors and Rivers (Man., repairs, &c.) 1627. Roads and Bridges, 1650. Miscellaneous (Surveys and Inspections) 1651 (i).
Quarantine Cattle (3657); (Public Health) 3656 (ii).
Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3203 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3432, 3493, 3542, 3744 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2951 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*
Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4561.
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3887 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2671 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 780 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C.—*Continued.*
Keefer, Hugh Forbes, Relief (B. 119, 1°*) on a div., 3324 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1788 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4891 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Justice) Judge's salary, P.E.I., 3997.
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (P.E.I.) 4124 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1999 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
Albert Ry. Grant on M. for Com. of Sup., 4562.
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1253 (i).
Annapolis P.O. and Custom House Building, purchase of Site (M. for Cor.) 3686 (ii).
——— Tenders for Erection (M. for Ret.) 254 (i).
——— Sale of Land to Govt. (remarks) 1517 (i).
Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2308 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3853, 3879, 3957, 4077, 4416, 4513 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 105, 343; in Com., 1080, 1404, 1519 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4406 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3874, 4505 (ii).
C.P.R., telegraphic Rep. in *Mail re* stoppage of Traffic through Maine, 1791 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4486 (ii).
Digby Wharf, Dues collected (M. for Ret.*) 530 (i).
Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672; on prop. M., 2915.
Flour, Can., Imported into Mar. Provs. *via* U.S., &c. (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
——— (M. for Stmnt.) 2671 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3942 (ii).
Grain Elevator, Halifax (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
——— Tariff of Rates, change (remarks) 2380 (i).
I.C.R., Casualties, &c., and Compensation allowed (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4414 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3155; in Com., 3157.
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4248 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2075 (i).
Logs, Export Duty, Amount (Ques.) 884 (i).
Merchants' Shipping Acts, Imp. Legislation (remarks) 2381 (i).
Modus Vivendi. See "U.S."
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 49, 1°*) 244 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 239, 356, 369 (i).
Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 48, 1°*) 244.
Patent Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1076 (i).
People's Bank of N.B. (B. 33, 1°*) 159 (i).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).
Ste. Croix Ry. Bridge Co., suspension of Rules *re* Pet. (M.) 212 (i).
St. Louis (N.B.) completion of Wharf (Ques.) 505.
St. Stephen's Bank (B. 24, 1°*) 104 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4103.
Shore Line Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 274 (i).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 523 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3189 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2394.
Civil Govt. (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 356; (Privy Council) contingencies, 239 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (N.S.) 1422 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4121 (ii), Post Office, 2293 (i). Rys.: I.C.R. (repairs, &c.) 3807; P.E.I. Ry., 4129 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection Service) 2375; (salaries, &c.) 2352 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2319 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Judge, Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I.) 3994, 4575 (ii); (Vice-Admiralty Court) Que., 482; (Librarian, Supreme Court) 479.
Legislation: H. of C. (gratuity, late Dr. Wilson) 4011 (ii). Library (salaries) 713 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1961; (Liverpool or London and St. John, and Halifax) 1959 (i).
Marine Hospitals, 2019 (i).
Militia (contingencies) 4012 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 1443; (Major's Hill Park) 1466; (N.S.) 1443. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1610, 1621. Roads and Bridges, 1649. Telegraph Lines, 1649 (i).
Rys.—Capital: I.C.R. (Dartmouth) 4014 (ii); (St John, City front) 1931; Moncton, increased accommodation) 1927 (i). Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 2020 (i).
Superannuation, 1307 (i).
Tidal Observations, on M. for Ret., 529 (i).
Trade Combinations Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 3704 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3878 (ii).
Vice-Admiralty Courts (Que., N. S. and N.B.) Cases entered (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3700.

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2978 (ii).
——— in Com., 3082, 3739 (ii).

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 338 (i).
New London Harbor Survey, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy*) 29 (i).
Pinette Harbor Survey, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy*) 29 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1895 (i).
Public Works, P.E.I. (remarks) 4830 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2418 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1970; (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1980; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1958; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1962; (St. John and Annapolis) 1972; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1467 (i); (Deptl. Buildings) 4698; (N.B.) 4701; (P.E.I.) 4700 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1611; (Mar. Provs.) 1615 (i); (N.S.) 4721 (ii); (P.E.I.) 1570 (i), 4721 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3527, 3564, 3746 (ii).
Wood Island Harbor Survey, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy*) 29 (i).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 13, 1°) 84.
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3816; in Com., 4395, 4524 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 549 (i).
Labor, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 3661 (ii).
North-Western Coal and Navigation Co.'s (B. 25, 1°*) 104 (i).
Three per Cent. Loan of 1888 (Ques.) 27 (i).

White, Mr. P., *North Renfrew.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3853, 3962, 4514 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 106, 1091, 1410, 1527 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4407 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 3454 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 428 (i).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1174 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 902 (i).

White, Mr. P.—*Continued.*
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1059 (i).
Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 273 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4241 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1759, 2064 (i).
Lumber, Import Duties (Ques.) 4662 (ii.)
N.W.T., Advisory Council, Resignation (M. for O. C.'s, &c.*) 104 (i).
Pembroke Post Office Robbery (M. for Cor., &c.) 158 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4112 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2392 (i); (*Patent Record*) conc., 4272 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4036 (ii).
Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2191 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2616 (ii).
——— in Com., 3099, 3224, 3738, (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., *East Elgin.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1852 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3378 (ii).
Crofter Immigrants, Pelican Lake (Ques.) 1795.
Franchise Act, Repeal (prop. Res.) 257; (M.) 1193; neg. (Y. 78, N. 99) 1198 (i).
——— and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1491 (i).
——— Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for 2°, 3721 (ii).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3913 (ii).
Kettle Creek, St. Thomas (M. for Cor., &c.) 153.
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
London and Port Stanley Ry. (M. for Stmnt.) 156 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) *re* Gas Well, 2256 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4400 (ii).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1506; on M. for Com., 1967, 2707 (i); in Com., 3227 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4367 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 498 (i); (Experimental Farms) 720; (Health Statistics) 498 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 2284 (i). *Income* (Welland) 4654 (ii).
Charges of Management, 167 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Civil Govt. (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 474; (Indian Affairs) 174; (Militia) contingencies, 376; (Public Works) contingencies, 471; (Rys. and Canals) 181 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 2344 (i). Canals (additional pay, &c.) 4152; (maintenance, &c.) 3869 (ii). Customs, 1432 (i); (contingencies) 4119 (ii). Excise (Fréchette, payment for Translation) 2341 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4121, 4257. Miscellaneous (Patrick Cullen, extra services) 4120 (ii); (salaries) 2330 (i). Post Office, 2292 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 4792 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income, 3660 (ii).
Dominion Police, 493 (i).
Geological Survey, 2143 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2412 (i); (expenses) 3648 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2167 (i), 4789 (ii); (Man. and N.W.T.) 2171 (i), 4788; (Ont. and Que., Oneida) 4785 (iii).
Justice, Administration of, 476; (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 489 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 713. Senate (Miscellaneous) 700 (i).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 3658: (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 3658 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2347 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3646; (Man.) 3639 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings, 1443; (Man.) 1439; N.W.T.) 1440; (Ont.) 1437 (i); (Printing Bureau, Plant) conc. 4274 (ii); (Que) 1113. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1627 (i), 4726 (ii); (Ont.) 1617 (i), conc., 4274 (ii). Roads and Bridges, 1649 (i), 4770 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Health) 3656 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—*Continued.*
Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 376 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3122, 3209, 3234, 3467, 3489 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. *Hesson*) on M. for 1°, 4847 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1255 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3820; in Com., 4078 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Toronto *Globe,* 4320.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (P. E. I.) 4141 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3395 (ii).

Wright, Mr. A., *Ottawa County.*
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 761 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: H. of C. (salaries) 707 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Carlton Point North, Survey (Ques.) 1484 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1884 (i),

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

"A" BATTERY, KINGSTON, OFFICERS' QUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1358 (i).

ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means 3512 (ii).

A. D. C., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2669 (ii).

ADAMS, JOHN, purchase of Timber Limits. *See* "Lincoln, Member for."

ACETIC AND PYROLIGNEOUS ACID, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3098 (ii).

ACID, PHOSPHATE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3099 (ii).

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Pope*) 4; seconded (Mr. *Prior*) 9 (i).

——— His Ex.'s Reply, 275 (i).

——— TO HER MAJESTY. *See* "LOYALTY."

ADJOURNMENTS, ANNUNCIATION DAY: M. (Mr. *Trow*) 2308; agreed to (Y. 59, N. 24) 2309 (i).

——— ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 734 (i).

——— ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4928 (ii).

——— GOOD FRIDAY: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2914.

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 2 (*pro forma*).

Adulteration Act (*Chap.* 107, *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 9** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 37; 2° and in Com., 1071 (i); reconsd. in Com. and 3°*, 2099 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

ADVERTISING PAMPHLETS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243 (ii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 2344 (i).

ADVISORY COUNCIL, N.W.T., RESIGNATION: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 104 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION COM.: List of Members, 37 (i).

Agricultural Fertilisers B. No. 95 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 963 (i); 2°, 3190; in Com. and 3°*, 3195 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

——— *See* "FERTILISERS."

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY. *See* "Self-Binders," &c.

AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION:

AGRICULTURAL BULLETINS IN GERMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1796 (i).

——— SOCIETIES (N.W.T.): in Com. of Sup., 2384 (i).

———DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 179; contingencies, 473.

AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 498, 715, 2384 (i), 3779, 4000, 4650, 4795 (ii).

BARLEY FOR SEED, EXPECTED ARRIVAL: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1795 (i).

——— DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1510 (i).

——— PURCHASE OF CROPS: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 4172 (ii).

CANADIAN HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1020 (i).

CATTLE DISEASE IN WESTERN STATES: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 85 (i).

——— QUARANTINE STATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 92 (i).

CENSUS, NEXT ENUMERATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 402 (i), 2827 (ii).

——— RETURN *re* PAGANS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).

CHINESE ADMISSION INTO CANADA, PAR. IN "EMPIRE:" read (Mr. *Edgar*) 3624 (ii).

——— IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 68 (i).

CROFTER IMMIGRANTS, PAR. IN "NORTH BRITISH DAILY MAIL:" Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1795 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 2260 (i).

EXHIBITION AT JAMAICA: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1201 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM REP., PRINTING EXTRA COPIES: remarks (Mr, *Bergin*) 1792 (i).

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).

HEALTH, ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1660 (i).

IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 2403; Suppl., 4001, 4797; conc., 4915 (ii).

IMMIGRANT RATES TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 186 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN PROV. DIST., POPULATION BY ORIGIN: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).

[*See* "SUPPLY."]

ALASKAN AND CANADIAN BOUNDARY LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 188 (i).

Alberta Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 722, 2°*, 1019 (i).

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 84; 2°*, 91; in Com. and 3°*, 352 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY., PAR. IN "GLOBE:" Personal explanation (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 4230 (ii).

ALBERT RAILWAY GRANT: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).

ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1657 (i).
ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND TARIFF: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3633.
Alien Contract Labor Prohibition B. No. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°, 32; 2° m., 1221; deb. adjd., 1259; rsmd., 1850, 2194; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2204; Rep. presented, 3367 (i).
Deb. on 2° (Mr. *Taylor*) 1221; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1228; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1229; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1231; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1231; (Mr. *Lister*) 1233; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1239; (Mr. *Denison*) 1241; (Mr. *Casey*) 1242; (Mr. *Scriver*) 1247; (Mr. *Lépine*) 1247; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1250; (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1252; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1253; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1255; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1258 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to print extra copies, 2911 (ii).
——— Rep. of Sel. Com.: presented (Mr. *Taylor*) 3367.
AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND: M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 99 (i).
AMMUNITION, CLOTHING AND MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 1316 (i).
ANDERSON CONTRACT. *See* "ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE."
Animals, Cruelty to. *See* "CRUELTY."
ANIMALS, LIVING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3099, 3104, 3208, 4480 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD:" Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1515 (i).
——— P. O. SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2229 (i).
——— P. O. AND CUSTOMS BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3686 (ii).
——— TENDERS FOR ERECTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 254 (i).
APPLES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3402 (ii).
ARTESIAN BORINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
ARTILLERY AND RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
ARMORIES (PUBLIC) AND CARE OF ARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1320 (i).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE AND MESSRS. ANDERSON: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100, 1021 (i).
——— CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 3440.
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4694 (ii).
ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS. *See* "AGRICULTURAL" and "FERTILIZERS."
AUDITOR GEN. REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 90 (i).
AXLE GREASE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3233 (ii).
BANDS OF EFFICIENT CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 1331.
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2671 (ii).
——— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2378 (i).
BALLOT BOXES, PATENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 2230 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) *re* Rep. of Sel. Com., 4655.
"BALTIC," STEAMER, AND ALLEGED OUTRAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 186, 1858 (i); remarks, 3079 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4027, 4663 (ii).
BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
BANK CHARTERS, B.N.A. AND B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 255 (i).
Bankers Safe Deposits, &c. *See* "DOMINION SAFE DEPOSITS."
Banking Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 2234; in Com. on Res., 1°* of B., 2249 (i); 2° m., 3811; 2° and in Com., 3853, 3879, 3955, 4074, 4277, 4415, 4507; 3°, 4590; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4928 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 31.)
Deb. on 2° (Mr. *Foster*) 3811; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3813; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 3816; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 3820; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3822: (Mr. *Casey*) 3823; (Sir *Donald Smith*) 3828; (Mr. *Kenny*) 3829; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3834; (Mr. *Hesson*) 3836; (Mr. *Waldie*) 3842; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 3845; (Mr. *Denison*) 3852 (ii).
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: List of Members, 36.
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names, 91 (i).
BANK NOTES, BONDS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243 (ii).
BANK OF UPPER CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
BANKS, CHARTERED, IN LIQUIDATION, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hesson*) 76 (i).
——— *See* "FINANCE."
BARLEY (TWO-ROWED) PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF CROPS: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 4172 (ii).
BAY OF QUINTÉ AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).
BEANS, TONQUIN, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584 (ii).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 187 (i).
——— M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 517 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO., SUBSIDIES VOTED: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3693 (ii).
BEDIQUE WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 561 (i).
BEEF, FRESH, IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 88 (i).
BEHRING'S SEA. *See* "FISHERIES."
BÉLANGER, P.R.A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 1797, 2034 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Turcotte*) 4500 (ii).
Belding, Paul & Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 103.)
BELL CREEK HARBOR AND BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2377, 2669 (ii).
Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Corby*). 1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 65.)
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).
BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Dickenson*) 188 (i).

BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoliel*) 529 (i).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. No. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 26; 2° and in Com., 105, 343, 1077, 1403, 1519; 3°*, 1582; consdn. of Sen. Amts., 4261; further consdn., 4404; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 4411; agreed to and Amt. as amended agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILLS WTHDRN., 4667, 4924 (ii).

BILLS ASSENTED TO, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, communications from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2376 (i); 3810 (ii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 2; *pro formâ.*

BILL (No. 2) To permit reciprocity in wrecking and in towing Vessels and Rafts.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 26; 2° called, 146 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3704 (ii).

BILL (No. 3) To admit Vessels registered in the United States to wrecking, towing and coasting privileges in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. *Ferguson*, *Welland.*)
1°*, 26 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 26 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend Chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 26; 2° m., 1203; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1219; 2°, 1220; Order for Com. read, 1506; in Com., 1823 (i); M. to further consdr. B. in Com. and Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1854; M. and Amt. wthdn., 1856 (i).

BILL (No. 6) Relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 26; 2° and in Com., 105, 343, 1077, 1403, 1519; 3°*, 1582 (i); consdn. of Sen. Amts., 4261; further consdn., 4404; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 4411; agreed to, and Amt. as amended agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 7) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Joncas.*)
1°, 26; 2°*, 1220; in Com. and 3°*, 1221 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 8) To prohibit the importation and migration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement, to perform labor in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°, 32; 2° m., 1221; deb. adjd., 1259; rsmd., 1850, 2194; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2204 (i); Rep. presented, 3367 (ii).

BILL (No. 9) Further to amend the Adulteration Act, Chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 37; 2°* and in Com., 1071 (i); reconsd. in Com. and 3°*, 2099 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 10) To further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 50, respecting The North-West Territories.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 38; 2° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 532; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 554; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 838; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 877; agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1017 (i).

BILL (No. 11) Further to amend the Act, Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Choquette.*)
1°*, 67 (i).

BILL (No. 12) For further securing the Independence of Parliament.—(Mr. *Casgrain.*)
1°, 67; 2°, 2208 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 84; 2°*, 91; in Com. and 3°*, 352 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 14) Respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 84; 2°*, 91; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 15) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 84; 2°*, 91 (i); ref. back to Ry. Com., 3321 (ii).

BILL (No. 16) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°, 86; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 17) To amend The Patent Act.—(Mr. *Carling.*)
1°, 90; 2°* and in Com., 1076; 3°*, 1403 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs).—(Mr. *Carling.*)
1°*, 90; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1076 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 19) To amend The Copyright Act.—(Mr. *Carling.*)
1°*, 90; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1077 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2098. (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Goderich and Wingham Railway Company.—(Mr. *Porter.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 185; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 21) To incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hudspeth.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Act to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. *Corby.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate Belding, Paul & Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the St. Stephen's Bank.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, Limited.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 26) Relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hickey.*)
1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 29) To amend The Railway Act.—(Mr. *Cook.*)
1°*, 118 (i).

BILL (No. 30) To amend The Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Cook.*)
1°*, 118 (i).

BILL (No. 31) To provide for the examination and licensing of persons having charge of stationary engines or other devices worked under pressure.—(Mr. *Cook.*)
1°*, 118 (i).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 145; 2° m., 395; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 398; in Com., 3° m. and Amt (Mr. *Curran*) 1293; consdn. rsmd., 1345; Amt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) to Amt. 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1349; Amt. neg. (Y. 23, N. 124) 1353; 3° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 33) Respecting the People's Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1°*, 159; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 159; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 159; 2°*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 36) To confirm an agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company and the Canadian Pacific Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 159; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Hudspeth.*)
1°*, 159; 2°*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 38) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 159; 2° m., 2212; Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 2218; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (i.)

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the York County Bank.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 184; 2°, 352 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the National Construction Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 184; 2°*, 399 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii.) (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Canada Cable Company.—(Mr. *Hesson.*)
1°*, 184; 2°*, 353; in Com. and 3°*, 1019 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 42) To amend Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: The Indian Advancement Act.—(Mr. *Doyon*).
1°*, 184; Order for 2° read, 1507 (i); 2° m., 2718; deb. adjd., 2739 (ii).

BILL (No. 43) To amend Chapter 4 of 52 Victoria, entitled: An Act to authorise the granting of Subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 184; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 44) To amend Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°*, 184 (i); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. wthdn., 3703 (ii).

BILL (No. 45) To incorporate the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 212; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 212; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 47) To amend Chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: An Act respecting the protection of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 212 (i); wthdn., 4667 (ii).

BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1°*, 244; 2°*, 399; in Com., 1019; 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1°*, 244; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 244; 2°*, 353; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 244; 2°*, 399; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 52) For the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. *Purcell.*)
1°*, 245 (i); 2°, 3704 (ii).

BILL (No. 53) To amend The Public Stores Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 245; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. *White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 273; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Shore Line Railway Bridge Company.)—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1°*, 273; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 56) To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Erie and Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lister.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Paterson, Brant.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

BILL (No. 59) To change the name of the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company to the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 60) To incorporate the Rainy River Boom Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 342; 2°, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 97.)

BILL (No. 61) To amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 79).

BILL (No. 62) For granting certain powers to The Canadian Millers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531 (i).

BILL (No. 63) To incorporate the Home Benefit Life Association.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Landry.*)
1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 65) Further to amend the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 342 (i); 2°, 3161; in Com., 3164, 3368; 3° m., and Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3411; neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3447; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to Amt., 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457; Amt. neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458; Amts. (Messrs. *Blake* and *McNeill*) neg. and 3°, 3460 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the Hamilton Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 1019 (i).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the South Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i).

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the West Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i).

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company—(Mr. *Rykert*).
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1505 (i). (53 *Vic*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the St. Lawrence International Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i).

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scarth.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Summerside Bank.—(Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 44)

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Bankers' Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited.)—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3323; title changed to "Dom. Safe Deposit and Warehousing and Loan Co., Limited," 3324 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 100.)

BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Calgary Water Power Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the Elbow River Water Power Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 2338 (i).

BILL (No. 77) To amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 504 (i); 2°*, 3703; in Com., 3704 (ii).

BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hesson.*)
1°*, 561; 2°*, 1019 (i); ref. back to Ry. Com., 3322 (ii).

BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 638; 2°*, 1019 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 638; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Don Improvement, Toronto.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 638; 2°*, 1019 (i).

BILL (No. 82) To confirm an agreement between the Montreal and Western Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Desjardins*).
1°*, 638; 2°*, 1019; in Com, and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Alberta Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 722; 2°*, 1019 (i).

BILL (No. 84) To amend the Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 722; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend The Fisheries Act, chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 722 (i); wthdn., 4667 (ii).

BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Corby.*)
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1019 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bryson.*)
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Bryson.*)
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 89) To amend the Act to incorporate the River Detroit Winter Railway Bridge Company, and to change the name of the Company to the River Detroit Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland.*)
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1020; in Com. and 3°*, 2210 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 90) To amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1020; in Com. and 3°*, 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 91) To grant certain powers to the Chambly Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1020; in Com. and 3°*, 2207 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to The Ontario Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bell.*)
1°*, 833; 2°*, 1020 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 833; 2°*, 1020 (i).

BILL (No. 94) To incorporate the Thousand Islands Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bell.*)
1°*, 833; 2°*, 1020 (i).

BILL (No. 95) Respecting Agricultural Fertilisers—(D) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 963 (i); 2°, 3190; in Com. and 3°*, 3195 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 24.)

BILL (No. 96) For better securing the safety of certain Fishermen—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Jones, Halifax.*)
1°*, 1198; 2°*, 1507 (i); M. for Com., 4440; Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) 6 m. h., 4443; agreed to, 4448 (ii).

BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the Montreal Bridge and Terminus Company).—(Mr. *Langelier, Quebec.*)
1°*, 1019; 2°, 1506 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

BILL (No. 98) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith)—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 1066; 2°*, 1506 (i); Ms. for Com., 1965, 2699; in Com., 3227; 3° m., 3319; Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) 6 m. h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 93) and 3°, 3321 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Owen Sound and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 1066; 2°*, 1355; in Com. and 3°*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Inverness Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 1066; 2°, 1355 (i).

BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Louisburg an Richmond Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 1066; 2°*, 1355 (i).

BILL (No. 102) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Dickey.*)
1°, 1198 (i).

BILL (No. 103) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 1199 (i); 2°, 3717; in Com., 3719; 3°*, 3720 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Railway Act—(A) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Shanly.*)
1°*, 1343; 2°*, 1507 (i); M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3332 (ii).

BILL (No. 105) To amend Chapter 148 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled : An Act respecting the improper use of Fire-arms and other Weapons—(B) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 2311 (i).

BILL (No. 106) Respecti&g the Great North-West Central Railway Company—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1° and 2°*, 1506 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

BILL (107) Respecting the Provincial Provident Institution of St. Thomas, Ontario.—(Mr. *Ward.*)
1°*, 1343 ; 2°*, 1506 (i).

BILL (No. 108) To amend The Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*)
1°, 1343 (i) ; Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 3720 (ii).

BILL (No. 109) Respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.—(K) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 1420 ; 2°*, 1506 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 110) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 1792 (i).

BILL (No. 111) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.—(R) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 1506 ; 2° m., 1532 ; 2° and in Com., 1533 ; 3° m., 1582 ; Amt. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1583 (i).

BILL (No. 112) Authorising the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1512 (i) ; wthdn., 4924 (ii).

BILL (No. 113) To authorise the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain Funds.—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 1581 ; 2°*, 1610 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 114) Further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Brien.*)
1°, 1581 (i) ; 2° m., 3720 ; deb. adjd., 3722 (ii).

BILL (No. 115) To amend Chapter 122 of the Revised Statutes, entitled : An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. *Choquette.*)
1°*, 115 (i).

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Department of The Geological Survey.—(C) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1 *, 1792 ; 2°, 2099 (i) ; in Com., 4028 ; 3°*, 4033 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend The General Inspection Act, Chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes.—(Q) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°* 1792 (i) ;

BILL (No. 118) To amend The Steamboat Inspection Act. Chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes.—(O) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°*, 1792 (i) ; 2° m., 3186 ; deb. adjd., 3190 ; 2° on a div., 4362 ; in Com., 4362, 4663 ; 3°*, 4663. (53 *Vic.*, c. 17.)

BILL (No. 119) For the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer.—(G) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Weldon, Albert.*)
1°, on a div., 3324 ; 2° (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 108.)

BILL (No. 120) For the relief of Christiana Filman Glover.—(H) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°, on a div., 3324 ; 2° (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 109.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend the Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
Rule suspended and 1° of B., 1936 ; 2°*, 2208 (i), in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 99.)

BILL (No. 122) To prevent the Disclosure of Official Documents and Information.—(T) *from the Senate*—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
1°*, 2020 (i) ; 2°, 3203 ; in Com., 3599 ; 3°*, 3600 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 10.)

BILL (No. 123) Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
1°*, 2020 ; 2°*, 2338 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 124) Respecting H. H. Vivian & Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 2097 ; 2°*, 2338 (i) ; in Com., 3231, 3622 ; 3°*, 3623 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

BILL (No. 125) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
M. to suspend Rules, 2178 ; 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2338 (i) ; in Com., 3228, 3621 ; 3°*, 3622 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 126) To amend an Act concerning Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.—(U) *from the Senate*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 2739 ; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4035 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

BILL (No. 127) Respecting Banks and Banking.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 2234 ; in Com. on Res., 1°* of B., 2249 (i) ; 2° m., 3811 ; 2° and in Com., 3853, 3879, 3955, 4074, 4277, 4415, 4507 ; 3°, 4590 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4928 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 31.)

BILL (No. 128) Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
Rules suspended and 1°*, 2594 ; 2°—; in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

BILL (No. 129) Further to amend the Act 50 and 51 Victoria, Chapter 16 entitled : An Act to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, and to make better provision for the trial of claims against the Crown.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2595 ; 2°* and in Com., 3160 ; 3°*, 3161 (ii.) (53 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 130) To amend The Interpretation Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2825 ; 2°, 3155 ; in Com., 3157, 3600 ; 3°*, 3604 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 131) Further to amend Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, The Territories Real Property Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2914; 2°, 3198; wthdn., 4924 (ii).

BILL (No. 132) To amend The Indian Advancement Act, Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 3151; 2° m., 3604; 2°, 3624; in Com., 3625, 4033; 3°*, 4034 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 133) Further to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue, Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 3151; 2°, 3626; in Com., 3627; 3°*, 3633 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 134) Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 3153; 2°, 3593; in Com., 3595, 3876; 3°*, 3878 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 135) To amend The Seamen's Act, Chapter 74 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°, 3153; 2°, 4359; in Com., 4360; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 4400; neg. on a div. and 3°, 4403 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 136) Further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Chapleau.*)
1°, 3196; 2°* and in Com., 3895; 3° m., 3937; Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3947; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954; 3°, 3955; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4663 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 137) To amend The Gas Inspection Act, Chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 3290; 2°, 4266; in Com., 4271; 3°*, 4272 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 138) Respecting grants of Public Lands—(W) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3624; 2°* and in Com., 4034; 3°*, 4035 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 139) To amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Steamboats and the examination and licensing of Engineers employed on them.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex.*)
1°, 3512 (ii).

BILL (No. 140) To amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: An Act respecting Interest.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3624; 2°, 4266; in Com., 4414, 4924; 3°*, 4924 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 141) To facilitate the purchase by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the Branch line between Hull and Aylmer.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°, 3591; 2°*, 3702; in Com. and 3°*, 4025 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 142) For the relief of Emily Walker—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1°*, 3624; 2° m., 3694; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 3695; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).

BILL (No. 143) To amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 3779; 2°* and in Com., 4484; 3° m., 4527; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4530; neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544; 3°, 4545 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 144) In amendment of The Patent Act.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex.*)
1°, 3811; 2°* and in Com., 4484 (ii).

BILL (No. 145) To amend the Militia Act, Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 4168 (ii).

BILL (No. 146) To amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories—(V) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 4373; 2° m., 4449; 2° and in Com., 4465 (ii).

BILL (No. 147) Respecting the Hereford Railway Company and the Maine Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ives.*)
Rules suspended, 4396; 1°* and 2°*, 4397; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to place on Order Paper, 4499; in Com., 4503; 3°*, 4504 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 148) To provide for the collection and publishing of Labor Statistics.—(Mr. *Chapleau.*)
Res. prop., 4590; in Com., 4836; ref. to Com. on B., 4837; 1°, 4398; 2°, 4835; in Com., 4838; 3°*, 4846 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 149) To provide for the payment of a Bounty on Pig Iron made from Canadian ore.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 2828; M. for Com., 4321; conc. in (Y. 69, N. 45) 4403; 1°* of B., 4404; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4835 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 150) Respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 4261; M. for Com., 4419; in Com., 4433; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4440; 2°* and in Com., 4816; 3°*, 4832 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 151) Respecting Railways—(Z) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 4480; 2° and in Com., 4816; 3°*, 4821 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 152) To amend the Acts respecting the Harbor of Pictou.—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°, 4588; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4835. (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 153) To amend the Indian Act, Chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes—(BB) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°—; 2°, 4903 (ii); in Com., 4904; 3°*, 4905 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 154) Respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 4761; 2° and in Com., 4847; 3°*, 4848 (i)). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 155) Respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
Rules suspended, 4821; 1°* and 2°*, 4822; in Com. and 3°*, 4906; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4930. (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 156) Respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hesson.*)
Rules suspended, 4846 ; 1° and 2° on a div., 4846 ; in Com. and 3°*, 4906 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 83.)

BILL (No. 157) To authorise the granting of Subsidies to certain Railways and Railway Companies.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 4762 ; in Com., 4848 ; conc. in, 4893 ; amended Res., 4824 ; in Com., 4896 ; 1°* of B., 4898 ; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 158) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1890, and the 30th June, 1891, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res., 4916 ; 1° of B., 2°*, 3°*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

BILL (No. 159) To amend the Act of the present Session, entitled : An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4910. (53 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

BILL (No. 160) To authorise the granting of Subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 4589 ; in Com., 4668 ; rep., 4694 ; M. for conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 4832 ; neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834 ; further Res., 4825 ; in Com., 4917 ; conc. in, 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., 4919 ; 3° m., 4920 ; 3°, 4923 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 161) To amend The Pilotage Act, Chapter 80 of the Revised Statutes—(DD) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°*, 4924 (ii).

BINDERS, REAPERS, &c. *See* "SELF-BINDERS."

BLACKFEET INDIANS, CAPTURE OF WHITE GIRL : Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 815 (i).

BLACKING, &C. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243.

BLAKE, CONVICT, TRANSFER TO ENG. : in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).

BLISS' PATENT LETTER BOX : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2827 (ii).

Board of Trade. *See* "TORONTO."

BOARD OF TRADE, QUEBEC, AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 55 (i).

BOOKBINDERS' TOOLS AND IMPLEMENTS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (ii).

BOOTS AND SHOES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3561 (ii).

BONDED FREIGHT. *See* "American Vessels."

Bounty on Pig Iron. *See* "PIG IRON."

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, EXPENSES *re* DISTRIBUTION : in Com. of Sup., 2376 (ii).
—— *See* "Pig Iron."

BRACES OR SUSPENDERS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (i).

BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF (MILITIA,) SALARIES : Com. of Sup., 1315 (i).

Brandon and South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Scarth*). 1°*, 449 ; 2°*, 679 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1355. (53 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4589 ; in Com., 4689 (ii).

Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*). 1°*, 342 ; 2°*, 531 ; in Com. and 3°* 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

BRASS FOR PRINTERS' RULES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (ii).

BREMNER FURS, REP. OF SEL. COM. : presented (Mr. *McNeill*) 3810 (ii).
—— EVIDENCE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4449 (ii).
—— PAYMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4931 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 4732 (ii).
—— *See* "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."

BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1358 ; remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) 1508, 1517 (i) ; M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for precedence, 1654 (i).
Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1370 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 1374 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1377 ; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1379 ; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1385 ; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1388 ; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1388 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 1392 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 1394 ; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1397 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1390 (i).

"BRIDGEWATER," SHIP, SEIZURE : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).

BRITISH ASSOCIATION (*re* INDIANS) GRANT TO SUPPLEMENT VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA :
ALASKAN AND CAN. BOUNDARY LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 188 (i).
BEHRING'S SEA. *See* "FISHERIES."
CHINESE ADMISSION INTO CANADA, PAR. IN "EMPIRE :" read (Mr. *Edgar*) 3624 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION : Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 68 (i).
CHISHOLM, MR., M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3081 (ii).
COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
DEFENCES IN B.C., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1120 (i).
—— FORTIFICATIONS : Ques. (Mr *Prior*) 1485 (i).
MAIL SERVICE IN B.C. : Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2668 (ii).
MINING MACHINERY, FREE IMPORTATION : Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (i).
NEW WESTMINSTER REPRESENTATION, VACANCY : Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3439 (ii).
SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C. : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).
SKEENA EXPEDITION : in Com. of Sup., 4057 (ii).
VICTORIA, B.C., RETURN OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

B.C. *vs.* ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA, COST OF APPEAL : in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762 ; in Com., 4874 (ii).

BUDGET, THE: Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii).
——— Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2566 (ii).
——— DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1907; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1950 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1094 (i).
——— *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
BUILDERS, &C., HARDWARE: in Com. of Sup., 3486.
BUILDINGS, PUBLIC. *See* "SUPPLY."
BUOYS IN ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2185 (i).
BUTTONS, VEGETABLE IVORY, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3384 (ii).
CABINET, LIST OF MEMBERS, iii.
CABINET MINISTERS, REFLECTION ON BY MEMBER: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 2252 (i).
CALDWELL, LOCKMASTER AT IROQUOIS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s agreement B. No. 150 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 4261; M. for Com., 4419; in Com., 4433; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4440; 2°* and in Com., 4816; 3°*, 4832 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 159; 2°*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO.: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4261 (ii).
——— LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4689 (ii).
Calgary Water Power Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
CALVIE, LEGAL SERVICES *re* PROSECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4399 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES VOTED: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3663 (ii).
CANADA AND JAMAICA, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
——— *See* "NEWFOUNDLAND," "WEST INDIES," &C.
CANADA AND TREATIES OF COMMERCE, COMS. BETWEEN H. M.'S GOVT. AND DOM. GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 3666 (ii).
CANADA AND UNITED KINGDOM STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4773; conc., 4915 (ii).
Canada Cable Co.'s incorp. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Hesson*). 1°*, 184; 2°*, 353; in Com. and 3°*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 244; 2°*, 399; in Com., 1019; 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 26 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 104; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 102 (Mr. *Hickey*). 1°, 1198 (i).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1°, 199 (i); 2°, 3717; in Com., 3719; 3°*, 3720 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, WORKING: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1021 (i).
CANADIAN COMMISSIONERS ABROAD: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
CANADIAN HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1020 (i).
Canadian Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 342; 2°*, 531 (i).
C.P.R. Act Amt. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
——— *See* "MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO."
CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:
AYLMER BRANCH, SALE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3591 (ii).
BRANDON BRANCH LINE, LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4589 (ii).
CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4013, 4653 (ii).
GLENBOROUGH BRANCH, LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. 4589; in Com., 4668 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Que.*) 55 (i).
RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Dupont*) 141 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND AND JAPAN, &C., STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 861 (i).
CANADIAN REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 2017 (i).
CANALS:
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 517 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 187 (i).
CALDWELL, LOCKMASTER AT IROQUOIS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
——— VESSELS, TONNAGE, &C., PASSED THROUGH: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1401 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, LETTER OF MR. PAGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bergin*) 1122 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 3703 (ii).
——— COMMISSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 145 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 118 (i).
WELLAND CANAL, REP. OF MR. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 885 (i).
——— M. to lay on Table (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1515 (i).
[*See* "P. W.," "RYS.," &c., under "SUPPLY."]
CANTEENS AT FREDERICTON CAMP: Remarks (Mr. *Gillmor*) 3078 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY. CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 3319 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4019 (ii).
CAPE CROCKER INDIANS, ANNUITY PER HEAD: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 1098 (i).
CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2378 (i).
CARAQUET RY., FINANCIAL AID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3723 (ii).
——— GROSS EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3811 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).

CARDIN, ELPHÈGE AND JEAN, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4655; conc., 4913 (ii).
CARTWRIGHT'S CASES, AID TO PUBLISH: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
CASCUMPEC HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1655 (i).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 1711.
CASCAPEDIA (GREAT) RIVER BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
—— (PETITE) P. O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
CATTLE DISEASE IN WESTERN STATES: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 85 (i).
—— QUARANTINE STATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 92.
CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS FOR INDEMNITY, COR., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1703 (i).
—— AGENT'S LETTER TO COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1797 (i).
—— ENGAGEMENT FOR CIRCUS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1654 (i).
—— MONEYS BELONGING TO: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1711 (i).
—— QUARRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 85, 247 (i).
—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 247 (i).
—— SURVEYOR'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1069 (i).
CAVALRY SCHOOL, QUE., OFFICERS' PROMOTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 3291 (ii).
CENSUS AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2386 (i), 4650 (ii).
—— NEXT ENUMERATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 402 (i), 2827 (ii).
—— PAGANS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).
Central Ontario Railway Co.'s B. No. 86 Mr. *Corby*). 1°*, 794; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N.B. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
CEREALS, FRAUDS IN SALE OF: prop. Res. (Mr. *Burdett*) 1148 (i).
CHALK-STONE, CHINA, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584 (ii).
CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2288 (ii).
—— VESSELS, TONNAGE, &c., PASSED THROUGH: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1401 (i).
Chambly Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 794; 2°*, 1020; in Com. and 3°*, 2207 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
CHAMPLAIN DISTRICT, REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2022 (i).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 161 (i).
CHATHAM (N.B.) QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 4001 (ii).
CHICAGO WORLD'S FAIR, CANADIAN REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1357 (i).
CHINESE, ADMISSION INTO CANADA, PAR. IN "EMPIRE:" read (Mr. *Edgar*) 3624 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 68 (i).
CHISHOLM, MR., M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3081 (ii).
CHISHOLM, KENNETH. *See* "Sick Mariners Fund."
CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, DISTRESS: Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4926 (ii).
CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 353, 460 (i), 3779, 3993, 4570 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°*, 118 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL MEN WITHOUT PASSING C. S. EXAM., NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lister*) 3693 (ii).
—— EXAMINERS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
—— LIST, COMPILATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3992 (ii).
CLOCKS AND CLOCK CASES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3388 (ii).
CLOTHING (MILITIA) SUPPLIES, TENDERS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3811 (ii).
—— READY-MADE, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3554 (ii).
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).
COCOA PASTE, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3390 (ii).
COINS, CABINETS OF, &c: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584 (ii).
COLBY, HON. C. C., MEMBER FOR STANSTEAD: Introduced, 1 (i).
COLLARS, COTTON, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3390, 3401 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOR, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1655 (i).
COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
COLORS, DRY: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3503 (ii).
COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 2288, 2313 (i), 3659, 3802, 4119, 4792 (ii).
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Navigation Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. *Mara*). Rules suspended and 1°*, 2594; 2° —; in Com. and 3°* 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
Combinations in Trade Prevention B. No. 77 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 504 (i); 2°, 3703; in Com. 3704 (ii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
—— TREATIES. *See* "TREATIES."
COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION: List of Members, 37 (i).
ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR B. 8: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) for Sel. Com., 2204 (i); Rep. presented, 3367 (ii).
BALLOT BOXES, PATENT: M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2230 (i); Rep. presented, 4656 (ii).
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: List of Members, 36.
—— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names 91 (i).
BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS AND BEEMNER FURS: M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1358, 1398 (i).

COMMITTEES—*Continued.*
BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS: Rep. presented (Mr. *Mc Neill*) 4732 (ii).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: M. for Sp. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 4.
—— List of Members, vii.
—— 1ST REP. OF COM.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1261 (i), 3153 (ii).
—— 2ND REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins* 3368 (ii).
—— 3RD REP.: presented (Mr. *Davin*) 4396.
—— M. (Mr. *Davin*) to conc., 4578 (ii).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref, back, 4578 (ii).
EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 34 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31 (i).
PRINTING, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31.
—— List of Members, 31 (i).
—— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names, 1651 (i).
—— 3RD REP.: M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc., 1856 (i).
—— objection (Mr. *Blake*) 440 (ii).
—— 6TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to conc., 4658 (ii).
—— 9TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc., 4928 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS (MISCELLANEOUS): List of Members, 35 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 33 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to employ shorthand writer 2098 (i).
—— REP. presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4397 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS; List of Members, 35 (i).
—— NON-MEETING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS, &C.: Llst of Members, 34 (i).
—— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names, 1651 (i).
SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3 (i).
——M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 29; Rep. presented, 30 (i).
STANDING ORDERS COM.: List of Members, 31 (i).
COMMITTEES, CHAIRMAN OF. *See* "DEPUTY SPEAKER."
COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 1267 (i).
COMPTON, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
Confederation Life Association B. No. 74 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)
CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 213, 1331 (i), 4575.
CONTRACTORS' CHEQUES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 27 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTION, HALDIMAND: Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *Speaker*) 83 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Carling*). 1°*, 90; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1077; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2098 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)
COPYRIGHT ACT AMT. (1889): Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 84.
CORINTH P.O.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 94 (i).
CORN DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1583; neg. on a div., 1610 (i).
—— SEED, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2828 (ii).
—— INDIAN: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584, 3588 (ii).
—— REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 195 (i); neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 211 (i).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390; deb. adjd., 393; rsmd., 451; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459 (i).
—— REMOVAL OF DUTY: Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583; neg., 1610 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2275 (i).
—— LETTER OF MR. PAGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bergin*) 1122 (i).
CORSETS, CLASPS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3485 (ii).
COTTON CORDAGE, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3392 (ii).
—— DENIMS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3400 (ii).
—— TWINE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3541 (ii).
COTÉ, F., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.: M. for copies * (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 121 (i).
Criminal Law (seduction, &c.) Amt. B. No. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 342 (i); 2°, 3161; in Com., 3164, 3368; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3411; neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3447; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to Amt. 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457; Amt. neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458; Amts. (Messrs. *Blake* and *Mc Neill*) neg. and 3°, 3460 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).
CROFTER IMMIGRANTS, PAR. IN "NORTH BRITISH DAILY MAIL:" Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1795 (i).
CROW HARBOR POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 400 (i).
Cruelty to Animals prevention Act (*Chap.* 172 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 26; 2° m., 1203; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1219; 2°, 1220; Order for Com. read, 1506; in Com., 1823; M. to further consd. B. in Com. and Amt. Mr. *Tisdale*), 6 m. h., 1854; M. and Amt. wthdn., 1856 (i).
"CRUISER," GOVT. YACHT, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
CULLEN, PATRICK, EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 2343 (i); suppl., 4121 (ii).
CULLERS' OFFCE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
CUSTOMS:
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED. *See* "SELF-BINDERS."
ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND TARIFF: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3633 (ii).
AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 99 (i).
"BRIDGEWATER," SHIP, SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).
CORN FOR SEED, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2828.
—— REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 195; neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 211 (i).
—— REMOVAL OF DUTY: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1583; neg., 1610 (i).
CUSTOMS DUTIES, AMOUNT PER CAPITA: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 188 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

EGGS, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS TO AND FROM ONT. AND QUE.: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Guillet*) 3693 (iii).

FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1811, 2024 (i).

FISH IN BOND, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 248 (i).

FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).

FLOUR, CAN., IMPORTS INTO MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2670, 2671 (ii).

—— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2671 (ii).

FREE LIST, EXTENSION TO CERTAIN ARTICLES: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 403 (i).

GRAINS AND SEEDS, IMPORTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1029 (i).

—— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Couture*) 1069 (i),

LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 884 (i).

LUMBER DUTIES AND MCKINLEY TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).

LUMBER, DUTY ON: Ques. (Mr. *Bryson*) 4662 (ii).

MACHINERY, DUTY ON MANUFACTURING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2670 (ii).

—— MINING, FREE IMPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 562 (i).

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1125; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (i).

MALT, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 516 (i).

MCLAGGAN, CUSTOMS OFFICER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 4500 (ii).

MEAT, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 55; Res. wthdn., 123 (i).

OLEOMARGARINE, IMPORTS INTO B.N.A.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 122 (i).

SAW LOGS, REBATE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3662 (ii).

SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS AND MOWERS EXPORTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1065 (i).

TARIFF, THE. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 26 (i).

TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2312 (i).

TREATIES OF COMMERCE, COMS. BETWEEN H. M.'S GOVT. AND DOM. GOVT.: M. for copies (Gen. *Laurie*) 3666 (ii).

[*See* "COLLECTION OF REVENUES" and "CIVIL GOVT." under "SUPPLY."]

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 143 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3779; 2°* and in Com., 4484; 3° m., 4527; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4530; neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544; 3°, 4545 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 159 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* 4910, (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

CUSTOMS DUTIES, AMOUNT PER CAPITA: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 188 (i).

CUSTOMS DUTY ON MEAT, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 55; wthdn., 123 (i).

DAIRYING INTEREST, DEVELOPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

DAMAGES BY STEAMERS. *See* "Govt. Property."

DARTMOUTH BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

DEAD LETTER OFFICE AND REGISTERED LETTERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 83 (i).

DEAD MEAT CO.: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, ACCOMMODATION FOR STAFF: remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 2723 (ii).

DEBATES COMMITTEE, LIST OF MEMBERS, vii.

—— *See* "COMMITTEES."

Deceased Wife's Sister (Marriage) Act Amt. B. No. 126 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 2739; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4035 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

DEFENCES IN B. C., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).

DEPTL. BUILDINGS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 474 (i).

DEPTL. SECRETARY (MILITIA) APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2670 (ii).

DEPOSITS IN SAVINGS BANKS. *See* "P.O." under "FINANCE."

DERBY BRANCH RY., EXTENSION: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 514 (i).

DESJARDINS' DÉBATS PARLEMENTAIRES DE QUÉBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4113 (ii).

Detroit Winter Ry. Bridge Co. *See* "RIVER DETROIT."

DICTIONNAIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DE L'ABBÉ TANGUAY: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).

DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 530 (i).

DINGMAN, INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Statement (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2160 (i).

DIONNE, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Pessaint*) 2023 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL BILLS SINCE CONFEDERATION, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 28.

—— MAN. MUNICIPAL ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 2377 (i).

—— POWER OF: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4083; agreed to, 4094 (ii).

DISCLOSURES, &C. *See* "OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS."

DISTILLERIES AND FACTORIES (EXTRA PAY OF OFFICERS): in Com of Sup., 2337 (i).

DIVISIONS:

ANNUNCIATION DAY, ADJNMT.: prop. M. (Mr. *Trow*) 2308; agreed to (Y. 59, N. 24) 2309 (i).

BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES: on Sen. Amts., Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii).

BUDGET, THE, &C., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1937; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1949 (i).

CORN, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 195, neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 212 (i).

—— REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390; deb. adjd., 393; rsmd., 451; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459 (i).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*): M. to recom. (Mr. *Bergin*) neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3447; neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS PREVENTION B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6m. h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1291 (i).

DIVISIONS– *Continued.*

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544 (ii).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*): Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 2216; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (i).

DIVORCE, KEEFER, H. F., RELIEF B. 119 (Mr. *Prior*): 2° agreed to (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 (ii).

—— SMITH, GEO. T., RELIEF B. 98 (Mr. *Small*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) 6 m. h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 92) 3321 (ii).

—— WALKER, EMILY, RELIEF B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*): 2° m., Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 3693; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).

EXODUS OF CANADIANS TO U. S.: M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 403; neg. (Y. 63, N. 94) 447 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*): 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to recom., 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3947; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954 (ii).

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to Repeal, 1139; neg. (Y. 78, N. 99) 1197 (i).

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., (ABOLITION) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*): on M. for 2°, Amt. to. Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 554; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 876; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1017 (i).

GRAINS AND SEEDS, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1029; neg. (Y. 59, N. 84) 1062 (i).

HERCHMER, COMMISISONER, INVESTIGATION *re* MANAGEMENT MOUNTED POLICE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 2674: Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 2690; neg. (Y. 52, N. 76) 3366; Res. neg. on same div., 3366 (ii).

JESUITS' ESTATES ACT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4173; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252 (ii).

LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR, TIMBER LIMITS: Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1746; agreed to (Y. 94, N. 72) 1790 (i).

LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 123; agreed to (Y. 161, N. 0) 136 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE IMPORTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1125; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) 1139; agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (i).

ORANGE INCORPORATION B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*): M. for 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 69) 398; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1346, Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) Party Processions, neg. (Y. 23 N. 124) 1353; 3° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i).

PIG IRON, BOUNTY: on M. to conc. in Res. (Mr. *Foster*) agreed to (Y. 49, N. 45) 4403 (ii).

RAILWAY ACT AMT. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*): on M. for Com., Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3331 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1536; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566 (i).

SUBSIDIES (LAND) TO RAILWAYS, REP. OF COM. OF WHOLE: M. to conc. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4822; Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS, THE TARIFF: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2584; neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 3075.

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) reducing Duty on Binding Twine and Cordage, neg. (Y. 44, N. 85) 3776 (ii).

Divorce (Glover, Christiana Filman) B. No. 120 (Mr. *McKay*). 1° on a div., 3324; 2° (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694; in Com. and 3° on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 109.)

Divorce (Keefer, Hugh Forbes) B. No. 119 (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*). 1° on a div., 3324; 2° (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694; in Com. and 3° on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 108.)

Divorce (Walker, Emily) B. No. 142 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 3624; 2° m., 3694; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 3695; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).

DOIG, MRS. A. A., CLAIM FOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1486 (i).

Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 7** (Mr. *Joncas*). 1°, 26; 2°*, 1220; in Com. and 3°*, 1221 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 9.)

Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 38** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 159 (i); 2° m., 2212; Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 2218; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (ii).

—— PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES, N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii)

DOM. LANDS ACT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316.

—— CAPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 4155 (ii).

—— INCOME: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).

Dom. Lands. *See* "PUBLIC LANDS."

DOM. LICENSE ACT, EXPENSES: Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4906 (ii).

Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). Rule suspended and 1° of B., 1936; 2°*, 2208 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 99.)

DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 494 (i).

Dom. Safe Deposit Warehousing and Loan Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3323 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 100.)

Don Improvement (Toronto) B. No. 81 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 638; 2°*, 1019 (i).

DORVAL STATION AND RIVIÈRE DES PRAIRIES RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824 (ii).

DRAIN PIPES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3401.

DRAWBACK. *See* "SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS, &C."

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1631 (i), 4729 (ii).

—— MCGREGOR'S CREEK: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 530 (i).

—— STR. "PRINCE EDWARD:" M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).

—— RIVER THAMES: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 144 (i).

—— REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4894 (ii).

DRILL HALL, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 883 (i).

DRILL INSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1320 (ii).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4889 (ii).

DUAL LANGUAGE. *See* "FRENCH LANGUAGE, N.W.T."

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 68 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 149 (i).
DUNNVILLE DAM, DAMAGES AT LOOMIS' CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2021 (i).
DUTIES. *See* "CUSTOMS."
DUVAR, LIEUT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1485 (i).
DYKE, JOHN, PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
EARLE, THOS., MEMBER FOR VICTORIA, B.C.: Introduced, 2 (i).
EASTER ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2596, 2671, 2741 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2914 (ii).
EASTERN EXTENSION RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1936 (i).
EAU CLAIR AND BOW RIVER LUMBER CO. *vs.* QUEEN, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).
EDUCATION, LEGISLATION *re*. *See* "DISALLOWANCE."
EGGS, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS TO AND FROM ONT. AND QUE.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guillet*) 3693 (ii).
Elbow River Water Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 in Com. and 3°*, 2338.
ELECTION, CONTROVERTED. *See* "HALDIMAND."
Electoral Franchise. *See* "FRANCHISE."
ELECTORAL LISTS FOR DOM., EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 83 (i).
ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX; Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3291 (ii).
Engineers Exam. and Licensing provision B. No. 31 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°*, 118 (i).
——— *See* "STEAMBOAT INSPECTIONS ACT."
ENGLISH PERIODICALS, COST OF MAILING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1856, 1918 (i).
Erie and Huron Ry. Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *Lister*). 1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 59.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4874 (ii).
ESTIMATES, THE, 1890-91: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 149 (i).
——— SUPPL., 1889-90: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2531 (i).
——— FURTHER SUPPL., 1889-90: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 3955 (ii).
——— SUPPL. 1891: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4479 (ii).
ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1120 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
FORTIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1485 (i).
ETHER, SULPHURIC: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3558 (ii).
EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3647 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act. *See* "SUPREME."
EXCHEQUER COURT, 3RD CLASS CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 2313 (i), 4120, 4792 (ii).
EXHIBITION AT JAMAICA: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1201 (i).
EXODUS OF CANADIANS TO U.S.: prop. M. for Sel. Com.) Mr. *Charlton*) 403; neg. (Y. 63, N. 94) 447 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Carling*) 408; (Mr. *Brien*) 409; (Mr. *Sproule*) 409; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 412; (Mr. *Fisher*) 414; (Mr. *Hesson*) 417; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 419; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 428; (Mr. *Watson*) 431; (Mr. *Davin*) 433; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 433; (Mr. *Freeman*) 434; (Mr. *Dupont*) 439; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 442 (i).
EXPENDITURE ON RYS., &C., SINCE CONFED.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 69 (i).
EXPENDITURE, PUBLIC: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARM, CENTRAL: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 145 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 715, 2383 (i), 3779, 4795 (ii).
——— REP., PRINTING EXTRA COPIES: Remarks (Mr. *Bergin*) 1792 (i).
EXPIRING LAWS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
EXPRESS SERVICE BETWEEN H. OF C. AND PRINTING BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (ii).
FABRE, MR., SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
FACTORIES. *See* "ONT. MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION."
FANCY WORKBOXES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (ii).
FEATHERS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3225 (ii).
——— OSTRICH, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3402 (ii).
FERNETVILLE POST OFFCE, CLOSING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
Fertilisers. *See* "AGRICULTURAL."
FERTILISERS, AGRICULTURAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1402 (i).
——— ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1811, 2024 (i).
FERRO-MANGANESE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3486 (ii).
FIBRE-WARE, INDURATED, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3554 (ii).
FINANCE:
AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 90 (i).
BANK CHARTERS, B.N.A. AND B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 255 (i).
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."
BUDGET, THE: Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii)
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 161 (i).
CHARTERED BANKS IN LIQUIDATION, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hesson*) 76 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE. *See* "ESTIMATES."
INTEREST ON DEPOSITS, CALCULATING: in Com. of Sup., 3994 (i).
LOANS AND POPULAR VOTE, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 4589 (ii).
PAPER CURRENCY GUARANTEE BY GOVT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 189 (i).
P.E.I. AND DOM. GOVT., MONEY DRAWN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 27 (i).
PIG-IRON AND FISHERY BOUNTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1811 (i).
PIG-IRON BOUNTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828, 4221 (ii).
P. O. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).

FINANCE—*Continued.*
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1860 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 83 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS IN DOM.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
STATISTICAL DIAGRAMS: in Com. of Sup., 4571 (i).
THREE PER CENT. LOAN OF 1888: Ques. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 27 (i).
UPPER CANADA BANK: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
[*See* "Civil Govt." under "SUPPLY."]

Fire-Arms, &c., Improper use Act (*Chap.* 148 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 105** (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 2311 (i).

FIRE-GUARD ALONG RY. TRACKS, N.W.T: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).

Fisheries Act (*Chap.* 95 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 85** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 722 (i); wthdn., 4667 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety B. No. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*). 1°*, 1198; 2°*, 1507 (i); M. for Com., 4440; Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) 6 m. h., 4443; agreed to, 4448 (ii).

FISHERIES:
BEHRING'S SEA SEAL FISHERIES, NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 886.
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1201 (i), 4906 (ii).
—— COR.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 513 (i).
—— NEWSPAPER PAR.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1509 (i).
—— Telegram read (Mr. *Mitchell* 1068 (i).
DUVAR, LIEUT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1485 (i).
FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 85 (i).
FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2916, 4930 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Flynn*) 1021 (i).
—— PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 732 (i),
FISHING BOUNTY. *See* "PIG-IRON."
FISHING LICENSES, UNSETTLED RETURNS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lister*) 1065 (i).
GAUTHIER, W., FISHING LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3076 (ii).
GREER, JAMES, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3811, 3662 (ii).
HERRING FISHERY, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 393 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 213 (1).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 395 (i).
INSPECTOR FOR P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 55 (i).
LICENSES TO FISHERMEN IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4169 (ii).
LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P.E.I.: Remarks on Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 650 (i).
LOBSTER FISHING REGULATIONS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 885 (i).
MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
"MODUS VIVENDI" AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 814 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3076 (ii).
—— STATEMENTS IN AMERICAN PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 532 (i).

FISHERIES—*Continued.*
SALMON FISHING WITH NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 4399 (i).
SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2229 (i).
TRAWL FISHING IN ST. MARY'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2377 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," "U. S. FISHING VESSELS."]
FISH-HOOKS, NETS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3585 (ii).
FISH IN BOND, CUSTOMS' DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 248 (i).
FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1795 (i).
FLETCHER, JAS., SERVICES (ENTOMOLOGICAL): in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
FLOATING LIGHT. *See* "STE. CROIX."
FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 884 (i).
FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).
—— IMPORTS INTO MAR. PROVS. *viâ* U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2670, 2671 (ii).
—— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2671 (ii).
FORBES, W. B., ARREARS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
Foreign Labor. *See* "ALIEN."
FORREST, LIEUT.-COL.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4564, 4567 (ii).
FORT COULONGE AND LA PASSE VILLAGE INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE: M. for Reps. of Engineers * (Mr. *Bryson*) 1065 (i).
Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 11** (Mr. *Choquette*). 1°, 67 (i).
Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 44** (Mr. *Barron*). 1°*, 184 (i); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. wthdn., 3703 (ii).
Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. 114** (Mr. *Brien*). 1°, 1581 (i); 2° m., 3720; deb. adjd., 3722 (ii).
Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 136** (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 3196; 2°* and in Com., 3895; 3° m., 3937; Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3947; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954; 3°, 3955; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4663 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 8.)
Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 108** (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1°, 1343 (i); Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 3720 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT AND PROVINCIAL VOTERS' LISTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1489 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, REPEAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 257; M., 1193; neg. (Y. 78, N. 90) 1197.
Deb. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 275; (Mr. *Casey*) 284; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 289; (Mr. *Lister*) 294; (Mr. *Edgar*) 298; (Mr. *Curran*) 300; (Mr. *McMullen*) 303; (Mr. *Platt*) 309; (Mr. *Sproule*) 312; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 315; (Mr. *Campbell*) 318; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 321; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 325; (Mr. *Hesson*) 328; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 332; (Mr. *Waldie*) 335; (Mr. *Welsh*) 337; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 337; (Mr. *Watson*) 339; (Mr. *Daly*) 340; (Mr. *Trow*) 1149; (Mr. *Fiset*) 1152; (Mr. *Béchard*) 1154; (Mr. *Brien*) 1158; (Mr *Dawson*) 1160; (Mr. *Choquette*) 1162; (Mr. *Charl-*

FRANCHISE ACT, REPEAL—*Continued.*
ton) 1166 ; (Mr. *White, (Renfrew)* 1174 ; Mr. *Mills, Bothwell)* 1176 ; (Mr. *Foster)* 1180 ; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax)* 1185 ; (Mr. *Haggart)* 1189 ; (Mr. *Semple)* 1191 ; (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin)* 1193 (i).

FRÉCHETTE, A.. TRANSLATION OF CIRCULARS : in Com. of Sup., 2339 (i).

FREDERICTON AND PRINCE WILLIAM, N.B., RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* 4764 (ii).

FREDERICTON, *viâ* OROMOCTO, AND GAGETOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* 4763 ; in Com., 4876 (ii).

FREE LIST, EXTENSION TO CERTAIN ARTICLES : Ques. (Mr. *Fisher)* 403 (i).

FREIGHT IN BOND ON AMERICAN VESSELS : M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Laurier)* 99 (i).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. No. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy).* 1°*, 38 ; 2° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Davin)* 532 ; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil)* 554 ; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 838 ; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson)* 877 ; agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1017 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien)* 545 ; (Mr. *White, Cardwell)* 549 ; (Mr. *Beausoleil)* 554 ; Amt. to Amt., 557 (i).

Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Denison)* 557 ; (Mr. *Muloch)* 576 ; (Mr. *Gigault)* 589 ; (Mr. *Curran)* 592 ; (Mr. *Robillard)* 595 ; (Mr. *Dawson)* 598 : (Sir *Hector Langevin)* 600 : (Mr. *Lavergne)* 614 ; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell)* 618 ; (Mr. *Charlton)* 651 ; (Mr. *Blake)* 670 ; (Mr. *McNeill)* 688 ; (Mr. *Sutherland)* 697 ; (Mr. *Laurier)* 725 ; (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* 745 ; (Mr. *Cockburn)* 752 ; (Mr. *Sproule)* 758 ; (Mr. *Wright)* 761 ; (Mr. *Landry)* 769 ; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert)* 780 ; (Mr. *Dessaint)* 784 ; (Mr. *Chapleau)* 816 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright)* 838 ; (Mr. *McCarthy)* 845 ; (Mr. *Davin)* 874 ; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson)* 877 (i).

Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell)* 887 ; (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* 890 ; (Mr. *Edgar)* 895 ; (Mr. *White, Renfrew)* 902 ; (Mr. *Barron)* 905 ; (Mr. *Cook)* 918 ; (Mr. *Béchard)* 926 ; (Mr. *Dewdney)* 932 ; (Mr. *Masson)* 936 ; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.)* 941 ; (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency)* 949 ; (Mr. *Amyot)* 963 ; (Mr. *Charlton)* 970 ; (Mr. *Holton)* 981 ; (Mr. *LaRivière)* 983 ; (Mr. *Beausoleil)* 998 ; (Mr. *Wallace)* 1001 ; (Mr. *Watson)* 1002 ; (Mr. *Dupont)* 1006 ; (Mr. *Scriver)* 1011 ; (Mr. *Laurier)* 1012 ; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant)* 1012 ; (Mr. *Ives)* 1015 ; (Mr. *McCarthy)* 1016 ; (Mr. *Platt)* 1017 (i).

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ORDINANCES, &C., PRINTED IN : M. for Rets. (Mr. *McCarthy)* 83 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy,* &c.) 160 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. *Amyot) re* Vote, 1069 (i).

——— PETS. : M. to read (Mr. *McCarthy)* 504 (i).

GARNEAU, JOSEPH, APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec)* 66 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (*Chap.* 101 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 137** (Mr. *Costigan).* 1°, 3290 ; 2°, 4266 ; in Com., 4271 ; 3°*, 4272 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 25.)

GASPÉ COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Joncas)* 193 (i).

GAUTHIER, W., FISHING LICENSE : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule)* 3076 (ii).

General Inspection Act (*Chap.* 99 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 117** (Mr. *Costigan).* 1°*, 1792 (i).

GEOGRAPHICAL, &C., MAPS AND GLOBES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243 (ii).

Geological Survey Dept. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney).* 1°*, 1792 ; 2°, 2099 ; in Com., 4028 ; 3°*, 4033 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 11.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 173, 2124 (i), 4789 (ii).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS : M. for copies* (Mr. *Muloch)* 1713 (i).

——— REPS. PUBLISHED AND SOLD : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland)* 530 (i).

Glover, Christiana Filman. *See* "DIVORCE."

GLOVES AND MITS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3484 (ii).

GODERICH AND STRATHROY P. O., TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Barron)* 2377 (i).

Goderich and Wingham Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Porter).* 1°*, 104 ; 2°*, 185 ; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 51.)

GOPHERS, N.W.T., DESTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

GOVTL. EXPENDITURE IN OTTAWA : Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen)* 1857 (i).

GOVT. BUSINESS, DELAY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier)* in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1937 ; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1950 (i).

GOVT. BUSINESS : M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* to take in Thursdays, 1066 (i).

——— M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* to take in Wednesdays, 2241 (i).

——— M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald)* to take in Mondays, 3937 (ii).

GOVT. OF N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 2306 (i).

GOVT. PRINTING BUREAU. *See* "PRINTING."

GOVT. PROPERTY, DAMAGES TO BY STEAMERS, &C., CLAIMS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook)* 1488 (i).

GOVT. STEAMERS : in Com. of Sup., 4041, 4779 (ii).

——— CARRIAGE OF MERCHANDISE : (Ques.) 504 (i).

——— TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot)* 1120 (ii).

GOVERNOR, DEPUTY : Assent to Bills, 2385 (i), 3873 (ii).

GOV. GEN.'S SEC., Letters to Speaker *re* Royal Assent, 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).

GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 168 ; contingencies, 222 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPECIAL CAR : in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).

GRANDIN, MGR., LETTER OF : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot)* 119.

Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Tisdale).* 1°*, 638 ; 2°*, 1019 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 63.)

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Ry. B. No. 79 (Mr. *Small).* 1°*, 638 ; 2°*, 1019 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 48.)

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 125 (Mr. *Curran*). M. to suspend Rules, 2178 ; 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2338 ; in Com., 3228, 3621 ; 3°*, 3622 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 49.)

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1957 (i).

GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).

GRAINS AND SEEDS, IMPORTS : prop. Res, (Mr. *Mc Millan, Huron*) 1029 ; neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1062 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1032 ; (Mr. *Rowand*) 1036 ; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1038 ; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1039 ; (Mr. *Semple*) 1040 ; (Mr. *Platt*) 1042 ; (Mr. *Foster*) 1043 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1044 ; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1045 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1047 ; (Mr. *Trow*) 1048 ; (Gen. *Laurie*) 1048 ; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1049 ; (Mr. *Cargill*) 1052 ; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1053 ; (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1056 ; (Mr. *Bergin*) 1056 ; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1057 ; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1059 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 1060 ; (Mr. *Scriver*) 1061 (i).

GRAIN TESTER, CHANGES : Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 4399.

GRAVING DOCK. *See* "ESQUIMALT," "KINGSTON," &c.

GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES IN N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).

GREAT EASTERN RY., &c. : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).

——— Co.'s BRIDGE SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 ; in Com., 4889 (ii).

GREAT NORTHERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2379 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).

Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s B., No. 106 (Mr. *Small*). 1° and 2°*, 1506 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 81.)

GREEN COVE BREAKWATER, REBUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 3154 (ii).

——— REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 84 (i).

GREENLY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3154 (ii).

GREER, JAMES, LATE FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3662, 3811 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 3654.

——— REGULATIONS : M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 83 (i).

——— RETURN OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1402 (i).

HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS IN N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3309 (ii).

——— AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY, N.W.T : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100 (i).

——— RELIEF OF DISTRESS IN N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4069 (ii).

——— *See* "BRESAYLOR," "BREMNER," "INDIANS."

HALIFAX AND NEWFOUNDLAND *via* CAPE BRETON STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1964, 1970 (i).

——— AND ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES AND S. AMERICA STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1973 (i); conc., 4275 (ii).

——— IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 2449.

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 1920 (i).

HALL'S HARBOR, N.S., REPS. OF ENGINEERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 2031 (i).

Hamilton Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 449 ; 2°*, 1019 (i.)

HAMMOCKS AND TENNIS NETS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3401 (ii).

HARBORS AND RIVERS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1568, 4040, 4720 ; conc., 4274 (ii).

HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS. *See* "MONTREAL," "QUEBEC" and "TORONTO."

HATS, FUR, FELT, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3485 (ii).

HEALTH, ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPT. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1660 (i).

HEALTH STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).

HELMETS FOR MILITIA : Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 886 (i).

HERCHMER, L. W. *See* "Mounted Police."

Hereford Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 244 ; 2°*, 399 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 72.)

Hereford Ry. Co. and Maine Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 147 (Mr. *Ives*). Rules suspended, 4396 ; 1°* and 2°*, 4397 ; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to place on Order Paper, 4499 : in Com., 4503 ; 3°*, 4504 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 73.)

HERRING FISHING INDUSTRY, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS : presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 393 (i).

HICKORY SPOKES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3586 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER : personal contingencies, 213 (i).

HILLIKER, MR., CLAIM : Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 402 (i).

HOLLY, M., INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 4792 (ii).

Home Benefit Life Association incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 342 ; 2°*, 531 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 46.)

HOMESTEADS IN N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2023 (ii).

——— MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHERA : M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).

——— (SECOND) IN N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).

HOULD, LÉANDRE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *Pope*) 4 (i) ; seconded (Mr. *Prior*) 9 (i).

——— HIS EX.'S REPLY, 275 (i).

ASH WEDNESDAY. *See* "ADJOURNMENTS."

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).

——— WITHDRAWN, 4667, 4924 (ii).

CABINET MINISTERS, REFLECTION ON BY MEMBER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 2252 (i).

CHISHOLM, MR., M.P., DECEASED : remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3081 (ii).

COMPTON, RETURN OF MEMBER : notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTION, HALDIMAND : Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *Speaker*) read 83 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, ACCOMMODATION FOR STAFF : remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 2723 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL. *See* "COMMITTEES."

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
GOVT. BUSINESS: Ms. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursday, 1066 (i).
——— to take in Wednesdays, 2241 (i).
——— to take in Mondays, 3937 (ii).
HALDIMAND, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1402 (i).
HUDSPETH, MR., DECEASED: remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4831 (ii).
INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS AND SENATORS, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 4907 (ii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 32 (i).
KENT, N.B., REPRESENTATION: Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3722 (ii).
——— VACANCY: remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3591 (ii).
LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR, RESIGNATION TENDERED, 4355.
——— *See* general heading.
MEMBERS, IMPERFECT HEARING: remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3878 (ii).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 184, 1403 (i), 4397, 4457 (ii).
MEMBERS, NEW, 1, 1402 (i), 4457 (ii).
MESS. FROM HIS EX.: 31, 149, 275, 393 (i), 2531, 3955, 4479 (ii).
OTTAWA, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4448 (ii).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4935 (ii).
PERLEY, MR., M.P., DECEASED: remarks, 2739 (ii).
PRIEUR, ARTHUR, EMPLOYMENT BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 2022, 2185 (i).
PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION AND SENATE: remarks, 2312 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS. *See* general heading.
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE" and "PROCEDURE."
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Rep. of Com. presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4397 (ii).
——— *See* "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
RICHELIEU, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
ROYAL ASSENT: communications from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, ABSENT MEMBERS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 4935 (ii).
SHAWINEGAN SENATORIAL DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 27 (i).
SPEAKER, DEPUTY, AND CHAIRMAN OF COMS.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
——— SALARY: conc., 4273 (ii).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: reported (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
STANSTEAD, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
STATIONERY AND CONTINGENCIES OF SENATE: M. (Mr. *Rykert*) 883 (i).
——— Res. of Senate read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1341 (i).
TASSÉ, ELIE, AND L. D. DUVERNAY, EMPLOYMENT BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4026 (ii).
VACANCIES: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i), 3439, 3722 (ii).
VICTORIA, B.C., RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
WOOD, JOHN FISHER: appointment as Dep. Speaker, &c., 32 (i).
[*See* "SPEAKER, MR.," and "LEGISLATION," under "SUPPLY."]

HUDSPETH, MR., M.P., DECEASED: remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4831 (ii).

HULL, RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES: remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 303, 506 (i).
"HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEER'S REPS., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3319 (ii).
HURRELL'S AND VALIQUETTE'S PENSIONS: remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2258 (i).
HURRELL'S MILITIA PENSION: Ques., and M. for Ret., 2378 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1267 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2312 (i).
HYDRAULIC RENTS, NAMES OF PARTIES IN ARREARS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 1065 (i).
IMMIGRATION. *See* "AGRICULTURE," "SUPPLY."
IMPERIAL FEDERATION ASSOCIATION AND C. SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 886.
Imperial Trusts Co. of Can. incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Hudspeth*). 1°*, 159; 2°*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS. *See* "CUSTOMS."
INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS AND SENATORS, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 4907 (ii).
Independence of Parliament B. No. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*). 1°, 67; 2°, 2208 (i).
Indian Act (*Chap.* 43 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 153** (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°—; 2°, 4903, in Com., 4904; 3°*, 4905 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
Indian Advancement Act (*Chap.* 44, *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 132** (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 3151; 2° m., 3604; 2°, 3624; in Com., 3625, 4033; 3°*, 4034 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c* 30.)
Indian Advancement Act (*Chap.* 44 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 42** (Mr. *Doyon*). 1°, 184; Order for 2° read, 1507 (i); 2° m., 2718; deb. adjd., 2739 (ii).
INDIANS:
BLACKFEET INDIANS, CAPTURE OF WHITE GIRL: remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 815 (i).
BREMNER FURS, EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4449 (ii).
——— PAYMENT: remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4931 (ii).
——— REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. *McNeill*) 3810 (ii).
——— M. to conc. in Rep. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4732 (ii).
BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1358, 1398 (i).
CAPE CROCKER INDIANS, ANNUITY PER HEAD: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE, QUARRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 85, 247 (i).
——— AGENT'S LETTER TO COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1797 (i).
——— COST OF SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 247 (i).
——— ENGAGEMENT FOR CIRCUS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1654 (i).
——— CLAIMS FOR INDEMNITY, COR., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1703 (i).
——— MONEYS BELONGING TO: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1711 (i).
——— SURVEYOR'S REP. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1069 (i).
CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, DISTRESS; remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4926 (ii).
DINGMAN, INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Stmnt. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2160 (i).

INDIANS—*Continued.*
HALF-BREED'S CLAIMS AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY, N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100 (i).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3309 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2151, 2443 (i), 4052, 4787 (ii).
LIQUORS, SELLING TO INDIANS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 29 (i).
LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT, N.W.T., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3319 (ii).
MICMAC INDIANS, SPEARING SALMON; remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Madill*) 1656 (i).
RESERVES IN MAN.: M. for List (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514.
[*See* "SUPPLY."]
INDIA RUBBER BOOTS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3485 (ii).

Industrial Designs. *See* "TRADE MARKS."

Inland Revenue (*Chap.* 34 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 133** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 3151; 2°, 3626; in Com., 3627; 3°*, 3633 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

INLAND REVENUE:
CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 26 (i).
HYDRAULIC RENTS, NAMES OF PARTIES IN ARREARS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 1065 (i).
LEATHER INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 2258 (i).
SALT MANUFACTURERS, PROSECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 1654 (i).
TOBACCO SALES AND INLAND REVENUE ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 85 (i).
TOBACCO SEIZURES IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4171 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTION FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1121 (i).
[*See* "COLLECTION OF REVENUES," under "SUPPLY."]
INSOLVENCY, LEGISLTION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 1122 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°*, 1792 (i).

INSURANCE, SUPERINTENDENCE: in Com. of Sup., 2124 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
I.C.R. and P.E.I. RY. WORKSHOPS, PETS. *re* INCREASE OF WAGES: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies*) 1711 (i).
AMENDED FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2379, 3078 (ii).
BRANCH LINES: remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4595 (ii).
CASUALTIES, &C., AND COMPENSATION ALLOWED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065 (i).
DERBY BRANCH, SWITCH AT BYRANTON: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 187 (i).
ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 5291 (ii).
EMPLOYÉS' INSURANCE SCHEME: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1710 (i).
FREIGHT RATES ON COAL: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1796 (i), 4503 (ii).
——— ON FLOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 248 (i).
——— ON PIG IRON: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2828.
——— ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2024 (i).
HARVEY BRANCH. *See* "SHORT LINE."
MATANE BRANCH. *See* general heading.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Continued.*
PASSENGER AND MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 146 (i).
OFFICIAL CARS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1710 (i).
PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1357 (i).
PETS. OF N. AND A. OUELLET, G. VOYER, F. COTÉ, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 66, 1357 (i).
ST. JEAN CHRYSOSTOME SIDING: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Guay*) 530 (i).
STEEL RAILS, PURCHASE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2021 (i),
TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1796 (i).
PROPERTY SOLD FOR EXTENSION OF STATION AT LÉVIS: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Guay*) 531 (i).
[*See* "RYS." under "SUPPLY."]

Interest Act (*Chap. 127 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B No. 140** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3624; 2°, 4266; in COM., 4414, 4924; 3°*, 4924. (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

INTERIOR:
ALASKA AND CANADA BOUNDARY LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 188 (i).
COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR; M. for Cor., &c. * (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 33 (i), 2739.
DOIG, MRS. A. A., CLAIM FOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1486 (i).
DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).
EXTRA CLERKS IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2826 (ii).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1713 (i).
——— REPS. PUBLISHED AND SOLD: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 530 (i).
GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).
HOMESTEADS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2023 (i).
——— MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHERA: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
——— SECOND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).
IRRIGATION IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3292.
LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT: prop. M. wthdn, (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).
MCGIRR, WILLIAM, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lister*) 1065 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2668 (ii).
RANCHES IN N.W.T., APPLICATIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Trow*) 1698 (i).
RONDEAU POINT, GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2022 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 145 (i).
SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).
STEPHENSON, MR. R., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 92 (i).
SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 140, 2186 (i).
SURVEYS IN N.W.T., COST PER ACRE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).

INTERIOR—*Continued.*
TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor., &c. * (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means: remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4907 (ii).
TIMBER LIMITS: enquiry for Rets. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2674 (ii).
—— remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
—— *See* "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
UNIVERSITY FOR N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
[*See* "CIVIL GOVT.," &c., under "SUPPLY."]
INTERNAL ECOMONY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 32 (i).
International Ry. and Bridge Co. *See* "ST. LAWRENCE."
Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2825; 2°, 3155; in Com., 3157, 3600; 3°*, 3604 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 7.)
INTERPRETER, IMMIGRATION, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 2471 (i).
Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 273; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 92.)
—— *See* "FORT COULONGE."
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4880 (ii).
Inverness Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1066; 2°, 1355 (i).
IRON OR STEEL, WROUGHT, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3498 (ii).
IRON, WROUGHT SCRAP, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3558 (ii).
—— *See* "PIG IRON."
IROQUOIS LOCKMASTER, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
IRRIGATION IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3292 (ii).
ISLE AUX NOIX WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1357.
JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
JAMAICA AND CANADA, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION, CAN. REPRESENTATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
JELLIES, JAMS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3498 (ii).
JESUITS' ESTATES ACT, REPS. AND OPINIONS OF LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN: M. for copies (Mr. *O'Brien*) 95 (i).
—— RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 189 (i).
—— RET.: enquiry (Mr. *Charlton*) 2029 (i).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4173; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252 (ii).
Deb.: (Sir *John Thompson*) 4192; (Mr. *Blake*) 4210; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 4222; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4226; (Mr. *Davin*) 4228; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4236; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 4242; (Mr. *Casey*) 4243; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 4248; (Mr. *Fisher*) 4248; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4249 (ii).

JUSTICE:
ADVISORY COUNCIL, N.W.T., RESIGNATION: M. for O.C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 104 (i).
CALVIE, LEGAL SERVICE *re* PROSECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4399 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE MAN. MUNICIPAL ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 2377 (i).
—— PROVINCIAL BILLS SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 28 (i).
—— POWER OF: Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4084 (ii).
DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 33 (i).
JUDGE'S RESIDENCE IN MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2021 (i).
—— SAGUENAY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 3292.
JUNIOR JUDGE, ESSEX CO., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
LEBOURDAIS BROS., CASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 187 (i).
LEGAL SERVICES, AMOUNTS PAID FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 245 (i).
—— PETERBOROUGH FIRMS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1199, 1356, 1484 (i).
—— PAYMENTS FOR: Ques. and M. for Ret. (Mr. *Doyon*) 3292 (ii).
MOREAU, ELIE, ACCOUNT *re* QUEEN *vs.* BOUCHER: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657 (ii).
PAUL, PETER, EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
PENITENTIARIES BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 168 (i).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1486.
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2099 (i).
REGISTRY OFFICES, N.W.T., RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1681 (i).
STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, FLOGGING PRISONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1120 (i), 2826 (ii).
SUPREME COURT, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 885 (i).
THREATS, INTIMIDATIONS, &c., PROP. LEG.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1857 (i).
VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS (QUE., N. S. AND N. B.) CASES ENTERED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065 (i).
VOLLET, ROBT., EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i).
[*See* "PENITENTIARIES" and "SUPPLY."
KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS *re* BUILDING: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 97 (i).
Keefer, Hugh Forbes. *See* "DIVORCE."
KENT, N.B., REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3591 (ii).
—— Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3722 (ii).
KETTLE CREEK, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 153 (i).
KING, MAJOR R. S., ESTATE: in Com. of Sup., 4012, 4156, 4898 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1097 (i).
Kingston, Napanee and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bell*) 1°*, 833; 2°*, 1020 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 62.)

KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).

Kootenay Ry. Co. *See* "SOUTH" and "WEST."

LABOR CONGRESS (PARIS) PREPARATION OF REP.: in Com. of Sup., 4815, 4901 (ii).

LABOR IN CANADA. *See* "ALIEN CONTRACT," &c.

——— LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3661 (ii).

Labor Statistics provision B. No. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*). Res. prop., 4590; in Com., 4836; ref. to Com. on B., 4837; 1° of B., 4398; 2°, 4835; in Com., 4838; 3°*, 4846. (53 *Vic., c.* 15.)

LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2275, 2288 (i), 4653 (ii).

LAC SEUL RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4689 (ii).

LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).

Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 79.)

LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4825; in Com., 4919 (ii).

LAKE OF TWO MOUNTAINS INDIANS, REMOVAL TO GIBSON; in Com. of Sup., 2156 (i).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764(ii).

LAND DAMAGES IN YAMASKA COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 530 (i).

Lands, Dom. *See* "PUBLIC LANDS."

——— *See* "DOM." "INTERIOR," N.W.T.," &c.

LAND SLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 63 (i).

LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT: prop. M. wthdn. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).

LANDS IN C.P.R. BELT, EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 4067.

LA PASSE VILLAGE AND FORT COULONGE INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE: M. for Reps. of Engineers* (Mr. *Bryson*) 1065 (i).

LARD, TRIED, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3498 (ii).

LAURIE, GEN., MILEAGE: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3198 (ii).

——— in Com., of Sup., 4003 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4644 (ii).

LEATHER-BOARD, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3500 (ii).

——— MOROCCO SKINS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3500 (ii).

——— INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 2258 (i).

——— *See* "INSPECTION ACT."

LEBOURDAIS BROS., CASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 187 (i).

LE DICTIONAIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DE FAMILLES CANADIENNES: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

LESUEUR, P., DUAL SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 400, 504 (i).

LEGAL SERVICES, AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 245 (i).

——— PAYMENT FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 3292 (ii).

——— PETERBOROUGH FIRMS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1199, 1356, 1484 (i).

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 700, 1957 (i), 3874 (ii).

LÉPINE, L. P., APPT. AS SUPT. OF GOVT. WORKS: M. for Cor. &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).

"LES BOURGEOIS DU NORD-OUEST": in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) *on* M. for Com. of Sup., 1304 (i).

"LE VIEUX LACHINE": in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).

LÉVIS, P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 506 (i).

LIBRARIAN, SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31 (i).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 713 (i).

LICENSES TO FISHERMEN IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4569 (ii).

LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR: Ques. of Priv. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 449 (i).

——— Documents, presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 795, 1652 (i).

——— (Mr. *Rykert*) 1657 (i).

——— LETTERS, BOOKS, &c., *re* INVESTIGATION: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) 2185 (i).

——— SENATOR MACPHERSON: M. to summon (Mr. *Girouard*) 2311 (i).

——— Resignation Tendered, 4355 (ii).

——— EX-MEMBER FOR: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 4730 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATION: Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 4396 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) *re* Timber Limits, 1713 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Rykert*) 1733; M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1746; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1749; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1759; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1762; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1767; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1770 (i); (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1771; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1777; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1778; (Mr. *Bergin*) 1779; (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 1785; (Mr. *Hickey*) 1787; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 1788; agreed to (Y. 94, N. 72) 1790 (i).

Deb. rsmd. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2051, Amt., 2055; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2055; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2059; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 2064; (Mr. *Casey*) 2068; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2072; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2073; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2075; (Mr. *Girouard*) 2078; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2079; (Mr. *Colby*) 2084; (Mr. *Blake*) 2087; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2093; Amt. agreed to, 2097 (i).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Hudspeth*). 1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 55.)

LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT (1883) COST OF ENFORCEMENT, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1713 (i).

——— COSTS OF PROSECUTIONS AND FINES: in Com. of Sup., 4121, 4255 (ii).

LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 94 (i).
LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup. 1958 (i).
LOAD LINE. *See* "SHIPPING."
LOANS AND POPULAR VOTE, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 4589 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. No. 110 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 1792 (i).
LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P.E.I. : Remarks on Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 650 (i).
——— FISHING REGULATIONS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 885 (i).
LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 884 (i).
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 156 (i).
LONELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, ONT. : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2670 (ii).
LOTBINIÈRE COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 85 (i).
——— M. for Pets., Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1680 (i).
Louisburg and Richmond Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1066; 2°*, 355 (i).
LOWER TRAVERSE RIVER, PIER AND LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2019 (i).
LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 96, 123 (i); agreed to (Y. 161, N. 0) 136.
LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT, N. W. T., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3319 (ii).
LUMBER DUTIES: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bryson*) 4662 (ii).
——— AND MCKINLEY TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
——— TIMBER, PLANKS, &C. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3585 (ii).
LUNDY'S LANE, PROTECTION OF CEMETERY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1798 (i).
MACDONALD, G. L., EXHIBIT OF STONE, PHIL. EX. : in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
MACHINERY, DUTY ON MANUFACTURING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2670 (ii).
——— MINING, FREE IMPORTATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 562 (i).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1125; Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (ii).
MACKINTOSH, C. H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR OTTAWA: Introduced, 4457 (ii).
MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
MCGIRR, WILLIAM, TRAVELLING EXPENSES; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lister*) 1065 (i).
MCGREGOR'S CREEK, DREDGING, PILING, &C. : M. for Rets. (Mr. *Campbell*) 530 (i).
MCKINACK RIVER WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).
MCKINLEY TARIFF. *See* "LUMBER DUTIES."
MCLAGGAN, CUSTOMS OFFICER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 4500 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
MAHONE BAY LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 885 (i).
MAIL SERVICE. *See* "POST OFFICE."
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i), 4773; conc., 4915 (ii).
Maine Central Ry. *See* "HEREFORD RY. CO."
MALT, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 516 (i).
Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 50 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 244; 2°*, 353; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
Manitoba and South-Eastern Ry. Co's incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 794; 2°*, 1020; in Com. and 3°*, 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4825; in Com., 4919 (ii).
MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4874 (ii).
MAPLE HILL P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i).
Marriage. *See* "DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER."
MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM QUEBEC P. O.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2186 (i).
MARINE:
ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1657 (i).
"BALTIC" STEAMER, ALLEGED OUTRAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 186, 1858 (i); remarks, 3079, 4028 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4027; remarks, 4663 (ii).
"BRIDGEWATER," SHIP, SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).
BUOYS IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2185 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Colby*) 1020 (i).
GOVT. STEAMERS, CARRIAGE OF PRIVATE MERCHANDISE: Ques., 504 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1120 (i).
GREENLY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3154 (ii).
LONELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, ONT. : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2670 (ii).
MAHONE BAY, LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 885 (i).
MARINE HOSPITAL, QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 75 (i).
MARINE HOSPITAL, SACKVILLE, ORIGINAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE, GRATUITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 92 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND HARBOR FEES: remarks (Gen. *Laurie*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4893 (ii).
"QUINTÉ" STR., REPS., EVIDENCE, &c., *re* LOSS: M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 149 (i).
"ROBERTS," E. K., AMERICAN TUG: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 3291 (ii).
"ROOTH" TUG, SEIZURE, PAPERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Charlton*) 1698 (i).
SAWDUST IN OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1065 (i).
SAWDUST IN RIVERS: remarks (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4094 (ii).

MARINE—*Continued.*
SHIPPING, CANADIAN IMP., Legislation respecting: remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2381 (i).
SICK MARINERS' FUND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 519 (i)
STE. CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2021.
—— M. for Pets., Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2207 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT: remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4924 (ii).
TIDAL OBSERVATIONS IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
VESSELS LOST IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1702 (i).
ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1656 (i).
—— KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2826 (ii).
[*See* "SUPPLY, &C."]

MANITOBA:
BLAKE, CONVICT, EXPENSE OF TRANSFER TO ENG.: in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).
BRANDON BRANCH LINE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4589 (ii).
GLENBOROUGH BRANCH LINE, LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res., 4589; in Com., 4668 (ii).
INDIAN RESERVES IN MAN.: M. for List (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4825; in Com., 4919 (ii).
LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT: prop. M. wthdn. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).
MANITOBA SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4825; in Com., 4919 (ii).
MUNICIPAL ACT, DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2277 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 145 (i).
STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1120 (i), 2826 (ii).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

MARITIME PROVINCES MAILS, DELAY: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 1582 (i).

MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4890 (ii).

MASSUE, JOS. AIMÉ, ESQ., MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU: Introduced, 184 (i).

MATANE BRANCH LINE RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
—— BUILDING: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Fiset*) 3693.

MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM P. O. AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2187 (i).

May, Samuel, Relief B. No. 16 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°, 86; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 106).

MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, CHANGE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1147 (i).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 184, 1403 (i), 4457 (ii).
—— IMPERFECT HEARING OF: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3878 (ii).
—— NEW: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 1402 (i).
—— OF PARLT., LIST OF, v.

MERCHANTS' SHIPPING ACT, IMP. LEGISLATION: remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2381 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:
ADDRESS IN ANS. TO SPEECH FROM THRONE: His Ex.'s reply, 275 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE, 1890-91: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 149.
—— SUPPL., 1889-90: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii).
—— FURTHER, 1889-90: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2955.
—— SUPPL., 1890-91: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4479 (ii).
HERRING FISHERY COMMISSIONERS' REP.: presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 393 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31 (i).

METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLY TO MANUFACTORIES: in Com. of Sup., 2341 (i).

MICMAC INDIANS, SPEARING SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).

MIDDLETON, MAJ.-GEN., BREMNER FURS, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4927 (ii).
—— *See* "BREMNER FURS."

MILEAGE, GEN. LAURIE'S: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4644; neg., 4649 (ii).

Militia Act (*Chap.* 41 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 145** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 4168 (ii).

MILITIA:
"A" BATTERY, KINGSTON, OFFICERS' QUARTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1358 (i).
A. D. C., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2669 (ii).
CANTEENS AT FREDERICTON CAMP: remarks (Mr. *Gillmor*) 3078 (ii).
CAVALRY SCHOOL, QUE., OFFICERS' PROMOTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 3291 (ii).
CLOTHING SUPPLIES, TENDERS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3811 (ii).
DEFENCES IN B. C., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
DEPTL. SECRETARY, APPOINTMENT: Ques. Mr. *Lister*) 2670 (ii).
ESQUIMALT FORTIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1485(i).
FORREST, LIEUT.-COL.: remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4564, 4567 (ii).
HELMETS FOR MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 886 (i).
HURRELL'S MILITIA PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1267.
—— Ques., &c. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2378 (i).
—— remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2312 (i).
LUNDY'S LANE, PROTECTION OF CEMETERY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1798 (i).
MIDDLETON, MAJ.-GENL., BREMNER FURS, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4927 (ii).
MILITARY COLLEGE, BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr, *Platt*) 245 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 3662 (ii).
—— INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 4026 (ii).
—— STUDENTS' MARKS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Platt*) 1025, 1064 (i).
—— PROP. CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 3662 (ii).
—— DISTRICT NO. 1, OFFICERS PAY, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Scriver*) 3319 (ii).
—— PROPERTIES, &C., CARE AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
MONCTON, MILITIA CAMP GROUNDS: remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
PORTNEUF (81ST) BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 245 (i).
POWELL, COL. WALKER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 562 (i).
PROMOTIONS AND CHANGES IN DEPT.: M. for O.C.'s* (Mr. *Lister*) 3693 (ii).
VALIQUETTE AND COL. HUGHES: remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3591 (ii).

MILITIA—*Continued.*
VALIQUETTE'S AND HURRELL'S PENSIONS: remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2258 (i).
VALIQUETTE'S PENSION: remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2311 (i).
VOLUNTEER'S SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1485 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," "BREMNER FURS," &c.]
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
——— (LITTLE) SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2022 (i).
MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Madill*) 1656 (i).
MINISTERS' SALARIES AND EXPENSES: M. for Rets. (Mr. *McMullen*) 70, 101 (i).
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 3658, 4113, 4790(ii).
Modus Vivendi. *See* "FISHERIES," and "U. S. FISHING VESSELS."
Moncton and Prince Edward Ry. and Ferry Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Landry*). 1°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).
MONEYS PAID FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. *See* "LEGAL SERVICES."
——— MILITIA CAMP GROUNDS: remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALDIMAND: Introduced, 1403 (i).
MONTCALM COUNTY EXPLORATORY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 186 (i).
MONTREAL AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 2°*, 342; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4848 (ii).
——— AND SOREL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4883.
Montreal and Western Ry. Co. and the C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1°*, 638; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
Montreal Bridge and Terminus Co.'s incorp. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*). 1°*, 1019; 2°, 1506 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)
——— COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).
——— HARBOR COMMISSION, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
——— HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 884 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Curran*) 3077 (ii).
——— HARBOR POLICE, GRATUITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 92 (i).
——— P.O. DROP BOXES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3512.
MONUMENTS, ERECTION OF TWO: in Com. of Sup., 4651.
MOREAU, ELIE, ACCOUNT *re* QUEEN *vs* BOUCHER: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657, 1797 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER HERCHMER'S MANAGEMENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Davin*) 2674; neg. (Y. 53, N. 76) 3367 (ii).
Deb. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2685: (Mr. *Laurier*) 2687: (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2689; (Mr. *Watson*) Amt., 2690; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2690; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2692; (Mr. *Blake*) 2695; (Mr. *Daly*) 2697; deb. rsmd. (Mr. *Davin*) 3332: (Mr. *Macdowall*) 3339; (Mr. *Dawdney*) 3340: (Mr. *Somerville*) 3342: (Mr, *Fisher*) 3349; (Gen. *Laurie*) 3350; (Sir *John A.Macdonald*) 3352; (Mr. *Fisher*) 3355; (Mr. *Laurier*) 3355; (Mr. *Watson*) 3357; (Mr. *Daly*) 3358; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3361 (i).
——— CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 3319.
——— RES. LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1485 (i).
——— COMMISSIONER WHITE'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 2050 (i)
——— in Com. of Sup., 2345 (i); suppl., 4053 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., 1503.
Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 212; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)
MOUNT OXFORD RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3319 (ii).
MOYLAN, J. G., SERVICES ON ROYAL COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup. 4649 (ii).
MUNICIPAL ACT, MAN., DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2377 (i).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i).
Napanee, &c., Ry. Co. *See* "KINGSTON NAPANEE AND WESTERN."
NASH, COLLECTOR, EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4792 (i).
National Construction Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 184; 2°*, 399 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)
Navigable Waters Protection Act (*Chap.* 91 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 47** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 212 (i); wthdn., 4667 (ii).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 244; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)
NEW BRUNSWICK:
ALBERT RAILWAY GRANT: remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).
CANTEENS AT FREDERICTON CAMP: remarks (Mr. *Gillmor*) 3078 (ii).
CARAQUET RY. CO., GROSS EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3811 (ii).
——— FINANCIAL AID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3723 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1795 (i).
FREDERICTON AND PRINCE WILLIAM, RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*)4764 (ii).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*
FREDERICTON *viâ* OROMOCTO AND GAGETOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
KENT REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3581 (ii).
—— Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3722 (ii)
MARITIME PROVINCES MAILS, DELAY: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 1382 (i).
MONCTON, MILITIA CAMP GROUNDS: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2229 (i).
STEWIACKE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
ST. LOUIS WHARF, COMPLETION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 505 (i).
ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875.
VICE ADMIRALTY COURTS (QUE., N.S. AND N.B.) CASES ENTERED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065.
[*See* "I.C.R.," "P.W.," "P.O.," "RYS.," "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]
NEW CANAAN P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND, ADMISSION TO CONFEDERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 4927 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
—— HARBOR FEES: Remarks (Gen. *Lauric*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4893 (ii).
NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
NEWSPAPERS OR SUPPL. EDITIONS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4243 (ii).
—— SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: Stmnt. in Com. of Sup., 228 (i).
NEW WESTMINSTER REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3439 (ii).
"NEW YORK MERCURY," CIRCULATION IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Scriver*) 4500 (ii).
NICOLET, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 4588 (ii).
North Canadian Atlantic Ry. and Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1°*, 794; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)
NORTH CARLETON POINT SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1484 (i).
NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4855 (ii).
Northern and Western Ry. Co. *See* "CANADA EASTERN RY. CO."
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 55 (i).
NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, MEM. *re* DUAL LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 401 (i).
North-Western Coal and Navigation Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
—— LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4689.
N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 4373; 2° m., 4449; 2° and in Com., 4465 (ii).
N.W.T. Act (*Chap.* 50 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 10** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 38; 2° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 532 (i).
[*See* "FRENCH LANGUAGE."]
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
ADVISORY COUNCIL, RESIGNATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 104 (i).
BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
BLACKFEET INDIANS, CAPTURE OF WHITE GIRL: remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 815 (i).
BREMNER FURS, REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. *McNeill*) 3810 (ii).
—— EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4449 (ii).
—— M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4732 (i).
—— PAYMENT: remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4931 (ii).
BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1358 (i).
BRITISH ASSOCIATION AND INDIANS OF N.W. AND B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
DOIG, MRS. A. A., CLAIM FOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1486 (i).
DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).
EAU CLAIR AND BOW RIVER LUMBER CO. *vs.* QUEEN, COSTS; in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).
EXPENSES OF GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4066 (ii).
FIRE-GUARDS ALONG RY. TRACKS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T. *See* general heading.
GOPHERS, DESTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).
HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3309.
—— AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100 (i).
—— RELIEF OF DISTRESS: in Com. of Sup., 4069 (ii).
HERCHMER, L. W., COM., N.W.M.P., CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 3319 (ii).
—— *See* "MOUNTED POLICE."
HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2023 (ii).
—— MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHERA: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
—— (SECOND): prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298 (ii).
IRRIGATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3292 (ii).
LANDS IN C.P.R. BELT, EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 4067 (ii).
LEG. ASSEMBLY, RES. *re* MONEYS VOTED BY PARLT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 104 (i).
LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT. N.W.T., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3319 (ii).
MEMORIALS, PETS. AND RES. PASSED BY LEG. ASSEMBLY: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 212 (i).
MEMORIAL *re* DUAL LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 401 (i).
LES BOURGEOIS DU NORD-OUEST: in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
ORDINANCES, &c., PRINTED IN FRENCH: M. for Rets. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 83 (i).
PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2668 (ii).
RANCHES, APPLICATIONS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Trow*) 1698 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Continued.*
REGISTRY OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 885.
—— RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
—— PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, POPULATION BY ORIGIN: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
SURVEYS, COST PER ACRE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).
TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO.: M. for Cor., Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2032 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means: remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4907 (ii).
TIMBER LIMITS GRANTED BY DOM. GOVT. SINCE MARCH, 1885: M. for List (Mr. *Charlton*) 2188 (i).
—— enquiry for Rets. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2674 (ii).
—— remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
TOBACCO SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4171 (ii).
UNIVERSITY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
[*See* "INTERIOR," "INDIANS," "MOUNTED POLICE," "SUPPLY," &c.]

NOVA SCOTIA:
ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY., PAR. IN "GLOBE:" personal explanation (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 4320 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS POST OFFICE, &c., TENDERS FOR ERECTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 254 (i).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD:" Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1515 (i).
—— SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2229 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3686.
CROW HARBOR POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 400 (i).
DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 530 (i).
ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3291 (ii).
FISH IN BOND, CUSTOMS DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 248 (i).
GREEN COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 84 (i).
—— REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 3154 (ii).
HALL'S HARBOR, REPS. OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 2031 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4880.
LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 94 (i).
LOBSTER FISHING REGULATIONS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 885 (i).
MAHONE BAY LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 885 (i).
O'BRIEN, JOTHAM; Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 4277 (ii).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 402 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 505.
—— TOTAL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 187.
QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2828 (ii).
RAILWAY COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN N.S.: remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 3324 (ii).
SACKVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL, ORIGINAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
SALMON FISHING WITH NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 4399.
SHELBURNE, LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4878 (ii).
SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1681 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*
TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
TRAWL FISHING IN ST. MARY'S BAY: Ques, (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2377 (i).
[*See* "P. W.," "RYS.," "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY."]

Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
O'BRIEN, JOTHAM: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 4277 (ii).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2017 (i). 4041 (n).
OCEAN MAIL SERVICE. *See* "ATLANTIC."
OFFICERS AND INSPECTORS (EXCISE) SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2313 (i).
OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE, iii.
Official Documents Disclosure B. No, 122 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). 1°*, 2020 (i); 2°, 3203; in Com., 3599; 3°*, 3690 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 10.)
OILS, LUBRICATING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3502 (ii).
OLD RECORDS OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
OLEOMARGARINE, IMPORTS INTO B.N.A.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 122 (i).
ONEIDA, &c., INDIANS, GRANT TO AGRICL. SOC.: in Com. of Sup., 4783 (ii).
ONTARIO MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, LEGISLATION *re* FACTORIES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 90 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 123 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 2020; 2°*, 2338 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 57.)
Ontario Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bell*). 1°*, 833; 2°*, 1020 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 62.)

ONTARIO:
ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY: on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 3512 (ii).
BANK OF UPPER CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
CAPE CROCKER INDIANS, ANNUITY PER HEAD: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, DISTRESS: remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4926 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOR, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1655 (i),
CORINTH P.O.: remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 94 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 68 (i).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 149 (i).
DUNNVILLE DAM, DAMAGES AT LOOMIS' CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2021 (i).
GAUTHIER, W., FISHING LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3076 (ii).
GODERICH AND STRATHROY P.O., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2377 (i).
GREER, JAMES, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3662, 3811 (ii).
INDIANS, SELLING LIQUORS TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 29 (i).
IROQUOIS LOCKMASTER, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
JUNIOR JUDGE, ESSEX CO., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
KETTLE CREEK, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 153 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 156 (i),
LONELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE,: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2670 (ii).
LUNDY'S LANE, PROTECTION OF CEMETERY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1798 (i).
MAPLE HILL P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i),
MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Madill*) 1656 (i).
NEW CANAAN P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
OTTAWA, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4448 (ii).
PAUL, PETER, EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
PICTON HARBOR, DREDGING AND IMPROVING: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2186 (i).
RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 562 (i).
READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Burdett*) 1486 (i).
ROCKPORT POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: on M. for Com. of Sup., 4895 (ii).
RONDEAU POINT, GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2022 (i).
SULTANA ISLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 140 (i).
—— INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 2186.
TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 1712 (i).
TORONTO UNIVERSITY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1950 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 118 (i),
—— M. for Ret.* (M. *Barron*) 145 (i).
—— BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 3703 (ii).
VOLLET, ROBT., EXPENSES OF TRIAL: (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i).
WOOD, MR. A. F. *See* "CANALS."
[*See* "CANALS," "P. O." "P. W." "RYS." "SUBSIDIES."]
OPIUM, CRUDE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3503 (ii).

Orange (Grand Lodge) incorp. B. No. 32

(Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 145; 2° m., 395; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 398; in Com., 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) 1293; consdn. rsmd., 1345; Amt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) to Amt. 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1349; Amt. neg. (Y. 23, N. 124) 1353; 3° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 105.)

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE.

ORDER:
ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY: Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* not to use insinuating remarks towards other Members, 3514 (ii).
ALIEN CONTRACT LABOUR B. 8: Member called to Order, a second speech on 2° of a B. not admissible; personal explanation in Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 1246 (i).
ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE: Remarks checked and Member called to Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 1517 (i).
CONTINGENCIES, UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Retraction demanded by the Member for West Elgin from the Minister of Militia, 378 (i).
HULL RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES: Member having spoken on a question of Privilege cannot speak again without unanimous consent of the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 509; personal explanation allowed, but time must be limited (Mr. *Speaker*) 510; Member's remarks checked, 513 (i).
IMMIGRATION AGENTS' SALARIES, UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Objection taken by the Member for North York to language used towards the Member for North Wellington, by the member for East Grey, 2464; Ruling (Mr. *Chairman*) and withdrawal, 2467 (i).
INTERRUPTIONS FROM THE GALLERIES: Attention of Mr. *Deputy Speaker* being drawn to same by Minister of Militia, orders were issued to the Sergeant-at-Arms to stop such improper conduct, 1279 (i).
INTERRUPTION OF A SPEAKER: Ruled by Mr. *Speaker* that the language used by the Member for Kingston, and taken exception to by the Member for North Wellington, was in Order, said Member having no right to interrupt, 4557 (ii).
LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: Member reminded by Mr. *Speaker* that he is out of Order in going beyond a personal explanation, 185 (i).
LEATHER INSPECTION: Member ruled out of Order for discussing the subject after asking a question (Mr. *Speaker*) 2258 (i).
MISQUOTING MEMBERS: Contradicting statements made by Members and discussing same not admissible; a Member must state exactly what was said and nothing more (Mr. *Speaker*) 3942 (ii).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS, UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Member called on by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* to withdraw offensive expression, and withdrawal of same, 1118 (i).
SAWDUST IN RIVERS: Members' remarks checked by Mr. *Speaker*, having spoken once, 4113 (ii).
SUPPLY: Remarks checked by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* and Members requested to confine themselves to subject matter before the Chair, 2433 (i).
UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Objection taken by the Member for North Perth to language used by the Member for North York towards the Minister of Public Works, 1451; withdrawal, 1453 (i).

PRIVILEGE:
ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY: Remarks of Member for East Simcoe as reported in Toronto *Mail* contradicted and retraction asked by Members for West York and Centre Toronto, 3512 (ii).
ABSENT MEMBERS: Paragraph in *Empire* contradicted (Mr. *Doyon*) 84, 90 (i).
ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE: Ms. made by Members to adjourn so as to obtain a second hearing an abuse of the privileges of the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 3474, 3516 (ii).
ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY.: Personal explanation and contradiction of statements made in the Toronto *Globe*, 4320 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE: Denial (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) of statements contained in paragraph in Montreal *Herald*, 1515; Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* to confine himself to Rules and not enter into a discussion of the subject, as it might establish a precedent, 1516 (i).
GAS WELL IN ESSEX COUNTY: Remarks reflecting on a Minister and a Member made by the Member for West Elgin, read and criticised by the Member for Essex, 2252; objection taken by Mr. Laurier, the discussion being out of Order; Ruled (Mr.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*

PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*

Speaker) that when a gentleman finds his honor attacked through statements made he is allowed full opportunity to defend himself, but renewal of a discussion of a previous debate not allowed, 2258.

LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR: Correspondence in *Globe* newspaper purporting to be signed by a Member of the House and involving the names of other Members, brought before the House by Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 449, 638 (i).

LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: Personal explanation *re* paragraph in Montreal *Herald*, "Did he Shirk?" 184 (i).

MILEAGE, GEN. LAURIE'S: Personal explanation *re* paragraph in Toronto *Globe*, 3197 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Letter in *Le Canadien* reflecting on Member for Quebec West read and commented on by Member for North Victoria; attention called by Mr. *Speaker* to irregularity of discussion, 4825 (ii).

PROCEDURE:

ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR B. 8: Objection taken by Sir *Richard Cartwright* and others to 2°, after being declared carried by Mr. *Speaker*, as such a Bill ought not to be passed without division, 2194 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT: Attention of Govt. drawn to the fact that a number of Bills having passed through all stages in both Houses only a certain number received the Royal Assent, when the whole of them, according to constitutional rule, should have become law at the same time, 2594 (ii).

CEREALS, PREVENTION OF FRAUD IN SALE OF: on M. to introduce B., ruled by Mr. *Speaker* that it being a public B. notice must be given, 184 (i).

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES: As such has no power to compel a Member to withdraw offensive language, but he can report same to the Speaker if a member asks "that the words be taken down;" he can only rebuke a Member, 1452 (i).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. B. 65: Objection taken by Mr. *Mitchell* to sub-Amt. of Mr. *Tisdale* to Amt. of his own; Mr. *Speaker* ruled sub-Amt. in Order, 3455 (ii).

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS B. 5: Order for House in Com. read, and there being no motion before the Chair the Order stands (Mr. *Speaker*) 1507 (ii).

DIVISIONS, VOTES GIVEN BY MEMBERS: According to English practice and authorities a Member voting on the wrong side is not allowed to change his vote (Mr. *Speaker*) 2227 (i).

DRAFTING AMENDMENTS: Uniformity of style should be adopted by Members (Mr. *Speaker*) 3455 (ii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY DEPT. B. 116: Orders of the Day having been called, reference to previous item ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 4028 (ii).

LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR: Printing documents in Votes and Proceedings should be defined (Mr. *Speaker*) 571 (i).

MINING MACHINERY: Objection taken by Mr. *Blake* to M. to adjourn the debate, the same being a substantive motion; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not a substantive motion but an Amt. to an Amt., and although improperly worded is in Order, 1144 (i).

SUPPLY: Objection taken by Mr. *Taylor* to the discussion of items foreign to the one read by the Chairman: Point of Order sustained by the Chairman and authority quoted, 2470 (i).

ORDERS IN COUNCIL, COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).

ORDINANCES, &c., PRINTED IN FRENCH IN N.W.T.: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *McCarthy*) 83 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, COSTS, COMMISSIONS, SALES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4121 (ii).

ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824 (ii).

OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4696; conc., 4914 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1859 (i).

—— AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Hickey*). 1°*, 104; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

—— AND MORRISBURG RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4855 (ii).

—— IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2448.

—— RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4448 (ii).

—— SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP. *re* SAWDUST IN RIVER: M. for copy* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1065 (i).

"OTTER," MAIL STEAMER, CONTRACT: Ques: (Mr. *Amyot*) 123 (i).

OUELLET, N. and A., PETS. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTIES BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713.

Owen Sound and Lake Huron Ry. Co.' incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1066; 2°*, 1355; in Com. and 3°*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

OYSTER PONDS POST OFFICE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93.

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 402 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 505 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 4017 (ii).

—— TOTAL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 187 (i).

PACIFIC RAILWAY. *See* "C. P. R."

PAGANS, CENSUS RETURNS OF STE. ELIZABETH: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).

PAGE, JOHN. *See* "CORNWALL CANAL."

PAILS, TUBS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3553 (ii).

PAIRS DURING SESSION, LIST OF, viii.

PAINTS AND COLORS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3504 (i).

PALMER ROAD CHAPEL, P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 92 (i).

—— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 517 (i).

PAPER CURRENCY, GUARANTEE BY GOVT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 189 (i).

PAPER HANGINGS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3504 (ii).

PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4935 (ii).

Parliament. *See* "INDEPENDENCE."

PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).

Patent Act Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Carling*). 1°, 90; 2°* and in Com., 1076; 3°*, 140 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

Patent Act Amt. B. No. 144 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°, 3811; 2°* and in Com., 4484 (ii).

Patent Commissioner. *See* "MAY" & "SMITH."

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 496 (i), 4000; conc., 4272 (ii).

PATTERSON, A. C., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4792 (ii).

PAUL, PETER, EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).

PEACHES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3439 (ii).

PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 118 (i).

PENITENTIARIES:

BLAKE, CONVICT, TRANSFER TO ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).

—— DORCHESTER: in Com. of Sup., 3637.

—— INSPECTOR'S TRAVELLING EXPENSES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 354 (i).

—— KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 496 (i), 3643 (ii).

—— MANITOBA, CHAPLAINS' SALARIES, INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., conc., 4910 (ii).

—— MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 3637, 3999, 4650, 4910 (ii).

MOYLAN, J. G., SERVICES ON ROYAL COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4649 (ii).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 3635 (ii).

STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, FLOGGING PRISONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1120, 2826 (i).

PEMBROKE P. O. ROBBERY. *See* "POST OFFICE."

PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).

People's Bank of N.B. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 159; 2°*, 186; in Com. and 3°*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

PERLEY, MR., M.P., DECEASED: Remarks, 2739 (ii).

PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 158 (i).

PERMANENT FORCES, PAY AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).

PICKLES IN BOTTLES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3504 (ii).

PICKS, MATTOCKS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3524 (ii).

PICTON HARBOR, DREDGING, &C.: M. for Cor., Pets., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 2192 (i).

—— DREDGING AND IMPROVING: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2186 (i).

Pictou Harbor Act Amt. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Colby*). 1°, 4588; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4835 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

PIERREVILLE P. O.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).

PIG IRON AND FISHERY BOUNTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1811 (i).

Pig Iron Bounty Provision, B. No. 149 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 2828; M. for Com., 4321; conc. in (Y. 69, N. 45), 4403; 1°* of B., 4404; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4835 (ii). (53 *Vic. c.* 22.)

Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4322; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4327; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4332; (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) 4337; (Mr. *Watson*) 4342; (Mr. *Daly*) 4344; (Mr. *Casey*) 4347; (Mr. *Kenny*) 4351; (Mr. *Dawson*) 4356 (ii).

Pilotage Act (*Chap.* 80 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 161** (Mr. *Colby*). 1°*, 4924 (ii).

PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).

PLANTS, FRUIT, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3531 (ii).

PLUMBAGO: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3505 (ii).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1°*, 794; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

—— LABORERS' WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3722 (ii).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s and C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°, 3591; 2°*, 3702; in Com. and 3°*, 4025 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)

—— PET.: M. (Mr. *Bryson*) to receive, 3511 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4886 (ii).

Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Hesson*). 1°*, 561; 2°*, 1019 (i); ref. back to Ry. Com., 3322 (ii).

Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 14 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 84; 2°*, 91; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).

—— HARBOR AND KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (ii).

PORT STANLEY. *See* "LONDON."

POPE, RUFUS H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR COMPTON: Introduced, 2 (i).

POPULATION BY ORIGIN IN SASKATCHEWAN PROVISIONAL DISTRICT: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).

PORK: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3501 (ii).

—— MESS; in Com. of Ways and Means, 3562 (ii).

POST OFFICE:

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE AND MESSRS. ANDERSON: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100, 1021 (i).

—— ANDERSON'S CONTRACT: remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 3440 (ii).

—— remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4694 (ii).

BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c., (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).

BLISS' PATENT LETTER BOX: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2827 (ii).

CASCAPEDIA (PETIT) P. O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).

CORINTH P. O.: remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 94 (i).

CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 121 (i).

CROW HARBOR POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 400 (i).

DEAD LETTER OFFICE AND REGISTERED LETTERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 83 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 69 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*
ENGLISH PERIODICALS, COST OF MAILING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1856, 1918 (i).
FERNETVILLE P. O., CLOSING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
GASPE COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 193 (i).
LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE: M, for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 94 (i).
LOTBINIERE COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 85 (i).
—— M. for Pets., Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1680 (i).
MAIL SERVICE IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2668 (ii),
MAPLE HILL P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27.
MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM P.O. AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2187 (i).
MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, CHANGE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1147 (i).
MONTREAL P.O. DROP BOXES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3512.
MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3319 (ii).
"NEW YORK MERCURY," CIRCULATION IN CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Scriver*) 4500 (ii).
"OTTER" MAIL STEAMER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 123 (i).
OYSTER PONDS P. O.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93 (i).
PALMER ROAD P.O.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 92, 517 (i).
PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 158 (i).
PIERREVILLE P.O.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 69 (i).
QUEBEC P.O., SUPERANNUATION: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 60 (i).
—— ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 562 (i).
RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, INCREASED PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 187 (i).
READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &C.: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *Burdett*) 1486 (i).
REGISTERED LETTERS AND DEAD LETTER OFFICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 83 (i).
—— GUARANTEE TO PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2022 (i).
REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1121 (i).
RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1063.
ROCKPORT, DEP. POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: on M. for Com. of Sup., remarks (*Richard Cartwright*) 4895.
ST. EDOUARD MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1680 (i).
STE. ANGELE DE MERICI MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
ST. EDMOND P.O.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 91 (i).
ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
SUNDAY CLOSING OF P. O.'S: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1021 (i).
WEST INDIES STEAM COMMUNICATION, ADVTSMNT., TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Ellis*) 1713 (i).

[*See* "COLL. OF REVENUES" and "CIVIL GOVT." under "SUPPLY;" also "P.W."]

POWELL, COL. WALKER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. (*Lister*) 562 (i).

PRECIOUS STONES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3099 (ii).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i).
PRIEUR, ARTHUR, EMPLOYMENT BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 2022, 2185 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2668 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1657 (i).
BEDIQUE WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
BELL CREEK HARBOR AND BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2669 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Davies. P.E.I.*) 2377 (i).
CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2378 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1655 (i).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 1711.
COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
DUVAR, LIEUT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1485 (i).
FISHERIES INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 55 (i).
LOBSTER FACTORIES: remarks on Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 650 (i).
MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
MARINE HOSPITAL, SACKVILLE, ORIGINAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
—— (LITTLE) HARBOR SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2022 (i).
NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
NORTH CARLETON POINT SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1484.
OYSTER PONDS P. O.: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93 (i).
PALMER ROAD P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 92; M. for Pets., &c., 517 (i).
PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I. RY: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 118 (i).
P.E.I. AND DOM. GOVT. MONEY DRAWN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 27 (i).
PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
"PRINCE EDWARD," STR., DREDGING: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).
PURSE SEINES AND GILL-NETS: M. for Pet., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
ST. PETER'S BAY WHARF, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 246 (i).
SUMMERSIDE AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
—— HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 121, 247 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 96 (i).
—— WHARFINGER'S RET. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Perry*) 1149 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).

[*See* "MARINE," "SUPPLY," "P.W.," &c.]

"PRINCE EDWARD," STR., DREDGING: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).

"PRINCESS LOUISE" AND "LANSDOWNE" STEAMERS, J. O'BRIEN'S CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4930 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 169 ; contingencies, 356 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU, TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON BUILDING PLANT, &C : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 90 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 4118, 4814 (ii).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT : conc., 4274 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 475 (i).
PRINTING COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."
PRINTING, PAPER AND BOOKBINDING : in Com. of Sup., 715 (i).
PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION AND SENATE : Remarks, 2312 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : Ms. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 84, 449 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) to suspend Rules 49 and 51, 1936 (i).
——— 60TH RULE : M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1936 (i).
——— REPS. FROM COM. : Ms. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 1198 (i), 2531, 3540 (ii).
——— NOS. 155 AND 156 : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to place on Order Paper, 4906 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 168 ; contingencies, 224, 353 (i) ; conc., 4272 (ii).
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. *See* "LEGAL SERVICES."
Promissory Notes. *See* "BILLS OF EXCHANGE."
PROTECTION FISHERY STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2375 (i), 4779 (ii).
PROVINCIAL BILLS DISALLOWED SINCE CONFEDERATION, &C. : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 28 (i).
Provincial Governments, Transfer of Property B. No. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1512 (i) ; wthdn., 4924 (ii).
PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION, REPRINT OF COR., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).
Provincial Provident Institution of St. Thomas, Ont., B. No. 107 (Mr. *Ward*). 1°*, 1343 ; 2°*, 1506 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).
——— COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John A Macdonald*) 1865 ; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1868 ; (Mr. *Flynn*) 1869 ; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1873 ; (Mr. *Ives*) 1875 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 1876 ; (Mr. *Robertson*) 1876 ; (Mr. *Perry*) 1878 ; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1884 : (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1887 ; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1895 ; (Mr. *Platt*) 1897 : (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1900 ; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1904 ; (Mr. *Daly*) 1903 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 1905 ; (Mr. *Scarth*) 1906 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 1907 ; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1908 ; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1908 ; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1916 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1916 ; agreed to, 1918 (i).
PUBLIC HEALTH, PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 3655, 4001 (ii).
Public Lands (Grants) B. No. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3624 ; 2°* and in Com., 4034 ; 3°*, 4035 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)
Public Property. *See* "PROVINCIAL."
Public Stores Act Amt. B. No. 53 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 245 ; 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)
PUBLIC WORKS :
ANNAPOLIS POST OFFICE, &C., TENDERS FOR ERECTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 254 (i).
——— SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2229 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3686 (ii)
BEDIQUE WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
BELL CREEK HARBOR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2377 (i), 2669 (ii).
CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2378 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1655 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Pet. (Mr. *Perry*) 1711 (i).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOR, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1655 (i).
CONTRACTORS' CHEQUES : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 27 (i).
COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
DEPTL. REP. : presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 212 (i).
DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 530 (i).
DREDGING, &C., MCGREGOR'S CREEK : M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 530 (i).
——— STR. "PRINCE EDWARD :" M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).
——— RIVER THAMES : M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 144 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4894 (ii).
——— PICTON HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2186 (i).
——— M. for Cor., Pets., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 2192 (i).
DRILL HALL, MONTREAL : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 883 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 149 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 68 (i).
DUNNVILLE DAM, DAMAGES AT LOOMIS CREEK : Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2021 (i).
ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1120 (i).
FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER : (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1795 (i).
FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 884 (i).
GODERICH AND STRATHROY P. O., TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2377 (i).
GOVTL EXPENDITURE IN OTTAWA : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1857 (i).
GOVT. PROPERTY, DAMAGES TO BY STEAMERS, &C., CLAIMS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1488 (i),
GREEN COVE BREAKWATER REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 84 (i), 3154 (ii).
HALL'S HARBOR, N.S., REPS. OF ENGINEERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 2031 (i).
"HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEER'S REPS., &C. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3319 (ii).
ISLE AU NOIX WHARF : Ques. (Mr *Bourassa*) 1357 (i).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS *re* BUILDING : M. for Pets. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 97 (i).
KETTLE CREEK, ST. THOMAS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 153 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

LAND DAMAGES IN YAMASKA COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 530 (i).

LÉVIS P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 506 (i).

MCKINACK RIVER WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).

—— (LITTLE) HARBOR SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2022 (i).

MONTCALM COUNTY EXPLORATORY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 186 (i).

MONTREAL COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).

MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 884 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Curran*) 3077 (ii).

NEW CANAAN P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).

NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).

NICOLET, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 4588 (ii).

NORTH CARLETON POINT SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1484 (i).

OTTAWA, NEW DEPTL. BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 1859 (i).

OYSTER PONDS P. O.: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93 (i).

PIERREVILLE POST OFFICE: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).

PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).

P.E.I., PUBLIC WORKS: remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 4830 (ii).

POST OFFICES, ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1484.

PUBLIC WORKS IN P. E. I.: remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 4830 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS. *See* "QUEBEC."

QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2828 (ii).

RIVER DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 530 (i).

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 92 (i).

ST. EDMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 401 (i).

ST. HYACINTHE, PURCHASE OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4399 (ii).

ST. LOUIS (LAKE) PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).

—— RIVER WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 245 (i)

ST. LOUIS, N.B., COMPLETION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 505 (i).

ST. MICHEL WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 246 (i).

ST. PETER'S BAY WHARF, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 246 (i).

ST. ROSAIRE P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 490 (i).

SUMMERSIDE HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 121, 247 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER REPAIRS, EXPENDITURES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 96 (i).

—— WHARFINGER'S RET. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).

TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 1712 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Concluded.*

TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).

VALLEYFIED, USE OF DAM BY PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 884 (i).

WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY, PUBLIC USE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4026 (ii).

WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr, *Perry*) 1149 (i).

WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).

YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 530, 1065 (i).

[*See* SUPPLY," &c.]

PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Steamboat Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 159; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 82.)

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3654, 4001 (ii).

—— CATTLE: in Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE REGULATIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1451 (i).

Quebec Harbor Commissioners' Acts Amt. B. No. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 1506; 2°* m., 1532; 2° and in Com., 1533; 3° m., 1582; Amt. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1583 (i).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4891 (ii).

QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4890 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4500, 4563 (ii).

—— STATEMENT OF MR. MCGREEVY: read (Mr. *Curran*) 4566 (ii).

—— ARTICLE IN "LE CANADIEN": Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 4825 (ii).

—— remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4907 (ii).

—— remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 4935 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE, SUPERANNUATIONS: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 60 (i).

—— RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2018 (i).

QUEBEC:

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2671 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2378 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 517 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 187 (i).

BÉLANGER, P. R. A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 1797, 2024 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 4500 (ii).

BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).

BUOYS IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2185 (i).

CALVIE, LEGAL SERVICES *re* PROSECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4399 (ii).

CARDIN, ELPHÉGE AND JEAN, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).

CASCAPEDIA (GREAT) RIVER BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
CASCAPEDIA (PETIT) P. O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
CATTLE QUARANTINE STATIONS; Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 92.
CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE. *See* "INDIANS."
CAVALRY SCHOOL, QUE., OFFICERS' PROMOTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 3291 (ii).
CENSUS RETURN OF PAGANS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).
CHAMPLAIN DISTRICT REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2022 (i).
CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
—— VESSELS, TONNAGE, &C., PASSED THROUGH: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1401 (i).
COTÉ, F., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (ii).
C. P. R. AND RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Dupont*) 141 (i).
CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 121 (i).
CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c.*: (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
DIONNE, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2023 (i).
DRILL HALL, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 883 (i).
FERNETVILLE POST OFFICE, CLOSING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 884 (i).
GAREAU, JOSEPH, APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
GASPÉ COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 193 (i).
GOVT. STEAMERS, TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1120 (i).
GRANDIN, MGR., LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 119.
GREAT EASTERN RY., &C.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).
GREENLY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3154 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).
HEREFORD RY. CO.: M. (Mr. *Ives*) to suspend Rules, 4396 (ii).
HILLIKER, MR., CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 402 (i).
HULL, RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES: remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 303, 506 (i).
"HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEERS' REP., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3319 (ii).
HOULD, LEANDRE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).
IMMIGRANT RATES TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 186 (i).
ISLE AU NOIX WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1357 (i).
JUDGE'S RESIDENCE IN MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2021 (i).
—— SAGUENAY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 3292.
KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS *re* BUILDING: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 97 (i).
LAND SLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 63 (i).
LEBOURDAIS BROS., CASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 187 (i).
LÉPINE, L. P., APPOINTMENT AS SUPT. OF GOVT. WORKS.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
LÉVIS P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 506 (i).
LOTBINIÈRE COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 85 (i).
—— M. for Pets., Cor. &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1680 (i).
MARINE HOSPITAL, QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 75 (i).
MATANE BRANCH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
—— BUILDING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Fiset*) 3693.
MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, CHANGE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1147 (i).
MCKINACK RIVER WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).
MONTCALM COUNTY EXPLORATORY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 186 (i).
MONTREAL COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (ii).
—— HARBOR COMMISSION, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
—— HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 884 (i).
—— HARBOR POLICE, GRATUITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 92 (i).
—— P. O. DROP BOXES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3512 (ii).
MOREAU, ELIE, ACCOUNT *re* QUEEN *vs.* BOUCHER: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657, 1797 (ii).
MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3319 (ii).
NICOLET, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 4588 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 55 (i).
"OTTER," MAIL STEAMER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 123 (i).
OUELLET, N. AND A., PETS. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTIES BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
PAGANS, CENSUS RETURNS OF STE. ELIZABETH: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).
PIERREVILLE P.O.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO. PET.: M. (Mr. *Bryson*) to receive, 3511 (ii).
—— LABORERS' WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3722 (ii).
PORTNEUF (81ST) BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 245 (i).
QUEEN *vs.* BOUCHER, LEGAL FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657, 1797 (i).
RICHELIEU, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1063 (i).
RIVER DU SUD PUB. WORKS: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 530 (i).
RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Dupont*) 141 (i).
SHAWINEGAN ELECTORAL DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 27 (i).
STANSTEAD, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
SUPERANNUATIONS, QUEBEC P. O.: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 60 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE DE MERICI, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 92 (i).
STE. CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2021 (i).

QUEBEC—*Concluded.*
STE CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: M. for Pets., Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2207 (ii).
ST. EDMOND P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 91, 401 (i).
ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
ST. GERMAIN, BRUNO, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
ST. HYACINTHE, PURCHASE OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4399 (ii).
ST. LOUIS (LAKE) PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401.
ST. LOUIS RIVER WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 245 (i).
ST. MICHEL WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 246 (i).
ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1656 (i).
—— KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2826 (ii).
ST. ROSAIRE P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 400 (i).
ST. SAUVEUR FIRE, AID TO SUFFERERS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1121 (i).
—— AND "B" BATTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1200 (i).
TONNANCOURT, GEO., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
TOURIGNY, HONORÉ, M.P.P., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2377 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, USE OF DAM BY PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 884 (i).
VOYER, GEO., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY, PUBLIC USE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4026 (ii).
YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1702 (i).
YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
[*See* "I.C.R.," "P.W.," "P.O.," "RYS.," "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]
QUEEN'S COUNSEL, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1486 (i).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2099; wthdn., 2141 (i).
QUEEN'S PRINTER, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3992 (ii).
QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2828 (ii).
QUEEN *vs.* BOUCHER, LEGAL FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657, 1797 (i).
'QUINTÉ," STEAMER, REPS., EVIDENCE, &C., *re* LOSS: M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 149 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°*, 118 (i).
Railway Act Amt B. No. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*). 1°*, 1343; 2°*, 1507 (i); M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m.h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3332 (ii).
Railway B. No. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 4480; 2° and in Com., 4861; 3°*, 4821 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
RAILWAY COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."
RAILWAY COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 3324 (ii).
Railway Laborers Protection B. No. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*). 1°*, 245 (i): 2°, 3704 (ii).
RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 562 (i).
—— INCREASED PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 187 (i).
RAILWAY STATISTICS FOR 1889: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 3663 (ii).
—— presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4658 (ii).

RAILWAYS:
ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY., PAR. IN "GLOBE:" personal explanation (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 4320 (ii).
ALBERT RY. GRANT: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).
AYLMER BRANCH, C.P.R., SALE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3591 (ii).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2671 (ii).
—— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2378 (i).
BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Dupont*) 141 (i).
CANADA ATLANTIC RY. BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES VOTED: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3663 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 3319 (ii).
CARAQUET RY. CO., GROSS EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3811 (ii).
—— FINANCIAL AID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3723 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
CASCAPEDIA (GREAT) RIVER BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 3324 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1343 (i).
DERBY BRANCH RY. EXTENSION: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 514 (i).
FIRE-GUARDS ALONG RY. TRACKS, N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
GREAT EASTERN RY., &C.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2379 (i).
HEREFORD RY. CO.: M. (Mr. *Ives*) to suspend Rules, 4396 (ii).
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 156 (i).
MATANE BRANCH RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
—— BUILDING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Fiset*) 3693 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 55 (i).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., TOTAL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 187 (i).
—— COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 402 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 505 (i).
PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 118 (i).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S PET.: M. (Mr. *Bryson*) to receive, 3511 (ii).
—— LABORERS' WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3722 (ii).
STATISTICS: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4658 (ii).
—— FOR 1889: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 3663 (ii).
SHORT LINE RY. (HARVEY BRANCH): Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 399 (i).
—— SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 505 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*
SHORT LINE RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2674 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).
SNOW PLOUGHS ON GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1656 (i).
—— "ROTARY," EFFICIENCY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1797 (i).
SUBSIDIES SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 69 (i).
See ALSO:
ALBERTA COLONISATION RY. CO.
ALBERTA RAILWAY AND COAL CO.
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO.
CANADA EASTERN RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.
CENTRAL ONTARIO RY.
COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. AND NAV. CO.
ERIE AND HURON RY. CO.
GODERICH AND CAN. PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
HAMILTON JUNCTION RY. CO.
HEREFORD RY. CO.
HEREFORD AND MAINE CENTRAL RY. CO.'S.
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.
INVERNESS RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
LOUISBURG AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
MONCTON AND P. E. I. RY. AND FERRY CO.
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND WESTERN AND C.P.R. CO'S.
MOUNT FOREST, MARKDALE AND MEAFORD RY. CO.
NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.
NEW BRUNSWICK RY. CO.
NORTH CAN. ATLANTIC RY. AND STEAMSHIP CO.
NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.
NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO. OF N. B.
ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RY. CO.
OWEN SOUND AND LAKE HURON RY. CO.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION AND C. P. R. CO.'S.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND DUCK MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.
RIVER DETROIT RY. BRIDGE CO.
SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION RY. CO.
SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.
SAULT STE. MARIE AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
SAULT STE. MARIE AND HUDSON'S BAY RY.
SOUTH KOOTENAY RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. LAWRENCE INTERNATIONAL RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
THOUSAND ISLANDS BRIDGE AND RY. CO.
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
VAUDREUIL AND PRESCOTT RY. CO.
VICTORIA AND SAULT STE. MARIE JUNCTION RY. CO.
WEST KOOTENAY RY. CO.
WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY.
WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.
[*See* "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]

Rainy River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 342; 2°, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 97.)
RANCHES IN N.W.T., APPLICATIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Trow*) 1698 (i).
READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &C.: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *Burdett*) 1486 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 83 (i).
REBATE OF DUTIES. *See* "CORN."
Reciprocity in Wrecking. *See* "WRECKING."
RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION OF OLD: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (i).
RED RIVER SURVEY: conc., 4905 (ii).
REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3647 (ii).
REGISTERED LETTERS AND DEAD LETTER OFFICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 83 (i).
—— GUARANTEE TO PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2022 (i).
—— REDUCTION OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1121 (i).
REGISTRY OFFICES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 885.
—— RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
REMUNERATION GOVT. EMPLOYÉS ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4152, 4793 (ii).
REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 3802 (ii).
REPORTS PRESENTED:
ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR (Mr. *Taylor*) 3367 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Foster*) 90 (i).
BALLOT BOXES, PATENT (Mr. *Chapleau*) 4656 (ii).
BREMNER FURS AND BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS (Mr. *McNeill*) 4732 (ii).
DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP. (Sir *John Thompson*) 33 (i).
HERRING FISHERY COMMISSIONERS', REP. (Mr. *Tupper*) 393 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 26 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Deiwdney*) 33 (i), 2739 (ii).
MARINE (Mr. *Tupper*) 1020 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 275 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER WHITE'S REP.: (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2050 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Haggart*) 69 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Bowell*) 4930 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 213 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Sir *John A, Macdonald.*) 1343.
SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 118 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 26 (i).
RESIGNATION OF MEMBER. *See* "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.:
ADVISORY COUNCIL, N.W.T., RESIGNATION*: Mr. *White* (*Renfrew*) 104 (i).
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED. *See* "SELF-BINDERS," &c.
AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND: Mr. *Laurier*, 99 (i).
ANNAPOLIS P. O., &C., TENDERS FOR ERECTION: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 254 (i).
—— P. O. AND CUSTOMS BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 3686 (ii).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE AND MESSRS. ANDERSON: Mr. *Laurier*, 100, 1021 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

BANK CHARTERS, B. N. A. AND B. C.: Mr. *Edgar*, 255.
BANK OF UPPER CANADA: Mr. *McMullen*, 100 (i).
BANKS, CHARTERED, IN LIQUIDATION, NAMES, &C.: Mr. *Hesson*, 76 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: Mr. *Bain* (*Soulanges*) 517 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO., SUBSIDIES VOTED*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 3693 (ii).
BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 529 (i).
BOARD OF TRADE, QUEBEC, AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 55 (i).
CANADA AND TREATIES OF COMMERCE, IMP. COR.: Gen. *Laurie*, 3666 (ii).
CANADA ATLANTIC RY. BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES VOTED: Mr. *Bergeron*, 3663 (ii).
CANADIAN COMMISSIONERS ABROAD: Mr. *McMullen*, 100 (i).
CANADIAN FLOUR IMPORTED INTO N.S., N.B. AND P. E.I.: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 2671 (ii).
C. P. R. *See* general heading.
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH*: Mr. *Macdonald* (*Victoria*) 3319 (ii).
CARDIN, ELPHÈGE AND JEAN, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPOVEMENTS: Mr. *Perry*, 1711.
CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE. *See* "INDIANS."
CENSUS RETURNS OF PAGANS: Mr. *Charlton*, 513 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, VESSELS, TONNAGE, &C., PASSED THROUGH*: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 1401 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL MEN WITHOUT PASSING C. S. EXAM., NAMES, &C.*: Mr. *Lister*, 3693 (ii).
COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR*: Mr. *Somerville*, 66 (ii).
COTÉ, F., PET., *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.*: Mr. *Fiset*, 1713 (i).
COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Curran*, 2188 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &C.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATIONS*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 66 (i).
DEAD LETTER OFFICE AND REGISTERED LETTERS: Mr. *McMullen*, 83 (i).
DERBY BRANCH RY. EXTENSION: Mr. *Mitchell*, 514 (i).
DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED*: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 530 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL BILLS SINCE CONFEDERATION: Mr. *Landerkin*, 28 (i).
DREDGING BY STR. "PRINCE EDWARD": Mr. *Perry*, 159 (i).
DREDGING, &C., MCGREGOR'S CREEK*: Mr. *Campbell*, 530 (i).
DREDGING RIVER THAMES*: Mr. *Campbell*, 144 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD: Mr. *Bain* (*Wentworth*) 149 (i).
EGGS, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS TO AND FROM ONT. AND QUE.*: Mr. *Guillet*, 3693 (ii).
ELECTORAL LISTS FOR DOM., EXPENSES: Mr. *Casgrain*, 83 (i).
FACTORIES, LEGISLATINN*: Mr. *Lister*, 90 (i).
FERNETVILLE P. O., CLOSING: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 529 (i).
FISHING LICENSES, UNSETTLED RETURNS*: Mr. *Lister*, 1065 (i).
FLOUR IMPORTED INTO N.S., N.B. and P.E.I. THROUGH U.S.: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 2671 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

FORT COULONGE AND LA PASSE VILLAGE INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE*: Mr. *Bryson*, 1065 (i).
FREIGHT IN BOND ON AMERICAN VESSELS: Mr. *Laurier*, 99 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ORDINANCES, &C., PRINTED IN*: Mr. *McCarthy*, 83 (i).
GAREAU, JOSEPH, APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 66 (i).
GASPÉ COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Joncas*, 193 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1713 (i).
——REPS. PUBLISHED AND SOLD*: Mr. *Ferguson* (*Welland*) 530, 1027 (i).
GOVT. PROPERTY, DAMAGES TO, BY STEAMERS, &C., CLAIMS: Mr. *Cook*, 1488 (i).
GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES IN N.W.T.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 3693 (ii).
GREAT EASTERN RY., &C.: Mr. *Rinfret*, 142 (i).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Mr. *Landerkin*, 145 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY, N.W.T.: Mr. *Laurier*, 100 (i).
HALL'S HARBOR, N.S., REPS. OF ENGINEERS: Mr. *Borden*, 2031 (i).
HERCHMER, L. W., COM. N.W.M.P., CONTINGENCIES*: Mr. *Davin*, 3319 (ii).
HOMESTEADS IN THE TERRITORIES, MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHERA*: Mr. *Davin*, 1065 (i).
"HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEER'S REPS., &C.*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 3319 (ii).
HYDRAULIC RENTS, NAMES OF PARTIES IN ARREARS*: Mr. *Somerville*, 1065 (i).
I. C. R. *See* general heading.
INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE. *See* "FORT COULONGE."
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF EGGS TO AND FROM ONT. AND QUE.*: Mr. *Guillet*, 3693 (ii).
IMPORTS OF CAN. FLOUR INTO N.S., N.B. AND P.E.I. THROUGH U.S.: Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 2671 (ii).
INDIAN RESERVES IN MAN.: Mr. *LaRivière*, 514 (i).
INDIANS, SELLING LIQUOR TO*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 29 (i).
JESUITS' ESTATES ACT, REPS. AND OPINIONS OF LAW OFFICES OF CROWN: Mr. *O'Brien*, 95 (i).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS *re* BUILDING: Mr, *Dessaint*, 97 (i).
KETTLE CREEK: Mr. *Wilson* (*Elgin*) 153 (i).
LAND DAMAGES IN YAMASKA: Mr. *Laurier*, 530 (i).
LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT: Mr. *LaRivière*, 514 (i).
LAND SLIDE AT QUEBEC: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 63 (i).
LA PASSE VILLAGE AND FORT COULONGE INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE*: Mr. *Bryson*, 1065 (i).
LEPINE, L. P., APPOINTMENT AS SUPT. OF GOVT. WORKS*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 66 (i).
LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, COST OF ENFORCEMENT, &C.: Mr. *Cook*, 1713 (i).
LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE: Mr. *Kirk*, 94 (i).
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY.: Mr. *Wilson* (*Elgin*) 156 (i).
LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE, PETS., COR., &C.: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1680 (i).
LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT, N.W.T., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 3319 (ii).
MCGIRR, WILLIAM, TRAVELLING EXPENSES*: Mr. *Lister*, 1065 (i).
MCGREGOR'S CREEK, DREDGING, PILING, &C.*: Mr. *Campbell*, 530 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: Mr. *McIntyre*, 248 (i).

MARINE HOSPITAL, QUEBEC*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 66 (i).

—— EMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Mr. *Langetier* (*Quebec*) 75 (i).

MARINE HOSPITAL, SACKVILLE, ORIGINAL COST: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).

MATANE BRANCH RY., PETS., &c. *re* BUILDING*: Mr. *Fiset*, 3693 (ii).

MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM P.O. AT QUEBEC: Mr. *Charlton*, 2187 (i).

MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, PETS. AND COR. *re* CHANGE: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1147 (i).

MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON, STUDENTS' MARKS: Mr. *Platt*, 1025, 1064 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE DEPT., PROMOTIONS AND CHANGES*: Mr. *Lister*, 3693 (ii).

MINISTERS, &c., EXPENSES, SINCE CONFEDERATION: Mr. *McMullen*, 70 (i).

MINISTERS' SALARIES AND EXPENSES: Mr. *McMullen*, 101 (i).

MONTREAL COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Curran*, 2188 (i).

MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P.O., CHANGE OF NAME*: Mr. *Bourassa*, 3319 (ii).

NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.*: Mr. *Welsh*, 29 (i).

NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 55 (i).

N.W.T., RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY *re* MONEYS VOTED BY PARLT.*: Mr. *Laurier*, 104 (i).

—— ADVISORY COUNCIL, RESIGNATION*: Mr. *White* (*Renfrew*) 104 (i).

—— MEMORIAL, PETS. AND RES. PASSED BY LEG. ASSEMBLY*: Mr. *Davin*, 212 (i).

ONTARIO MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, COR.*: Mr. *Lister*, 90 (i).

ORDINANCES, &c., PRINTED IN FRENCH IN N.W.T.*: Mr. *McCarthy*, 83 (i).

OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP. *re* SAWDUST*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1065 (i).

OUELLET, N. AND A.: Pets. *re* Damages to properties by I.C.R.*: Mr. *Fiset*, 1713 (i).

OYSTER PONDS POST OFFICE: Mr. *Kirk*, 93 (i).

PAGANS, CENSUS RETURNS OF STE. ELIZABETH: Mr. *Charlton*, 513 (i).

PALMER ROAD POST OFFICE: Mr. *Perry*, 517 (i).

PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES IN N.W.T.*; Mr. *Charlton*, 3693 (ii).

PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY: Mr. *White*, *Renfrew*) 158 (i).

PICTON HARBOR, DREDGING, &c.: Cor., Pets., &c., Mr. *Platt*, 2192 (ii).

PIERREVILLE P. O.: Mr. *Choquette*, 517 (i).

PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.*: Mr. *Welsh*, 29 (i).

POPULATION BY ORIGIN IN SASKATCHEWAN PROVISIONAL DISTRICT*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS*: Mr. *McMullen*, 29 (i).

PRIEUR, ARTHUR, AMOUNT PAID AS TRANSLATOR OF H. OF C.: Mr. *Neveu*, 2185 (i).

"PRINCE EDWARD," STR., DREDGING: Mr. *Perry*, 159 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, BUILDING, PLANT, &c., TOTAL EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Innes*, 90 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS FOR: Mr. *Doyon*, 3292 (ii).

PROVINCIAL BILLS DISALLOWED SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 28 (i).

PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: Mr. *McIntyre*, 248 (i).

QUEBEC P. O., SUPERANNUATIONS: Mr. *Langelier*, (*Quebec*) 60 (i).

"QUINTÉ," STR., REP., EVIDENCE, &c., *re* LOSS: Mr. *Platt*, 149 (i).

RANCHES IN N.W.T., APPLICATIONS, &c.: Mr. *Trow*, 1698 (i).

READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &c.*: Mr. *Burdett*, 1486 (i).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 83 (i).

REGISTERED LETTERS AND DEAD LETTER OFFICE: Mr. *McMullen*, 83 (i).

REGISTRY OFFICES, N. W. T., RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES*: Mr. *Davin*, 1065 (i).

RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Fiset*, 1063 (i).

RIVER DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS*: Mr. *Choquette*, 530 (i).

"ROOTH," TUG, SEIZURE, PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Charlton*, 1698 (i).

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. *See* "MILITARY COLLEGE."

RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: Mr. *Dupont*, 141 (i).

STE. CROIX, LOTBINIÈRE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE: Pets., Cor., &c.*: Mr. *Rinfret*, 2207 (i).

ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: Mr *Beausoleil*, 529 (i).

ST. GERMAIN, BRUNO, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).

SACKVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL, ORIGINAL COST*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR*: Mr. *Somerville*, 66 (i).

—— PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, POPULATION BY ORIGIN*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).

SAVINGS' BANKS DEPOSITS IN DOM.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 29 (i).

SAWDUST IN OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1065 (i).

SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS AND MOWERS EXPORTED*: Mr. *Paterson* (*Brant*) 1065 (i).

SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C.: Mr. *Laurier*, 137 (i)

SICK MARINERS' FUND: Mr. *Flynn*, 519 (i).

SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S,, COR. *re* LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. *Jones* (*Halifax*) 1681 (i).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Mr. *McMullen*, 69 (i).

SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS: Mr. *Barron*, 140 (i).

TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR*: Mr. *Somerville*, 66 (i).

—— COR., MEMORIALS, &c.: Mr. *Wallace*, 2032 (i).

THAMES RIVER, DREDGING*: Mr. *Campbell*, 144 (i).

TIDAL OBSERVATIONS IN GULF AND ATLANTIC COAST: Mr. *Curran*, 527 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE: Mr. *Perry*, 96 (i).

TIMBER LIMITS GRANTED BY DOM. GOVT. SINCE MARCH, 1875: Mr. *Charlton*, 2188 (i).

TONNANCOURT, GEO., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND*: Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).

TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).

TREATIES OF COMMERCE, Imp. Cor.: Gen. *Laurie*, 3666 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION*: Mr. *Barron*, 145 (i).
TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.*: Mr. *Barron*, 1712 (i).
UPPER CANADA BANK: Mr. *McMullen* 100 (i).
VESSELS LOST IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: Mr. *Curran*, 527 (i).
VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS (QUE., N.S., N.B.) CASES ENTERED*: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 1065 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (1889) PRINTED OUTSIDE OF PRINTING BUREAU*: Mr. *Innes*, 29 (i).
VOYER, GEO., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.*: Mr. *Fiset*, 1713 (i).
WEST INDIA STEAM COMMUNICATION, ADVTSMNT., TENDERS, &C.*: Mr. *Ellis*, 1713 (i).
WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Perry*, 1149 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.*: Mr. *Welsh*, 29 (i).
YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE, PETS. AND COR.: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1702 (i).
YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS*: Mr. *Laurier*, 530, 1065 (i).
RETURNS: Enquiry (Mr. *McMullen*, &c.) 394 (i).
REUTER'S TELEGRAPH AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).
RICE, UNCLEANED: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3245 (ii).
RICHELIEU, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 1335.
RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1063 (i).
River Detroit Ry. Bridge Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 794; 2°*, 1020; in Com. and 3°*, 2210 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)
RIVER DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 530 (i).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4766 (ii).
"ROBERTS, E. K.," AMERICAN TUG: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 3291 (ii).
ROBERTSON, CAPT. TAIT, CANCELLATION OF LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 186 (i).
ROBICHAU, R., GRATUITY ON RETIREMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4119.
ROBINSON TREATY, ANNUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 2153 (i), 4051 (i).
ROCKPORT, DEP. POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL; remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4895 (ii).
RONDEAU POINT, GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2022 (i).
"ROOTH," TUG, SEIZURE, PAPERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Charlton*) 1698 (i).
ROULEAU'S DEBATES, QUE. LEG. COUNCIL: in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).
——— COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC: read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
——— INFORMALITY OF PROCEDURE: remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2594 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. *See* "MILITARY COLLEGE."
ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3659.
RUBBER BELTING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3505 (ii).
RULES SUSPENDED. *See* "PRIVATE BILLS."
RYKERT, J. C., M.P. FOR LINCOLN, RESIGNATION, 4355
STE. ANGÈLE DE MERICI MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
STE. CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2021 (i).
ST. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 92 (i).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Rykert*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1505 (i). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com. 4855 (ii).
——— MILLING AND LUMBERING CO. *vs.* QUEEN, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4058 (ii).
——— M. for Pets., Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2207 (i.)
ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (i).
ST. EDMOND P.O.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 91 (i).
——— ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 401 (i).
ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
ST. GERMAIN, BRUNO, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
ST. HYACINTHE, PURCHASE OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4399 (ii).
ST. JOHN AND PORTS IN BASIN OF MINAS, &C., STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).
——— DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 1972 (i).
——— VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4765; in Com., 4891 (ii).
St. Lawrence International Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER LIGHTS: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).
——— AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
——— FISHING: Remarks (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4569 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
ST. LOUIS (LAKE) PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401.
——— RIVER WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 245 (i).
——— N.B., COMPLETION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 505 (i).
ST. MICHEL WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 246 (i).
ST. PETER'S BAY WHARF, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 246 (i).
ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4653 (ii).
ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1656 (i).
——— KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2826 (ii).

ST. ROSAIRE P.O. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 400 (i).
ST. SAUVEUR FIRE, AID TO SUFFERERS : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1121 (i).
——— AND "B" BATTERY : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1200 (i).
ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4875 (ii).
St. Stephen's Bank B. No. 24 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 104 ; 2°*, 186 ; in Com. and 3°*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 3635 (ii).
SACCHARINE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3511 (ii).
SACKVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL, ORIGINAL COST : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
SALMON FISHING WITH NETS : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 4399.
——— PICKLED, &C. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3561 (ii).
SALT MANUFACTURERS, PROSECUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 1654 (i).
——— INCOMPLETE RETURNS : Remarks, 2186.
SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA (B.C.) MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1972 (i).
Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°*, 84 ; 2°*, 91 (i) ; ref. back to Ry. Com., 3321 (ii).
——— AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
——— LAND AND HOMESTEAD CO. *See* "Temp. Colonisation Co."
——— PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, POPULATION BY ORIGIN : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 159 ; 2°*, 186 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 833 ; 2°*, 1020 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 104 ; 2°*, 186 ; in Com. and 3°*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS IN DOM. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
Savings Banks in Ont. and Que. Act (*Chap. 122 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 115** (Mr. *Choquette*). 1°*, 115 (i).
Saving Banks in Quebec B. No. 154 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 4761 ; 2° and in Com., 4847 ; 3°*, 4848 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
——— *See* "FINANCE."
SAWDUST IN OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP. : M. for copy* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1065 (i).
——— IN RIVERS : Remarks (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4094 (ii).
SAW LOGS, REBATE OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3662 (ii).
SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 145 (i).
Seamen's Act (*Chap. 74 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt B. No. 135** (Mr. *Colby*). 1°, 3153 ; 2°, 4359 ; in Com., 4360 ; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Wilson Elgin*) 4400 ; neg. on a div. and 3°, 4403 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
SECRETARY OF STATE :
BALLOT BOXES, PATENT : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 2230 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) *re* Rep. of Sel. Com., 4655 (ii).
CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, WORKING : Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1021 (i).
CHAMPLAIN DISTRICT REVISING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2022 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL MEN WITHOUT PASSING C. S. EXAM., NAMES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lister*) 3693 (ii).
COPYRIGHT ACT AMT., 1889 : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 84 (i).
DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 118 (i).
DOMINION LICENSE ACT, EXPENSES ; remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4906 (ii).
ELECTORAL LISTS FOR DOM., EXPENSES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 83 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL VOTERS' LISTS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1489 (i).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to Repeal, 257 ; m., 1193 (i).
IMPERIAL FEDERATION ASSOCIATION AND C. SERVANTS ; Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 886 (i).
LABOR STATISTICS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 4590 (ii).
LESUEUR, P., DUAL SALARY : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 400, 504 (i).
——— remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1304 (i).
LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, COST OF ENFORCEMENT, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1713 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4930 (ii).
SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP. : presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 118 (i).
VOTERS' LIST (1889) PRINTED OUTSIDE OF PRINTING BUREAU : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 29 (i).
——— COMPLIANCE WITH ACT : Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 3154 (ii).
——— RECEIPT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3724 (ii).
——— REVISED, PRINTING : remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 2380.
——— REVISING OFFICERS' RETURNS : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2827 (ii).
——— REVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1357 (i),
[*See* "CIVIL GOVT.," under "SUPPLY."]
Seduction, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
SEED BARLEY, DISTRIBUTION : Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1510 (i).
——— EXPECTED ARRIVAL : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1795 (i).
SEED GRAIN ADVANCES, COLLECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).
——— FOR SETTLERS, N.W.T., PURCHASE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
SEEDS AND GRAINS, IMPORTS : personal explanation (Mr. *Couture*) 1069 (i).
SEEDS IN BULK : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3505.
SEIZURES. *See* "BRIDGEWATER," "ROOTH."
SELECT STANDING COMS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS AND MOWERS EXPORTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1065 (i).

SENATE, MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
—— MACPHERSON, SENATOR: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to summon before Priv. and Elec. Com., 2311 (i).
—— PRINTING AND STATIONERY: prop. Mess. (Mr. *Rykert*) 883 (i).
—— SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).
SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, ABSENT MEMBERS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 4935 (ii).
SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).
SHAWINEGAN SENATORIAL DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 27 (i).
SHELBURNE, LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4878 (ii).
SHIPPING, CANADIAN, AND IMP. LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2381 (i).
Shore Line Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 273; 2°*, 531; in Com. and 3°*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 94.)
SHORT LINE RY. (HARVEY BRANCH): Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 399 (i).
—— SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 505 (i).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1536; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1539; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1541; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1543; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1547; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1550; (Mr. *Kirk*) 1553; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1557; (Gen. *Laurie*) 1562; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1563 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2674 (ii).
SHOVELS, SPADES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3525 (ii).
SICK MARINERS' FUND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 519 (i).
"SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER TO REPLACE: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
SKEENA EXPEDITION: in Com. of Sup., 4057 (ii).
SLIDE AND BOOM DUES, COLLECTION: in Com of Sup., 3872 (ii).
SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2229 (i).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. No. 98 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1066; 2°*, 1506; Ms. for Com., 1965 (i), 2699; in Com., 3227; 3° m., 3319; Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) 6 m. h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 93) and 3° 3321 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 107.)
SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1681 (i).
SNOW PLOUGHS ON GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1656 (i).
—— "ROTARY," EFFICIENCY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1797 (i).
South Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i).
SPEAKER, DEPUTY AND CHAIRMAN OF COMS.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
—— SALARY: conc., 4273 (ii).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
SPIRITUOUS OR ALCHOLIC LIQUORS, &C.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 3725 (ii).
STANDING ORDERS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
STANSTEAD, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
STATIONERY AND CONTINGENCIES, SENATE: M. (Mr. *Rykert*) 883 (i).
—— RES. OF SENATE: read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1341 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (*Chap.* 78 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 118** (Mr. *Colby*). 1°*, 1792 (i); 2° m., 3186; deb. adjd., 3190; 2° on a div., 4362; in Com., 4362, 4663; 3°*, 4663 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 17.)
Steamboat Inspection Act, &c., Amt. B., No. 139 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 3512 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4924 (ii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 2019 (i).
STEAM SERVICE. *See* "VANCOUVER," "WEST INDIES," &c.
STEPHENSON, MR. R., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 92 (i).
STEREOTYPES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3508 (ii).
STEWIACKE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, CHAPLAINS' SALARIES: conc., 4910 (ii).
—— CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Laveryne*) 1120 (i), 2826 (ii).
SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 140 (i).
SUBSIDIES. *See:*
BAY OF QUINTÉ AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
BRANDON (C.P.R.) BRANCH LINE.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO.
CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N.B.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. CO.
DORVAL STATION AND RIVIÈRE DES PRAIRIES RY.
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
ERIE AND HURON RY. CO.
FREDERICTON AND PRINCE WILLIAM, N.B., RY. CO.
FREDERICTON *vid* OROMOCTO AND GAGETOWN RY. CO
GLENBOROUGH BRANCH, C.P.R.
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAC SEUL RY. CO.
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION RY. CO.
LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
MANITOBA SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.
MASKINONGE AND NIPISSING RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGE RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND SOREL RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO.

SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
MOUNT ORFORD RY. CO.
NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NANIGATION CO.
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND MORRISBURG RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.
PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.
SHELBURNE, LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA RY. CO.
STEWIACKE VALLEY RY. CO.
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.
SUMMERSIDE AND RICHMOND, P.E.I., RY. CO.
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.
WATERLOO JUNCTION RY. CO.
WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.
WOODSTOCK *viâ* LONDON TO CHATHAM RY.
[*See* "RAILWAYS," &c.]

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 184; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 3.)

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 4589; in Com., 4668; rep., 4694; M. to conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 4832; neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834; further Res., 4825; in Com., 4917; conc. in, 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 4918; 3° m., 4920; 3°, 4923 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. No. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 4762; in Com., 4848; conc. in, 4893; amended Res., 4824; in Com., 4896; 1°* of B., 4898; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

SUBSIDIES TO RYS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 69 (i).

SUGAR CANDY, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3524 (ii).

SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 140.

—— INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 2186 (i).

Summerside Bank B. No. 72 (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679; in Com. and 3°*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

—— HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 121, 247 (i).

—— AND RICHMOND, P. E. I. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).

SUNDAY CLOSING OF POST OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1021 (i).

SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1304 (i).

—— CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, QUEBEC: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 60 (i).

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Rebate of Duty on Corn, 390; deb. adjd., 393; rsmd., 451; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Short Line Ry., 1533; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566. Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) Corn Duties, 1583; neg. on a div., 1610. Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) Public Expenditure, 1860. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Govt. Business, Delay, 1937; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1049. Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) Toronto University, 1950. Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) Queen's Counsel, Appointments, 2099; wthdn., 2141. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright* and others) Can. Dead Meat Co., 2260. Remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) Load Line for Can. Shipping, 2381 (i). Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Tariff Res. (spirits or alcoholic liquors) 3633. Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) Lumber Duties, 3989. Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) Power of Disallowance, 4083; agreed to, 4094. Remarks (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) Sawdust in Rivers, 4094. Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) Jesuits' Estates Act, 4174; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252. Remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) Timber Limits, 4545. Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) Albert Ry. Subsidy, 4559. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Quebec Harbor Improvements, 4563; (Mr. *Curran*) 4566. Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Lieut.-Col. Forest, 4564. Remarks (Mr. *Beausoleil*) St. Lawrence River Fishermen, 4569. Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) I.C.R. Branch Lines, 4595. Remarks (Mr. *Blake* and others) Caraquet Ry., 4601. Amt. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) Gen. Laurie's Mileage, 4644; neg. on a div., 4649. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Atlantic Mail Service, 4694. Remarks (Gen. *Laurie*) Newfoundland Harbor Fees, 4893. Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) Dredging River Thames, 4894. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Rockport Deputy Postmaster, 4895 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1890-91, 149 (i); suppl., 1889-90, 2531, 3955; suppl., 1890-91, 4479 (ii).

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com.: 25; Ms. for Com., 160, 1533, 1583, 1860, 1938, 2099, 2270, 2381 (i), 3633, 3989, 4083, 4094, 4174, 4545, 4595, 4694, 4893 (ii).

IN COM., 162, 213, 353, 459, 700, 1095, 1267, 1303, 1420, 1568, 1610, 1920, 1953, 1970, 2141, 2260, 2313, 2339, 2383 (i), 3634, 3779, 3992, 4036, 4113, 4253, 4570, 4649 4696, 4766, 4898 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Agricultural Societies, N.W.T., 2384 (i).
Barley (two-rowed) purchase and distribution, 3999
Census and Statistics, 2386 (i), 4650 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, 498 (i).
Dairying Interest, development, 2399 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 715 (i), 3779, 4795 (ii).
Health Statistics. 498 (i).
Jamaica Exhibition, Can. representation, 4796 (ii).
Macdonald, G. L., Exhibit of Stone, Phil. Ex., 4796
Patent Record, 496 (i), 4000; conc., 4272 (ii).
Public Health, 4001 (ii).

Charges of Management:

General Vote, 161 (i).

Canals. See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Civil Government :
Agriculture Dept., 179 (i).
Contingencies :
Agriculture Dept., 473 (i).
Civil Service Examiners, 218 (i).
Dept. Buildings (care and cleaning) 474 (i).
Indian Affairs, 387 (i).
Interior, Dept., 381 (i).
General, suppl., 4575 (ii).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 222 (i).
Marine Dept., 474 (i).
High Commissioner (personal) 213 (i).
Militia and Defence, 375 (i).
Penitentiaries, Inspector's travelling expenses, 354 (i).
Printing Bureau (care and cleaning) 475 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 356 (i).
Post Office Dept., 472 (i).
Privy Council Office, 224, 353 (i).
Public Works Dept., 470 (i).
Queen's Printer's Dept., 3992 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 3993, 4570 (ii).
Secretary of State's Dept., 460 (i).
Customs Dept., 176 (i) ; suppl., 4574 (ii).
Finance (Statistical Diagrams) 4571 (ii).
Fisheries Dept., 180 (i).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 168 (i).
Indian Affairs, Dept., 173 (i) ; suppl., 4574 (ii).
Inland Revenue Dept., 176 (i).
Interior, Dept. 171 (i) ; suppl., 4573 (ii).
Geological Survey, 173 (i).
Justice Dept., 168 (i).
Penitentiaries Branch, 168 (i).
Marine Dept., 179 (i).
Militia and Defence Dept., 168 (i).
Postmaster General's Dept., 176 (i).
Interest on Deposits, calculating, 3994 (ii).
Printing and Stationey Dept., 169 (i).
Privy Council Office, 168 (i); conc., 4272 (ii).
Public Works Dept., 180 (i).
Queen's Printer's Dept., J. G. Barrette (extra services) 3992 (ii).
Railways and Canals Dept., 180 (i), 3779, 4570 (ii).
Secretary of State's Dept., 168 (i).
Civil Service List, compilation, &c., 3992 (ii).
Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food, 2344 (i).
Canals :
Remuneration to Govt. Employés for Saturday night and Sunday services, 4152, 4793 (ii).
Repairs and Working Expenses, 3865 (ii).
Culling Timber, 2343 ; suppl., 4121 (ii).
Customs :
Dyke, John, payment for services, 4119 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1420 (i).
Robichau, R., Gratuity on retirement, 4119 (i).
Dominion Lands—Income :
General Vote, (ii) 3659.
Excise :
Cullen, Patrick, extra services, 4120 (ii).
Distilleries and Factories (extra pay of officers) 2337 (i).
Fréchette, A., translation of circulars, 2339 (i).
Manager, increase of salary, 4791 (ii).
Methylated spirits, supply to manufactories, 2341.
Nash, Collector, extra services, 4792 (ii).
Officers and Inspectors (salaries) 2313 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Preventive Service, 2335 (1).
Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, &c., 2338 (i).
Minor Revenues :
Liquor License Act, 1883.
Costs of Prosecutions and Fines, 4121, 4255 (ii).
Ordnance Lands :
Law Costs, Commissions, &c., 4121 (ii).
Post Office, 2288 (i), 4153, 4794 (ii).
Public Works :
Slide and Boom Dues, Collection, 3872 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Land and Cable, 3872 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 3873 (ii).
Railways :
Repairs and Working Expenses :
Cape Breton Ry., 3809 (ii).
Forbes, W. B., Arrears Travelling Expenses, 4150 (ii).
Intercolonial, 3802 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Ry , 3808, 4123 (ii).
Weights and Measures, 2343 (i).
Kelly, M., increase of salary, 4792 (ii).
Patterson, A. C., increase of salary, 4792 (ii).
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands—Capital :
Surveys, Exam. of Returns, Printing Plans, &c., 4155 (ii).
Dominion Police :
General Vote, 494 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries :
General Vote, 2351 (i), 4779 (ii).
Fish-breeding Stations, clearing rivers, &c., 2370 (i)
Fishery Protection Steamers, maintenance, &c., 2375 (i).
Fishing Bounty, expenses *re* distribution, 2376 (i).
New Brunswick, 2352 (i).
Nova Scotia, 2352 (i).
Prince Edward Island, 2353 (i).
Protection, 4779 (ii).
Geological Survey :
General Vote, 2124 (i).
Artesian Borings, 4789 (ii).
Fletcher, Jas., services (entomological) 4789 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. :
General Vote, 2306 (i).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration :
General Vote, 2402 (i); suppl., 4001, 4797 ; conc., 4915 (ii).
European Agencies, 3647 (ii).
Halifax Agent, 2449 (i).
Interpreter (assistant) Winnipeg, 2471 (i).
Ottawa Agent, 2448 (i).
Vancouver Agent, 2472 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Agent, 2471 (i),
Winnipeg Agent, 2449 (i).
Indians :
Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces :
General Vote, 2151 (i).
Lake of Two Mountains Indians removal to Gibson, 2156 (i).
Oneida, &c., grant to Agricl. Soc., 4783 (ii).
Robinson Treaty, Annuites, 2153 (i), 4051 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Indians—Continued.
Ontario, Quebec and Maratime Provinces—*Con.* Schools, Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B., 2151 (i), 4787 (ii).
Survey of Reserves, 2157 (i).
British Columbia, 2165, 4043 (ii).
Manitoba and N. W. T., 2170 (i), 4788 (ii).
Schools, Day and Boarding, 2172 (i), 4045 (ii).
Nova Scotia, Medical Services, 4052 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 2164 (i).
Insurance Superintendence:
General Vote, 2124 (i).
Justice, Administration of:
Exchequer Court, 3rd class Clerk, 482 (i).
General Vote 475 (i).
Law Reports and Text Books, Supreme Court Library, 482 (i).
Librarian, Supreme Court, 479 (i).
Printing, &c., Supreme Court Reports, 481 (i).
Registrar, Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec, 482 (i).
Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I., salary of Judge, 3994, 4575 (ii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 711 (i).
Express Service between H. of C. and Printing Bureau, 4011 (ii).
Library, Salaries, &c., 713 (i).
Printing, paper and book-binding, 715 (i).
Salaries, per Clerk's estimate, 704 (i).
Speaker, Deputy, Salary, conc., 4273 (ii).
Thompson, J. S., Indemnity to Heirs, 4003 (ii).
Translators (extra French), 4008 (ii).
Wilson, Dr., late Law Clerk, Gratuity to Family, 4012 (ii).
Senate:
Miscellaneous Expenses, 700 (i).
Salaries and Contingencies, 3874 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Lower Traverse River, Pier and Lighthouse, 2019.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Campbellton and Gaspé, 1961 (i).
Canada and United Kingdom, 4773; conc., 4915 (ii).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 1957 (i).
Halifax and St. John, and West Indies and South America, 1973 (i); conc., 4275 (ii).
Halifax and Newfoundland *viâ* Cape Breton, 1964, 1970 (i).
Liverpool or London, and St. John and Halifax, 1958 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Steam Communication, 1953 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 1961 (i).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 1972 (i).
St. John and ports in Basin of Minas, &c., 1963 (i).
St. John, Digby and Annapolis, 1972 (i).
Marine Hospital:
General Vote, 2019 (i).
Quebec, Gratuity to Dr. P. A. Wells, 4043 (ii).
Militia:
Ammunition, Clothing and Military Stores, 1316 (i).
Armories (Public) and care of Arms, 1320 (i).
Contingencies, &c., Grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations, Bands and efficient Corps, 1331 (i).
Drill Instruction, 1320 (i).
King, Major R. S., prop. payment to Estate, 4012, 4156, 4898 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Militia—Continued.
Militia Branch and District Staff, salaries, 1315 (i).
Military Property, &c., Care and Maintenance, 1335 (i).
Military College, Kingston, 1337 (i); conc., 4273 (ii).
Monuments, erection of two, 4651 (i).
Permanent Forces, Pay and Maintenance, 1341 (i).
Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 1335 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Banff Hot Springs, Roads and Bridges, 3658 (ii).
B.C. *vs.* Attorney General of Can., Costs of Appeal, 4118 (ii).
Cartwright's Cases, Aid to publish, 3658 (ii).
Commercial Agencies, 3658 (ii),
"Cruiser," Govt. Yacht, repairs, &c., 4118 (ii).
Desjardins' "Débats Parlementaires de Québec," 4113 (ii).
Dictionnaire Généalogique de l'Abbé Tanguay, 3659 (ii).
Eau Clair and Bow River Lumber Co. *vs.* Queen, Costs, 4060 (ii).
Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, 3658 (ii).
Gophers, N.W.T., destruction, 4790 (ii).
Half-breeds, Relief of Distress in N.W.T., 4069 (ii).
Indians of N.W. and B.C., Grant to Supplement Vote by British Association, 4167 (ii).
Labor Congress (Paris) preparation of Rep., 4815, 4901 (ii).
Lands in C.P.R. Belt, Examination, 4067 (ii).
"Le Vieux Lachine," 4791 (ii).
"Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Canadiennes," 4116 (ii).
"Les Bourgeois du Nord-Ouest," 4791 (ii).
N.W.T., Expenses of Govt., 4066 (ii).
Old Records of Can., 4791 (ii).
Orders in Council, Collection, 3658 (ii).
Printing Bureau, additional Plant, 4118, 4814; conc., 4274 (ii).
Records, classification of Old, 4118 (ii).
Rouleau's Debates Quebec Legis. Council, 4791 (ii).
Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 3659 (ii).
Seed Grain Advances, Collection, 4060 (ii).
Skeena Expedition, 4057 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. *vs.* Queen, Costs, 4058 (ii).
Taschereau's Work on "Criminal Law," 4069 (ii).
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 2345 (i); suppl., 4053 (ii).
North-West Territories. See "Government."
Ocean and River Service:
Canadian Registration of Shipping, 2017 (i).
Princess Louise and *Lansdowne*, J. O'Brien's claim, 4041 (ii).
Quebec River Police, 2018 (i).
Sir James Douglas, steamer to replace, 4779 (ii).
Tidal Observations, 4041 (ii).
Open Account:
Seed-Grain for Settlers in N. W. T., Purchase and Supply, 4167 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 3646 (ii).
Blake, Convict, expenses of transfer to England, 3999 (ii).
Dorchester, 3637 (ii).
Kingston, 496 (i) 3634 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Penitentiaries—Continued.
Manitoba, 3637 (ii).
Chaplains' salaries, increase: conc., 4910 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 4650 (ii).
Stoney Mountain, conc., 4910 (ii).
Regina Jail, 3647 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3635 (ii).
Moylan, J. G., services on Royal Commission, 4649 (ii).
Pensions:
Compensation in lieu of Land, 1267 (i).
Police. See "Dominion Police."
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital:*
Cape Tormentine Harbor, 1098 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1105 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, 1097 (i).
Ottawa, additional Building, 4696; conc., 4914 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River, 1095 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Improvement of Ship Channel, 1099 (i).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia, 1443 (i).
Manitoba, 1439 (i), 4038, 4719 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1111 (i), 4700 (ii).
North-West Territories, 1443 (i), 4039, 4719 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1106, 1443 (i), 4036, 4698 (ii).
Ontario, 1437 (i), 4036, 4702 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 4700 (ii).
Public Buildings generally, 1443 (i).
Quebec, 1112 (i), 4036, 4702 (ii).
Dredging:
Manitoba, 1648 (i).
Maritime Provinces (new plant) 4729 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1631 (i).
Experimental Farm, 2383 (i).
Harbors and Rivers:
British Columbia, 4728 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers generally, 1630 (i), 4166 (ii).
Manitoba, 1627 (i), conc; 4915 (ii).
Maritime Provinces generally, 1615 (i), 4040 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1610 (i), 4726 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1568 (i), 4720 (ii).
Ontario, 1617 (i), 4040, 4727; conc., 4274 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1569 (i), 4721 (ii).
Quebec, 4040, 4726 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 1651 (i).
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1455 (i).
Roads and Bridges, 4766 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, 1648 (i), 4772 (ii).
British Columbia, 4773 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 4041 (ii).
Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 3657 (ii).
Chatham, N.B., 4001 (ii).
Grosse Isle, 3654 (ii).
Public Health, precautionary measures, 3655 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 3654 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville, 4655; conc., 4913 (ii).

*See "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Income—Continued.
Chambly, 2288 (i).
Lachine, 2288 (i), 4653 (ii).
St. Peter's, 4654 (ii).
Welland, 4654 (ii).
Railways:
Surveys and Inspections, 4021 (ii).
Special Car for His Ex., 4021 (ii).
Concurrence, 4911 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals:
Cornwall, 2275 (i).
Lachine, 2275 (i).
Murray, 2277 (i).
St. Peter's, 4653 (ii).
Tay, 2288 (i), 4652 (ii).
Trent River Navigation, 2277 (i).
Welland, 2277 (i).
Railways:
Canadian Pacific Ry., construction, 4013, 4653 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry., 4019 (ii).
Eastern Extension Ry., 1936 (i).
Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
Dartmouth Branch, 4014 (ii).
Halifax, increased accommodation, 1920 (i).
Moncton, increased accommodation, 4014 (ii).
Montreal and European Short Line Ry., 4796.
St. Charles Branch, 4014 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., 1933 (i), 4017 (ii).
Statistics. See "Arts, Agriculture," &c.
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation, 1304 (i).
Superintendence of Insurance. See "Insurance."
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 2019 (i).
Territorial Accounts, 4253 (ii).
Unprovided Items, 4156 (ii).
CONCURRENCE:
Can. and United Kingdom Mail Service, 4915 (ii).
Carillon and Grenville Canals (repairs) 4913 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, Ont., 4274 (ii).
Halifax and St. John and W. Indies and S. America, 4275 (ii).
Immigration, suppl., 4915 (ii).
Military College, Kingston, 4273 (ii).
Ottawa, additional building, 4914 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 4272 (ii).
Patent Record, 4272 (ii).
Printing Bureau, including Electric Light Plant, 4274 (ii).
Railways and Canals (Income) 4911 (ii).
Red River Survey, 4915 (ii).
Speaker's (Deputy) salary, 4273 (ii).
Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Chaplains' salaries, 4910 (ii).

Supply B. No. 158 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. 4916; 1° of B., 2°*, 3°*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. No. 129 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2595; 2°* and in Com., 3160; 3°*, 3161 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

* For Repairs and Working Expenses, *see* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPREME COURT LIBRARY, LAW REPORTS AND TEXT BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
SUPREME COURT REPS., PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
SUPREME COURT, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 885 (i).
SURGICAL BELTS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3233 (ii).
—— INSTRUMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3487 (ii).
SURVEY AND INSPECTION OF CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
—— IN N. W. T., COST PER ACRE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).
—— OF INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 2157.
TARIFF, THE. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
—— RES., SPIRITS OR ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3633 (ii).
TASCHEREAU'S WORK ON "CRIMINAL LAW": in Com. of Sup., 4069 (ii).
TASSÉ, ELIE, AND L. D. DUVERNAY, EMPLOYMENT BY H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4026 (ii).
TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2288 (i), 4652 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 1648 (i), 3873, 4041, 4772 (ii).
—— LAND AND CABLE: in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).
—— *See* "CAPE BRETON RY."
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824; in Com., 4896 (ii).
TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
—— M. for Cor., Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2032 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4907 (ii).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4253 (ii).
Territories Real Property Act (*Chap.* 51 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 131** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2914; 2° m., 3198: wthdn., 4924 (ii).
THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).
—— DREDGING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Campbell*) 144 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4894 (ii).
THOMPSON, J. S., INDEMNITY TO HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).
Thousand Islands Bridge and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 94 (Mr. *Bell*). 1°*, 833; 2°*, 1020 (i).
THREATS, INTIMIDATIONS, &c., PROP. LEG.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1857 (i).
THREE PER CENT. LOAN OF 1888: Ques. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 27 (i).
TIDAL OBSERVATIONS IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 96 (i).
WHARFINGER, RETS. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°*, 212; 2°*, 273; in Com. and 3°*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 56.)
TIMBER LIMITS: enquiry for Rets (Mr. *Charlton*) 2674 (ii).
—— GRANTED BY DOM. GOVTS. SINCE MARCH, 1885: M. for List (Mr. *Charlton*) 2188 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
—— *See* "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
TOBACCO, NATIVE GROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 2229 (i).
—— SALES AND INLAND REVENUE ACT AMT: Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 85 (i).
—— SEIZURES, IN N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4171.
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824; in Com., 4896 (ii).
TONNANCOURT, GEO., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
Toronto Board of Trade B. No. 109 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1420; 2°*, 1506; in Com. and 3°*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 39.)
—— HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 1712 (i).
Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trusts B. No. 113 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1581; 2°*, 1610; in Com. and 3°*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 40.)
—— UNIVERSITY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
TOURIGNY, HONORÉ, M.P.P., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2377 (i).
TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
—— LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3654 (ii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 26 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2312 (i).
Trade Combines. *See* "COMBINATIONS"
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Carling*). 1°*, 90; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1076 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 14.)
TRANSLATORS, EXTRA, IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).
TRAWL FISHING IN ST. MARY'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2377 (i).
TREATIES OF COMMERCE, COMS. BETWEEN H. M.'S GOVT. AND DOM. GOVT.: M. for copies (Gen. *Laurie*) 3666 (ii).
TREES AND NURSERY STOCK: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3460 (ii).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 3703 (ii).
—— COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 118 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 145 (i).
TRUNKS, VALISES, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3528 (ii).
TUG "ROOTH." *See* "ROOTH."

TWINE, HARVEST BINDING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3542 (ii).
UMBRELLAS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3546.
UNIVERSITY FOR N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (ii).
UPPER CANADA BANK: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
U.S. Fishing Vessels and "Modus Vivendi" B. No. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 3153; 2°, 3593; in Com., 3595, 3876; 3°*, 3878 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
U.S. VESSELS. *See* "AMERICAN."
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 83 (i), 3439, 3722, 4396 (ii).
VALIQUETTE'S PENSION: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2311 (i).
—— AND HURRELL'S PENSIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2258 (i).
—— AND COL. HUGHES: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3591 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD, USE OF DAM BY PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 884 (i).
VANCOUVER AND JAPAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 86 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2472 (ii).
Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co. *See* "MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO."
VESSELS LOST IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
VICE-ADMIRALTY COURT (P.E.I.) SALARY OF JUDGE: *in Com. of Sup., 3994, 4575 (ii).*
—— (QUE., N.S. AND N.B.) CASES ENTERED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065 (i).
—— REGISTRAR: in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 84 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 722; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
VICTORIA, B. C., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2471;
VICTORIA, B. C., RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Dawson*) 1°*, 2097; 2°*, 2338 (i); in Com., 3231, 3622; 3°*, 3623 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
VOLLET, ROBT., EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i).
VOLUNTEERS' SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1485 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (1889) PRINTED OUTSIDE OF PRINTING BUREAU: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 29 (i).
—— REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1357 (i).
—— PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 2380 (i).
—— REVISING OFFICERS' RETURNS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2827 (ii).
—— COMPLIANCE WITH ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 3154 (ii).
—— RECEIPT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3724 (ii).
VOYER, GEO., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
Walker, Emily. *See* "DIVORCE."
WATCHES, CASES, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3552 (ii).
WATERLOO JUNCTION RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4853 (ii).
WAYS AND MEANS: prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).
—— BUDGET, THE: Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii).
—— Ms. for Com., 3081, 3208, 3233, 3384, 3460, 3523, 3724, 4480, 4910, 4916 (ii).
Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2566; (Mr. *Colby*) 2585; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2596; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 2616; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2634; (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 2656; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2645; (Mr. *Brown*) 2767; (Mr. *Flynn*) 2782; (Mr. *Hesson*) 2787; (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2807; (Mr. *McKeen*) 2818; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2829; (Gen. *Laurie*) 2845; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2853; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2856; (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 2876; (Mr. *MacMillan, Huron*) 2878; (Mr. *Fisher*) 2892; (Mr. *Turcot*) 2903; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2917; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2930; (Mr. *Watson*) 2951; (Mr. *Porter*) 2958; (Mr. *Ellis*) 2970; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2978; (Mr. *Daly*) 2988; (Mr. *Semple*) 3001; (Mr. *Ward*) 3008; (Mr. *Cameron*) 3012; (Mr. *Barron*) 3015; (Mr. *Masson*) 3022; (Mr. *Hall*) 3030; (Mr. *Platt*) 3030; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3044; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3055; (Mr. *Ross*) 3059; (Mr. *Davin*, 3069 (ii).
TARIFF CHANGES:
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]
(Acetic and pyroligneous acid, &c.) 3098; (Acid, phosphate) 3099; (Advertising pamphlets, &c.) 3243; (Animals, living) 3099, 3104, 3208, 4480; (Apples) 3402; (Axle grease) 3233; (Bank notes) 3243; (Beans, Tonquin) 3584; (Blacking, &c.) 3243; (Bookbinders' tools and implements) 3244; (Boots and shoes) 3561; (Braces or suspenders) 3244; (Brass for printers' rules) 3244; (Builders', &c., hardware) 3486; (Buttons, vegetable ivory, &c.) 3384; (Cabinets of coins, &c.) 3584; (Chalk-stone, china, &c.) 3584; (Clocks and clock cases) 3388; (Clothing, ready made, &c.) 3554; (Cocoa paste, &c.) 3390; (Collars, cotton, &c.) 3390, 3401; (Colors, dry) 3503; (Corn, Indian) 3584, 3588; (Corset clasps, &c.) 3485; (Cotton cordage, &c.) 3392; (Cotton denims, &c.) 3400; (Cotton twine) 3541; (Drain pipes, &c.) 3401; (Ether, sulphuric) 3558; (Fancy workboxes) 3244; (Feathers) 3225; (Feathers, ostrich) 3402; (Ferro-manganese) 3486; (Fibre ware, indurated, &c.) 3554; (Fish hooks, nets, &c.) 3585; (Geographical, &c., maps and globes) 3243; (Gloves and mitts) 3484; (Hammocks and tennis nets, &c.) 3401; (Hats, fur, felt, &c.) 3485; (Hickory spokes) 3586; (India rubber boots, &c.) 3485; (Iron or steel, wrought, &c.) 3498; (Iron, wrought, scrap, &c.) 3558; (Jellies, jams, &c.) 3498; (Lard, tried, &c.) 3498; (Leather board, &c.) 3500; (Leather, Morocco skins) 3500; (Lumber, timber, planks, &c.) 3585; (Newspapers or Suppl. editions, &c.) 4243; (Oils, lubricating) 3502; (Opium, crude) 3503; (Pails, tubs, &c.) 3553; (Paints and colors) 3504; (Paper hanging) 3504; (Peaches) 3439; (Pickles, in bottles) 3504; (Picks and mattocks, &c.) 3524; (Plants, fruit, &c.) 3531; (Plumbago) 3505; (Pork) 3501; (Pork, mess) 3562; (Precious stones) 3099; (Rice, uncleaned) 3245; (Rubber belting) 3505; (Saccharine) 3511; (Salmon, pickled, &c.) 3561;

WAYS AND MEANS—*Continued.*

TARIFF CHANGES—*Continued.*

(Seeds, in bulk) 3505; (Shovels, spades, &c.) 3525; (Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, &c.) 3725; (Stereotypes, &c.) 3508; (Sugar candy, &c.) 3524; (Surgical belts, &c.) 3233; (Surgical instruments, &c.) 3487; (Trees and nursery stock) 3460; (Trunks, valises, &c.) 3528; (Twine, harvest binding) 3542; (Umbrellas, &c.) 3546; (Watches, cases, &c.) 3552; (Wheat flour) 3269; (Woollen manufactures) 3556; (Yeast, compressed) 3556 (ii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 2343 (i).

——— INSPECTION FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1121 (i).

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "SUPPLY."

——— REP. OF MR. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 885 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) to lay on Table, 1515 (i).

WELLS, P. A., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 4043.

WEST INDIA STEAM COMMUNICATION, ADVTSMNT., TENDER, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Ellis*) 1713 (i).

West Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 449; 2°*, 679 (i).

WESTERN UNION TEL. CO. *See* "CAPE BRETON."

WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY, PUBLIC USE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4026 (ii).

WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATER, P.E.I., EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Perry*) 1149 (i).

WHEAT FLOUR: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3269.

WILSON, DR., LATE LAW CLERK, GRATUITY TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 155 (Mr. *Daly*). Rules suspended, 4821; 1°* and 2°*, 4822; in Com. and 3°*, 4906; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4930 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 80.)

WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2449 (ii),

WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).

WOOD, Mr. A. F. *See* "WELLAND CANAL."

WOOD, JOHN FISHER, APPOINTMENT AS DEP. SPEAKER, &c., 32 (i).

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. No. 156 (Mr. *Hesson*). Rules suspended, 4846; 1° and 2° on a div., 4846; in Com. and 3°*, 4906 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 83.)

WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).

WOODSTOCK *viâ* LONDON TO CHATHAM RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res., 4762; in Com., 4855 (ii).

Wrecking and Towing Vessels, &c. (Reciprocity) B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 26; 2° called, 146 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3704 (ii).

Wrecking and Towing Privileges (U.S. in Can. Waters) B. No. 3 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°* 26 (i); Order for 2° dschgd.

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Canadian Waters B. No. 4 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 26 (i).

WOOLLEN MANUFACTURES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3556 (ii).

YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1702 (i).

YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 530, 1065.

YEAST, COMPRESSED: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3556 (ii).

York County incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 184; 2°, 352 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic., c.* 41.)